

ALEXANDER FEDOROV

**Record holders of the banned
Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the
mirror of film criticism and
viewers' opinions**

Fedorov, A. Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: "Information for all". 2021. 102 p.

The monograph provides a wide panorama of the opinions of film critics and viewers about full-length feature Soviet films (1951-1991), which were banned for a long time (over five years) from being shown in cinemas and on television or stopped while filming.

For higher education teachers, students, graduate students, researchers, film critics and historians, journalists, as well as a wide range of readers interested in the history of cinematography, the problems of cinema, film criticism and film sociology.

COPYRIGHT © 2021 BY ALEXANDER FEDOROV

1954ALEX@MAIL.RU

ALL RIGHT RESERVED.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 2 1

FEDOROV, ALEXANDER. 1954-.

RECORD HOLDERS OF THE BANNED SOVIET CINEMA (1951-1991) IN THE MIRROR OF
FILM CRITICISM AND VIEWERS' OPINIONS /ALEXANDER FEDOROV.

INCLUDES BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.

1. SOVIET MOVIES. 2. BANNED FILMS. 3. FILM STUDIES. 4. CINEMA. 5. USSR. 6. FILM
CRITICISM. 7. SCREEN. 8. IDEOLOGY. 9. VIEWERS. 10. OPINIONS. 11. RUSSIA. 12. FILM
HISTORY. 13. RUSSIAN CINEMA. 14. AUDIENCE. 15. JOURNALS.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
1. Record holders of the banned Soviet feature films (1951-1991), who have been on the "shelf" for over five years or stopped while filming.....	9
2. Soviet full-length feature films (1951-1991), released only to the republican film distribution	69
Appendices	73
Stereotypes of the Soviet cinematographic image of the war and Valentin Vinogradov's film "Eastern Corridor" (1966)	74
Alexander Ivanov: "How I played a major role in the destroyed movie "The Moment of Truth" ("In August of 1944")"	81
Filmography	86
About the author	93
Refefence	97

Introduction

The monograph provides a wide panorama of the opinions of film critics and viewers about full-length feature Soviet films (1951-1991), which were banned for a long time (over five years) from being shown in cinemas and on television or stopped while filming.

The choice of just such a time interval (1951-1991) was due to the fact that in 1995 the book "Seized Movies" of Y. Margolit and V. Shmyrov was published, which gives a wide panorama of the banned and lost Soviet films of the 1920s – 1940s years (Margolit, Shmyrov, 1995).

Certain parts of the text of the book "Record holders of the Forbidden Soviet Cinema (1951-1991) in the Mirror of Film Criticism and Viewers' Opinions" were preliminarily tested on Yandex platforms, the portals "Kinopressa.ru", "Kino-teater.ru" and Facebook (where the author often received good corrections and comments; in particular, I thank Sergey Kudryavtsev and Igor Arkadiev for constructive comments).

Unfortunately, the number of viewers for the first year of demonstration is not available for all Soviet feature films. The number of millions of viewers in the first year of film distribution is given, according to a number of sources (Belenky, 2019; For Success!, 1967; 1968; Furikov, 1990; Kudryavtsev, 1998; What viewers are watching, 1987; 1988; 1989, Zemlyanukhin, Segida, 1996, etc.).

Fragments of viewers' reviews on the portals Kino-teatr.ru, Kinopoisk, etc. are used to illustrate the views of the audience about certain films.

This book includes only full-length feature films, since the banned Soviet short films (for example, "The Dinner Party" by Friedrich Ermler, "Entering the Sea" by Leonid Osyka, "Angel" by Andrey Smirnov, "Homeland of Electricity" by Larisa Shepitko), animation, documentaries – topic for a separate research...

I also did not include in this publication the full-length feature films, which were initially released in wide cinema distribution, but then for various reasons (changes in the political and other conditions, bureaucratic voluntarism, emigration of directors or leading actors, etc.) were removed from the screens ("Silver dust" by A. Room, "49 days" , "Lebedev against Lebedev" by G. Gabai, etc.).

Based on the criteria of a real exit on the Soviet screens of the 1950s – 1970s, it was necessary to refuse to include such films as "Man from Nowhere", "Thirty-three", "The Source", "The Last Swindler", "Short Meetings", "Boy and Girl" , "Adventures of a Dentist", "Asya's Happiness" ("The Story of Asya Klyachina, Who Loved, But Did Not Marry"), "Pervorossians", "Ave, vita!", "The way home", "We and our Mountains", "Hold on to the clouds" , "Ivanov boat" , "Long farewell" , "Love" , "Among gray stones" , "The Color of the Pomegranate" , "Plea" , "Autumn" , "Mirror" , "Stalker" and others, which, albeit the second or third screen (often in small circulation and for a short time), were still released in Soviet film distribution.

The book also did not include such landmark films for Soviet cinema as "I am twenty years old" (1962, film distribution – 1965) and "Andrei Rublev" (1966, film distribution – 1971), "My friend Ivan Lapshin" (1982, film distribution – 1985) , "Repentance" (1984, film distribution – 1987), released 3-5 years after their filming.

The list of selected films – "shelf" record holders – was compiled on the assumption that they were not available to viewers for over five years (quite often this kind of prohibition lasted for two decades).

In the course of writing this book, it turned out that sometimes the well-established information about the total prohibition of one or another Soviet film turned out to be false.

So in many sources (Wikipedia, the portals "Kino-teater.ru", "Kinopoisk", etc.) it is still asserted that the drama of Kira Muratova "Long Farewell" (1971) did not appear on the

all-Union screen, since it was banned and lay on the "shelf" until 1987 perestroika. Similar information is contained even in such authoritative publications as "Our Cinema" (Kudryavtsev, 1998: 55), "Home Cinematheque. National cinema 1918-1996" (Zemlyanukhin, Segida, 1996: 127), "Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia" (Cinema of Russia..., 2010: 330).

However, it is not. Here is what Natalya Ryazantseva, the author of the script for "Long Farewell", writes about this: "The picture came out in a small number of copies. Thanks to Gerasimov. And then she was suddenly removed from the screen in all cinemas by order. It did not last long ... There were more than five hundred copies" (Ryazantseva, 2008).

However, "Long Farewell", apparently, was at the box office in 1971 not a day or two, but a much longer period, since as a result of a survey of readers of the magazine "Soviet Screen" this picture by Kira Muratova was recognized as the worst film of the year: 27.3 % of the viewers who saw him recognized him as bad, 7.3% – weak, 30.9% – mediocre, 21.8% – good and only 7.2% – excellent (Competition-71. Results, 1972: 19).

Thus, "Long Farewell" was in the Soviet film distribution in 1971, and printed in not such a small circulation – over 500 copies (by the way, in the reference book "Home Cinematheque. National Cinema 1918-1996" it is noted that the circulation of this picture was 535 copies, but at the same time, as I have already indicated above, it is erroneously asserted that, despite this, the film was not released in the 1970s) (Zemlyanukhin, Segida, 1996: 127).

But the circulation of 500-535 copies is quite comparable with the circulation figures of such famous films as "Tenderness" by E. Ishmukhamedov (508 copies and 9.3 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas), "Girl and Echo" by A. Zhebrunas (501 copy and 5.8 million viewers), "I come from childhood" by V. Turov (504 copies and 7.6 million viewers), "I am 20 years old" by M. Khutsiev (535 copies and 8.8 million viewers per episode), "Blue Notebook" by L. Kulidzhanov (483 copies and 8.5 million viewers), "A plot for a short story" by S. Yutkevich (420 copies and 8.1 million viewers), "Steppe" by S. Bondarchuk (552 copies and 3.2 million viewers), "The Woodpecker Doesn't Have a Headache" by D. Asanova (544 copies and 6.6 million viewers), "Flights in Dreams and in Reality" by R. Balayan (502 copies and 6.4 million viewers), "The Fox Hunt" by V. Abdrashitov (499 copies and 5.9 million viewers), "Valentina" by G. Panfilov (496 copies and 5.4 million viewers), "The Voice" by I. Averbakh (533 copies and 2.3 million viewers).

And this is much more circulation of such outstanding films as "July Rain" by M. Khutsiev (164 copies and 3 million viewers), "Long Happy Life" by G. Shpalikov (89 copies and 1.5 million viewers), "Adventures of a Dentist" by E. Klimov (78 copies and 0.5 million viewers), "Pervorossians" by E. Shifers and A. Ivanov (32 copies and 0.5 million viewers), "Andrei Rublev" by A. Tarkovsky (277 copies and 2.9 million viewers), "Ivan's boat" by M. Osepian (197 copies and 1.0 million viewers at the box office in 1974), "There lived a Songbird" by O. Ioseliani (320 copies and 2.6 million viewers), "Pirosmani" by G. Shengelayi (209 copies and 1.5 million viewers), "Plea" by T. Abuladze's (179 copies and 1.2 million viewers), "The Color of the Pomegranate" by S. Parajanov (143 copies and 1.1 million viewers), "Sing a song, poet..." by S. Urusevsky (265 copies and 2.2 million viewers), "Autumn" by A. Smirnov (261 copies, 9.8 million viewers), "Mirror" by A. Tarkovsky (84 copies and 2.2 million viewers), "Stalker" by A. Tarkovsky (193 copies and 4.3 million viewers), "Funny People!" by M. Schweitzer (215 copies and 1.6 million viewers), "Farewell" by E. Klimov (270 copies and 1.3 million viewers), "Parade of the Planets" by V. Abdrashitov (263 copies and 2.2 million viewers), "My friend Ivan Lapshin" by A. German (118 copies and 1.3 million viewers) (the source is book of film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev "Our Cinema" and in his Internet blog).

And since 1.7 million viewers watched them during the re-release of "Long Farewell" 1987, it can be assumed that in 1971 the audience for this film by Kira Muratova was not less, but much more. Here I proceed from the fact that O. Ioseliani's film "There lived a Songbird" (1972), which is equally far from entertainment and also black-and-white, managed to get 2.6 million viewers even with a significantly smaller circulation – 320 copies, and "July Rain" (1967) by M. Khutsiev was seen by 3 million viewers with a circulation of 164 copies ...

At the same time, it is clear that ordinary cinemas tried to get rid of such non-entertainment films as "Long Farewell" as early as possible, they went there for a maximum of a week, and then smoothly moved to club halls – for a couple of days, for one or two sessions ...

Therefore, we can safely say that even if "Long Farewell" in the all-Union box office ran for only two weeks, they managed to gather their 2-3 million viewers, some of whom later noted this psychological drama as the worst film in the questionnaire of "Soviet Screen" of the year...

A similar example is the usually considered totally forbidden film by M. Osepian "Ivan's boat" (1972). Having received the so-called fourth category and a circulation of 197 copies, this drama was released in Soviet distribution in 1974 and gathered 1 million viewers in its first year of demonstration.

It is curious that when during the "perestroika" (in 1987) "Ivan's boat" was released to the all-Union rental again, accompanied by warm reviews in the press, the audience for the first year of the demonstration gathered viewers even in smaller numbers: only 0.9 million (source – Internet blog of film critic S. Kudryavtsev).

Not included in this book and the famous film by Andrei Konchalovsky "The story of Asya Klyachina, who loved, but did not marry." And not only because dozens of articles and chapters have been written about him (as well as about the films "Andrei Rublev" and "I am 20 years old") in film studies monographs, but mainly because this picture, titled "Asya's Happiness" in the late 1960s (again, contrary to numerous allegations of a complete ban), she still visited the Soviet box office.

Here is what the film critic N. Zorkaya (1934-2006) wrote about it: "The story of Asya Klyachina", disfigured by amendments and cuts, was released under the ironic title "Asya's Happiness" and in a ridiculous number of copies" (Zorkaya, 2006). This fact was also noted by the film critic Marina Kuznetsova: "Several printed copies were released on the third screen in the so-called club distribution, renaming it, as if in a mockery, "Asya's Happiness" (Kuznetsova, 2006).

And here again the question arises, if the screenwriter Natalya Ryazantseva considered the circulation of K. Muratova's film "Long Farewell", which amounted to 535 copies, to be small, then it is quite possible that the "ridiculous" circulation of "Asya's Happiness" was commensurate with, indeed, small circulations at that time such famous films as "July Rain" (164 copies and 3 million viewers), "Long Happy Life" (89 copies and 1.5 million viewers), "Adventures of a Dentist" (78 copies and 0.5 million viewers). viewers) and "Plea" (179 copies and 1.2 million viewers). And, consequently, the film "Asya's Happiness" attracted at least one million viewers in the Soviet film distribution in the end of 1960s.

But when, with the triumphant support of the cinematographic authorities and the perestroika press, "The Story of Asya Klyachina, Who Loved But Did Not Marry" appeared on the screens in 1988 in a repeated (and, presumably, considerable) circulation, then following the results of the first year of showing in cinemas it attracted 1.9 million viewers from cinemas...

In my opinion, this speaks volumes about the fact that there was no significant audience potential for this black-and-white drama based on rural material, outstanding in

its artistic merit, but devoid of even minimal entertaining baits – neither in the late 1960s, nor in the late 1980s.

When I tentatively tested the above text on the Internet, but immediately received responses from some fellow film critics, in which, in the spirit of Soviet vocabulary, they accused me of “juggling the numbers” and that all this is far from the “true political and cultural context of that time”, “they do not explain anything”, “millions of viewers of 1965 and 1988 are completely different millions”, and that I, they say, hinted that “since these films were released for hire and turned out to be so unattractive that it was hardly worth reviving them during the perestroika campaign”...

As we can see, a well-known manipulative technique was used, when phrases that did not belong to him were attributed to the “opponent” and then criticized.

Of course, both in the 1980s and now I believe that the prohibited films during the “perestroika” were quite rightly freed from the captivity of the “shelf” and shown to the audience, but this in no way negates the real facts, which clearly indicate that: 1) “Asya's Happiness”, “Long Farewell” were at the box office in the late 1960s and in 1971, respectively, and at least 1-2 million viewers watched them; 2) in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, Soviet viewers watched films like “Long Farewell” and “Ivan's Boat”, in very moderate quantities for those times, as they mostly preferred entertainment / spectacular film production.

My previous monograph “One Thousand and One Highest-Grossing Soviet Film: Opinions of Film Critics and Audiences” (Fedorov, 2021) is devoted to the preferences of the Soviet mass audience. So I am well aware of the political and sociocultural context of the Soviet era, as well as the fact that as a result of the prohibitions “the most promising trends of Soviet cinema were thrown to the periphery, that the destinies of the most talented filmmakers were broken.”

Yes, millions of viewers at different times are different in “weight”. But aren't they ten times different? Well, let's say, “Long Farewell” would have been given in the 1970s a circulation not of 535 copies, but 2,000, and would have been released in wide distribution. Would they really have received an audience of more than 3-4 million? No, of course not, since for all its artistic merit, this is a non-entertaining “movie not for everyone”...

Of course, the ideal option was simply to release such films in regular distribution, then there would have been no need to create any commissions in the 1980s for their rehabilitation...

Let me also remind that hundreds of articles and dozens of books have been devoted to the phenomenon of audience success (including Soviet cinema), including such leading Russian film scientists of the past decades and the present as N. Zorkaya (Zorkaya, 1981, etc.), Y. Khanyutin (Khanyutin, 1976), M. Turovskaya (Turovskaya, 1979; 1996), M. Yampolsky (Yampolsky, 1987, etc.), M. Zhabsky (Zhabsky, 1978; 1983; 1998; 2020), L. Rondeli (Rondeli, 2013), N. Khrenov (Khrenov, 1981, etc.) and many others. And all these studies prove that complex, philosophically filled art-house films never received even a tenth of the audience, relatively speaking, “Diamond Hand” or “Pirates of the XX century”...

Let me also turn to the problem of the return on investment of Soviet films at the box office.

Here the situation is significantly clarified by A. Anashkin. His article showing the income and losses of the Soviet film distribution using the example of several films of the 1960s, that is, at a time when the attendance of cinemas was high (up to 19 visits per year per inhabitant) (Anashkin, 1967: 85).

From the analysis of A. Anashkin, it follows that even such a relatively popular Soviet film as “Jung from the Schooner Columbus”, with a circulation of 1,714 copies, managed to

collect 12.1 million viewers, turned out to be unprofitable in the end (62 thousand rubles of loss). The film "Strict Game" also turned out to be unprofitable, which with 1496 copies was watched by 13.3 million viewers, since the expenses of the film distribution to pay for the film and circulation amounted to 631 thousand rubles, incomes only 532 thousand rubles, that is, losses amounted to 99 thousand rubles.

Consequently, in the then Soviet film distribution, movies that crossed the threshold of 15 million viewers could bring tangible income, and there were not many of them...

Among the films taken off the shelf (there were over three dozen of them), only "Agony" achieved "profitable" indicators (18.1 million viewers in the first year of demonstration). It can also be assumed that in the case of the timely release of such potentially spectacular films as "Goodbye America!" (1951), "The Rainbow Formula" (1966), "Intervention" (1968), "Literature Lesson" (1968), "Always on the lookout!" (1973), "Starling and Lyra" (1974), "While the Dream Is Mad" (1978), they would also make a profit in the box office. And truly championship fees could await the destroyed film "The Moment of Truth" ("In August 44th") by V. Žalakevičius, based on the sensational novel by V. Bogomolov, if it had been released in Soviet cinemas in 1975 or 1976 ...

Based on the fact that the most popular Soviet films based on military material ("The Dawns Here Are Quiet ...", "Shield and Sword", "Strong in Spirit") gathered from 55 million to 66-68 million viewers in the first year of demonstration, it can be assumed that that "The Moment of Truth" could even surpass these indicators and reach the level of 70 million viewers ...

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

1. Record holders of the banned Soviet feature films (1951-1991), who have been on the "shelf" for over five years or stopped while filming

Agony. USSR, 1974/1975. Directed by Elem Klimov. Screenwriters Semyon Lungin, Ilya Nusinov. Actors: Alexey Petrenko, Anatoly Romashin, Velta Line, Alisa Freindlich, Leonid Bronevoy, Boris Ivanov, Alexander Romantsov, Yuri Katin-Yartsev, Pavel Pankov, Nelly Pshennaya, Mikhail Svetin, Vladimir Osenev, Boris Romanov and others. **Film was not released in the 1970s in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1985, as a result, it attracted 18.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Elem Klimov (1933-2003) directed 7 full-length feature films, two of which ("Agony", "Come and See") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

The path to the screen of Elem Klimov's film "Agony" was difficult. However, the creative fate of the director himself ("Welcome or No Unauthorized Entry", "Adventures of the Dentist", "Farewell", "Come and See") was very thorny.

In "Agony", the crisis of Russia in 1916 is shown with the inherent synthesis of irony and psychologism inherent in Elem Klimov. Farcical, eccentric scenes are replaced by terrible naturalistic visions... In the center of the picture is the powerful figure of Grigory Rasputin. A wandering "holy old man", "seer", "healer", alcoholic and sex maniac, who managed to gain the trust of the royal family and influence the course of state affairs.

Rasputin is played by Alexey Petrenko (1938-2017). The actor managed to achieve an amazing result. The role is built on the differences of volcanic temperament, animal fear, superhuman strength, humiliated weakness, depravity and religiosity. The task is the most difficult, but the actor managed to catch the nerve of the role, to embody an ambiguous character on the screen.

Anatoly Romashin (1931-2000), who played the role of Emperor Nicholas II, had a no less difficult task. It was very easy here to get lost in a poster tone or grotesque. But A. Romashin played a man who lost the country, by his inaction, doomed it to suffering and destruction.

Around these figures – the tsar and Rasputin – a complex, multifaceted composition of the film with many characters is built. And as if cutting the film into parts, the historical chronicle invades the plot fabric...

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev believes that "the reputation of a long-suffering and long-banned film, of course, prevents (and still) to perceive "Agony" without false piety. And the twenty-year-old story of the director's struggle to defend his views on the era of the collapse of the Russian empire in general and the murder of the tsar's idol Grigory Rasputin in particular, from the inception of the initial concept to the release of the film in official release, deserves, of course, special respect. Although it is difficult not to admit that the forced transformation of the manner of presentation of the material (from farcical-eccentric, almost in the style of Russian popular print, as in the first versions of the script, to the form of a historical chronicle drama in the final version), on the one hand, really expanded and deepened the authors' approach to controversial events in Russian history. But on the other hand, the inevitable, albeit insignificant, concessions to censorship in the interpretation of pre-revolutionary trends in society ("when the upper classes cannot rule in the old way, and the lower classes do not want to live in the old way") led to the paradoxical tragicomic story of the rise "vicious old man", the newly-minted Grishka the

Pretender, was somewhat mixed with the help of abundant inclusion of chronicles and scenes filmed for documentary films" (Kudryavtsev, 1997).

Film critic Irina Shilova (1937-2011) wrote about "Agony" as follows: "A tense, spectacular, apocalyptic film performance, however, includes powerful psychological, realistic episodes, and a chronicle ... Both the picture itself and its individual accents were a big surprise for cinematic leadership ... Klimov unfolded on the screen a panorama of the feast during the plague. Revelry and debauchery. Endless intrigues, belief in all prejudices, ... the Tsar's inability to rule a huge state did not exclude from the director's attention the personal drama of Nicholas (whose role was brilliantly played by A. Romashin), who turned out to be an incapable ruler and an unhappy father. The figure of Rasputin, played by A. Petrenko, grew to the size of a monstrous obsession. ... The historicity of the film narration did not close the problem, but in its pathos unfolded the past into the present. ... the past reminded of the still unconscious consequences of inattention to the life of the people, of the upcoming upheavals, it tried to awaken the mass consciousness and look for less tragic ways to transform the country" (Shilova, 2010: 228).

Film critic and literary critic Lev Anninsky (1934-2019) asked the question: "How can one explain the fluctuations and maneuvers of censorship? From the very beginning, the very intention of the director Elem Klimov to turn to such a scandalous figure in Russian history as Grigory Rasputin seemed suspicious to her. Experts, attracted by cinematographers to discuss the director's plan, warned against possible "vulgarity", "sensational playing with court secrets", "smuggling pornography under the guise of exposing". The conclusion was that one should not "pull out this dirt on the screen, even in order to expose tsarism". It is unlikely that the officials seriously believed that "pornography" was actually possible in Klimov's film; rather, the cautious writings of the "experts" gave them the formal right to new filming bans for completely different reasons. However, the need to "expose tsarism" did not disappear; it was steadily becoming the responsibility of film propaganda. Gifted artists, on the other hand, have not taken up such a topic for a long time, leaving servile artisans to graze on the field of social orders, whose dull creations left the public absolutely indifferent. The temptation to get the talented director Klimov, capable of creating an impressive and thus propagandistically effective picture, was too great for the film leadership, and, overcoming doubts, again released the director to the set. To take the risk of allowing Klimov to film "Agony" could have prompted the bosses and the fact that the director, who had already made the film "Welcome, or No Unauthorized Entry" and "The Adventures of a Dentist", managed to become famous as a caustic satirist. The calculation, presumably, consisted in the fact that Klimov would pour out his sarcasm at the necessary address for the film leadership – on the tsar and his entourage. ...

What is the essence and strength of the Klimov film? In a sense of a common illness that had destroyed Russian society and the state by 1917. We are used to thinking of that situation in two colors: here are the guilty ones, but the right ones, and if anyone hesitates, he is also wrong. A black-and-white knife, cutting through everything, the logic of the struggle was quite understandable for those times. But Klimov answers the questions of our time. He wants to understand not this or that solo part, but the general course of the tragedy, striking all the souls brought down into it. ... Here the volcanic willfulness hidden behind the sullen slowness of Petrenko turns out to be truly a godsend: he plays in Rasputin – in addition to precise portrait features, this bearish, break-through, boundless, unpredictable rebellion plays the "folk folly" going awry to the pathetic tyranny of the autocrats not self-controlled power. And this earthly, uncontrollable version of "grassroots" madness is the same sign of a general "end of the world", like the pitiful sanity of the higher authorities trying to build something on a shaking foundation" (Anninsky, 1988).

Film critics Valery Fomin and Lilia Mamatova (1935-1996) drew the attention of readers that "the emperor, played by Romashin, clearly realizes that his beloved Russia is mortally ill. And as a kind of refrain and together – a bitter allegory: a fatal threat constantly hangs over the fate of the sovereign's only son. The disease of the heir is incurable, any minor scratch – and the blood cannot be stopped. Who knows how to save a child, does not allow the thinnest thread of his life to be torn? Rasputin. The same Rasputin, who is considered to be the culprit of all the troubles and misfortunes of Russia, who must be immediately driven away from oneself ... But it is with him that one cannot part. The circle is closed. The quiet and tired sovereign, whom we see on the screen, realizes that he has fallen into a fatal trap, from which there is no way out. The actor and director make the image of the noble and aging emperor so convincing that even if the viewer harbored deliberate prejudices against the real historical "autocrat", he would not be able to overcome the direct impressions of his on-screen incarnation and get rid of living sympathy for him.

What stands out in "Agony" is the truly brilliant performance by Alexey Petrenko of the role of Rasputin. ... The acting task was not easy. In one person, it was necessary to reveal a fan of various, but at the same time completely vicious qualities: meanness, the ability to treachery and betrayal, insatiable greed, bestial lust and enduring foolishness. Revealing the demonic essence of his character, Petrenko plays at the ultimate afterburner, not embarrassed by the physiological manifestations – dirt, sticky sweat, mad foam on the lips. In the plastic figure of the role, a sinister beast appears to us in the guise of a man, moving in frank and climaxing moments on all fours, as on four legs. It would be difficult to endure the spectacle of such a hero over a long history if the naturalistic grotesque was not fused in its characterization with a complex psychological content; Rasputin on the screen repels and at the same time fascinates with his uncommonness, heroic power and energy. Alexey Petrenko creates in the viewer a clear understanding that not only the devil is playing with Rasputin, but Rasputin is also playing the devil, deliberately testing the strength of the elegant and gentile audience around him, frightening them with his natural strength and power, gained in approaching the royal family.

No wonder the censors, reading the first version of the literary script, guessed in Rasputin's behavior "Pugachevism", or, as they also wrote in their reviews, "a kind of sublimation of the people's spirit." And it was not in vain that they were alarmed: contrary to the stereotyped ideas of Marxist-Leninist historiography about the "consciousness of the masses" on the eve of the glorious revolution, the script and then the film presented something different: the seething of the dark principles of the "collective unconscious" Russia. Thus, Klimov's film did not respond to the demand of the film leadership to portray the country at the beginning of the century in such a way as to confirm the "kindness and justice" of the October Revolution that followed and the series of events it had already caused. On the contrary, the state of society that appeared on the screen promised Russia not "kindness and justice", but a terrible fate, that is, exactly what happened in real history.

It is easy to guess about the reaction of film officials who first saw Klimov's film. Even more, paradoxically, they were frightened by the spectacle of the very "court camarilla" that the filmmakers themselves demanded to be "flogged" in the film. ... People who are completely captured by political games and weaving of intrigues, their position seems to be strong, they do not realize the inevitability of an imminent general catastrophe, which the film foreshadows with all its system. The figurative world of Klimov allows the viewer to come to a piercing guess that, no matter how many grotesquely carnivalized characters swarm, no matter how much they rave, in fact no one was in power in Russia. She seemed to be off the axis of her history and rushed into the abyss. Having seen this film in 1975, cinematographic officials perceived it as a detailed metaphor for the disintegration of the

top in the Brezhnev era. As it turned out, it was not in vain: the party bosses, having watched the film, recognized in its characters ... themselves and expressed the highest anger. The painting was banned" (Fomin, Mamatova, 2003).

In the book "Shelf". Documents. Testimonials. Comments. Issue 3 "(The Shelf, 2006), the following documents are given concerning the prohibition of "Agony":

"The State Security Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR on August 1, 1975, No. 2058-A. Secret. Central Committee of the CPSU. At the Mosfilm studio, shooting of the film by E. Klimov "Agony" has been completed, based on a script by S. Lungin and I. Nusinov, in which the "Rasputin" period of the Russian Empire is shown. According to the data available in the security agencies, this motion picture distortedly interprets the historical events of that time, unreasonably great attention is paid to showing the life of the royal family and the intimate life of Rasputin. The motion picture contains scenes of a sexual nature. Therefore, apparently, it is no coincidence that foreign filmmakers are showing an increased interest in this film, and distributors intend to purchase a film to be shown on a foreign screen. In connection with the above, the State Security Committee considers it inappropriate to release the film "Agony" on the screens of the country and for its sale abroad" (RGANI. F. 4. Op. 22, D. 1811, L. 47).

"The Central Committee of the CPSU. Secret. About the film "Agony". ... The film was finished on September 25, 1974 and after repeated amendments was adopted by the State Film Committee on April 18, 1975, was printed in two copies, and was not shown in an open audience. The creative team of cinematographers did not manage to carry out their plan in the creation of this film properly. At present, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography and the Department of Culture of the Central Committee of the CPSU consider it inappropriate to release the film "Agony" on the screen. Head Department of Culture of the Central Committee of the CPSU V. Shauro, F. Yermash, Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography. August 14, 1975 (RGANI, F. 4. Op.22, D. 1811, L. 44).

Audience feedback on Agony usually shows that the audience recognizes the talent of its authors today:

"A very strong and difficult film. Alexey Petrenko's acting is simply amazing, I had the feeling that this is not an actor, but a real Grigory Rasputin. Such a piercing look! ... The atmosphere is conveyed harshly and sometimes cruelly. But such is the harsh truth of life and that troubled time" (Natalie).

"Fantastic, brilliant work of Alexey Petrenko! Watching a movie is sometimes just hard - the feeling of an impending disaster is so strong. There is hopelessness in everything, in the eyes of the actors, in color, in music" (Ace).

"The main thing in art is not the most accurate transfer of some historical facts in this case, but a reflection of the emotional state of that time. So this state in the film is conveyed with unprecedented power and at the same time accuracy, and the use of various and innovative artistic means. I watched the film "Agony" 12 times with various comrades and each time I discovered new layers of thought laid down by the artist-director! And the fact that the film still forces people to divide their opinions into two opposing political camps only proves the strength and relevance of this film masterpiece. The monarchy, the Russian Orthodox Church, the merchants, ministers, the nobility, superstition and other now artificially praised institutions are subject to calm but merciless criticism" (Ivan).

Always on the lookout! (In the North, in the South, in the East, in the West). USSR, 1973. Directed by Efim Dzigan. Screenwriters Efim Dzigan, Vadim Kozhevnikov. Actors: Tatiana Lennikova, Alexander Degtyar, Pyotr Chernov, Nikolai Alekseev, Alexey Presnetsov, Sergei Martynov, Vladimir Sokolov, Viktor Pavlov, Dalvin Shcherbakov, Maya Menglet and others. **Filming was stopped after the first episode was ready. Their continuation was banned. The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In 2010, this picture (or rather, its completed first series) was shown at the Russian Archival Film Festival.**

Efim Dzigan (1898-1981) directed 15 films (mainly on the so-called historical-revolutionary and military theme: "The first cornet Streshnev", "God of War", "We are from Kronstadt", "If tomorrow is war", "The first horse", "Prologue", "Iron Stream"), three of which ("We are from Kronstadt", "If there is war tomorrow", "Iron Stream") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

After the large-scale epic "Iron Stream", Efim Dzigan decided to please the audience with an equally large-scale large-format color film, but this time about spies and border guards – "Always on the lookout!" ("In the North, in the South, in the East, in the West"). A dilogy was planned, but in the end, by 1973, only the first part was filmed: the shooting was suddenly stopped, and the picture itself was banned from showing.

Journalist and critic Alexei Mokrousov believes that the plot of the film "Always on the lookout!" similar to an anecdote: "an operative general looking for spies simultaneously leads excursions in the museum of border troops for foreign journalists, and spies sneak into the tank exercises of the Warsaw Pact countries, where one of them must shoot the other in order to provoke. But ours were on the alert from the moment when the enemies sailed on the ice to the Soviet coast. ... The sad story of a man who was interested in the social order in the cinema, who watched political weather vane on a daily basis, but tragically did not keep up with the aesthetic demands of the time. ... In art, he had long been interested not in the form, but in the social order, he stopped studying the language of cinema, switching to film broadcasts. Did he guess, at least towards the end of his life, that it was the authors of the editorials who were forgotten in the first place? ... The case of Dzigan is not unique, but for some reason the bitterness does not disappear from understanding this" (Mokrousov, 2010).

Film critic Victor Matizen believes that "without any artistic value, such works are of interest as fossilized evidence of the psychology of their creators and the social atmosphere. ... It is significant that many of these truly clinical pictures were filmed by directors of advanced age. In cinema, the signs of a decline in intellectual powers are much more pronounced than in literature. And when the lowering of IQ is superimposed on the servility inherent in domestic filmmakers as figures of the most dependent on the power of the art – write is lost" (Matizen, 2010).

What is the reason for the ban on the film "Always on the lookout!"?

After all, it would seem that only one co-author of the script – the famous Soviet writer Vadim Kozhevnikov (1909-1984), the author of the novel "The Shield and the Sword", should have inspired the respect of the "top". Yes, and the authority of Yefim Dzigan himself, the director of the hurray-revolutionary drama "We are from Kronstadt", officially ranked among the Soviet film classics, could not just be written off to the archive. Plus, the theme was chosen by V. Kozhevnikov and E. Dzigan, a proven, "sure" – there were always a lot of films about enemy spy (unsuccessful) intrigues in the USSR, and most of them calmly appeared on the screen.

Victor Matizen believes that the reason for the ban on the tape "Always on the lookout!" was in its low artistic quality and "excessive stupidity, which caused the same soreness among the high authorities, which caused the last film by Grigory Alexandrov "Starling and Lyre "(Matizen, 2010).

To be honest, this version seems to me untenable, since I can easily name dozens of artistically weak and stupid films that were freely released in the USSR in 1972-1973, and earlier and later ...

Political reasons are another matter.

Judge for yourself: right during the filming of the film "Always on the lookout!", On May 22-30, 1972, the visit of US President R. Nixon to the USSR took place, during which the USSR and the USA signed an agreement on the limitation of anti-missile defense and on the joint space program " Union" – "Apollo". Moreover, on October 18 of the same year, the USSR and the USA signed a trade agreement ...

And here Dzigan and Kozhevnikov have American spies-provocateurs in full swing in the film!

But that's not all: in 1974, R. Nixon once again visited the USSR and on July 3 signed an agreement on the limitation of underground nuclear tests. The detente did not stop after Nixon's resignation: on November 23-24, 1974, US President J. Ford arrived in the USSR. On July 17, 1975, the successful docking of the Soviet Union and the American Apollo took place in space. And on August 1, 1975, the USSR, together with the Western countries, signed the Helsinki Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

You might say, but what about the Soviet films about Western spies "Fifty-Fifty" by Alexander Feintsimmer (31.9 million viewers) and "Marked Atom" by Igor Gostev (27.7 million viewers), released in Soviet distribution exactly in 1973?

I answer: these fighters of the ideological struggle managed to slip onto the screens by inertia, even before the start of such a full-scale detente between the USSR and the USA: launched into filmmaking back in 1971 and fully completed in 1972, "Marked Atom" and "Fifty-Fifty" were at the box office in the winter of 1973 (January 22 and February 4, respectively), and by April 1973 they were replaced on screens by completely different tapes.

But in "Helsinki" – "Union-Apollo" 1975, the release of these spy tapes would have been impossible.

As a result, from April 1973 and almost until the early 1980s, no new Soviet films about American spies were released.

Running a little ahead, I note that a similar story with the inconsistency of anti-Western spy themes with the policy of detente happened to Grigory Alexandrov's film "Starling and Lear", which was banned in 1974...

Unlike Efim Dzigan and Grigory Alexandrov, this changed political situation was very well felt by the author of "The Resident's Mistakes" (1968) and "The Resident's Fate" (1970), directed by Veniamin Dorman (1927-1988). In the era of "detente" he quickly switched to the adventure "The Lost Expedition" (1975) and "Golden River" (1976), but in the new round of the Cold War he calculatedly returned to "The Return of the Resident" (1982) and the "End of Operation Resident" (1986).

So I dare to assume that if Yefim Dzigan had managed to complete the shooting of his two-part film in 1972, he would most likely have had time to go out without any problems...

Bad Anecdote. USSR, 1966. Directed by Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov. Screenwriters: Alexander Alov, Leonid Zorin, Vladimir Naumov (based on the story of the same name by F.M. Dostoevsky). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Viktor Sergachev, Georgy Georgiu, Alexander Gruzinsky, Elizaveta Nikishchina, Pavel Pavlenko, Gleb Strizhenov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. spectators. **The film was banned and was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in 1987, as a result, it gathered 1.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

On the joint creative account of **directors Alexander Alov (1923-1983) and Vladimir Naumov** 10 films, 7 of which ("Anxious Youth", "Pavel Korchagin" "Wind", "Running", "The Legend of Thiel", "Tehran-43", "Coast") entered the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

In his book "The Shelf", the film expert Valery Fomin tells in detail the story of the ban on the film "Bad Anecdote" (Fomin, 1992).

At the studio discussion of the "Bad Anecdote", director Ivan Pyryev (1901-1968) sharply opposed the film: "The work is talented – both as a director and a cameraman. I would even say very talented. At international festivals in Cannes, Venice, San Sebastian, apparently, the picture will be a great success. But for me personally, it is offensive for its filth, human abomination and primitiveness of human existence! It can be shown and, obviously, Dostoevsky says that there are vile souls, there are humiliated people, there are offended people, there are crushed people. But not brutes. They are people after all. They are humiliated, insulted, crushed. But they are people. Here I see cattle. What they just do not do: and poop, and pee and vomit – whatever. Why is this done? Why is that? I have a question. Obviously, the picture is really talented and, I repeat, it will obviously be a huge success and will receive an award in Venice. But it is insulting to the people of our nation, our Motherland" (Pyryev, 1965. Quoted from: Fomin, V.I. The Shelf. Moscow, 1992).

Director J. Raizman (1903-1994) tried to defend the picture: "I do not agree with Ivan Alexandrovich, who believes that this can be offensive to the people and that the people are depicted here ... It seems to me wrong. Here, quite clearly, an insignificant, but existing stratum of petty officials is taken, which was really suppressed, strangled, and where the appearance of such a general is an incredible fact in itself, causing not fear, but horror. In general, a very local society is taken here, and I did not have such a feeling of something widely offensive" (Raizman, 1965. Quoted from: Fomin V.I. The Shelf. Moscow, 1992).

The well-known literary critic and film critic Stanislav Rassadin (1935-2012), although he was not as harsh as I. Pyryev, was also dissatisfied with the film: "The authors of the "Bad Anecdote" do not play giveaways with the viewer, their expressive means are unexpected, inexhaustible, very talented – are designed for knowledge, not recognition. And the authors do not always take into account the possibilities of our perception. Even a sophisticated one. And we cannot drink pure essences – we want a solution too. ... The film is overloaded with symbolism – the algebra of art. This excessive algebraization, meaningful, appealing to reason and not to the heart, leads to a harsh rationalism" (Rassadin, 1967: 192).

As a result, all the discussions ended with the "Bad Anecdote" lying on the "shelf" for twenty years ...

It is curious that when in 1987 "Bad Anecdote" was released in the Soviet Union, the reviews of film critics largely echoed in the text with the above opinion of director Ivan Pyryev, but the fact that he had a minus sign became a plus.

So the film critic Anna Kagarlitskaya wrote that "this spectacle will reveal to you the most ugly and disgusting human properties, you will look into the humiliated souls of people deprived of the light of reason, dignity, love. Together with the heroes of Dostoevsky's story, according to which the picture was filmed, you will find yourself in the dark, desperately impoverished nooks of life, where the concepts of good and evil are shifted, where the usual proportions of things and faces are violated, where dreary madness reigns. ... Warning about the onset of the era of imaginary calm, the creators of the "Bad Anecdote" wanted to disturb the audience with the caustic, absurd, nervous unrest of their film ... About how passionate and sincere they were in their intentions, the talented, integral artistic world of this picture, where in black-white, darkened space is so scary for the human soul" (Kagarlitskaya, 1987: 8-9).

And Lev Anninsky (1934-2019) argued that in the film "Bad Anecdote" "there is no hope, there is no glimpse, there is no human form for a person. That's what the movie is about! Stylistically, it is made solid and strong. From the first episode, when General Pralinsky rants about humanity, and his head is cut off by a frame (and a chain of Shchedrin associations turns on in our minds: Organchik, etc.), and even more so from the moment when instead of the face of the official Pseldonimov you see an open mouth and eyes bulging with fear (and the Gogol's chain to pig's snouts, etc.), – from two points of reference, an orgy of gorging, dancing, courage and trembling proceeds in the film. How crowded the frame is! How everything here crawls into the eyes, walks, "rushing ahead"! ... The extreme "departures" of the style of Alov and Naumov, the eschewing-precision "dreams" and idiotic masks, of course, scratch my taste, but I must admit that the bulk, the main stream of action, is done powerfully. Although the masquerade seems to be monotonous, because from the very beginning its falsity is declared, but this is not what we comprehend, we comprehend something else. ... But the truth was revealed as a result!

First, the truth about the "people." An attempt to tell the terrible truth about the state of the people – as opposed to the age-old myth of the "God-bearer", the myth endured by the intelligentsia of the last century and in our century transformed into the idea of a people who are "always right", "knows everything", will put everything in its place. In an atmosphere of unshakable, old-fashioned worship of the people, to go against it is an act of desperate courage.

Second, the truth about the intelligentsia. About her illusions, about her powerlessness, about her being infected with a common slave spirit. In an environment where the dull hatred of the "rotten intelligentsia" could only be opposed to the image of the "martyr" intelligentsia, in a halo and a halo – in this situation to go against everything – there was also a need for great courage.

And, finally, the very despair of the artists who tried to cope with their (and our) illusions, the very hopelessness – this is also a spiritual experience of great importance. It is their hopelessness, theirs – Alexander Alov and Vladimir Naumov, who most recklessly believed in the dazzling self-sacrifice of Pavel Korchagin ... The most recklessly believing, the most blinded, the brightest souls plunge into the darkness of despair. And this is also a great revelation given to people at the end of time, when it becomes clear where is the tin, and where is the steel" (Anninsky, 1990).

In a more academic style, but also on the whole, the film was positively assessed on the pages of "Soviet Screen" by a connoisseur of F.M. Dostoevsky, literary critic L. Rosenblum (1939-2011), noting that in "Bad Anecdote", the authors "very accurately felt the "cinematic nature" of the work of Dostoevsky chosen by them. They found an excellent opportunity for a film story not only in an eccentric plot, not only in colorful pictures of Petersburg life and a whole string of almost wordless characters, each of whom bears his own suffering and his own destiny. The main thing that makes up the artistic originality of

both the story and the film is sharp, sometimes fantastic grotesque, satirical and tragic at the same time” (Rosenblum, 1988: 16).

Film critic Valery Fomin believed that “the film by Alov and Naumov is shocking: we have never been spoken to from our screen with such a degree of rage and contempt. Never before has he, the screen, been shaken by imagery, so thickly grotesque, so mercilessly destructive. Slavery is the main "character" of the film. Slavery in its two inseparable forms: master and lackey. This is a world in which normal human relations are distorted, brought to their last degeneration: to command or obey, there is no third way. Slavery here has eaten into flesh and blood, poisoned everything. ... Evgeny Evstigneev (this is perhaps his best film work) played Pralinsky with amazing psychological skill. ... Played by his bureaucratic self-confidence, his bureaucratic inclination to see life not as it is, but as he designed it in his beautiful office. And she, this life, – genuine in all its savagery, filth, neglect, poverty, answered him to his dreamed idyll with a full-fledged slap in the face” (Fomin, 1992).

This kind of assessment was shared by film critic Irina Shilova (1937 – 2011): “This film is merciless and satirically aimed, it brought the problem of slavery into the center of attention and considered it in all possible aspects and turns. A round dance of strange characters populated the screen - miserable and aggressive, obsessed with petty passions and sanctimonious hypocrisy. The very classical tradition of the satire genre, which at all times aroused indignation and indignation, was forbidden in Soviet cinema (only enemies of the state were subject to satirical ridicule), was revived by the filmmakers with their inherent artistry and positional accuracy. ... The ugliness, perversity of self-perception and behavior of the characters, distorted plastic, eerie coloring of the screen image, each of the elements of cinematic expressiveness - all this combined created a concentrated image of non-humans, monsters, voluptuous freaks, reveling in their servility” (Shilova, 2010: 21).

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev believes that “we can agree with the point of view of the Russian film expert Valery Fomin, who has been studying the history of forbidden films for many years, that it was the film adaptation of “Bad Anecdote” in September 1966 ... that laid the foundation for the notorious “shelf” in the Brezhnev era. ... The film by Alexander Alov and Vladimir Naumov ... was naturally declared a libel, defaming the entire nation and its historical past. Moreover, directors inclined to a condensed metaphorism really got too carried away with deforming optics, showing an obviously unsympathetic wedding gathering in an ugly way, even if we take into account that all this was seen through the eyes of a "wedding general" who was intoxicated to the point of loss of consciousness, devoid of all human dignity unlike his Chekhovian “colleague in misfortune” (Kudryavtsev, 2006).

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about the film "Bad Anecdote" differ significantly:

“The most brilliant film. And he lay on the shelf, because it shows how much the opinion of the people of those in power differs from the people themselves. It was then, and it is now” (Igor).

“It's just a crime not to show such a film, or to show it rarely, in front of the audience, in front of the actors, because it is a real work of art. ... It seemed to me that the film mixed the motives of Dostoevsky, and Gogol, and Saltykov-Shchedrin, and Chekhov ... After the film there was only one desire – to watch it a second time ... ” (Novikova).

“The film is very impressive. After rereading “Bad Anecdote” before watching, I can even say that it is stronger than its literary basis. This is not only Dostoevsky, but also Gogol, Saltykov-Shchedrin, even Kafka. Yes, and Dostoevsky is here of a later period, say, "Crime and Punishment". ... The visual, artistic solution of the film is original and made at the highest level. The acting performance of Evgeny Evstigneev and Victor Sergachev is

perfect. The whole considerable ensemble of performers is very good. Perhaps this is one of the best adaptations of Dostoevsky's works, if not the best" (Leonid).

"A very talented film. Very unusual and simply extremely atypical for Soviet cinema. Actors and cameraman generally work wonders. However, it is unlikely that I will have a desire to often revise this picture – it is very difficult to watch it, so terribly, gloomy, almost infernal what is happening on the screen looks. There is something devilish in the film, not every viewer can stand it. The feeling is as if he had plunged into hell for 1.5 hours" (I. Godunov).

"With all the talent of the film, it's still not my movie, and I won't watch it a second time. Evstigneev in the role of Pralinsky is excellent, as always, but the other characters seem too caricatured. ... One can note in the film the excellent work of the cameraman and production designers, expressive musical design. The scenery in a number of scenes looks deliberately skewed, and this makes one recall even the expressionist German cinema of the 1920s" (B. Nezhdanov).

"Although I am a fan of serious Soviet cinema (in the sense of a masterpiece), I probably have not yet grown up to Dostoevsky. But I didn't understand half of this caricatured, grotesque punk. Well, too, caricatured. Having looked, I personally understood why this film was put on the shelf" (Seatrpod).

"I didn't like the film. Everything plays in an overly pretentious grotesque way, such a movie can never become a favorite for the public" (V. Prokopchuk).

"The film did not convey Dostoevsky's story to the viewer, the film doesn't have subtle humor or Dostoevsky's psychology. There is no plot tension, no "scrutiny" and empathy. No wonder that the film lay on the shelf for so many years and was almost lost, it would be better if it was lost! Apparently, everyone was ashamed for such a screen version of Dostoevsky" (Exacustodian).

Blue Wasteland. USSR, 1972. Directed by Valentin Vinogradov. Eight-episode TV movie. **The director managed to shoot only four episodes. The film was banned and destroyed.**

Valentin Vinogradov (1933-2011) in his life was able to direct only seven full-length feature films (the shooting of one of which – "Blue Wasteland" – was interrupted due to their ban). Two of his films ("The Day Turns Thirty" and "Letters to the Living") were among the thousand highest-grossing Soviet films.

This is how Valentin Vinogradov himself described this ban: "With this film – "about the deep tragedy of Russia" – a difficult story also came out. "I shot four episodes out of eight, and what I did was really liked by the editing, well, so advanced ... But someone in the studio said that I was holding a cobblestone in my pocket against the Soviet regime. As a result, Aliyev came to the "Blue Wasteland" as the party bosses. I was not even allowed to see it. Later, my friend, editor Y. Ivanov, told me that he came, tall, so elegant ... "Where does the room say here?" They sat down, the light went out, and he fell asleep. For all four episodes. Woke up and said: "Anti-Soviet! Anti-Soviet!" And all four episodes were washed off the film. And they kicked me out of television" (Vinogradov, 2011. Quoted from: Gershezon O. Unknown Vinogradov. Portrait of the director // Cinema Art. 2011. No. 7).

Checking on the Roads. USSR, 1971. Directed by Alexey German. Screenwriter Eduard Volodarsky (based on military prose by Yuri German). Actors: Rolan Bykov, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Vladimir Zamansky, Oleg Borisov, Fedor Odinokov, Nikolai Burlyayev and others. **The film was banned and was not released in the all-Union release until April 1986. According to the results of the first year of demonstration in cinemas, it was watched by 9 million viewers.**

Alexey German (1938-2013) directed six full-length feature films ("The Seventh Sputnik", "Checking on the Roads", "Twenty Days Without War", "My Friend Ivan Lapshin", "Khrustalev, Car!", "It's Hard to Be God").

The film by Alexey German "Checking on the Roads" (1971) was waiting for release on screens no less than fifteen years. During this time, such well-known films about the war were shot as "The Ascent" by Larisa Shepitko, "Torpedo Bombers" by Semyon Aranovich, "Come and See" by Elem Klimov. And Alexey German himself, continuing to follow the difficult path of uncompromising art, has established himself as a true master ("Twenty days without war" (1976), "My friend Ivan Lapshin" (1981).

And during the session "Checking on the Roads" you clearly understand how much this picture gave to our cinema, what a high level of truth it offered to our art. The level that other bureaucrats from the screen seemed naturalistic, too far from the prevailing stereotypes, according to which the dashing five of the brave, jokingly playing, dealt with hundreds of enemies, carelessly drinking cognac in night restaurants.

The strict black-and-white stylistics of Alexey German's painting is based on the reliability of every detail, every word, gesture, look. The life of a partisan detachment in the winter of 1942 appears before us without varnishing. Do not forget the hard look of a simple peasant woman, hungry and desperate to live to see victory, and her bitter words. And for a long time still stands in the eyes of the sad gesture of the old woman, who, leaving the village, takes the most precious thing – the icon, but has no strength to carry it ... And along with everyone the crippled teenager hobbles on a wooden leg..., disciplined occupiers ...

In the context of such shots, the fury of the partisan Solomin (Oleg Borisov) is understandable, with which he throws a plate of hot stew in the face of the former soldier and the former policeman Lazarev, the hatred of the enemies is great and the political instructor Petushkov (Anatoly Solonitsyn) will never forgive the Nazis for the death of a family, son-pilot. In the name of revenge on the Nazis, Petushkov is ready to sacrifice a lot, even the lives of unarmed prisoners of war.

In the role of the former policeman – Vladimir Zamansky. He plays this, in my opinion, his best role so that from the first shots it is clear that his hero, who once broke down, lost his head from fear, is now ready to atone for grave guilt before the Motherland at the highest price – life. We understand his contemptuous look towards the young policeman (Nikolai Burlyayev), with whom the partisans lock him in the barn: he is hysterical, screaming heart-rendingly about his "childhood", babbling something about bondage ... Lazarev silently and indifferently thinks about something else. About how to prove to people that he made a final and sincere decision.

Lazarev is given a chance to atone for his guilt. The commander of the Lokotkov partisan detachment (Rolan Bykov) believes him. He believes, because he cannot do otherwise – it is unnatural for him to live without faith in a person, centuries for him, is impossible.

This is how Alexey German and screenwriter Eduard Volodarsky approach the main topic that worries them. Humanity in inhuman conditions. The problem of humanism in

war. Many critics who wrote about "Checking on the Roads" compared Lokotkov with Captain Tushin from "War and Peace", emphasizing the traditions of L.N. Tolstoy, the best features of the Russian national character. Rolan Bykov, however, created not only a traditional, but also a deeply individual image of a person in war. His Lokotkov, it would seem, does not want to part with many of the habits of a peaceful life, his "home", by no means menacing and heroic appearance does not at all resemble the poster appearance of dashing military commanders. But at the right moment, a partisan commander can be both strict and military tough, adamant in orders, uncompromising and decisive.

And you have to fight with a strong and by no means a timid enemy. Alexey German is not afraid to show how a young German officer fearlessly rushes forward, under machine-gun bursts, in order to prevent the partisans from stealing a train with food, although he could well have sat out for a minute or two, wait it out. But the courage of an unjust deed is devoid of the aura of achievement. And when the bullets sent by Lazarev overtake the fascist lieutenant, we do not for a moment doubt the need for retribution, as well as the justice of the shot at the very "minor" policeman who, after escaping from custody, again put on a German uniform...

Aleksey German has directed a few films... Other peers of A. German have shot three times more in the same period. Only the artist is not judged by the amount of film shot. Art. And when they talk about the cinema of Alexei German as a phenomenon of the domestic screen, these words do not seem to be an exaggeration. Each film directed by the director was a new step towards understanding our past and present, cognition of the human soul, time, history.

Overcoming the clichés of viewers' thinking, the cinema of Alexei German immersed us in the atmosphere of action not from the standpoint of outside observers, but people close to the protagonists. The director hoped that we would not be interested in cleverly twisted intrigues, fatal coincidences of circumstances and a happy ending, but the very process of the characters' lives, its incompleteness and inconsistency, the abruptness of phrases and everyday vanity, heated debates and prolonged silence, someone's fleeting glance and an unfinished song, a small portrait in a black frame and the noisy fun of the holiday, kindness and cruelty, tenderness and pain...

"Checking on the Roads", in fact, is another test of our spectator's ability to perceive cinema as an art with a capital letter, requiring labor of the soul, co-creation, involvement, breaking stereotypes.

It is clear that the first reviews of the film "Checking on the Roads" were published only in the year of the release of this military drama on Soviet screens.

So literary critic and film critic Lev Anninsky (1934-2019) on the pages of the "Cinema Art" magazine asked the question: "What would happen if "Checking on the roads" appeared on the screen not in 1986, when it was expected as a master's thing, but in 1971, when did the thirty-year-old debutant take it off? How would she look then? What did it correlate with? What role could it play in the movement of our art? 1971 is fifteen years before Elem Klimov, relying on the prose of Ales Adamovich, lit a Belarusian village on the screen with an apocalyptic torch, let the raging punishers go there: "Come and see!". Alexey German, it turns out, said this earlier. Simpler. He made the painting in black and white, icy, graphic style. You don't even see the flame. And the punishers had just emerged from the dank fog. And the mortal hoop has already overwhelmed the village, and you can feel it by the instant current of horror that pierced the people. By the way a woman rushed after the last partisan carriage leaving into the forest, carrying a child in her arms, and dragging the other by the hand. There is something mortally slow in the way these people run through loose knitting snow, hoping to escape into the forest. And another child hobbles around – one-legged, on crutches. He also hopes to make it. And to the forest – an endless field. Loose, cold, open. Nothing flames at Herman. Ice, cold. And the seconds drag

on. This dank dampness, these black trees on white snow, this icy whistle of wind around the meager dwelling holes hidden in silence... Lokotkov. The main acting success of the film, the absolute hit in the image... Rolan Bykov plays two psychological plans. Popular "understanding", rooted in the age-old peasant wisdom. And a person's fidelity to the logic of the time, the laws of war, which is natural in a local policeman, whom the war put at the head of a partisan detachment. According to all the laws of "intellectual reflection", these two plans must collide, tear the soul apart. And they do not collide, they somehow lightly coexist in the character played by Bykov. But in your, spectator's soul, they collide, they tear and torture your soul, you are forced to drag "obvious facts" like millstones. And all this works not only because R. Bykov plays masterfully. The entire cast of the film convinces, first of all, because it works in the amazing, almost inexplicable, cinematic reality created by German" (Anninsky, 1986).

"Checking on the Roads" was also highly praised in a review published in "Soviet Screen": "Each of the characters in the film bears and defends their own truth, and the general sound of the picture, its main, root meaning, cannot be indifferent to it. Yes, exactly like that: the enemy is one, and the hatred of the heroes of the film, the partisans, is unitingly boundless, and it only grows stronger day by day. ... The shots with the silent crowd on the deck, appearing so unexpectedly, filling the entire screen space, is both a real movie and a concrete reminder that a small visible part of an object does not always give a true idea of it. Well, cognition is non-stop, and cognition of the great war is included" (Rudenko-Desyatnik, 1986).

Film critic Evgeny Surkov (1915-1988) wrote that "Checking on the Roads" is not a retrospection. The past is experienced in him as the present still lasting in us. It burns and torments. And it makes you ponder over some of the moral lessons of the war, before the "Check" in war films, if researched, then rarely. Two themes are intertwined in "Checking on the Roads". To some extent autonomous. The theme of the partisan camp, seen not from a temporary distance and not from the upper layer of the household, but as if from the inside. And the theme of a man who, by chance, was forced to put on a German soldier's greatcoat. And now demanding that he be given the opportunity, at least at the cost of his own blood, to wash off this shameful scab from himself. Without this, he does not only have life – death worthy of a person, and never will. ... The collision is of tragic content and depth. It has not appeared in our art since the time of Leonov's "Invasion" (Surkov, 1986).

Film critic Irina Pavlova argued that "Checking on the Roads" is "a film that became the beginning, a reference point for a whole artistic direction in Russian cinema, at the time of its appearance on the screen it was still perceived as a summit tape, as the highest achievement within this direction. And most importantly, the film left an impression of extraordinary originality; the paintings that had already followed in his footsteps looked much older, traditional. ... the director had no intention of giving anyone "absolution." But there is also something that practically defies retelling. That which must certainly be seen and internally experienced; what it takes for the soul, being expressed with piercing sincerity, pain and love. With compassion so rare on the screen today. Perhaps this is why the old tape did not get old, because the feelings that moved its author, those painful questions that he asked everyone sitting in front of the screen, which we must solve not later, after the film, but simultaneously with its characters, are eternal, ageless. This very minute, for these questions – whenever they arise before a person, whether yesterday, today or tomorrow – cannot be delayed. Because the cost of delays is human destiny, human honor, human life. ... In the strict chronological consistency of the "Check", a single scene sounded as a sudden revelation – the memory of how the partisans did not dare to blow up the bridge under which a barge with prisoners of war was passing. An episode that

has nothing to do with the general movement of the plot, even as if it had slowed down this movement, is perceived today as the moral tuning fork of the entire film” (Pavlova, 1986).

Film critic Alexander Lipkov (1936-2006) noted that “the theme of memory, which is so important in two subsequent films of German, is still only visible here in the form of a light, dotted outline, set by a nagging and sad melody, so unexpected next to black-and-white harsh textures of the film, and so necessary complementing them. This is a melody of either farewell to something dear, gone, or memories of it, a melody that is conjugated not with specific episodes or plot twists and turns, but with the time of action, a saint, stern, which has already become an irreversible past, but powerfully appeals to our memory ... However, unlike German's subsequent films, it is not time that dominates here, not the memory of him and the people who lived in it, but the plot involved in a sharp conflict, which the director deliberately destroys in subsequent films. ... The future German is also recognized in the fear of telling the truth of the time, touching the sick and the bitter, that which is not customary to remember in partisan “westerns” (Lipkov, 1988).

“Checking on the Roads” is highly appreciated by film critics and film critics in the 21st century as well.

Film critic Vladimir Gordeev believes that “Alexey German, while still a very young director, made an outstanding film about the war. Deprived of its artillery epic scope, the film sniper shots at the target (the audience's heart) with pinpoint shots. ... Outlining to the audience the main moral dilemma of the film – the possibility / impossibility of atonement, Alexey German is extremely honest. From the very beginning, he makes a stern accusation to the main character of the picture. ... It is not so important for German to prove a person's right to life as to show the bright moments of this life. He seems to say: by punishing a person with death, you deprive him of the opportunity to shine. A person has the right to live only for the sake of these brilliant moments, for the sake of, albeit a short-term, victory of will over the forces of fate and his character. ... The film is too vital, too uncomfortable, too unpleasant. It is superbly filmed, harmonious, as the world around us is harmonious, and at the same time as ambiguous as human life, which takes place in this harmonious world, is ambiguous. The film lay on the shelf because it broke the established laws, including moral laws, and this was inconvenient for a society already accustomed to these laws” (Gordeev, 2007).

Film critic Evgeny Margolit reminds readers that “in Soviet cinema there have always been two concepts of victory. According to one of them – a purely official one – the war appears as a collision of two military state machines, and the Soviet one is obviously more perfect than the German one. This concept goes from “The Fall of Berlin” to “Liberation” and numerous “Stirlitzians”. But there is another – one where the military machine and the soldier, as its cog, is opposed by an individual person in his human fullness. ... The heroes of films in which the second concept dominates, with their entire existence oppose the laws of wartime. The final goal here is not the destruction of the enemy – it is only a consequence of the main task: the salvation of the Motherland as a clan. House Salvation. And their home, of which there are millions. Ha-genus. ... What, in fact, is the deep plot of Lazarev's role? A person striving to avoid physical death at any cost discovers that his desire to survive at all costs brings him to the brink of spiritual death – and it turns out to be a hundred times more terrible. At such a terrible price, Lazarev discovers a personal principle in himself, which he did not suspect earlier. And it becomes clear that only the hero himself, and no one else, will be able to decide how to live for him now with his own discovery. Vladimir Zamansky does not even play this torment of personal self-awareness, but simply brings it with him to the film” (Margolit, 2003).

The opinions of 21st century viewers about “Checking on the Roads” are generally very positive:

"I consider this film a masterpiece of Russian cinema" (Nick).

"This is the best film about the Great Patriotic War in the entire history of Soviet and Russian cinema!" (Petrovich).

"Wonderful movie. Even, not so much about the war, but about repentance, heroism, trust and ordinary people who were ground by the worst war in history" (Andrey).

"The film is a masterpiece! An absolutely brilliant piece of art. And to perceive it, in my opinion, it is worthwhile precisely as a work of art, in which not all the details must necessarily correspond to reality. Another Truth is important here – the Truth of art. And she is!" (Sashko).

"This film could not appear on the screen at the time of its creation, in 1971, well, it just could not! Everything about him is anti-Soviet, everything contradicts the official interpretations imposed by the authorities (party) on the idea of war, of victims and of sacrifice. Endless longing, hunger and cold... And any character in the film is wrong: both a German with sad eyes, and some of ours, not heroes-liberators ... Those who forbade the film did not need such images. Especially with eyewitnesses who were still alive and alive, participants and victims of the Great War. ... And in my humble opinion the best actor in this film is the great Rolan Bykov" (Lugas).

However, there are other viewers' opinions:

"The film is instructive, albeit quite mediocre. The director managed to reveal the topic: the deceased traitor is morally superior to the artillery major, who persecutes the arrested person with unfounded suspicions. ... The film left a double impression. On the one hand, outstanding directorial finds, good acting, an excellent combination of Zamansky – Bykov, a good production. On the other hand, a completely incomprehensible ending, incomplete work on trifles, and most importantly, the superiority of a traitor over an officer of the Red Army ... There is nothing bright and hopeful. Vileness, anger, distrust are put on display, and faith in a person, not finding support among the fighters, is relegated to the background for some reason. In general, an unpleasant aftertaste in the soul" (Masha).

Commissar. USSR, 1967. Director and screenwriter Alexander Askoldov (based on the story of V. Grossman "In the city of Berdichev"). Actors: Nonna Mordyukova, Rolan Bykov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Lyudmila Volynskaya, Vasily Shukshin, Lyuba Katz, Pavlik Levin, Dima Kleiman, Marta Bratkova, Igor Fishman, Otar Koberidze, Valery Ryzhakov, etc. **This film was prohibited. Premiere: 1987 (Moscow film festival screening) and 1988 (film distribution). As a result, it was watched by 3.5 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas.**

This is the only full-length feature film directed by **Alexander Askoldov (1932-2018)**, who was deprived of the right to work in cinematography for twenty years after the "Commissioner" was banned.

The action of the drama "Commissar" takes place in the era of the civil war, but Alexander Askoldov's view of the events of those years was "non-canonical" and therefore dangerous for Soviet ideology.

Film critic Valery Fomin describes in detail the reasons for the prohibition of "Comissar": officials of the state film industry believed that this film "is not just a denial, but a desecration of the revolution, its lofty humanistic goals and objectives, those bright ideals for which its fighters fought and died. A revolution, according to the author, regardless of its nature, as well as the civil war that accompanies the revolution, is in any case an absolute evil. These social cataclysms bring misfortune to all human beings – regardless of their place in the social system, regardless of their place in this struggle. ...

And it is even more amazing that this work could have appeared on the eve of the great holiday – the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution" (A. Akhtyrsky), and the picture "gives a wrong solution to the theme of revolutionary humanism and proletarian internationalism. According to the picture, it objectively turns out that revolution is a force opposing a person, his desire for personal happiness. ... During the discussion of the film material in the screenwriting and editorial board of the Main Directorate of Art Cinematography, it was decided not to accept A. Askoldov's movie in the form presented by the studio and the Higher Directing Courses" (E. Surkov).

The results of numerous discussions were summed up by the then Chairman of the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR Alexey Romanov (1908-1998), arguing that Alexander Askoldov's film "Commissar" "is completely unacceptable for our screen ... What is the major mistake of this film? In a nihilistic perception of the history of our revolution. ... Is it possible to accept the film in the form in which it is presented? No you can not".

Since the director, by appealing to various authorities, continued to fight for the appearance of "Commissar" on the screen, he was punished – in 1969 he was fired from his job and expelled from the CPSU.

Excommunicated from cinema for many years, Alexander Askoldov, and after the release of "Comissar" in Soviet distribution (1988), was very sensitive to the fate of his long-suffering brainchild and, at a press conference at one of the foreign festivals, argued that the Soviet press still ignored his work.

After attending this press conference, film critic Valery Kichin on the pages of the newspaper "Soviet Culture" made an open letter addressed directly to the director: "What silence can there be if the "Comissar "has already dedicated enthusiastic lines and whole articles "Izvestia" and "Week", "Soviet Russia" and "Evening Moscow", "Soviet Film" and "Soviet Screen", "Cinema Art" and "Moskovskaya Pravda", "Moscow News" (three times!) and Riga's "Kino", "Moskovsky Komsomolets", "Leisure in Moscow" and even "Projectionist" ... And this is long before the release of the film! What silence, if only "Soviet Culture" returned to the "Commissar" eight times, scrupulously noting its international successes, if it gave several critics' reviews under the heading "Spectrum of Opinions", if it published a passionate article by Yevtushenko! ... You said in Toronto that the film is hushed up by Central Television. And I wanted to pinch myself – did I really see footage of your film on the TV screen in Moscow with an extremely benevolent commentary by V. Demin, the secretary of the board of the Union of Cinematographers? And what about the interview with you conducted by A. Plakhov? You have argued that the international success of "Commissar" is carefully hidden from the public. And again I wanted to interrupt this dream – after all, I had already read about the West Berlin triumph, moreover, I myself happily conveyed information to Moscow about the triumph of the "Commissar" in Montreal. And then, to be more precise, there was also a special note under the heading "Commissar in Toronto." ... Now your film is at the box office. There will probably be new reviews. He did not generate the expected excitement in the public. But here, it seems to me, too, there is no malicious hand of "corrupt artists" who "do not like it when a picture is successful", there is no subversive activity of the "new leaders of the Union of Cinematographers" who "compete in self-affirmation" – I am quoting your press conferences again.

It's just that the film turned out to be interesting to someone, to someone not. Which, in my opinion, is normal. It's abnormal – this is when artistic success is replaced by scandalous success, which the officials, who zealously banned the film for 20 years, undoubtedly achieved. After all, the Western press, as you can easily see, is much more electrified by your really dramatic destiny than by artistic categories. This is

understandable: your bitterness is shared not only abroad, but also by your compatriots – colleagues, critics, and even those who are not close to the film” (Kichin, 1988).

Let us now turn to how the Soviet press of the era of "perestroika" greeted the release of "Comissar".

Considering that the first public screening of "Commissar" took place in 1987, the year of the 70th anniversary of Soviet power, film critic Elena Stishova published on the pages of "Soviet Screen" a text that was quite traditional for the beginning of perestroika: "The film "Commissar" is a work marked by a truly philosophical depth of thought about the revolution and the people who fought for it. ... Askoldov was one of the first to introduce into the film narration about the past the semantic layer of modern consciousness – as a system of spiritual coordinates. Screen time is condensed. The action takes place on the border of reality and myth. In the common fate of the participants in the drama, super-meaning is highlighted, unknown to them, revealed only to descendants. ... in the morning Claudia will leave to die for the truth, and Maria and Efim will stay to nurse her son. This will be their contribution to the cause of the revolution” (Stishova, 1987: 14-15).

The article by film critic Konstantin Shcherbakov, who noted that “the director builds his film narration on precise details, reliable realities of the time, was consistent in approximately the same vein. But converging, colliding, as in the feverish visions of Claudia, they carve out a poetic thought, give the film a new – symbolic, metaphorical dimension. And the scythe, helplessly and fruitlessly gleaming in the sun, will creak across the sand. And looking into the eyes of Claudia, glowing with peace and happiness, holding a newborn baby in her arms, we suddenly remember the stone Virgin Mary, past which – remember, at the beginning of the picture – the commissar Vavilova's comrades rode tiredly, without turning their heads. ... Toward morning, Klava will take the child in her arms, breastfeed him and, choking on her tears, will speak meaningless, painfully piercing, affectionate words. And then he will carefully lay the child down, look at him for the last time and, crying out desperately: Maria! Maria! – will rush to catch up with the leaving red army” (Shcherbakov, 1987).

Film critic and literary critic Lev Anninsky (1934-2019) was sure that “Mordyukova's amazing organicity in the role of Commissar Vavilova is connected not only with nominal fidelity to the type ... but the drama is deeper and darker there. Something in Mordyukova's simpler natural force is complicated, something is "taken away"; something demonic is visible in a sane peasant woman who was created to love, give birth, lead a house, but still abandons the house, and abandons the child, and accepts the death of a loved one as a fatal inevitability: she is not surprised at death, is not afraid of death, ready for death ... In the crushing natural force that Mordyukova puts into the image of the "commissar", there is not exactly what you expect at face value and type: there is no concatenation of words, there is no dry fanatical fire. There is something deeper: what should catch on to the words should ignite: some kind of gleam of the spirit, a failure of the spirit, unaccountable demonism, quiet credulity, blocked by screaming determination. And Askoldov also sensed this secret drama in Mordyukova and realized that it was more important than the nominal feverish faith traditionally expected from the “commissar”. ...

This is a drama of being, as if suspended, as if raised – either by an explosion, or by an impulse, this being, enchanted by some force that threatens, attracts, hypnotic, crushing, persistent. This is how the third pole of the figurative tension appears in the film. If the first two are realized in the visible figures of a heavy, sullen commissar and a Jewish tinsmith, light as fluff, then the third pole (fulcrum, reference point) is created most of all by the very behavior of the camera. This is nothing more than the author's presence, the eye of an observer who knows about the heroes what they do not know about themselves.

Nervous montage, interrupted rhythm, intersecting lines within the frame tension – all this creates a sense of danger hanging in the air of the film. Feeling like a catastrophe, a war. ... What is Askoldov's microconcept? In a sense of catastrophe, the disintegration of the one, in a hopeless attempt to bring the edges together. There is as much civil war here as we want to extract. And the same amount – the despair of the sixties, in whose eyes the renewal of life, constituting their fate, their faith, their existential task - turns into a chain of "attractions". The texture loses its structure” (Anninsky, 1991).

"Commissars in dusty helmets" – wrote L.A. Anninsky – this is a song, a legend, a slogan picked up by the sixties, a sign of light, a sign of renewal of the soul and the world. At the beginning of the period, cinema first of all returned this symbolism to the screen. Alov and Naumov did it directly in Pavel Korchagin: they revived the inspired commissar with burning eyes – a challenge to stupidity, hunting order, philistinism, everything that tied wings at that time, prevented "the words from returning their original sound." They wanted to return the original sound to everything: words, feelings, colors. Chukhrai's defiant hedonism in "The Forty-First" was the same attempt to purify himself as the defiant everydayism of the young Khutsiev; but it was Alov and Naumov who conveyed this purification most accurately, then it was the purification of the legend: yes, sacrifice, yes, ascetic faith, yes, fanaticism, but this is the only way to revive a hero in which yours and the common, dream and strength, flight and power will unite together. Didn't connect. It took ten years to make sure of this. Ten years later Askoldov answers – a legend. He shoots in rapid motion, in super-large size, stretching out on the screen in agony – as the thin commissar's glasses that have fallen on the pavement are split and scattered. Fragility. Asceticism of black and white, graphic, transparent texture. Poetry of sorrow. Irreparability” (Anninsky, 1991).

The interest of Russian cinematography in the "Comissar" has not dried up even in the 21st century.

Film critic Mikhail Brashinsky believed that "Askoldov made a wonderful film – both in the context of his time and outside it. In the same years, at the same time as "Commissar", "Andrey Rublev" and "July Rain", "There is no ford in the fire", "Short Meetings" and "Intervention" were made, but against their background the picture of A. Askoldov looks an anomaly – almost an ideological sabotage of the author, free from internal censorship. A sabotage is all the more "dangerous" because it was carried out on "socialist" soil, loosened with the usual historicism and realism. As the further fate of "Comissar" showed, his language has not become obsolete over the years. Whole, austere, grainy – in concept, tone and image – the film was shot as if A. Askoldov was the last unbroken avant-gardist of the twenties, who in the late sixties decided on the tragedy of the Civil War. Tragic in the film is not only the space wide open for the duel of life and death, and the ascetic crystal structure that unswervingly attracts the heroes to death, and the audience to catharsis, but also the play of actors – Nonna Mordyukova, Rolan Bykov, Vasily Shukshin, who combine detailed psychologism with broad symbolic generalization. To determine the place of A. Askoldov's film in history, it is enough to admit that, apart from "Andrei Rublev" and "Comissar", the post-thaw Soviet cinema did not create original tragedies” (Brashinsky, 2001).

Film critic Evgeny Margolit is convinced that "Commissar" is a film that must have appeared in the 1960s. When the intelligent audience, following Bulat Okudzhava, repeated, like an incantation: "I will still fall on that, on that only civilian. And the commissars in dusty helmets will bow silently over me". When one after another came out "The Ballad of the Commissa", "Extraordinary Commissar", "Commissars", and these were talented and worthy films. When cinema discovered the poetry of the realities of the objective world, the poetry of the document, and this discovery sharpened the taste of a

dizzying metaphor ... At the same time, "Commissar" is a film that could not appear on the screen in the 1960s. For the tendencies dissolved in the cinema of these years, he concentrated in himself, and things were revealed for which names had not yet been in the public language. ... The pathetic refrain of many works of socialist realism – "thousands will take the place of one" – is suddenly called into question in "Comissar". The finiteness of one human life suddenly begins to cause fears in the finiteness of the life of the human community as a whole. The entire mass turns out to be made up of individual people, each of whom is terribly mortal" (Margolit, 2003).

Irina Orkina wrote that in "Comissar" Askoldov pushes the time and space limits, realizing that the civil war, the death camp and the maternal victim are all events of the same tragic order. Linear links that stretch the storyline along the hero's fate no longer work. They fail to capture the scale of the disasters of the twentieth century. Here you need an outlet to the depth, a new, inward-looking view. The search for a new integrity required the director to disentangle the existing linear course of the story. The right to this terrible generalization was given to him by the knowledge of the coming hard times. This is his argument in a dispute with those who accused the director of an allegedly distorted and fundamentally incorrect "concept of civil war", of "editing attractions." Askoldov does not and never had a separate concept of civil war. The view of the world is broader here. This is a microconcept based on the material of the Civil War. ... The tragic sound of "Commissar" goes far beyond any concept of war and the film language of the 1960s. "Commissar" is a heavy, dramatic analysis of human nature. When in the final shots the boys from the command courses are marching across the white snow with bayonets, the thought pierces with lightning: it is not a monster, not an impersonal hellish machinery, that sows death. The infernal circle is broken, instead of the apocalyptic unprecedentedness of evil, its banal nature is revealed. ... "Commissar" is, no less, a look at the possibility of both good and evil nesting in each of us" (Orkina, 2007).

Film critic Gerald McCausland emphasized that Alexander Askoldov's film "Commissar" is significant for several reasons. First of all, it contains a radical rethinking of the civil war, one of the central themes of Soviet cinema, starting from its origins. The interpretation that Askoldov gives to this historical fact is unorthodox and casts doubt on many ideological stereotypes. The incompatibility of motherhood and nepotism with the ideals of the Revolution is an idea alien to Soviet cinema since the Stalinist 1930s. The decision to bring the Jewish family to the center of the drama and focus the narrative on an ethnic theme is, one might say, unheard of in Soviet cinema. The place occupied in the film by religious motives, which is not only tangible, but also fundamental in its visual structure, is also unusual. Although the film is mostly characterized by the realism typical of Soviet cinema of the 1960s, it is scattered about episodes in which there is an almost phantasmagoric editing, modernist stylization and even – in one of the most famous scenes - a bold historical prophecy. In its form and content, as well as due to the history of its prohibitions, the film marks the final end of the thaw in Soviet cinema (McCausland, 2012: 255-256).

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about the "Comissar", as a rule, are quite contrasting.

Pro:

"It's not just a film – it's a scream, it's hard to believe that it was shot in 1967. To say that this is an outstanding film is too pathetic. The film is not immediately realized, if the person is not prepared, but realizing its humanity, the viewer cannot help but notice that his view of history has changed. Together with the talent and dedication of the author and all those who participated in the creation, this film is a diamond of Russian culture" (E. Fukshan).

"The film was 40 years ahead of its time, and maybe more ... Jewelry work with a camera in the style of the best cameramen of today ... Surrealistic scenes have no analogues and, paradoxically, only add to the realism of the civil war ... Plus the undoubted talent of the actors" (Whittle).

"An amazingly realistic and versatile film. How warm and taking into account the details the life of a large family is spelled out. What a sad and at the same time life-affirming humor. Every time in this film, I discover something new. ... Thanks to the directors who, despite the repressions from the censorship, made such films that make you think, feel, empathize" (Nadezhda).

Contra:

"Awful movie. And not because it is bad. On the contrary. Filmed very talented. ... But the message! To what extent is it psychologically suppressing and depressing! After watching, it feels like you've been gutted. Vile sediment and vexation" (Tal).

"Who entrusted the newcomer Askoldov to make films based on the brightest works about the civil war? ... The idea of the Revolution was vulgarized not by enemies, but by our creators with the permission (or teaching) of new ideologists" (San San).

"The film is disgusting! ... I expected to see a masterpiece with political overtones, feeling sorry in advance for the director, who was so disgraced. I thought that the reason for this reaction was that he showed a civil war without embellishment, a brutal fratricidal war. But what was my surprise when I saw the film! Such gorgeous stuff, with a stellar cast to spoil so much! I am terrified! After watching it, two questions arose: what was it and what did the director have with his head? Most of the scenes are frankly drawn out, much is incomprehensible, full of scenes from which a psychiatric hospital clearly blows. For example, a scene in which warriors are mowing sand with scythes! Strange wanderings of the main character through the destroyed synagogue. What did the director mean by this? Completely outside of this time, the scene with the Holocaust, which will be much later than the civil war. I am already silent about some, in my opinion, unhealthy tendency of the director ... to show absolutely naked children. ... Just a madhouse. There are a lot of incomprehensible things. ... In general, I personally understand that the director, who made such a terrible movie on such excellent material, was recognized as professionally unsuitable" (A. Lapin).

Conscience. USSR, 1968. Directed by Vladimir Denisenko. Scriptwriters Vladimir Denisenko, Vasily Zemlyak. Actors: Anatoly Sokolovsky, Viktor Malyarevich, Nikolai Oleinik, Nikolai Gudz, Alexander Dedukh, Vasily Bogosta, Vyacheslav Krishtofovich, Vladimir Denisenko and others. **The film was banned and was not shown on Soviet screens in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1989, the painting was restored from the only surviving copy, and in 1990 its belated world premiere took place at the Montreal International Film Festival.**

Vladimir Denisenko (1930-1984) directed 11 full-length feature films, of which only two ("Roman and Francesca" and "High Pass") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

Film critic Vladimir Voitenko believes that the war drama "Conscience" is one of the most principled films in the history of the entire Ukrainian cinema. ... World War II, Ukraine occupied by the Germans. During a collision on the road, a village boy Vasily kills a German officer. The invaders demand to extradite the guy, threatening to destroy everyone. The problem of choice arises both in front of Vasily, because of whom fellow villagers can be shot, and in front of them. How to be? What will your conscience tell you here? In fact, the authors of the film simulate a situation on the screen that is consonant

with the postulates of the philosophical doctrine of existentialism that were relevant for that time, which, of course, could not be accepted where the "only correct" Marxist-Leninist rule prevailed. The plot of "Conscience" reveals the story of a person deprived of choice, when each of the possible actions is practically a losing one. And when conscience triumphs over ideology. Of course, such a film in the then Soviet Ukraine could not get on the screens. It was banned for viewing" (Voitenko, 2015).

The views of the 21st century viewers regarding this black-and-white, rough-textured military drama, shot by Vladimir Denisenko together with his students, are sometimes opposite.

Pro:

"A very unusual film about the war in general, and for the Dovzhenko film studio in particular. Moreover, "Conscience" is fundamentally different from domestic war films not only in style – a strict pseudo-documentary presentation of the material – but also in the material itself: no hap-hating happy ending, when ours always win in the end. Everything is tough, tragic and hopeless" (G. Volanov).

"Tragic film. It is a pity for the villagers. It's hard to watch. Tightened. Maybe in this way the director wanted to emphasize the terrible tragedy of that time" (Alfiya).

Contra:

"A very weak film. The first twenty minutes it is not clear at all what the speech is about. The rest are a little clearer, but still bad. Prolonged close-ups on business and without business, senseless pauses and emphasis on unnecessary trifles" (Chihach).

"Typical arthouse of the 1960s, abstruse cinema 'not for everyone.' I don't like Arthouse in principle, but I especially don't like it when they practice in this way on such a tragic topic as the Great Patriotic War. ... What does "conscience" have to do with it? Whether the partisans surrendered or not, the hostages were doomed anyway. But art house and logic are incompatible things" (Rousset).

Conscience of the World. USSR, 1951. Directed by Abram Room. Screenwriter Lev Sheinin. Actors: Mikhail Astangov, Lyudmila Skopina, Valentina Ushakova, Arkady Tolbuzin, Nikolai Garin, Mikhail Bolduman, Rostislav Plyatt and others. **After a significant part of this film had already been filmed, its filming was banned, and the filmed material was sent to the archive.**

Abram Room (1894-1976) directed 19 films during his long career in cinema, three of which ("Court of Honor", "Pomegranate Bracelet", "Late Flowers") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

In post-war times, director Abram Room became a kind of record holder among directors whose films were banned from showing. First it happened with the film "In the mountains of Yugoslavia" (1946), which glorified the partisans led by Tito: shortly after its release, it was removed from the screens because of the quarrel between the USSR and Yugoslavia. The premiere of the anti-American film by Abram Rome "Silver Dust" took place on October 19, 1953, but the film was at the box office for a relatively short time and soon turned out to be banned from cinema / television for many years ...

In the political drama "Conscience of the World" (1951), Abram Room brought to the fore the figure of a certain Danish physicist who did not want the atomic bomb to serve imperialism and was joining the Communist Party.

Soon after the start (about a third of the planned material was filmed), the shooting of "Conscience of the World" was stopped: there is a version that the Soviet leadership did not want to quarrel with Norway because of the negative image of the Nobel laureate Knut

Hamsun (1859-1952), who approved of Nazism and Nazi policy Norwegian "minister-president" (1942-1945) V. Quisling (1887-1945), who was shot on October 24, 1945.

Today the materials of the saved 37 minutes of the film "Conscience of the World" can be viewed only at the State Film Fund...

As a result, having received a ban on three of his films in a row by the mid-1950s, Abram Room decided not to tempt fate anymore and never returned to international politics in his works. And in the 1960s – 1970s, he, in general, moved away from modern themes, turning to film adaptations of Russian classical literature.

Farewell America! USSR, 1951. Director and screenwriter Alexander Dovzhenko (based on the book by Annabella Bucar "The Truth About American Diplomats"). Actors: Lilia Gritsenko, Nikolai Gritsenko, Alexander Polinsky, Grigory Kirillov, Vyacheslav Gostinsky, Nikita Kondratyev, Yuri Lyubimov, Lyudmila Shagalova, Grigory Shpigel, etc. **In the midst of filming (one of the two parts was completely filmed), this political drama was banned.**

Alexander Dovzhenko (1894-1956) directed ten full-length feature films, of which only "Shchors" managed to enter the 1,000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

In 1951, by the decision of "above", the shooting of one of the brightest ideological films of the Cold War – the color anti-American film by Alexander Dovzhenko "Farewell America!" was interrupted.

There are several versions of the ban on this last work of A. Dovzhenko.

Version number 1: Dovzhenko showed too grotesque image of American diplomats / imperialists. Personally, this version seems to me the most unconvincing, since in other anti-American films successfully released on screens – "Meeting on the Elbe" (1949), "Conspiracy of the Doomed" (1950), "Secret Mission" (1950), all this was also in excess.

Version No. 2. In 1951, the international situation changed, and the Soviet leadership decided to completely stop the production of anti-American film products. The version is more logical, but also raises questions, since the international situation did not prevent the launch and completion of filming in 1953 of the anti-American film Silver Dust (which, however, was also banned shortly after the premiere).

Version No. 3. Revenge of I.V. Stalin personally to Alexander Dovzhenko, whom L.P. Beria has already accumulated a hefty "dossier". This version also seems to me untenable, since no reprisals against A. Dovzhenko after the ban on the filming of the film "Farewell America!" did not follow. Thus, there was no point in stopping an expensive film project, previously approved by all censorship authorities, just to annoy A. Dovzhenko, not to mention financial losses...

Version No. 4. Personal whim of I.V. Stalin, who allegedly said the following about the author of the anti-American book A. Bucar, which served as the basis for the script of the film "Farewell America!" , and ordered to stop filming halfway (in the end, 50% of the two-part tape was filmed). The version is rather bizarre, but it makes sense, since I.V. Stalin, as you know, was prone to paradoxical actions in relation to the "creative intelligentsia"...

Findings. So, we can say that the unambiguous explanation for the ban of the film "Farewell America!" no, but the readers of this book can look at this work of A. Dovzhenko on the Internet and put forward their own version (or support any of the four above).

At the end of the 20th century, film critic Vladimir Antropov wrote about it this way: "Now it is easy to criticize what Dovzhenko did or did not manage to finish. Yes, "Farewell America" is far from the best in his legacy, yes, it is an outspoken journalism with an unpleasant ideological mood; there are many other serious complaints about the material.

But do we have the right, having taken out of the historical context, from a terrible time, not just a film, but a piece of life, the painful suffering of the Artist, to accuse him of all mortal sins? And is everything really so unambiguous in the picture, is it such an unrecognizable, alien Dovzhenko? One has only to accept the rules of the director's game, and we will recognize his passion, indifference, journalism, characteristic of many of his works, we will see satirical, grotesque images” (Antropov, 1996).

Farewell Beyond the Line. USSR, 1981. Directed by Karen Gevorkyan. Screenwriters: Karen Gevorkyan, Alexander Divanyan. Actors: L. Manukyan, A. Mirakyan, V. Pluzyan, Levon Harutyunyan, Vruyr Harutyunyan, V. Martirosyan and others. **The film was banned in 1981 and was not released in the all-Union film distribution.**

Karen Gevorkyan has directed seven full-length feature films, among which the most famous is “Piebald Dog Running by the Edge of the Sea”.

In the psychological drama “Farewell Beyond the Line”, a university student, being in a state of moral anxiety, tries to deal with life's problems...

For some unknown reason, the authorities considered this film anti-Soviet and it was banned. Until today, "Farewell Beyond the Line" is one of the few domestic years of the 1980s that are not available on the Internet ...

Forest. USSR, 1980. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Motyl (based on the comedy of the same name by A.N. Ostrovsky). Actors: Lyudmila Tselikovskaya, Boris Plotnikov, Vyacheslav Kirilichev, Stanislav Sadalsky, Elena Borzova, Alexander Solovyov, Mikhail Pugovkin and others. **The film was banned in 1980 and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in May 1987.**

Vladimir Motyl (1927–2010) directed 10 full-length feature films, three of which (“Zhenya, Zhenya and Katyusha”, “White Sun of the Desert” and “Star of Captivating Happiness”) were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

There is a version that the comedy of Vladimir Motyl "Forest" was banned due to the fact that the characters' morals reminded of someone from the Soviet "top" ... Another version is simpler: the picture was put on the "shelf" for farcical distortion of theatrical classics ...

In the year of the release of "Forest" on the screen, the Soviet film press greeted him ambiguously:

Film critic Valentina Ivanova (1937-2008) believed that “the endless shocking of the film – with overturning ladies in disability, drinking in the hayloft, among layers and pigs, maids and lackeys, and in general with all this round dance of flawed half-personalities – this shocking is by no means just a comic aims aiming, although we laugh incessantly. Its goal is not only endless exposure, but also endless sadness for lost human values, for the land that is being devastated, for the forest that is being sold. After all, a living soul is also laid with the forest – the fate of Ksyusha, her love, the fate of Gennady Gurmyzhsky (who is also the actor Neschastlivtsev) is at stake, in essence equated to that cherished mint-crumpled thousand rubles, which constantly passes from hand to hand. And the soul is still alive, albeit completely worn out, oiled and oiled, like that same thousand” (Ivanova, 1987: 9).

And the theater critic Mikhail Shvydkoi was convinced that Vladimir Motyl shot “his picture in such a way that the feeling of the non-falsity of what was happening would not

leave for a minute. Blurred boundaries of the frame, a kind of artificial flair of each composition – everything seems to betray a desire to balance on the edge of life and art, paradoxically asserting great naturalness and naturalness behind fiction, acting. In a similar solution to the play, no doubt, there is A.N. Ostrovsky, the Russian genius of theatricality, is the time when the picture was created, the end of the 70s of our century. ... [but] everything that can be guessed about the director's deep intention is guessed with great difficulty in a chaotic pile of episodes, not verified in tempo-rhythm and editing, in constant violation of measure and taste, in the eclecticism of the visual series. ... In the idea you recognize a subtle artist, the embodiment of the conceived - sometimes not even at the level of a strong craft" (Shvydkoi, 1987: 10).

The opinions of today's viewers about V. Motyl's comedy "Forest" also differ significantly:

"Great movie! ... This film is an example of high art ... I enjoyed watching it all the time! Frankly, I do not like the adaptation of the classics, as a rule, they disappoint me, but not this one. I think that Ostrovsky would definitely approve of such a frank, sharp and ruthless grotesque, satire on society, which he sought! The bloodworm has reached its goal. This is precisely the purpose of the classics. Expose vices, make society look back, wake up, look at themselves from the outside. This film does it mercilessly ... Razor sharp and insanely talented at the same time. I got great pleasure. Ahead of its time" (Slim).

"Interesting film. But the impression is twofold. It seems that the actors played talentedly. But there are roughnesses that are difficult to explain. The film does not give the impression of integrity, it consists of a series of scenes. The actors replay a little, the angles are not always successful. In short, directorial and cinematography flaws. Raw film" (Seryozha).

Formula of the Rainbow. USSR, 1966. Directed by Georgy Yungvald-Khilkevich. Screenwriter Yuri Chernyavsky. Actors: Nikolai Fedortsov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Savely Kramarov, Ivan Ryzhov, Frunzik Mkrtchyan, Georgy Vitsin, Lev Stepanov, Roman Tkachuk, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Grinko, Evgeny Shutov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. **The film was not released on a wide screen (although some reports went in limited rental on the Ukrainian territory). It was shown on TV only in post-Soviet times.**

Georgy Yungvald-Khilkevich (1934–2015) is known to the audience, first of all, for his "musketeer" films. During his long film career, Georgy Yungvald-Khilkevich directed 22 films, five of which ("Dangerous Tour", "Insolence", "Season of Miracles", "Where He Goes!") were included in a thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

In the fantastic comedy "Formula of the Rainbow", a scientist creates a robot that looks absolutely similar to himself. Everything would be fine, but the robot is trying to be too independent ...

Filming for "Formula of the Rainbow" was completed in 1966, but the film was never released to the wide screen. The reasons for this are still unclear.

There are several versions. The first of them is based on the fact that the filmmakers did not like the satirical sharpness of the film. The second assumption (which was expressed, for example, by G. Jungwald-Khilkevich himself) reminds that the "Formula of the Rainbow" had a strong competitor with a similar plot – the fantastic comedy "His Name Was Robert", which was released in 1967. The third version of the "shelf" fate of the "Formula of the Rainbow" (the version, in my opinion, a joke, since the camera work in the film, in my opinion, is quite consistent with professional standards) was proposed by film critic Denis Gorelov: in his opinion, this film was "banned for professional marriage: three

cameramen still did not learn to point the camera exactly at the face together, and the frame of the frame now and then passed exactly along the upper lip" (Gorelov, 2009).

Today, of course, in the "Formula of the Rainbow" the flaws of the debut direction are clearly visible. And the composer Alexander Zatsepin, in my opinion, is clearly disappointing here. After the brilliant music in "Operation "Y", one could expect much brighter and more modern melodies from him.

But on the whole, the "Formula of the Rainbow" does not look without interest, and, I think, taking into account a good acting ensemble, it would have every chance to attract Soviet audiences in 1966 or 1967 to cinemas

The views of the 21st century viewers about the "Formula of the Rainbow" differ significantly.

"For": "In my opinion, the film is much more interesting and funnier than "His name was Robert". Very bright, colorful. Wonderful cast! (Hellas). "Great eccentric comedy! ... In some satirical moments "Formula of the Rainbow" surpasses "His name was Robert", but "Robert..." takes its "stars": after all, Oleg Strizhenov and Marianna Vertinskaya are super!" (G. Volanov).

"Against": "The filmmaker is strange ... Initially, it is clear that this film will not have a future, because with its ingenuity it caused some associations among the leadership of our country at that time. Despite the good selection of actors, the film is still very weak" (Barygin-Amursky).

Hare Reserve. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Rasheev. Screenwriter Vasily Reshetnikov. Actors: Evgeny Lebedev, Alexander Kalyagin, Lev Durov, Alexander Khochinsky, Alexander Potapov, Vladimir Receptor, Irina Sokolova, Natalya Borovkova and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s, since it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Nikolai Rasheev directed nine full-length feature films (among them – "Little School Orchestra", "Kings and Cabbage", "Apple in the Palm"), but his most famous work was the television "Bumbarash".

The action of a musical satirical comedy takes place in a certain hare reserve, where the hares have long been eaten, and the director (Evgeny Lebedev) expects a penalties from the authorities ... But then suddenly a fountain of mineral water begins to beat in the center of the reserve, and the director comes up with the idea to organize its sale...

Film officials of the 1970s, apparently, were afraid of satirical arrows directed against bureaucracy and theft, however, in my opinion, they were afraid in vain. Unlike "Bumbarash", "Hare Reserve" was made with the spirit of archaic Soviet operettas – with inexpressive music, flat humor, student-cabbage poems and recitations – and, despite the participation of well-known comic actors, to collect any I could not have a significant audience at the box office ...

It is clear that the Soviet "perestroika" press could not help but support this "shelf", and even satirical comedy.

Screenwriter and film critic Robert Vickers (1931-2000) was convinced that "it would be unfair to call the picture" morally obsolete". Unfortunately, the targets that her critical arrows were aiming at have not yet disappeared from our everyday life. Evil can disguise itself, adapt to any circumstances. And those who like to profit from the government become especially resourceful when their well-being is threatened" (Vickers, 1987: 5).

The film critic Boris Berman commented very positively, although referring to the "conservatism" of the tastes of the mass audience, about the "Hare Reserve", noting that he

was "very funny ... Yevgeny Lebedev, Alexander Kalyagin, Lev Durov and Alexander Khochinsky, portraying rogues and crooks, ... they play with such imagination, with such ease and, if you will, childish foolishness that many episodes of the film can be described as virtuoso pop sketches. ... "Bumbarash", as you remember, was liked by many. "Hare Reserve" will have fewer fans, I think. The acute form, chosen by the authors, is both unusual and, most importantly, unusual. And the unusual, it just so happened, often repels the audience. Including the "non-ordinary" (Berman, 1987: 12).

But not bound by any "perestroika" obligations and "straws" viewers of the XXI century, as a rule, consider the "Hare Reserve" a creative failure:

"This film is, of course, a failure. A weak scenario, launched only to fill the planning unit, did not promise a masterpiece. ... A full-fledged musical requires good drama and much higher financial costs" (B. Nezhdanov).

"E. Lebedev, L. Durov and A. Kalyagin completely dissolved in a mediocre act, staged, as if, by the forces of a school drama club. And in this sense, it is even incomprehensible why the "Hare Reserve" was banned: they would have released it – it would have failed and everyone would have forgotten about it! And so the "Hare Reserve" had a certain halo of a "martyr's film", as prompted me to look at it today and then really regret the wasted time!" (G. Volanov).

"Oh my God! I would like to ask: "What was that?" ... I stumble upon, freeze, seeing my favorite actors ... I try to penetrate, overcome myself, they say, these stars cannot act in a bad movie. I can't stand it: it turns out that by some miracle they were able to participate in this adventure. ... Inescapable" (Irina).

"This is from the series – what kind of movie shouldn't be! A bunch of great actors ... trying to save a completely empty scenario of this action with their improvised acting ... And they do not succeed, because we see here, what we see is a very nasty movie" (Woland).

Intervention. USSR, 1968. Directed by Gennady Poloka. Screenwriter Lev Slavin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Vladimir Vysotsky, Valery Zolotukhin, Olga Aroseva, Gelena Ivlieva, Efim Kopelyan, Rufina Nifontova, Vladimir Tatosov, Yuri Tolubeev, Valentin Gaft, Marlen Khutsiev, Georgy Shtil, Sergei Yursky, etc. **Film in the 1960s - 1970s in the Soviet film distribution was not released, as it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Gennady Poloka (1930–2014) directed 14 full-length feature films, but only two of them ("Republic SHKID" and "One of Us") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

In the tragicomedy "Intervention", the action took place in Odessa during the civil war.

The farcical nature of the film was extremely disliked by the then authorities, and on May 17, 1968, the Order of the Chairman of the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR A. Romanov wrote: "The film shows the situation in the southern city during the civil war from a philistine perspective. A whole string of tasteless, meaningless episodes make up the content of this picture. The farcical style chosen by the director came into complete contradiction with the heroic-revolutionary pathos of the literary principle and the original concept of the film. The depiction of the heroic struggle of the underground revolutionaries is lost in the stream of ridiculous masks, farcical scenes and, as a result, looks caricatured. The pictorial solution of the film is uninteresting, alien

to the traditions of Soviet cinematography” (Romanov, 1968. Quoted from "Forbidden Films (Shelf). Moscow, 1993). So the film was banned.

Film critic Oleg Kovalov explains in more detail the reasons for the ban on "Intervention": "Poloka, creating "Intervention" – a colorful screen spectacle filled with mischievous references to the most diverse works of the Soviet era – worked in a "mined field": even when he rethought the shots in the most benign way and the motives of the Soviet film classics, his films were perceived by the leadership as a mockery of ideology, the main weapon of the apparatchiks. ... Of course, the authorities are usually more intolerant of aesthetics than ideology, and the cinematic leadership could not help irritating the conventional colors and decisions of the film ... But the main reason for the banning of the film was so shameful for the regime that it was not spoken about aloud. The "Six Day War" has recently died down, and among the heroes of this "Odessa" film there were, of course, many Jews. Raiders in boats shifted to their ear came here from Babel, dreamers with violins from Chagall. When the media screamed at the command from above about "Israeli aggressors", the film with such a lovingly and densely painted national flavor was doomed – and it did not matter whether it was "Soviet" or "anti-Soviet" (Kovalov, 2010).

In the year of the release of the long-suffering "Intervention" on the screens, the Soviet press assessed it ambiguously.

For example, a reviewer of the Ukrainian magazine "Screen News" wrote his article in the spirit of socialist realist times, emphasizing that "a funny booth is the first surface layer of the film. And behind him – reflections about life and death, satire on the old world and the enthusiastic dedication of the fighters for the revolution" (Wolfson, 1987: 5).

Film critic Olga Sherwood noted that "after endless monotonous, completely devoid of any signs of any aesthetic thought, we now need a fair amount of effort to enter the game on an equal footing. For this, in addition to open-mindedness, knowledge is also needed; however, the film itself is generous with "tips" ... And from all sides: Balagan! The circus! Theater of masks! Lubok! Meyerhold! Parody! Eisenstein! Poster! Music Hall! It's just a deck of cards! Oh yeah! The filmmakers, as high-class players, reshuffled all this masterly, and the layout turned out to be similar in form only to itself, and in spirit – reviving the romantic traditions of our literature and art of the 20s. The spirit is undeniable – and then take history as a partner and guess and solve its moves" (Sherwood, 1987).

Sergei Ilchenko also agreed with Olga Sherwood, as "the director himself carefully hinted in the film at the tradition that he was trying to ironically rethink. Some of his intra-frame compositions almost literally reproduce shots of Eisenstein's immortal masterpiece – "Battleship Potemkin": a crowd running up the stairs; lions "raised from stone"; procession on the pier. In the twenties, Eisenstein filmed an optimistic tragedy about the revolution. Forty years later, Poloka spoke about the revolution and its heroes in a fun and eccentric genre where "everything and everyone" can mix. ... Each scene has not only its own genre tonality, plot completeness, like a circus act, but also a purely color scheme: from the dazzling whiteness of the prologue to the blood-black color of a gambling house. The total eccentricity of all terms is preserved and multiplied" (Ilchenko, 1987).

The film critic Victor Demin (1937-1993) was much more restrained in his attitude to Intervention, who wrote on the pages of the "Cinema Art" magazine as follows: "Director Gennady Poloka took offense at me. In the questionnaire of "The Week" I put too few stars next to "Intervention". Other critics, however, were not generous either. ... I, however, would like to say now words on a completely different topic. About how, out of the old habit, we could be fascinated and create legends not to confuse restoration of justice with a laurel wreath, which is awarded to masterpieces. For twenty-two years Intervention has been gathering dust on the shelf. Dust for nothing. The artist was mumbled something in the spirit that the revolution evokes a feeling of awe, certainly not laughter, especially such

a booth to which the film invites. The artist replied: we are laughing not at the revolution, but at its enemies. It was explained to him additionally: you did not understand, funny, especially parody, colors are inappropriate here. Blasphemous. Such a topic. ... Poloka is an eccentric, a fan of areal genres. The element of play, dressing up, carnival masquerade called him to her. Moreover, in contrast to all the instructions, he was looking not for the cinematic equivalent of the intoxicated theatricality of Lev Slavin's play, but for ways to expand, sublimate it, the possibility - with the help of the screen - to thicken, concentrate convention, to make it twice, three times convention. ... Today Poloka has a double holiday. Time sometimes rewards the courageous. Television took the four-part episode "Our Calling" off the shelf. "Intervention" is also a reason for congratulations. Justice has finally been restored. Society received the work of an artist, hidden from all of us at the whim of the bureaucrats. And ... And let's enroll him as a masterpiece? This is the usual property of our everyday thinking" (Demin, 1988: 25).

Anatoly Makarov also reacted with restraint to "Intervention": "The film remains in the minds, if not impeccable stylistically, but undoubtedly a living phenomenon of art" (Makarov, 1987: 3).

21st century viewers were also divided on "Intervention":

"About "Intervention" I will say this: it is a masterpiece! Directing, shooting, music, acting are incomparable. I watched this film many times and always – with great pleasure" (Leonid).

"The film is weak. Yes, the individual performances and the performance of the artists are wonderful. But the trouble is that everything does not come together. There is no wholeness. And the comedy-parody must also have integrity. Otherwise, it is then already just a revue, where the performances of each are connected by some entertainer" (Lina).

"The film, in my opinion, is unsuccessful, much worse than the play by Lev Slavin. I understand why the film did not appear on the screens and was completely forgotten. The whole film is annoying giggles that make you yawn with boredom. Flat, sad and pretentious. The characters are cardboard, even the brilliant actors did not help. Slavin's play is an optimistic tragedy, a story about how you can remain human even in mortal danger, how you can joke and do your own thing, knowing that death is a very real threat. And the film is boring clownery, deeply disappointing" (Eliabel).

Kiev Frescoes. USSR, 1966. Directed by Sergei Parajanov. Screenwriters Sergei Parajanov, Pavel Zagrebely. Actors: Tengiz Archvadze, Antonina Leftiy, Viya Artmane, Afanasy Kochetkov, Nikolay Grinko, Mikhail Gluzsky and others. **The shooting of this film was interrupted at the initial stage, further work on the film was prohibited.**

Sergei Parajanov (1924–1990) directed eight full-length feature films, of which, alas, his recognized masterpieces "Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors" and "The Color of Pomegranate" were not included in the 1,000 highest-grossing Soviet films. And there was only one uncomplicated collective farm comedy "The First Guy"...

According to the actress Vija Artmane (1929-2008), it was very unusual for her to act in "Kiev Frescoes": "An indelible impression. We lay in a coffin with Nikolai Grinko. I was all in white, even the skin was bleached, and only the beads and lips were coral. And Grinko smoothed my hair – I had such a three-meter braid ... And already from the tests I saw that it was brilliant!" ...

As a result, only 15 minutes of trial material was left of the film, saturated with complex poetic metaphors (cameraman – Alexander Antipenko), which were first shown to the public only in 1988, at the Munich Film Festival.

Even today, the material of “Kiev Frescoes” amazes with its surreal freedom and bold pictorial sophistication.

The impressions of the spectators of the XXI century, who saw the surviving fragments of "Kiev Frescoes", are as follows:

“Such a film was closed! And your hands are not dry! Recently we saw film and photographic materials on television, which miraculously survived – incredibly beautiful Artmane and Kochetkov, beautiful, as in any of their films, in black clothes of stylish fashion of the 60s, what movements, looks they have ... One can only imagine what magic could happen!” (Yulia).

“This is not a film, of course, fragments and complete impressions are, unfortunately, impossible to compose. The language of cinema is absolutely metaphorical, somewhere even above. It was shot in medium shot and the shots are strikingly beautiful, as picturesque” (June).

The Life and Ascension of Yuras Bratchik (Christ has Landed in Grodno). USSR, 1967. Directed by Vladimir Bychkov (with the participation of Sergei Skvortsov). Scriptwriter Vladimir Korotkevich (based on his own novel "Christ has landed in Grodno"). Actors: Lev Durov, Ilya Rutberg, Lev Krugly, Alexey Smirnov, Pavel Kormunin, Lyubov Rumyantseva, Anatoly Stolbov, Vladimir Vasiliev, Donatas Banionis, Valery Nosik, Victor Avdyushko and others. **Film in the 1960s - 1970s at the all-Union film distribution was not released because it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1989.**

Vladimir Bychkov (1929-2004) directed 17 films for his creative biography, including such a notable film as "The City of Masters" (1965). His highest-grossing work was "Property of the Republic" (1972). These two spectacular films – "The City of Masters" and "Property of the Republic" – were included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

On the account of **Sergei Skvortsov (1904-1983)** there is only one full-length feature film, shot with his directorial participation, – "The Life and Ascension of Yuras Bratchik" ("Christ has Landed in Grodno").

The action of this picture takes place in the 16th century, in the course of the plot, a certain actor appears to people in the image of Christ ...

As a result, after numerous "amendments" this picture was rejected by the censors from the state cinema because of the "fuzzy" interpretation of the religious theme, the complexity of the film language, was banned and was released only in 1989.

The opinions of viewers of the XXI century about this film by Vladimir Bychkov are ambiguous:

“I will not say that I liked the film, but interesting, wonderful work of the director. ... I do not presume to call the film blasphemous, but the name of the Saint and the comedy is no longer good. ... And I do not like ridicule towards any religion, especially over the feelings of believers” (Novikova).

“In general, I liked the film, although some of the storylines – pseudo-saints, the "healing" of simulators – clearly echoes the "Feast of St. Jorgen". And in this regard, it is simply amazing why the film lay on the "shelf" for twenty years!” (G. Volanov).

Literature Lesson. USSR, 1968. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriter Victoria Tokareva (based on her own story "A Day Without Lies"). Actors: Evgeny Steblov, Leonid Kuravlyov, Inna Makarova, Valentina Malyavina, Evgeny Leonov, Larisa Pashkova, Lyubov Dobrzhanskaya, Gotlib Roninson, Victoria Fedorova, Nikolai Parfyonov, etc. **The film was banned and was not released in the all-Union film distribution. After the collapse of the USSR, it began to be shown on TV.**

Alexey Korenev (1927-1995) directed 13 films during his creative career. Basically, these are comedies, among which there are, in my opinion, very successful ("Literature Lesson", "Big Break", "For Family Circumstances"). In total, Alexey Korenev's 1,000 highest-grossing Soviet films included two comedies – "Chernomorochka" and "Accelerate Girl".

According to the plot of this comedy, a young literature teacher Konstantin Mikhailovich (Evgeny Steblov) decides to live without lies...

Apparently, it was this step of the protagonist that became the reason for the ban on the tape. The logic of the authorities, most likely, was as follows: "He, you see, does not want to lie! So, all the other Soviet people lie every day, so what?".

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about The Literature Lesson are generally the warmest:

"Recently I discovered this film. She seems to be an experienced cinema, but "Literature Lesson" not only hadn't seen it before, but hadn't even heard of it. I got great pleasure, since the good old films have already been watched, revised, and here you have old, and kind, and interesting, and even watching for the first time. And what actors have gathered in this film! ... And the film turned out to be pleasant, sincere, funny and a bit sad, as if she had received a gift" (Tamara).

"The scene when Steblov's hero comes to interview the writer is remarkably played. ... The scene is so lively, natural, the actors are absolutely true and organic in every gesture. The duet of Steblov and Dobrzhanskaya, a young teacher of literature and the wise life of a writer, a little comical in her throwing between work and domestic troubles, conquers with the reliability and vitality of the images they create. The film is very kind, funny, wonderful, talented actors are involved in it and it looks with interest" (Pavel).

"A light, witty film with interesting dialogues. A familiar set of characters from other pictures, but each character is made special ... Again, it is difficult to play up school situations in a new way, and yet the authors did it pretty well" (With).

The Lonely Voice of a Man. USSR, 1978. Directed by Alexander Sokurov. Screenwriter Yuri Arabov (based on the works of Andrey Platonov "The Potudan River", "The Secret Man", "The Origin of the Master"). Actors: Tatiana Goryacheva, Andrey Gradov, Vladimir Degtyarev and others. **The film was banned in 1978 and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987, as a result, it gathered 0.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

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

Alexander Sokurov got the sad fame of one of the most "shelf" Soviet directors. Having staged about a dozen feature films and documentaries in the late 1970s and the first half of the 1980s, it was only in the second half of the 1980s that he acquired the status of a public cinematographer. His first full-length work "The Lonely Voice of a Man" is, in my opinion, an interesting attempt, following Larisa Shepitko ("Homeland of Electricity"), to transfer Andrei Platonov's prose on the screen. In the film, the director's desire to feel the stringy rhythm of intra-frame movement is palpable, to transfer the philosophical load to the image, to use the half-forgotten principle of the "type" of the performers ...

In the year of the release of "The Lonely Voice of a Man" in the all-Union release, he was greeted by the film press quite kindly, although not without emphasizing its "roughness":

Film critic Lydia Polskaya wrote that "the complex, multi-storey metaphorical series of "The Lonely Voice of a Man" is sometimes difficult to understand, much less to evaluate right away. But let's "dance" not from "tricky" direction – it is still only a consequence, a continuation of the literary source – but from the prose of Andrei Platonov. Can you imagine the principle of her cinematic arrangement in a careful, stage-by-stage storyboard? Is it possible to build a film based on Platonov's continuous dialogues...? Probably not: in that case, nothing would have remained of Platonov. The film by Alexander Sokurov can be considered a fantasy based on Platonov's themes. And, perhaps, this is the surest move for Platonov's film production: after all, the kinship of souls is determined not only by literal precision. The director created a sketch plastically approaching the writer's prose. ... The feeling of connection between the director and the writer is the most interesting thing in the film. The viewer is fascinated by trying to guess the words through the image, equating this image with Platonov's phrases ... And he thinks about how rich and expressive the language of the film adaptation can be, despite its obvious incompleteness and some student's etude. But a sketch in painting has almost the same powers as the finished piece of painting itself. Shouldn't this rule be extended to cinematography as well?" (Polakaya, 1987: 4).

Film critic Lev Karakhan was noticeably stricter: "The authors strove to give the prisoner ... in this piece of thick Platonov's prose an amazing combination of almost straightforward frankness, simplicity and complexity, to convey something that is clearly beyond the control of mere fictional presentation of events. For some reason, the story itself disintegrates in the film into flattened fragments devoid of psychological development and, as it were, drowns in the capacious and rich cinematic pictures-states that come to the fore. ... The film "The Lonely Voice of a Man" ... is not easy to watch, but it is necessary to watch. This phenomenon is controversial, but extraordinary and promising. The picture, albeit belatedly, will take its place in the history of cinema, and Sokurov, perhaps, will more clearly sense his purpose and get rid of the self-defense extremism and unjustified claims evident in his subsequent works" (Karakhan, 1988: 9).

Already in the 21st century, film critic and director Oleg Kovalov wrote that this "landmark work at first seems not just" wrong", but – exploding the world order, and there is a reason. ... The chamber, it seemed, the love story of the Red Army soldier Nikita and the girl Lyuba especially infuriated the bosses with the fact that, with obvious ideological unacceptability, it was difficult to isolate an obvious political sedition from it: two "dubious" dialogues about chopped up enemies and a bright future did not change anything in the overworldly detached meditative the intonation of the film. But even his sincere supporters could not grasp the very substance of the film's novelty – and out of habit, all the same "ideologically unstable" passages gave the director credit. ... "The Lonely Voice..." amazed as the embodiment of their own unformed dreams of some kind of ideal

film, freeing the mind from the tormenting secrets of folk history. ... "A lonely voice..." is absolutely closed: a rarity for a debutant, usually eager to amaze with his unprecedentedness. In this way, Sokurov's film shrewdly coincides with the most striking feature of Platonov's artistic universe. ... The film is called "The Lonely Voice of a Man", it seems, because the director himself was not fully aware at that time of the meaning of his creation - in fact, the tape is the voice of the collective unconscious. The "chamber" story of Nikita, unable to realize in this world the full completeness of love harmony and only through voluntary, unthinkable torments of the cross, reviving for unity with a loved one, outgrows concrete historical particulars, becoming the archetype of the tragic Russian mentality, the embodiment of the social complexes of the only Platonic hero, whose name is "we". That is why "A Lonely Voice..." is a landmark film for us: it is shot as if from the first person plural. ... "The Lonely Voice..." is truly lonely: in the latest cinema, in which there is no organic feeling of oneself as a part of the people's "we". Therefore, the scorching presence on the screen of disturbing images of the collective unconscious so frightened the VGIK leadership. ... For ten years, "The Lonely Voice of Man" was an invisible movie, a ghost movie, a legend movie, a rumor movie. This feature of the film brings a certain higher meaning to its fate, which at first seems unenviable. Indeed – a scandal, a ten-year silence, an imperceptible release on the third screen ... But the history of landmark works is always what it should be" (Kovalov, 2011).

It is clear that the defiantly "arthouse" "Lonely Voice of a Man" still causes fierce controversy among viewers of the 21st century:

"A beautiful, subtle, unforgettable film and an amazingly accurate title" (Nadine).

"When I watched this film, I didn't know what it was based on. And suddenly, I identified the works of Andrei Platonov. It was a shock. I never thought that it was possible to convey Platonov's syllable by means of cinema. But it turned out to be possible. Indeed – the Master" (San Zhorich).

"I can't say that A. Sokurov's work is very close to me, but I accept this film unconditionally! We somehow forgot that although this is not a film adaptation, it is based on "The Potudan River" and "The Origin of the Master" by A. Platonov, that is, the literary material itself is harsh and gloomy! And here Sokurov is faithful to his theme, the theme of the tragic gap between body and spirit, when a joyless life emasculates the soul and body, making a person incapable of happiness. And I, personally, am impressed by these unadorned faces on the screen, scanty nature, almost a documentary frame! That's very beautiful! Only special beauty, "beautiful ugliness!" (Amelina).

"It is because of these films and with their help the USSR was destroyed. Psychedelia for the unbalanced" (Julia).

"All Sokurov's films are the cry of a soulless godless soul. That is why they are so painful. The further – the closer to hell. "Faust" is an absolutely hellish work. The author passes it off as the truth. But this is just the feeling of an unhappy person. He has nothing but digging in the gloomy wilds of what, according to Sokurov, is the "inner world." Even nature for him is not a gift from God, but a part of the hero's pathological world. Moreover, Sokurov's people act as a function of his plan, that is, as a means. Chooses frankly ugly – both externally and internally. Only the unclean looks at a person like that" (Dace).

Missing Letter. USSR, 1972. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriter Ivan Drach (based on the story of the same name by Nikolai Gogol). Actors: Ivan Mykolaichuk, Lydia Belozeroва, Fyodor Strigun, Mikhail Golubovich and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s. The release of this picture took place in the late 1980s.**

Boris Ivchenko (1941-1990) directed 11 films, but only two of his first works – "Annychka" and "Olesya" had real audience success. It was these melodramas that were included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

"Missing Letter" was banned in 1972: they say that film officials of the 1970s considered this comedy too Ukrainian-free...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Maryana Yankevich writes about this movie as follows: "I have watched it many times. This is the film that won over with Ukrainian irony. He's theatrical. ... What I like most is the very well written dialogue between the characters and the acting. This is not a historical or realistic film. This is a fiction, a fairy tale in which our characters exist: you will be a Cossack, you will be a devil. That is, in fact, in front of us is a nativity scene. ... This film is mystified, and this is its beauty. People love hoaxes, our people, despite the prohibitions of religion, first of all only go to fortune-tellers. There are seductive witches, devils, Cossacks. ... Now this style is already outdated, but as a film in a certain historical context, this film is a reflection of the Ukrainian cultural layer in cinema" (Yankevich, 2020).

Viewers' opinions about "Missing Letter" differ significantly:

"Great movie! I looked with great pleasure!" (A. Lapina).

"Wonderful movie! A sort of Gogol is not Gogol. ... And here there is his – Gogol – an absurd beginning. ... And the rarest case is the comic component of the tragedian Mykolaichuk!" (Misha56).

"In this film, the influence of the traditions of the Ukrainian Baroque and the associated "chimeric prose" is perceptible ... And this decision of the picture is incredibly pleasant to me. ... I am personally very impressed by the connection of this picture with folklore. ... the overall flavor is somehow very true, without unnecessary pathos and deliberate decorativeness. The sensation of "waking dream" is superbly conveyed" (Thea).

"The film has a Ukrainian spirit: there are beautiful landscapes of Ukrainian villages, steppes, and Ukrainian songs, and invincible Cossacks who love to hang over ... One of the main advantages of the film "Missing Letter" is, of course, humor. ... the film looks in one breath and leaves behind extremely positive emotions. I think Gogol, having watched this adaptation, would have been pleased" (Operator).

"I watched this movie ... but I was very disappointed. Of course, in it you can occasionally see beautiful landscapes of the steppes and some cool scenes from the Ukrainian life of the Cossacks. But overall the humor (in my opinion) is weak, the jokes are flat and unfunny today (unless you drank 1-2 bottles of vodka before watching the film)" (Nicolas777).

Mistakes of Youth. USSR, 1978. Directed by Boris Frumin. Screenwriters Eduard Topol, Boris Frumin. Actors: Stanislav Zhdanko, Mikhail Vaskov, Marina Neyolova, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Karachentsov, Afanasy Kochetkov, Yuri Chernov, etc. **After filming ended, the film was banned and was not released. He appeared on Soviet screens only in October 1989.**

Boris Frumin directed seven full-length feature films (Diary of a School Director, Family Melodrama, Errors of Youth, etc.). In 1978 he emigrated to the United States.

The film "Mistakes of Youth" had a difficult fate, to put it mildly. The picture was filmed in 1978, but did not appear on the screens. Its screenwriter Eduard Topol and director Boris Frumin emigrated, and the leading actor, the talented Stanislav Zhdanko (1953-1978), soon committed suicide (or was he killed?).

Of course, against the background of "perestroika" acute social pictures on the youth theme "Mistakes of Youth" looked much more modest. But if the film came out by some miracle then, in the late seventies, it would probably have produced an almost shocking impression. Not only that, perhaps for the first time in Russian cinema, Boris Frumin showed the army "bullying" in action. "Mistakes of Youth", in spite of its enticing and melodramatic title, boldly brought the unusual figure of a working guy into the heroes of the story.

The unfamiliarity of the hero of the film – Mitya Guryanov – is declared almost from the very beginning of the picture. The authors embarked on an experiment that was very "fraught" at that time: they conveyed to him such "intellectual" features as the loss of life guidelines, torment because of the feeling of being a "superfluous person" in a society that seemingly purposefully approaches a brighter future.

The explosive temperament of Stanislav Zhdanko, in my opinion, was ideal for this role. Moments of serene calmness come to Sergei only in his sleep (as in the frame where he is fast asleep, placing next to the pillow a number of "Soviet Screen" with a portrait of Valentina Malyavina).

At first glance, the plot of "Mistakes of Youth" contains a whole collection of stamps from the Russian cinema of the 1970s. Here is the desire of an excellent student of combat and political training after military service to go to distant construction sites in the North or Siberia. And the struggle at this very construction site with the harsh nature, the local leader and other inevitable difficulties, not to mention the textbook episode for the youth tapes of that time, when the "positive" hero knocks off a beautiful girl from the "negative" (Marina Neelova).

But Boris Frumin boldly breaks the established cliché: young conquerors of northern nature are completely devoid of an exemplary halo, and the hero himself travels to distant lands not at all because of an innate adherence to high ideals – he wants to try himself in business, he wants complete independence.

The finale of "Mistakes of Youth" seems to be drawn to "happy end" – the main character, who abandoned the construction site and moved to St. Petersburg, marries a lonely young woman (Natalya Varley), provided, as it is customary to indicate in the ads for the exchange of apartments, isolated living space with all the comforts.

Just, oh, what a sad wedding this is. It would seem, what the hell else do you need? Almost a capital city, an apartment, a charming wife. No, no! Mitya is still dissatisfied, everything hesitates...

In this scene, Stanislav Zhdanko, in my opinion, manages to convey the sensations that arise every time you hear the famous lines of Vladimir Vysotsky by purely acting

means – the plasticity of restless movements, the sharpness of gestures, the differences in intonation and facial expressions: It's not like that, guys...".

Hero S. Zhdanko is not given to explain in words what exactly does not suit him in the world around him. He is not strong in the theoretical analysis of socio-political and administrative-economic structures. As the fact that Guryanov is so acutely aware that something is wrong around, the authors convey on the screen powerfully and accurately.

Again, taking into account the times in which the film was created, one can clearly imagine that Boris Frumin was largely forced, as they say, to step on the throat of his own song: to keep silent about something, to only hint at something. The solution to other episodes looks today, probably, too straightforward, and sometimes somewhat edifying (like the line of the army friend Sergei – a character "cinematically" positive).

However, "Mistakes of Youth" with all its shortcomings and inconsistencies still seem to me to be a landmark work for the art of the 1970s. As well as the "shelf" films "Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt" by I. Sheshukov, "Theme" by G. Panfilov, "Vacation in September" by V. Melnikov, "Mistakes of Youth" were one of the few movie breakthroughs to the truth. ... Breakthroughs, alas, were stopped by super-vigilant censorship.

In the era of perestroika, the Soviet film press greeted "Mistakes of Youth" of Youth with sympathy.

Film critic Alexei Erokhin (1954-2000) wrote in "Soviet Screen" that "this picture, which has just now reached the screen, looks almost like a revelation: its hero rushes through life, but cannot find the meaning of being, and no party members of you - bloodsuckers, no ritual death. After all, the tragedy of life is not primarily measured by the number of corpses, not by the fatal duels of the forces of progress with social evil, but by the movements of the human soul, poking in this world like a blind kitten" (Erokhin, 1989: 6).

Andrei Vasiliev noted the symptoms of "suppressed confusion, a feeling of absolute powerlessness under the pressure of "developed socialism", a feeling of the inevitability and irreparability of "Mistakes of Youth" that are poured into the atmosphere of Boris Frumin's film" (Vasiliev, 1989: 5).

Film critic Yevgeny Margolit considered that "Mistakes of Youth" is an example of a movie of "moral concern": with the inevitable inconsistency of the script, with a paradoxical combination of acting out common topics and persistent recording of the most prosaic (because – the most repeatable) details of everyday life and, finally, with completely unexpected, absolutely "non-acting" actors, for whom this cinema had some kind of almost supernatural flair. ... a cinematography of this kind is created by a hero, but he cannot clearly explain what is wrong with him. This cinematography is a convulsive gesture. An indistinct gesture of unspoken concern, tearing apart the entire being of the hero. Anxiety transmitted to authors" (Margolit, 1990: 56, 61).

Today's viewers are still ready to argue about the "Mistakes of Youth":

"The question is, why was the film on the shelf? What is political, immoral, anti-Soviet? The kid safely, after the demobilization, rushed to the north, filled his pocket with gold pieces, wanted to touch life and women from all angles ... And, by the way, he managed a lot. A hero with a difficult character, good parents, but who have not instilled the values of respect for others. He rushes about, demands attention to himself, but, of course, he does not know that he has to pay in the same way" (Pompey).

"A film shocking in its veracity! I couldn't tear myself away from the first shots. It feels like they were filming almost a documentary. Everything is so real, from our life. And not only the seventies. So it was in the eighties, and in the nineties, and in the 2000s" (Born in the USSR).

"Great movie! It's a pity that I didn't come out in due time. And how reliably the 70s are shown! And songs, clothes, dances, atmosphere of time! But this is all secondary. The

main thing is the fate of the protagonist. ... It seems to him that it is worth coming to another place, as life will sparkle with bright stars, and joy will come to his heart. But no, nothing like that! He, like Shukshin's hero, seeks a holiday, but does not find it. As a result, Mitya finds himself in a big city surrounded by drunken, rude people, with a completely random woman. Everything is very boring, he feels it, and suffers unbearably. Zhdanko perfectly performed this role, he got used to the image so much that the game is not visible, he is Mitya Guryanov" (M. Dzhiganskaya).

"I looked for the first time. My first thought is a keen regret that the film did not come out in 1978. Then he would have been a resounding success. First, the problem of non-regulation in the army. By today's standards, this film can be labeled 12+. They don't kill, they don't swear, they don't fight scary and little, there is no sex. But then the censorship could not miss such sedition. ... The film is far from ideal, I admit it. Indeed, a ragged plot, the ending is too vague. But the film was worthy to be seen by the domestic audience in a timely manner" (Mikhail).

"From the film, I have a kind of ambivalent impression. Despite the fact that I liked the acting (Stanislav Zhdanko is especially good), and the fact that the film turned out to be one of the most truthful in the 1970s (it was not for nothing that it was put on the "shelf"), the very construction of the film causes some misunderstanding" (Alexander).

"Quite a boring film, I hardly watched it to the end ..." (Kmead).

Moment of Truth (In August 44th ...). USSR, 1975. Directed by Vytautas Žalakevičius. Scriptwriter Vladimir Bogomolov (based on his own novel). Actors: Sergei Shakurov, Anatoly Azo, Alexander Ivanov, Bronius Babkauskas, Borislav Brondukov, Nikolai Trofimov, Mihai Volontir, Elena Safonova, Sergei Sazontiev, Boris Shcherbakov and others. **The film was banned when its shooting was 99% complete, and the director made rough cut. Unfortunately, the painting has not survived, as it was destroyed by order of the authorities.**

Vytautas Žalakevičius (1930–1996) directed 14 full-length feature films, two of which ("Nobody Wanted to Die", "This Sweet Word is Freedom") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

The famous Lithuanian actor B. Babkauskas (1921-1975) committed suicide on October 21, 1975. This is how the outstanding actor D. Banionis (1924-2014) recalled it: "Our star was Babkauskas, a wonderful artist. His fate was tragic: while fishing, he broke his spine and after that he began to forget everything, could not find his way home. He was getting worse and worse, in the end he hanged himself..." (Banionis, 2012).

The death of Babkauskas was one of the reasons to stop the almost completely completed filming of the film adaptation of the novel by Vladimir Bogomolov "In August 44th ..." / "Moment of Truth"...

And there were many reasons for this: the quarrel between the director Vytautas Žalakevičius (1930-1996) and the writer and screenwriter Vladimir Bogomolov (1926-2003), who did not share the harsh style and harshness of the director's interpretation. The reluctance of the filmmakers to get a dark version of one of Žalakevičius' previous films – "Nobody Wanted to Die". In addition, not so long ago, Alexey German's film "Checking on the Roads" was put on the shelf, also solved in a manner that was extremely realistic for those years ...

The role of Captain Alekhine in the film by Žalakevičius was played by the outstanding actor Sergei Shakurov, and Senior Lieutenant Tamantsev was played by the talented, but, alas, already deceased Anatoly Azo (1934-2007). The role of Lieutenant

Blinov was played by the then VGIK student Alexander Ivanov (see in the appendix his exclusive interview given to the author of these lines).

This is how Sergei Shakurov recalled the film: "I played Alekhine. I didn't have such a role at all. And then no one saw her. Žalakevičius is a very tough man and he quarreled with the author, and the picture was eventually closed. There were literally 5-10 minutes of screen time missing. And she lay for a long time, lay and, in the end, then she was washed off, because no one was concerned with this fate. But they could have restored it" (Shakurov, 2012).

It is paradoxical that in the end Žalakevičius' film shared the fate of the first version of the film "Stalker". For some reason, the materials of "Moment of Truth" were not deposited with the State Film Fund, they were simply destroyed...

Now it is difficult to say how the film by Vytautas Žalakevičius would have ended up. But I think that with such a dramatic basis, direction and cast, this could be one of the best and most truthful films about the war...

My Home is a Theater. USSR, 1975. Directed by Boris Ermolaev. Screenwriters Sergei Ermolinsky, Vladimir Lakshin. Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Valentina Malyavina, Galina Polskikh, Oleg Yankovsky, Oleg Anofriev, Boris Ivanov, Leonid Kulagin, Larisa Vadko, German Kachin, Konstantin Voinov, Igor Kashintsev, Vladimir Zamansky, Nikita Podgorny, Sergei Dreyden, etc. **Film in 1970- x years was banned and was not released in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Boris Ermolaev shot only six full-length feature films, the most famous of which was "Our Father" (1989).

The biographical drama "My Home is a Theater" told about the life of the great playwright A.N. Ostrovsky. It would seem, what is forbidden here?

However, Boris Ermolaev himself spoke about the reasons for the banning of the film as follows: "This picture, filmed for the 150th anniversary of Ostrovsky, happened at the time of the expulsion from the country of Solzhenitsyn. And the cinematographic authorities immediately concluded that these were allusions, that I was talking about the impossibility for an artist to work in Russia. And the painting was closed for twelve years, I was left without work" (Ermolaev, 1990. Quoted from: Pinsky, 1990: 4-5).

When the film "My Home is a Theater" was finally released, the Soviet press greeted him quite warmly.

For example, according to film critic Valentina Ivanova (1937-2008), the picture of Boris Ermolaev destroyed the established image of the wise and all-understanding classic A.N. Ostrovsky: the actor who played him "Kaidanovsky, by his very appearance on the screen, immediately shatters the legend of stone immobility: he is nervous, explosive, impulsive, although his predominant state is melancholy. ... as the first and very bold touch to such an inexhaustible source as Ostrovsky, the film is curious" (Ivanova, 1987: 8).

Spectators of the XXI century do not always like the film "My Home is a Theater":

"The film is interesting. ... Kaidanovsky played the role of Ostrovsky well. And at the same time, I didn't fully believe him. He played someone else. G. Polskikh – a miracle, how good she is" (Alfia).

"A.N. Ostrovsky is a great compatriot I respect, I treat him like a loved one. This influenced the perception of the film. A. Kaidanovsky is a brilliant and unique actor whom I endlessly admire. But, unfortunately, for me in this particular case "I believe" did not happen. The very idea of the film is talented. There are some successful finds: V. Zamansky as M. Pogodin (portrait likeness!)... But, unfortunately, the film was shot too cinematic. Do

you understand? There was not enough theater flair, theatricality itself, the atmosphere of the time, but I think it would be useful. And there was a feeling that the director tried to fit as much as possible into the screen time” (Erna).

Only Three Nights. 1969. Directed by Gavriil Egiazarov. Screenwriter Alexander Borschagovsky (based on his own story "Night"). Actors: Nina Gulyaeva, Valery Kozinets, Irina Korotkova, Vladimir Vorobey, Nikolai Grinko, Alexey Glazyrin, Oleg Efremov and others. **The film was not released in the all-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s, as it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1989.**

Gavriil Egiazarov (1916-1988) directed ten full-length feature films, three of which ("Sinner", "Hot Snow", "From Dawn to Dawn") were included in a thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

Film critic Neya Zorkaya (1924-2006) told about the reasons for the ban on this modest melodrama in her article in "Soviet Screen": "I'll start with a light note, although bitterness is mixed with the joy for the release of this film: "Only Three Nights". Its director, the famous master G. Egiazarov, a modest man, did not have time to see on the screens this film of his, shot many years ago according to the script of Alexander Borschagovsky and sent to the ill-fated "regiment", that is, banned. "For what?" – Ask today's young Spectator, who did not survive that time. How could this small, like a story, story of the difficult love of two, a rural projectionist and an exemplary collective farmer (she is a beautiful woman, the mother of a teenage boy), frighten? Shocked the prudes by showing an irresistible feeling, the drama of four people, which is told from the screen sincerely, tenderly and chastely? ... But even now the viewer who loves the art of cinema will appreciate the authenticity of feelings, the play of Nina Gulyaeva, the lyrical atmosphere of the action” (Zorkaya, 1989: 14).

In his review film critic Yuri Gladilshchikov wrote that the film "Only Three Nights" was "accused ... of promoting "bourgeois adultery". Do not think what. There are no popular frivolities in the film. The story is unusually chaste. Told with tact and taste. And the hero is not cheating on his wife! On the contrary, having married, betraying feelings of calculation, he betrayed true love – and she takes her own. And she does not destroy him, but saves him. But even that, apparently, shocked the officials that a person does not live ... but only love. Pure passion. Heart. In a rush. Lives by the truth of feelings. And that's good, the authors say. High passion is the main thing that a person has and for what it is worth being” (Gladilshchikov, 1989: 5).

Viewers of the XXI century usually like this melodrama:

“An excellent simple film about the difficult fates of some village people. I watch it for the umpteenth time and show it to others. ... I really like this film, especially because of Nina Gulyaeva. A wonderful woman and actress!" (N. Igonin).

“Good old movie. ... Simple, uncomplicated, clean and sad. Very vital. Gulyaeva amazingly played a loving and abandoned woman. I just looked through it and there was some nagging feeling inside” (Igor).

“I really liked the film. So quiet, rustic, autumnal...” (Hamadi).

“Great movie! Of course, this is not a movie for ordinary people” (Olga).

People Remain People. USSR, 1965. Directed by Dmitry Vurov (based on the novel of the same name by Yuri Pilyar). Actors: Lyudmila Davydova, Lyudmila Marchenko, Viktor Uralsky, Viktor Markin, Vladimir Zemlyanikin, Valerian Vinogradov, Marina Ladynina and others. **This TV movie was banned and was not shown to the audience.**

Dmitry Vurov (1916-1975) directed five full-length feature films, mainly television performances.

The film "People remain people" told about the Nazi death camp Mauthausen...

Price. USSR, 1969. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Kalik (based on the play by Arthur Miller). Actors: Mikhail Gluzsky, Alexandra Klimova, Leonid Gallis, Lev Sverdlin and others. **This television movie was banned and first shown on Soviet TV only in 1989.**

Mikhail Kalik (1927–2017) directed nine films, two of which ("Ataman Kodr" and "Lullaby") were included in one thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

In the course of the plot of the psychological drama "Price", two brothers meet after a long separation ...

The emigration of Mikhail Kalik to Israel became the reason for the banning of "Price" for TV screenings, the film was released on television screens only during "perestroika".

Already in the 21st century, Natalya Balandina wrote that "in "Price" Kalik develops the main theme of memories in his cinema, which determined the construction of the picture "Goodbye, boys!". The viewer guesses about the director's intention, having heard the clear, transparent harpsichord melody of Mikael Tariverdiev on the opening credits of the film – the motive of the fragility of childhood. But after it the sharp noisy score of the metropolis sounds – chaos and cacophony of voices, framing the story of an old house in Manhattan. However, it turns out that the dramatic situation of Miller's play for Kalik is a story about the opportunity to fix the irreparable, to fix the damaged one many years ago, like the cracked resonator of an old mother's harp – the evaluator draws attention to this defect. Time and place are given to the heroes to try to restore the lost integrity, the lost harmony, which is reminiscent of musical and plastic etudes, "frozen moments" interrupting the main action. And therefore the concept of "nostalgia" in the structure of the film, in addition to its direct meaning, acquires an additional meaning: music and images that appear in the screen space are a means of healing the characters and returning the disturbed balance. Thus, the director seems to become an accomplice in the story, he intervenes in what is happening, composing a reality in which he draws the characters" (Balandina, 2018: 402-403).

Today's viewers, as a rule, have a positive attitude towards "Price":

"Four actors in a confined space and over 100 minutes of running time. Only a strong professional can make a highly artistic work and keep the viewer with the adaptation of such a play (this is exactly what was expected from Mikhail Kalik). After 20 minutes of watching, I was a little discouraged from a not very intelligible and unpromising beginning, but as soon as the Jewish appraiser Solomon appeared in the frame ... suspicions were instantly dispelled (then he reproached himself for doubting the director). There are dynamics, tension, intrigue that do not subside for a long period. Despite the fact that the play and the production are very classical, I enjoyed watching "Prices" (M. Mitskevich).

"An amazing production ... Now this play is very relevant, when everyone is talking about all kinds of "spiritual bonds", I advise you to watch this film, carefully and understand if you could preserve the human as Victor did, going through all the crises and not losing humanity" (M. Usatova).

Seagulls over the Dunes. USSR, 1960. Directed by Gennady Poloka. Screenwriter Yuri Trifonov. **In the midst of the filming period, this picture was banned, filming was stopped ...**

Gennady Poloka (1930–2014) directed 14 full-length feature films, but only two of them ("Republic SHKID" and "One of Us") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Film critics Marianna Kirieva and Yevgeny Margolit wrote in detail about the reasons for the ban on this feature-length debut film by Gennady Poloka: "Who has heard anything about the film "Seagulls over the Dunes" today? Gennady Poloka's no less brilliant film was closed. And not just closed: as a result of filming, the director was charged under three criminal articles, two of which said – "up to the highest measure." The director survived; his picture is not. Shooting as retribution for formalistic delights? This was not the case in the 37th. Meanwhile, the very new cinema language is at the heart of the conflict between all the visiting VGIK members and all local bureaucrats. ... After all, the plot component ... is quite orthodox-Soviet. The same "Seagulls over the Dunes", for example, about the heroic "obsession and merger" of the Soviet people on the construction of the Karakum Canal, and here is a separate fascinating story: after all, "Seagulls over the Dunes", by the way, is a film script by Yuri Trifonov that is definitely not known today. But this is a merger, how to turn it ... Apparently, Poloka should have got something in the spirit of "Time, forward!" Mikhail Schweitzer, where, under the pressure of a perky eccentric, the "correct" plot was melted into the history of the creation of the next sixties City of the Sun. ... "Ingenious material! - the famous Ivan Pyriev will tell Poloka. "Well, this is just the second Eisenstein!" And the cinema synclite decides: to recognize the picture as having all-Union significance and to involve Gorky's studio in its production – so that Poloka is not eaten in Central Asia. However, the east is a delicate matter, the republic intends to defend its decision at any cost. And then a criminal case is brought up against the director Poloka. ... an indictment comes from Ashgabat to Poloka: he was filming material discrediting our reality, while allowing gigantic waste. Further developments in the genre of criminal drama: recognizance not to leave, hours of interrogation. Even in the bullpen, the VGIK debutant has time to sit, who only meant to make a good movie. The young director will be saved by the same Pyryev: he will not be afraid to go and convince Furtseva that there is nothing behind the "Poloka case" except a cunning eastern intrigue at the level of the Council of Ministers or even the Central Committee of Turkmenistan. With the knowledge of Furtseva, the Union of Cinematographers will write a letter to the Prosecutor General. And Poloka will be released. ... But what if Pyryev was right, and incomprehensible ambitions ruined the future masterpiece? You can't recognize it anymore" (Kireeva, Margolit, 2014).

Small School Orchestra. USSR, 1968. Directed by Alexander Muratov, Nikolai Rasheev. Screenwriters: Vladimir Zuev, Alexander Muratov, Nikolai Rasheev. Actors: Galina Shabanova, Svetlana Smekhnova, Sergei Vlasov, Viktor Totsky, Vladimir Khodzitsky, Vladimir Chinaev and others. **The film was shot for TV, but was never shown on central television in the USSR. It began to be shown on television only in the 21st century. There is, however, information that during the Soviet era this picture could sometimes be seen on local, non-capital channels.**

Alexander Muratov has directed 23 full-length feature films during his long film career, none of which had tangible success with a mass audience.

Nikolai Rasheev directed nine full-length feature films (among them – "Little School Orchestra", "Kings and Cabbage", "Apple in the Palm"), but his most famous work was the television "Bumbarash".

The premiere of the film "Little School Orchestra" could have taken place on one of the central TV channels, but the film was banned by "higher authorities". The main reason for the ban was the accusation of "excessive" liberties on the authors.

As a result, the "Little School Orchestra" lay on the shelf for a record 42 years: only thanks to the persistent searches of the film expert Yevgeny Margolit, who found the banned tape in the television archives, the picture was first shown to Russian viewers in 2010.

If you concentrate on Soviet films of youth and school themes of that time, then, first of all, it is worth mentioning "I am 20 years old" (1961-1965) by M. Khutsiev and G. Shpalikov, "I am walking in Moscow" (1965) by G. Danelia and G. Shpalikov, "The personal life of Valentin Kuzyaev" (1967) by I. Averbakh and I. Maslennikov, "Not the best day" (1967) by Y. Yegorov, "We will live until Monday" (1968) by S. Rostotsky, "Male conversation" (1968) by I. Shatrov, "Three days of Victor Chernyshev" (1968) by M. Osepyan and others. Some of these films were distinguished by significant social acuteness at that time (for example, "I am 20 years old", "Three days of Victor Chernyshev"), however, all the same, albeit with bills, they appeared on a wide screen.

But the fact of the matter is that the above-mentioned Soviet films (more or less) fit into the usual socio-cultural context of "socialism with a human face", while "The Little School Orchestra" (1968) by Alexander Muratov and Nikolai Rasheev breathed the air of freedom, improvisational jazz lightness, watercolors of the plot and visual series.

The main feature of the film (which apparently immediately alerted the censors) was its detachment from political (school and Komsomol) and national contexts.

In fact, the characters do not live in the USSR, but in a certain "Central European" city, where extravagant ladies walk pedigreed dogs along the alleys of the park, and the school orchestra plays jazz at the prom. And where one of the main sixteen-year-old heroes falls in love with a thirty-year-old beautiful neighbor ...

In this world, contrary to the standards of "Soviet society", motives of jazz improvisation, love, an atmosphere of free flight and admiration for the cultural / religious heritage of the distant past dominate (episode with a tour of St. Sophia Cathedral, led by one of the main characters of the film). The main characters are young – they are from 16 to 30 years old, they are beautiful, charming, musical, intelligent. In the "Little School Orchestra" there is no ideological chatter, no Komsomol meetings, no didactic speeches of teachers.

The authors conceived and created their film at the end of the era of the so-called "thaw", when many still thought that an improved version of "socialism with a human face" was possible.

However, unlike most domestic films about school and youth of the 1960s era, "Small School Orchestra" is done in an improvisational way. There is no accentuated sociality, immersion in everyday details, politically / ideologically arranged conversations and other attributes of the Soviet "thaw" cinema ...

The characters of the "Small School Orchestra" are presented contrary to the stereotypes of Soviet films on the "school youth" theme of the 1960s: they do not reflect on the revolutionary heritage ("I am 20 years old"), are not immersed in social ("Three Days of Victor Chernyshev") and / or family ("Male Conversation") problems. The characters' images are sketched, but this does not prevent them from evoking the audience's sympathy.

"Small School Orchestra" accurately reflected the "musical tendencies" of the late 1960s: the characters of the film live in music, their life seems to be dissolved in the jazz rhythms of the wonderful music of Mikael Tariverdiev. Conversations that have anything to do with the social context are kept to a minimum. The main thing in the film is music and love, improvisation and freedom.

It was in the second half of the 1960s that the era of "tape" music began in the USSR, when the broad masses of the population for the first time received the "clandestine" opportunity to record and listen to Western rock, beat, jazz music, practically excluded from the official Soviet media (radio, television, gramophone) ... Under the influence of the Western bands, the *Beatles*, the *Rolling Stones*, and others, which were super popular at that time, in the USSR in the second half of the 1960s, the so-called vocal and instrumental ensembles (professional and amateur) multiplied like mushrooms after rain, and jazz bands also experienced a rebirth.

"Small School Orchestra" reflects all this very accurately – the main characters – school graduates – play jazz with enthusiasm, which largely determines their attitudes, values, behavior. Music can be both a declaration of love, and a momentary experience and a symbol of freedom...

In the "Small School Orchestra", contrary to the established traditions of Soviet cinema of the 1960s, the main characters are shown practically outside the realities of the "socialist way of life", and there are no teachers or parents among the characters. At the same time, it is not the verbal line that dominates (the first word in the film is pronounced only at the ninth minute of its action), but the image and music. A striking example is the scene when the main character of the film conducts an excursion in the cathedral: we do not hear her words, we see only her inspired gestures and facial expressions, arranged by a musical row. As for the episode of the bicycle race, it is generally filmed as a jazz improvisation – with freeze frames, abstract lines of lights and, again, to the musical overflow of jazz music, which sounds in the "Small School Orchestra" almost constantly...

If I may put it this way, the "cultural code" of the young characters of the "Small School Orchestra" is passion for jazz music, love, inner freedom, detachment from the "Soviet way of life."

Soviet cinematography of the 1960s experienced tangible influences from the leading world cinematographic movements of those years – "Cinema vérité", French and Czech "new waves". At the same time, these were not only stylistic, visual influences, but also plot, thematic, of course, adapted to the conditions of the requirements of the Soviet censorship. In this respect, the film by G. Danelia and G. Shpalikov "I Walk Through Moscow" (1965), where the so-called "stream of life", devoid of any ideological pathos, was filigree played by the authors at the junction of dramatic and comedy genres, is indicative...

"Little School Orchestra" was filmed in the politically "hot" 1968, however, the film does not reflect the political events of those years. But the influence of the Cinema vérité style, French and Czech "new waves" of the 1960s is obvious.

In the 1960s, a number of films on a youth theme, avant-garde in content and film language, were released in the West. Among the most notable films of the Czech "new wave" are "Competition" (1963), "Black Peter" (1964) and "The Amorous Adventures of a Blonde" (1965) by M. Forman. From the "new wave" of the French – "400 strokes" (1959), a short story in the film "Love at 20" (1962) and "Stolen Kisses" (1968) by F. Truffaut. From the masterpieces of Polish auteur cinema – "Innocent Sorcerers" (1960) by A. Wajda, "Knife in the Water" (1961) by R. Polanski, "Rysopis" (1964) and "Walkover" (1965) by E. Skolimowski.

However, I dare to suggest that the famous film by Alain Robbe-Grillet and Alain René "Last Summer in Marienbad" (1961, Golden Lion at the Venice Festival) had a key influence on the pictorial series of the "Little School Orchestra": for example, in one from the initial episodes of this film, we see geometrically arranged figures placed in the interior space, and then – from the upper angle, a picturesque city alley shot along which elegant ladies with dogs walk towards each other, one of whom carries an umbrella of her mistress in her teeth ... The geometry of the location of the figures on the landscape, again verified and thought out to the smallest detail. The people sitting on the benches of the alley seemed to be frozen in a freeze-frame. Jazz improvisation sounds... This is how the authors boldly introduce the audience into the imaginative world of their film...

Vladimir Chinaev, who played the role of a musician on drums in this film, wrote more than forty years later: "A lot of memories, feelings. Now, oddly enough, this movie-mood is perceived better than in its 60s. ... This film, as I remember, liked S.I. Parajanov (Chinaev, 2010).

The ban on the "Small School Orchestra" also has a purely political version. She is like that.

The film "was taken to Moscow in the fall of 1968, and in Moscow they say: "These are the musicians who made the Prague Spring. Deny". The picture fell under this screwing. Her voice was too clear" (Margolit, 2010).

It was during the filming of the "Little School Orchestra" – in 1968 – that the active performances of the revolutionary-minded "left" began almost simultaneously in Prague and Paris.

The events of May 1968 in Paris are rightly called an attempt at a "student revolution." Beginning with spontaneous student unrest associated with the discontent of the regulars of the Parisian cinémathèque with the dismissal of Henri Langlois from the post of its director (April 1968), the events very soon – already in May of the same year – turned into a real social crisis – with large-scale demonstrations, riots and a general strike under political (Marxist, Trotskyist, Maoist and anarchist) slogans, with economic demands for a forty-hour work week and an increase in the minimum wage. As a result, all this led to a change of government and the resignation of the most famous French president – Charles de Gaulle (he left office on April 28, 1969) and to serious changes in French and European society. So, against such a broad background, the "revolutionary" closure of the Cannes Film Festival by the "left" filmmakers in May 1968 turned out to be an episode of local significance...

The reaction of the Soviet authorities (which had good relations with France and de Gaulle in the 1960s) to these events was rather negative. At the same time, the Soviet media especially emphasized the negative nature of the Maoist and anarchist unrest in May 1968...

No less acute were the events in Czechoslovakia, where, since the mid-1960s, the leadership began to actively pursue a course of European integration. On January 5, 1968, Alexander Dubcek became the head of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. With his arrival, the state censorship (and before that one of the most liberal in the countries of the "socialist camp") weakened noticeably, a gateway for public discussions was opened. More and more often it was said about the usefulness of a multi-party system and private property, entrepreneurial activity, about the need for freedom of speech, assembly and movement around the world, etc. (twenty years later, all this, almost word for word, was expressed – already in the USSR – during the period of "Gorbachev's perestroika"). Thus, 1968 was the peak of the attempt to finally build "socialism with a human face" in a "single state."

Naturally, unlike France, in the case of Czechoslovakia, the Kremlin could afford much more than just criticism and condemnation of certain events. At first, the attack on the "Prague Spring" was conducted "peacefully": in the spring of 1968 (March 23 in Dresden and May 4 in Moscow), the Soviet leadership expressed open dissatisfaction with the democratic changes in Czechoslovakia. Political pressure on A. Dubcek's team intensified in July-August 1968. After making sure that the reforms of "socialism with a human face" are supported in Czechoslovakia by the broad masses (and again, like in France, students and youth), and "calm down" the recalcitrant It does not work out in words, the USSR decided on an armed intervention – on the night of August 20-21, 1968, troops were brought into the territory of Czechoslovakia. Naturally, this led to massive protests (including armed) by Czechs and Slovaks against the occupation. But the forces were too unequal: in April 1969 (almost simultaneously with de Gaulle's departure from the presidency in France) A. Dubcek was removed from his post, and a long period of "tightening the screws" began in Czechoslovakia...

So the angry and harsh reaction of the cinematographic bosses to the free flight of the improvisation of the young heroes of the "Little School Orchestra" in the humanistic spirit of "universal human values" in the fall of 1968 was quite predictable.

The views of the 21st century audience about the "Little School Orchestra" are generally enthusiastic:

"From the first shots, from the first chords – and you can't tear me away from the screen ... What an atmospheric, sincere, light-sad film, all as if woven from half hints, understatement ... A film with the effect of complete immersion – right up to the feeling of summer showers, smells of the city after the rain, the mood of youth ... A film about time, but timeless. The acting game cannot be sincere" (Anastasia).

"Which present! It's amazing that we had such a movie! At that time we admired the "Umbrellas of Cherbourg", and we had our own "Little School Orchestra". What a mesmerizing harmony of color and music! And the breath of our youth" (Go).

"These guys have beautiful, soulful faces. Where can you find these now? In modern Russian cinema, you often see on the screen either aggressive morons, or outwardly pretty, but absolutely faceless and interchangeable boys and girls. I saw this film for the first time and watched it twice... And the pictorial solution, the alternation of black-and-white and color episodes plays a very important role in combination with the wonderful music of Tariverdiev" (B. Nezhdanov).

"And I realized what a colorful life, the colors of childhood and adolescence are the brightest and most delicious, such that they are remembered for a lifetime, and everything else is compared with that color and taste. ... Yes, there is something so nostalgic in this film, watercolors and such wonderful music. And even without a whole plot, without famous actors, you just listen and enjoy" (September).

Spring for the Thirsty. USSR, 1965. Directed by Yuri Ilyenko. Screenwriter Ivan Drach. Actors: Dmitry Milyutenko, Larisa Kadochnikova, Feodosia Litvinenko, Nina Alisova, Gemma Firsova, Ivan Kostyuchenko and others. **The film was banned and was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in November 1987, as a result, it gathered 0.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Yuri Ilyenko (1936-2010) directed 12 full-length feature films, the most famous of which was the drama “White Bird with a Black Mark”.

"Spring for the Thirsty" is a vivid example of a poetic parable in the surreal style of "cinema is not for everyone." This surrealism, which ran counter to socialist realism, in fact, aroused the overbearing anger in the mid-1960s and became the reason for the banning of the painting ...

Here is what the film critic Victor Demin (1937-1993) wrote about this film: “The confusion of many and many instances, both direct, cinematic, and very, very indirect, arose solely because they, instances, could not bear the artistic innovation of the movie... There was not enough taste and knowledge of art, not enough creative courage to rise to this pictorial avant-garde. They attributed to the artist absurd inclinations, including political ones... Let's leave them alone. Let's take care of ourselves. And we, you and I, those who do not prohibit anything and do not want anything to be prohibited, are we able to withstand such avant-gardeism? I will say about myself – with great difficulty.

According to the script by Ivan Drach, poetic and even surreal, but in moderation, it was assumed, as you can understand, quite traditional cinema, color, volumetric, lifelike, with psychological undertones. As part of this movie, a rather strange story unfolded. The old man, offended that the children scattered around the world, forgot him, sent them all telegrams that he had died. Come to bury. The children came together, he lay down in a coffin out of fright, with the last of his strength he was pulling the game, they say, and if he really died ... They shift awkwardly, shyly coughing. “Father, why are you lying there? Get up”. – “Hey gays. I'll get up now”. And before we had a bite, once we got together, we went to the cemetery to visit our mother. And they got lost. Children do not remember where the deceased mother lies. My father got hot, angry, but in fact – he got confused himself, does not know where to turn in the vast, quiet, overgrown with grass and bushes cemetery.

Yuri Ilyenko reasoned as follows: if we are dealing with a parable, then what volume can the characters have, what semitones, what kind of reliability! ... This is an assumption. Nothing of the kind actually happened. And if so, then we will look for such a full-scale site so that there is no blade of grass, no blade of grass, only bare sand. Complete asceticism! Assumption is so assumption! Quite consistent in its own way. Only the newly-minted director did not realize that the conventionality of the parable is being killed by the open conventionality of the image. If, for example, the whole cemetery consists of a sandy, almost vertical rectangle with eight crosses, then how can one get lost in it? You have to portray everything with the help of pantomime.

Ivan Drach, as the director admits, did not immediately come to terms with his interpretation. But still he recognized its legitimacy. It seems that such a gesture is a consequence of a rare spiritual dedication, the need to understand a colleague even in the most difficult, most impossible case. For me, "A Spring for the Thirsty" remains the story of a hopelessly ruined script, ruined for the sake of a spectacular camera trick, for the sake of a stunning director's decision. The motley, generous, multicolored and multi-meaning reality has been replaced by a dull emotional and mental prescription.

No one, I hope, will consider me an ally of the persecutors. Everything is just the opposite: if not for their revelry, we could probably help the talent with a soft, tactful, timely reproach" (Demin, 1988: 26).

Meanwhile, in Ukraine in 1987, "Spring for the Thirsty" was greeted as no more, no less, as a masterpiece of cinematography. In a voluminous article in the magazine "Screen News" it was concluded that "for twenty years the film not only has not aged – on the contrary, today it seems very relevant and modern in its artistic means, deeply truthful and poignant" (Sizonenko, 1987: 7).

The views of the 21st century viewers about the "Spring for the Thirsty" today differ significantly:

"I looked at "Spring for the Thirsty"... and did not understand anything. After all, philosophical and symbolic films for me are a dark forest! Separately, as a constructive criticism, I would like to pretend to be the comrades from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, who showed political myopia and sent the film to "sunbathe" on the "shelf"! And very soon wait for his complete failure at the box office!" (G. Volanov).

"Director's debut, the first peak of many peaks conquered by Yuri Ilyenko, New cinema, a new word in cinema, an apple tree cut down in bloom. Brilliant director, brilliantly played the role of Dmitry Milyutenko. The film was ahead of its time, and therefore was burned (thank God, not all copies) by the Bolshevik scoundrels. For them it was incomprehensible, contrasting, almost without text (there is nothing to complain about), therefore it was recognized as ideologically harmful. Powerful officials did not understand its true meaning - genocide of the people, death and hope for rebirth" (O. Troyan).

"It's a strange, disturbing, disturbing film ... It's difficult to watch, and even more difficult to leave the screening and try to forget what you saw. Almost mystical in its undisguised realism, this film will haunt you for a long time with its dazzling shots. It is difficult to evaluate and needs to be absorbed through the skin and touch. The last shots are deafening and dazzling. An old man, carrying a fruiting cut apple tree on his shoulders, radically changes the idea... The information about the death of the actor at the end of the film leads to a stupor. And finally, about the completely magical sounding – words are not needed. They are superfluous. You will not forget this film" (M. Roma).

"Telling a film is easy, showing it is difficult. Show the way the director and (aka) cameraman of the film Yuri Ilyenko showed, this is on the verge of reality. The film is filled with poetic surreal metaphors, images, yes, to be honest, the film is one big metaphor. The film is complex and, paradoxically, at the same time almost everything is clear in it, it is possible only at the subconscious, intuitive level. ... The film certainly requires your attention, its uniqueness leaves a scar in Soviet cinema" (Pistol84).

Starling and Lyra. USSR-Czechoslovakia-East Germany, 1974. Directed by Grigory Alexandrov. Screenwriters: Grigory Alexandrov, Alexander Lapshin, N. Pekelnik. Actors: Lyubov Orlova, Pyotr Velyaminov, Nikolai Grinko, Boris Kordunov, Boris Ivanov, Boris Zaydenberg, Rina Zelenaya, Rimma Markova, Svetlana Svetlichnaya and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In the 1990s, it was first shown on TV.**

Grigory Alexandrov (1903-1983) directed 11 full-length feature films, seven of which ("Merry Boys", "Volga-Volga", "Circus", "Spring", "Meeting on the Elbe", "Composer Glinka", "Russian Souvenir") were included in one thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

According to the plot of "Starling and Lyra", Soviet intelligence officers Lyudmila and Fyodor carry out important tasks of the Soviet leadership in Germany in the pre-war, war and post-war years ...

The main versions of the ban on the large-scale spy tape "Starling and Lyra" are as follows:

- low artistic quality: the management of the state cinema, seeing the finished film and being horrified at its low professional level, decided not to release it on the screen, so as not to spoil the reputation of the classics of Soviet cinema – Grigory Alexandrov (1903-1983) and Lyubov Orlova (1902-1975);

- propaganda of "beautiful bourgeois life" under the guise of a struggle against Nazism and imperialism: it might have seemed to some of the authorities that the director was too carried away by Western textured luxury to the detriment of Marxist-Leninist ideology;

- dissatisfaction from the KGB: in the course of the plot, Lyudmila, under the guise of a relative, is being introduced into a German family, and this could cause ethical criticism in foreign countries, then look – in any relative from the USSR they will see a KGB agent there;

- changes in the political situation: the policy of "detente", characteristic of the mid-1970s, seemed to the leadership of the state cinema and "higher" incompatible with the traditions of the "cold war" cinema, in which the picture "Starling and Lyra" was sustained;

- the desire of the director and his muse: making sure that the heroine of seventy-two-year-old Lyubov Orlova still does not seem thirty-year-old on the screen, Grigory Alexandrov, at the suggestion of his wife, himself asked to put the film on the far shelf.

To me personally, the most likely version seems to be related to a change in the political situation...

It is clear that in Soviet times, no reviews of the film "Starling and Lyra" were published. And only in the 1990s, articles and books appeared, the authors of which shared their perception of this latest feature film by Grigory Alexandrov.

Dmitry Scheglov in his book "Love and the Mask" wrote that the main scenes of "Starling and Lyra" were "filmed in the early spring of 1973. Orlova was in the seventy-second year. There was an episode in the scene with Peter Velyaminov, where she stands in a wedding dress, in a veil. It was a strange and frightening sight. Her head was visibly shaking in the frame. She was only concerned with how and how old she looked. Enough has been said about her hands. Neither carefully calibrated light nor special angles helped. The work was reduced to the production of "eyelash mise-en-scène". The real theme of the picture is Orlova's desperate struggle with time. It was a film where two people – the director and the main performer – equally did not feel, did not see, did not know their age. Funny stories were circulating around the studio, somewhat similar to the jokes that at that time were persecuted about the anemic elders from the Communist Politburo. "Starling and Lyre" was quickly renamed "Sclerosis and Menopause". ... She did not give up even after seeing the footage, which showed the limits of her capabilities with the utmost cruelty. ... How many of her admirers were thereby spared disappointment, bitterness and longing ... She hardly understood this when she went to her last scoring in the spring of 1974" (Shcheglov, 1997: 324-326).

And film critic Mark Kushnirov regretted that "instead of a quiet inconspicuous decline into oblivion, the cinema of Alexandrov and Orlova preferred a noisy, playful agony in front of the public. And the most bitter thing was that it was their real, blood-borne cinema, only withered, deserted – born by an already insensitive, already automatic, motionless attitude. ... It became clear what was gone and what was left. Gone is the naive romantic self-forgetfulness, relaxed temperament, bodily energy. Children's ease of

fantasy. And also the feeling of ascent, risk, "calf joy" of being. A sense of consonance with the audience ... The "lightness in thought", the smoothed, postcard unnaturalness of the pictorial texture, the twist of plot and visual attractions, "catchy" contrasts between chic poverty and fabulous chic remained in force. And a keen addiction to "necessary" politically prestigious topics. And the same acute, hard-to-hide affection for foreignism, for the comforts and luxuries of the despicable Western civilization. And the cult of an impeccable – mentally and physically vigorous – personality, not corroded by either false ideas or lack of ideas. ... With such a rig they dared to set sail for the second time. The ship was called "Starling and Lyra". After a two-year cruise on domestic and foreign waters, it acquired the appearance of a curious, expressive cabinet of curiosities of the ideological myths of our ceremonial cinema in its own way. ... On the business side, the film was of great help in the person of a high-ranking curator, Colonel-General of the KGB Semyon Tsvigun. (Is it not him – with a respectful aspiration – played by Alexandrov himself in one of the episodes of the film? Really, this is easy to suspect ... However, this support was purely nominal – for greater importance and tranquility. The management of the studio and the State Film Agency did their best to ensure that the venerable classic worked without embarrassing any obstacles and expenses – so that the picture had at least something to see. ... In fact, Alexandrov and Orlova created here the last and most frank variation on their favorite theme – "the world of our dreams". His ideality is emphasized first of all by the absence of time in him – the feeling of "beginnings" and "ends". We have here three chronotopes impressive in their length: a three-hour chronotope of the film itself, a long chronotope of the action taking place in the film (1940s - 1970s) and a certain chronotope of eternity, in which the heroine Orlova resides, remaining "forever young" in all eras. This is really creepy – like any feeling of timelessness, an abyss. ... And indeed: the only living goal of all these espionage games and political intricacies was only one thing: to enable a beautiful woman and her chosen one to live in accordance with their ambitions and innermost desires. Among the bankers, generals, aristocrats, capitalist ministers. In chic mansions, ancient castles, fashionable hotels. In the most picturesque corners of Europe ... It is for this that "two worlds – two systems" revolve, are opposed, for this purpose all the cogs and tongues of international politics are set in motion" (Kushnirov, 1998).

The opinions of today's viewers about "Starling and Lyra" are sometimes polar.

Pro:

"I really liked the film: both the music and everything is very beautiful, I liked this film more than "17 Moments of Spring" (Alexander).

"I watched this film twice today, in all details. I liked it. Especially the game of Lyubov Orlova. She's in shape. She is especially good in the second series – in the role of Madeleine. Magnificent figure, demeanor. Here she dances and rides a horse, and uses a fighting technique against the SS man. For her age, the game is simply incomparable. ... The film itself is not bad and even prophetic. Where the Nazis talk about the ways of the collapse of the Land of Soviets – through ideology, through the introduction into society of specially trained agents who incite discontent with the system. In vain they put the film on the shelf. On the contrary, it was necessary to show widely. I recommend everyone to look and think. And to scold an actress for her age is simply unethical" (Svetlana).

"I like it! Orlova looks great ... I realized that I wanted to convey to us Alexandrov! This is a global policy, about which we became aware only in the last 5-7 years, and the film was shot in 1974! ... But now it is clear what information Alexandrov and Orlova possessed and what they wanted to warn about. The entire world government carried out, our country was taken away, the youth was corrupted, the countries allied to us were seized. That's what the movie is about!" (Margot).

Contra:

"The film was shot in the spirit of the "Exploit of the Scout", which in the 1970s already looked naive. If "Starling ..." appeared in the late 1940s or early 1950s, then yes, it would be a success. ... It was a pity to look at Orlova, you would not wish any actress such a career point" (D. Drir).

"A terrible sight. ... an elderly woman pretends to be young, it is so strange to look, as if it is intended for blind and stupid spectators! The film really looks like a child's. ... Everything is so theatrical, pretended, even Orlova speaks as on stage" (Santi).

"The film is kind of awkward: an absurd script, stilted heroes who you don't sympathize with in the least, poster-like straightforward style. ... Artists play badly, but they have nothing to play! ... The film was put on the shelf correctly, it would have been better not to get it!" (Finna).

Steppe Dawns (State Eye). USSR, 1953. Directed by Leon Saakov. Screenwriter Boris Bedny (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Iya Arepina, Lev Frichinsky, Nikolai Moskalenko, Yuri Sarantsev, Boris Runge, Rimma Shorokhova, Valentina Telegin, Leonid Kmit, Ekaterina Savinova and others. **The film was banned and never appeared on Soviet screens.**

Leon Saakov (1909-1988) directed eight films, but only one of them – the war drama "Spring on the Oder" – managed to enter the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

The reason for the ban on the simple film "Steppe Dawns", which told about the Komsomol field brigade, was indicated in the newspaper "Soviet Art" (03/20/1953): "in view of the extremely low ideological and artistic level of the film, the USSR Ministry of Culture decided not to release it on the screen as not responding the high demands of the Soviet people to the art of cinema".

Theme. USSR, 1979. Directed by Gleb Panfilov. Screenwriters Gleb Panfilov, Alexander Chervinsky. Actors: Mikhail Ulyanov, Inna Churikova, Evgeny Vesnik, Evgenia Nechaeva, Sergei Nikonenko, Natalia Selezneva, Stanislav Lyubshin and others. **The film was banned in 1979. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1986, as a result, she gathered 3.9 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Gleb Panfilov directed 13 films ("There is no ford in the fire", "I ask for words", "Valentina", "Vassa", etc.), of which only "Beginning" was included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

In the year of the release of "Theme" on the screens, the Soviet film press greeted her very positively.

Here is what, for example, the author of this book wrote about the "Theme" on the pages of the magazine "Cinema" (Lithuania): "Love for the Motherland, goodness, cultural values is expressed in the "Theme" through dramatic destinies, in a conflicting confrontation of worldviews. It is precisely such bold works, diametrically opposed to the gray, faceless mass of "nothing" tapes, that we need today, although bitter experience shows that it was they who made their way onto the screen with maximum difficulties for a long time.

"Morality is truth". These words of Vasily Shukshin are recalled while watching the film by Gleb Panfilov "Theme". The picture, which addressed acute and painful problems,

has by no means lost its topicality even now, although its shooting was completed at the end of the seventies.

Moreover, Gleb Panfilov's film essentially anticipated those uncompromising disputes about the truth of art, true morality, human responsibility for one's business, conscience and honor, which sounded in full force in the mid-eighties.

In one of the TV programs, the presenter asked the designer of the original project, who had been "breaking through" through bureaucratic obstacles for years: "When do you think we will need this car"! The designer answered with sad irony: "She is needed yesterday." Of course, I am far from mechanically transferring the laws of production to the development of art, but I am firmly convinced that our yesterday's spiritual heritage would have been noticeably richer if the talented and truthful works of Elem Klimov, Alexey German, Gleb Panfilov were not "defended" on the shelves.

Yes, many of the characters in "Theme" cannot be called "role models." The controversial figure of the famous playwright Kim Yesenin, impressively played by Mikhail Ulyanov, is far from the textbook ideas about honored writers. They used to talk about such heroes – they are atypical, they say...

However, typicality does not mean mass prevalence at all. The point is in the characteristic tendency of the phenomenon. From this point of view, the hero of M. Ulyanov, who has been wasting his talent for the sake of the conjuncture for several decades, personifies the process generated by constant compromises in life and in art, the tenacious principle "no matter what happens," the desire to thickly conceal flaws, to depict – dubious experiments of a voluntaristic sense with pink paints.

Mikhail Ulyanov plays a strong personality. Kim Yesenin is head and shoulders above his other fellow fiction writers, who put their pen on the conveyor belt to receive their next fee, who are never tormented by remorse anywhere. The drama of the character of M. Ulyanov is that, even if it's late, in his sixties, he understands that it is impossible to live like this anymore, it is impossible to write things that are needed by someone, and not by the artist himself. This bitter insight makes the character of Kim sarcastically caustic and hot-tempered.

Here is Kim playing democracy: he listens condescendingly to the compliments of a police officer and a pensioner teacher, "thinks for three" together with two strangers. Here it is as if a wave of self-criticism and self-destruction breaks through him, and he delivers a long disclosure speech, accusing himself of all mortal sins. So he indignantly learns that his son left the prestigious directing department for some kind of stage. But even here he is concerned, it seems, not with the professional fate of his son, but with the fact that the string of conversations and calls to "the right people" for the sake of providing the boy with a "director's future" has now turned out to be meaningless...

The habit of living with double-entry bookkeeping is so ingrained in the mind of Kim Yesenin that it seems ridiculous to the lieutenant's demand for a fine. It is no coincidence that when one of the heroes of "Theme", the young scientist Andrei, makes a major discovery in the field of literary criticism, his boss, apparently no less prosperous than Kim, offers her co-authorship as a matter of course ...

Here, the authors touch upon another painful problem, which has been talked about loudly only recently. Undoubtedly, in the name of advancing science forward, you can humble your pride, realizing that it is very difficult for a provincial author who is not crowned with high titles and degrees to gain recognition, but under the wing of a venerable leader, you see, something will work out ... But Andrei, such, as Stanislav Lyubshin plays him, he chooses a different path - to fight to the end. And he is losing this fight – the inequality in forces and opportunities is too great.

Andrey has to leave the institute. And here is the tragic breakdown of fate. The position of "unrecognized genius". Demonstrative transition to work in ... the gravediggers

of the local cemetery. An open challenge to others. Endless talk about the lack of freedom. And finally – the final decision to leave the Motherland ...

For a long time, our cinematography has depicted such destinies in an extra-dialectical and sometimes simply caricatured way. The authors of "Theme" prefer a different tone of conversation. Andrey's haunted gaze, his words about the "uncle" who sent a challenge "... In this doomed gaze, one can read the further fate: nostalgia, life with memories, attempts to create "there" something brilliant, gradual oblivion, despair...

Next to Andrei is Alexandra, another heroine of the picture. Gleb Panfilov has always succeeded in female characters. As in the films "There is no ford in the fire", "Beginning", "I ask for words", "Valentina", "Vassa", one of the main roles was played by Inna Churikova. Her Alexandra is an art critic by profession, an employee of the local museum. Modest, concentrated, in a strict suit, fluent in French, she kind of personifies the appearance of the modern intelligentsia. She, the only one of the people surrounding Kim Yesenin during his trip to the province, told him the truth about the true, not "nomenclature" significance of his work, since she is organically incapable of lying in the name of maintaining good relations.

Her enthusiasm for the talented poetry of a local self-taught writer who died early in almost complete obscurity is transmitted even to Kim Yesenin, who decides to interrupt his next "custom" play and write a book about the truth of folk talent. However, the authors make it clear that this decision is most likely impulsive...

And tomorrow everything can go back to normal. But I want to believe that the meeting of Kim Yesenin with Alexandra will not pass without a trace for him...

Love for the Motherland, for those boundless snow-covered spaces that Leonid Kalashnikov's camera so carefully and with inspiration, for the masterpieces of ancient Russian antiquity, for the values of Russian culture sounds in the "Theme" not through abstract concepts, but in human destinies, in the conflict confrontation of worldviews, good and evil, sincerity and falsehood, truth and lies. The picture invites all viewers to the discussion, for whom the question is important, not how a person lives, but what he really is!" (Fedorov, 1986: 7).

In the same 1986, the venerable film critic Rostislav Yurenev (1912-2002) wrote on the pages of "Soviet Screen" as follows: "I cannot understand the long, seven-year delay in the release of the film "Theme" on the screen. Of course, every new, fresh, non-standard solution to a modern topic can lead to incomplete or inaccurate understanding, but this leads to deliberation, to disputes, to comparison with life observations, viewers, and it is this, and not complete poster clarity, that makes psychological dramas interesting ... But the unusual always scares the incompetent. The common truths are forgotten without leaving a trace in the souls. And the independent solution of the complex problems raised by the artist educates the viewer. And then - did the comrades, who were wary of releasing the "Theme", thought about the fate of the artist, about the path of Gleb Panfilov, undoubtedly one of our most talented and serious filmmakers? Having proved in the film "Beginning" the creative readiness to create a film about Joan of Arc, Panfilov never found sympathy for his excellent script ... Panfilov was persuaded not to run away into the Middle Ages, to talk about modernity. And when he spoke about modernity, he spoke not even as sharply as deeply – it seemed to someone unnecessary. ... Beautiful in terms of dramatic, directorial and visual skills, complex, deep, somewhat controversial, but fascinating in thought, the picture "Theme", although late, but comes out on screens. Our modernity needs it" (Yurenev, 1986: 8).

Film critic Yevgeny Gromov (1931-2005) also published a positive review of "Theme": "The film is unusual for our cinema already in its material. If in the films of major foreign directors, primarily Fellini and Bergman, the figure of a restless, reflective artist is often displayed on the screen, then we usually prefer not to show such confusion. As if they are

not at all and cannot be among the members of the USSR Writers' Union and other creative unions. Or does it turn out that the general public should be protected from such intra-artistic problems? They are, de she, incomprehensible, uninteresting. The deepest delusion! The main questions of artistic creation are not only aesthetic questions, but also ethical, ideological, and generally significant ones. ... "Theme" is a bold, bright, deeply patriotic film. Here we could put an end to our article, if not for one important circumstance. The film "Theme", released in the fall of 1986, was completed seven years ago. All these years he lay on the shelf. The film is not outdated, it sounds surprisingly topical. Nevertheless, it is pertinent to ask the question: what scared the people in him, on whom his rolling fate then depended? There is only one answer. I was frightened by the acute problematic of the film. Burned the ice and fire of truth. The film will probably have opponents even now. But, I am convinced, there are immeasurably more supporters" (Gromov, 1988: 95, 98).

The high appraisal of "Theme" was preserved by film critics in the 21st century.

Literary critic and film critic Lev Anninsky (1934-2019) noted in the depths of the "Theme" space "the main character. She is played by Inna Churikova. The icy, frozen figure of a young woman, full of vague misfortune, is a denial of unraveled passions. You peer further: the fast-paced courtship of the eminent Moscow guest is an empty number: the woman's soul is not here, it is not for these people. For whom? And you gradually understand. You see the silhouette of a young man. Signs are barely marked; no face, no eyes; a beard is a modern sign of intelligence; in the intonations of speech – the same intelligent restraint, but what this person is talking about, why he works as a gravedigger in a cemetery, you cannot grasp, you are hindered by "interference". Some kind of primordial wordlessness, inarticulateness is embedded in the condition of the picture; Lyubshin plays a man who, it seems, cannot find words; the meaning of what is happening to him you catch with difficulty. However, you catch it, and the meaning becomes even more piercing because it reaches you through the veil of "hindrances". You are looking for: why did this vaguely visible person leave the scientific institute for the cemetery workers? Who was stopping him? Unsolicited "co-authors"? Prohibitors? Again, no faces, no details ... But why faces? Are faces in such a role? Or maybe there is a wall of facelessness? A soft, invisible wall. A wall that every living and active person stumbles upon.

Continuing to think about the reasons for the drama, which Churikova and Lyubshin didn't say, under loud delirium, with a savory overabundance "negotiated" by Ulyanov and Vesnik, you make a mental circle, return to the figures of the foreground, among which the "writers" are weaning. Who is to blame for the misfortunes of the Lyubshin hero? Is the whole value system distorted? Aren't they the unnamed dogmatists and clampers whom he curses through clenched teeth? No, not them. Who is it? And that old teacher who listens with mute delight to the "Yesenin" delirium. A terrible discovery: after all, she, the kindest, devoted toiler, for decades has trampled the soil for the fanfare with a pocket of spirit, helped to sow an atmosphere of slavish reverence for exaggerated authorities around her, hammered into the heads of the pupils those formulas, based on which "Kim Yesenin" grows in our culture with all its stormy "flourishing of genres". Of course, we can say about him, standing in the foreground with nonsense: he is to blame. And about her, about the teacher, with her nonsense – how can you say that? ...

Panfilov builds a picture, as if modeling our illusions: two or three careful strokes in the depths, in an icy vacuum, in an abyss, and for those who cannot stand it – a literary game, bold scribbles according to the first plan, a lifeline: grab, hold on, here everything is familiar and understandable, here the writer has a little detached from life, rested on his laurels, did not work as it should, did not open the topic. And this same Kim Yesenin is swaggering, teasing and teasing the internal officials in us: aha, that's who's stopping us! That's who it is! Safe, I must say, game" (Anninsky, 2006).

So in his article Yan Levchenko asked the question: “Why did the “Theme” removed from the shelf receive the “Golden Bear” in 1987? For perestroika and new thinking, for a dream come true about glasnost? For all the good, which then, unlike today, no one doubted? For that too. The film got into the right context, at that time the interest in renewal in the Soviet Union grew sharply. ... This is an honest movie that boldly castigates the customs of the Soviet creative elite and suffered for its insolence. Politically charged cinema, as always, was respected in Berlin. But there is an additional circumstance. Panfilov's painting is an example of not ideological, but social and even anthropological satire. Its point is aimed at making a person look better. The hero of "Theme" does not fall just because he has nowhere to fall, except for a ditch. This is the death of a hero of a long, almost endless era of peaceful decay of the Soviet Union. The last hope for a new life is heard in the music that sounds over this decay. Perhaps it was something that was heard in Berlin” (Levchenko, 2010).

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about the "Theme", as often happens, were divided:

Pro:

“One of my favorite films, touching upon a whole layer of the so-called creative intelligentsia (among which, of course, there were many excellent masters) as a phenomenon, ideological inspirers of the masses, writing about nothing, filming about nothing, talking about nothing, with different approach and temperament, but in an equally artless, boring manner. ... This is a very colorful and accurate sketch of the realities of that time. A number of bright, recognizable human types are presented ... It seems to me that the film is still modern, as a true work of art. Like all Panfilov paintings, he is deep and extremely lyrical. In my opinion, some of the best roles of Mikhail Ulyanov and Inna Churikova have been played here” (Vitaly).

“Yes, it’s very difficult to write anything about a true masterpiece, an extremely deep and sincere film, when watching which it seems that all this is happening in front of you, the film is so authentically and emotionally staged. And Inna Churikova is a genius, there are no words!” (Ilya).

“A wonderful picture about an internal search, a search for oneself, a search for a cause, a search for a moral core ... An amazing duet Ulyanov – Churikova, beautiful landscapes of an ancient Russian city” (Anastasia).

Contra:

“I liked the movie before. Highly. Today I looked with irritation. One "poor genius" (Chizhikov) is from the past, the other (a traffic cop) is from the present. Yes, sincere, but semi-literate freaks. ... And the arrogance of the county young lady is annoying. I read the chronicles, and was delighted with Kim, and with the epitaphs of Chizhikov. ... Nothing differs from Kim Yesenin. Pursed lips, intelligently rude to the former idol. By the way, for some reason he is still in demand” (Christa).

“I started viewing with a fair amount of awe; after all, the director is Gleb Panfilov himself, and the main roles are Mikhail Ulyanov and Inna Churikova. Surnames alone make you shiver! Alas, the film is so-so – just insane boring things” (G. Volanov).

Trizna. USSR, 1972. Directed by Bulat Mansurov. Screenwriters: Bulat Mansurov, Askar Suleimenova (based on Ilyas Dzhansugurov's poem "Kulager"). Actors: Kargambay Sataev, Kenenbay Kozhabekov, Bayten Omarov and others. **The film was banned and in the 1970s it was not released in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in October 1987, as a result, it attracted 0.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Bulat Mansurov (1937-2011) directed 16 full-length feature films and serials ("Competition", "Quenching Thirst", "Trizna", etc.). His highest-grossing film turned out to be his adaptation of the prose of Alexander Green – "The Shining World".

The poetic parable of Bulat Mansurov, which takes place in Kazakhstan in the 19th century, was not to the taste of the filmmakers, and "Tryzna" was banned.

Film critic Alexander Lipkov (1936-2007) believed that "one should not be surprised at the hardships that befell the poem and its adaptation. The theme of both works "poet and power" was deliberately doomed to a suspicious, painful reaction, fraught with conclusions. One can also be glad that Mansurov "slipped through" with his first work "Competition", since it is about the same thing – about the human spirit, capable of withstanding the violence of tyrannical power. ... Transferring "Kulager" to the screen, Mansurov created a completely independent work, in which many motives of the poem and the fate of its historical hero – the poet Akhan-Seri, the motives of the legends and tales of the Kazakh people, the director's reflections on the artist's personality, were intertwined. the circle of thoughts that worried him before, however, not only him – the entire bright and fruitful branch of "poetic cinema" of the 1960s – early 1970s. Dzhansugurov's poem, epic in character, acquired on the screen the features of a tense philosophical drama: here different worldviews collide, are tested for strength – the ruler – and the poet, the servant of power – and the disobedient to it. ... Mansurov's film is full of metaphors. Everything is full of meaning – each of the characters, costumes, words, deeds, nature itself, so impressively captured by Viktor Osennikov, with its breath of heat and cold, the scorching sun, the severity of the mountains. Becomes blazing red – Roerich – the sky with swirling clouds; horses rush over it like blue birds, the black sun is not light, but darkness falls on the ground. Is the artist right, so unrestrained in his enthusiasm for the possibilities of poetic cinema language? I have no doubt right. Not only because it filmed the poem, for which such a style is natural and necessary, but because it enlarges as much as possible, it highlights the eternal categories of Good, Evil, Truth, Power, Poetry, Motherland in the poem. ... Has "Tryzna" got old, having appeared on the screen so late? Not at all. Today the film is perceived even more deeply as an artistic phenomenon, and even more sharply – as a public one. Mansurov did not fight with windmills, putting forward as his moral ideal a poet-warrior who does not bend his neck before the mighty of this world, does not sell his word either for honor or for money, faithful to the stale bread of truth" (Lipkov, 1988: 72-76) ...

There are practically no audience reviews of the 21st century viewers about "Tryzna", although the picture is on YouTube. Apparently, the philosophically filled parable of Bulat Mansurov is no longer interesting to the modern audience ...

Unexpected Joys. USSR, 1972-1974. Directed by Rustam Khamdamov. Screenwriters: Andrei Konchalovsky, Friedrich Gorenstein, Rustam Khamdamov, Evgeny Kharitonov. Actors: Elena Solovey, Yuri Nazarov, Tatiana Samoilova, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Natalia Leble, Oleg Yankovsky and others. **The film was banned in the middle of the filming process.**

Director and artist Rustam Khamdamov directed four full-length feature films, the most famous of which was "Anna Karamazoff" (1991).

... 1920. The leading role in the silent film "Slave of Love", which is being shot, is played by the famous movie star The Great Mute (Elena Solovey). And the director Prokudin-Gorsky (Emmanuil Vitorgan) is looking for some special antique carpet, which is lacking in his collection....

The aesthetic film "Unexpected Joys", refined in its pictorial range, was categorically disliked by the filmmakers who accused Rustam Khamdamov of "decadence", and they ordered the shooting to be stopped. The negatives of the painting were destroyed ...

However, after 12 years, several boxes with the working material of the film, saved by the operator Ilya Minkovetsky, were restored and edited. It is from these remaining fragments that we can judge what this picture could have been.

Interestingly, according to the already heavily transformed scenario, but with the same actress in the lead role, in 1975 Nikita Mikhalkov shot the film "Slave of Love". The film used the motives of the image of the main character and some other artistic solutions of "Unexpected Joys" associated with makeup and costumes...

Today, on YouTube, twenty-minute fragments of "Unexpected Joys" and admire their pictorial range, masterfully stylized by Rustam Khamdamov based on the production of the Great Mute.

Vacation in September. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Vitaly Melnikov (based on the play by A. Vampilov "Duck Hunt"). Actors: Oleg Dal, Irina Kupchenko, Irina Reznikova, Natalya Gundareva, Natalya Mikolyshina, Yuri Bogatyrev, Gennady Bogachev, Nikolai Burlyaev, Yevgeny Leonov, etc. **This television film was banned in the year of its creation and was released on Soviet television screens only during the "perestroika" – in 1987.**

During his long creative career, **Vitaly Melnikov** has directed two dozen full-length feature films, three of which ("Seven Brides of Corporal Zbruev", "Hello and Goodbye", "Chief of Chukotka") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films (and this is not counting his popular TV movie "The Elder Son").

... Forty-year-old Vitya Zilov suffocates in the dull atmosphere of provincial life. And even vodka – the traditional Russian "cure for melancholy" – does not make him happier. Zilov is disgusted with lying, and in this damned life he has to lie every now and then. And thoughts about the meaninglessness of being and suicide more and more often come to his mind ...

Perhaps it was in this film adaptation of the famous play by Alexander Vampilov "Duck Hunt" that Oleg Dal (1941-1981) played his best role, putting into it not only his soul, but also his destiny.

Alas, Dahl failed to see the film on the screen: due to the "gloom and despair" "Vacation in September" was banned from showing, and the premiere took place after the death of the talented actor...

At one time, the "progressive press" tried to tie this tragicomic story of an outsider to the "ulcers of socialism." If only it were that simple! The problem of "extra people" was and is in any society. And it is not directly connected with any "... isms" ... And today it would be no easier for Zilov to live than in the 1970s ...

Film critic Vladimir Gordeev explains the ban on "Vacation in September" by the fact that the then television bosses were convinced: "A Soviet person should not see himself in a mirror. Art must seduce. ... Vampilov throws up an absolutely hopeless problem for the viewer. And Vampilov is heartily echoed by Melnikov: there is a living person. A person has a lucrative public service, where you can cheat from the heart. He was given an apartment. He has a pretty wife. He has a lot of friends. He has a young mistress. He has – duck hunting, finally, his favorite business of his life! And everything makes him sick. The film is excellently shot, beautifully edited. Oleg Dal plays absolutely brilliantly. ... You basically try to watch this dramatic, intense film. Watching will be a good experiment, a test of your own honesty. Try to see Zilov in yourself!" (Gordeev, 2009).

Film critic Natalya Miloserdova believes that in "Vacation in September" "the process of reworking Vampilov's drama into Melnikov's drama is immensely interesting. He compresses the already dense fabric, clearing it of explanatory dialogues, complicating the relations of the characters and sharpening their characteristics, introduces complex motives and more subtle nuances" (Miloserdova, 2010: 305).

Viewers of the XXI century continue to argue animatedly about "Vacation in September" and about the character played by Oleg Dal:

"Zilov is a brilliant reflection of the Russian character. The hero was sick of everything. And the process of self-destruction began. The wife is a pure person, but she has already fallen so badly that she destroys this, the only thing that is dear. In general, the process has begun and everything flies into the furnace. ... The ideals of youth have been lost, but there are no new ones. You don't remember the past (as his wife asks him to remember those words!), But the present is already polluted with lies, casual connections, pretense even in front of himself. And the soul is still alive, torn, cannot stand. Zilov is not a superfluous person, but a lost one" (Mari).

"I don't know how, – and I do not hold back tears in every frame of this film. I'm sorry for Zilov. He is both pathetic and disgusting. Pity his wife, whom he emptied, even gutted. This loneliness, this emptiness, even with guests and friends. Scenes at work – the same nightmare of indifferent everyday life ... He echoes me with Yankovsky from "Flights in Dreams and in Reality". I just can't understand why? How did it happen that on the screen we already see the result of a break, the loss of oneself, indifference to everything under the sauce of cynicism ... After all, judging by the dialogues with his wife, he was once completely different?! What is the root cause? And what to do (or not to do) to avoid becoming Zilov in middle age?" (Anastasia).

"I love the film very much, Oleg Dal, of course, is incomparable, but the more I watch it, the more acute is the feeling that in the life of such a "character" I would with great pleasure strangle it. I never could understand people who, in the absence of real life problems, sucked them out of nowhere, for life balance, so that everything would not be so smooth and good. Not to live and not to give to others, not to have any guidelines in life, to rush from woman to woman, to ridicule everyone and everyone just because of their own dissatisfaction – an extremely dubious heroism for me. And no Zilov is a "superfluous person". The "superfluous" person feels lonely and lost in the world around him for various reasons, but this one does not feel lost at all, he wants to be the king, the king of provocation and cynicism, the king of everyone's attention and, of course, not feeling enough in this, he eventually flirts... And here he becomes really scared, not lonely, but scary, from the fact that friends suddenly turned away, his wife left, and he couldn't even

imagine such a thing, he was sure that everyone, the king, would be blissful endure to the end of the century. ... And he really doesn't know what he wants. But I just don't understand why it is necessary to sympathize and heroize such a vile slippery creature?" (Lika).

"Oleg Dal played very mercilessly, my attitude towards the hero was projected onto the actor himself, although, in fact, he played himself somewhere in his protest to everything. It is now customary for us to sympathize with such "rebels", to justify drunkenness, despite all the troubles that followed, there is some kind of idolatry to this way of life, but it is very sad when famous actors from the screen savor the details of their drinking, even during the filming of their "film masterpieces". Incidentally, this is also evident in the quality of these works. You would think about the audience and the younger generation, greedy for imitation. This is by no means about Dahl and not about this film" (K. Zetkin).

"About Oleg Dal, I. Kupchenko, Y. Bogatyrev, E. Leonov, N. Gundareva! I bought it as it is I bought it for a beautiful cover and a suspiciously high rating! I was so intrigued that I slept and saw literally, as if, finally, to watch this mysterious movie. And here you are, – it happened ... The attitude to the main character, you say? ... The palette is something like this: worthlessness, immorality and lack of will. Generous strokes, a riot of the indicated colors – no options, in my opinion. Light colors that could symbolize sympathy, compassion? Completely out of place. No reason. I don't like and don't understand such pictures. I cannot grasp what kind of feelings and emotions the author suggests you to experience, feel. And most importantly, for what purpose? Why if someone deliberately (for there are no circumstances that necessarily compel us to do this from day to day, there is and cannot be) turns his life into a swamp, others should certainly take part in this? Is legitimate contempt and disgust really so vicious? Can anything change the efforts of your favorite actors trying to somehow humanize the disgusting images? It seems unlikely to me" (Andron).

"From the very first shots, the film surprises with absolutely disgusting acting from famous and great actors. The brilliant Dal, the wonderful Bogatyrev, the charismatic Leonov do not feel at ease in this story. They just don't understand who they are playing and why, they change their intonation all the time, and you don't believe them. The film is full of insincere screams, strained laughter and false emotions. The sheer monstrous miscast is constantly striking. ... To be honest, the landscapes of a demolished construction site in the rain work for the mood much better than all the actors put together. The main leitmotif of the narrative is bewilderment. The perplexity of the actors about what they need to play, how they should feel in general. ... Here everything looks as if "Hamlet" was staged in the Youth Theater by the forces of "Puss in Boots and the Gray Wolf" (M. Grinkevich).

Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt. USSR, 1977. Directed by Igor Sheshukov. Screenwriter Eduard Volodarsky. Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Nikolay Rybnikov, Oleg Borisov, Alexander Kharashkevich, Victor Poluektov, Mikhail Terentyev, Lev Lemke, Antonina Bogdanova, Alexander Pashutin, Vladimir Zamansky, Leonid Dyachkov, Ivan Bortnik, etc. **All-Union film distribution was not released. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Igor Sheshukov (1942-1991) directed eight full-length feature films, but, perhaps, it was Viktor Krokhin's Second Attempt that became his main directorial work.

In the late 1970s, this drama could not overcome the censorship due to social acuteness and the display of family life, devoid of warming lyrical moments. Accusations of pessimism and gloom in showing the life of Soviet people followed.

The Soviet press of the era of "perestroika" greeted the "Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt" rather warmly.

Film critic Miron Chernenko (1931-2004) noted that "it is simply amazing how real and natural, as if indeed from some unremoved chronicle of those years, an uncomfortable, hungry life of the forties-post-war, impoverished kingdom of communal apartments grows on the screen ... how they move, live, feel in this dense world, which can not be called "retro", which is outlined by coarse, tough, by no means nostalgic strokes, people of those years ... And finally, in this twist of fate, a boy, a wartime animal, who never had enough ... who believed that there is nothing in the world higher than the strength of a fist, an eye, reaction, immediate retribution to everyone who dares ... That's about him, about a boy who comes from here ... a picture of Igor Sheshukov, choking on excess feelings, uneven, tattered, rough narration ... "(Chernenko, 1987: 12).

And film critic Tatyana Khlopyankina (1937-1993) wrote about this film in "Soviet Screen" as follows: "Today we no longer need those lengthy offscreen comments that were supplied to the action of "Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt". However, it is unlikely that they were needed before. But now they especially hurt the ear. We have become ten years smarter, and from the air of this complex, extraordinary picture, from its atmosphere, we are able to independently extract its meaning, its bitterness and hidden tenderness. As a result, Victor Krokhin, who returned to the screen today, was able to tell us everything that he was going to, but something beyond that. He gave us a feel for how time has changed, and what a huge distance lies between 1977 and 1987. Let us meet this late guest with respect – there is also his merit in the changes that have happened to us..." (Khlopyankina, 1987: 9).

Film critic Elena Stishova on the pages of the "Cinema Art" magazine argued that "ten years of excommunication were not in vain for the picture. She's gone cold. Not because during this decade we have seen post-war communal apartments. There were none like here. The cross-cutting image of the boxing ring and fistfight is still read as a metaphor for the struggle for existence. But then, in 1977, when the living life of today was ousted from the screen by an equal kind of literature under the banner of genre cinema necessary for the viewer, like bread, this nervous, uneven picture, with obvious breakdowns, was also represented from the post-war reality with all its humiliating for the individual poverty, and from the reality of those years with its tolerable life and burning spiritual problems. ... The ferment of the spirit, deciding the eternal question: who am I – a creeping creature or do I have the right? – the film captured. And in this sense, he completely belongs to the 70s: the collapse of faith in the immediate victory of good has cast doubt on many values, gave rise to the cynicism of "iron boys", the philosophy of personal success" (Stishova, 1987).

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about the "Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt", as a rule, are ambiguous:

"A film about ordinary people ... about everyday life, about trying to become a person, honest, without meanness. ... It is a pity that this film did not come out in due time" (Tusya).

"A very honest film about people striving for success. In sports and in life, this happens more often than is usually shown in films, especially in those days. ... So you will pay for victory in life with loneliness ... This is the film about this ... And this is a lot ... The film is a brilliant work of cinema ... It was not appreciated then at its true worth, and today everything is also forgotten" (Flim).

“After watching it, it seemed to me that the film was cut short and there was a residue of understatement. ... And the cast is really good” (Sibiriyak).

“To be honest, the idea of the film is not quite clear. It is not clear what the authors wanted to say: did the hero act well or badly? There is no assessment, there is only a statement ... Art must bear some moral criteria: this is good, this is bad, this is honest, this is dishonest, this is moral, this is mean, and so on. Yes, it is possible that in life they often win not entirely honestly (not only in sports), but this is not the norm. ... In my opinion, the film is unfinished, and the position of the authors is absolutely indistinct” (Topol).

“I think the film was not put on the shelf in vain. ... the film is indistinct, and the director is primarily to blame for this. ... Some scenes are clearly drawn out, while others, on the contrary, are cut off” (Andrey).

Where the Mountains are White ... USSR, 1973. Directed by Askhat Ashrapov, Victor Pusurmanov. Screenwriter Satimzhan Sanbaev. Actors: Nurmukhan Zhanturin, Biken Rimova, Mukhtar Naimanbaev, Natalia Arinbasarova and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s and 1980s. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1991.**

Operator Askhat Ashrapov (1931-2008) directed only three films as director, the most famous of which was the drama "Wolf Pack" (1990).

Director Viktor Pusurmanov made nine films, none of which received a noticeable resonance...

The ecological drama "Where the mountains are white...", the action of which in the Kazakh steppes, in 1973 did not like the filmmakers, who saw "unnecessary moral concern." But, when almost twenty years later this picture, modest in its artistic qualities, was nevertheless released on the screen, it no longer interested anyone - neither film critics, nor spectators ... Spectators of the 21st century do not watch it either.

While the Dream is Mad. USSR, 1978. Directed by Yuri Gorkovenko. Screenwriter Vasily Aksenov. Actors: Nikolay Karachentsov, Lyubov Reimer, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Nikolay Grinko, Leonid Kuravlyov, Mikhail Boyarsky, Oleg Anofriev, Sergey Migitsko, Vladimir Basov, Rolan Bykov, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Steblov, Sergey Filippov, Kakhi Kavsadze, Artyom Ryzhetyan, Ivan Nikolai Parfyonov, Sergei Nikonenko, Rimma Markova, Lyudmila Shagalova, Gurgen Tonunts, Grazhina Baikshite and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place only in 1988.**

Yuri Gorkovenko has directed only three full-length feature films, and the most famous of them is the film "While the Dream is Mad".

This musical adventure comedy told about the first Russian aviators and was banned solely because of the emigration to the West of the scriptwriter – the famous writer Vasily Aksenov (1932-2009).

The Soviet "perestroika" film press greeted this work of Yuri Gorkovenko rather coolly.

For example, film critic Alexei Erokhin (1954-2000), in his article discreetly praised this film, along the way telling readers about the reason for its ban (Erokhin, 1988: 7).

As for the current audience, their opinions about this film differ significantly:

“I liked the movie “While the Dream Is Mad”. Great actors, songs. ... They are so lively, daring, brave. ... I watched the film twice recently” (V. Anchugov).

“Great movie! In the best traditions of Soviet musical films! And a unique chance to see almost all of our actors, many of whom, alas, are no longer with us” (Podmosvichka).

“I personally liked the film. Not a masterpiece, of course, but quite a decent light musical comedy” (Vladimir).

“To be honest, I'm not surprised that the film has been “marinated” in the archives for ten years. It resembles a vinaigrette, which, together with beets and cabbage, was stuffed with meat, kiwi and shrimps...” (Cormega).

“After reading the annotation, you might think that the film is interesting, but here it is ... Some kind of superficial vaudeville, uninteresting both in the plot and in musical terms. The case when a large number of good actors did not translate into film quality” (Ashrp).

2. Soviet full-length feature films (1951-1991), released only for republican film distribution

Clicks. USSR. 1973. Directed by Rezo Esadze. Screenwriters Friedrich Gorenstein, Rezo Esadze (based on the satirical stories of F. Gorenstein: "The Man in the Tree", "Non-Resistant", "On behalf of the Collective", "The Thinker"). Actors: Zurab Kapianidze, Ramaz Chkhikvadze, Kakhi Kavsadze, Leo Antadze, Rezo Esadze, Gia Peradze and others. **In 1974 this television movie was shown only on the republican TV of the Georgian Soviet Republic.**

Rezo Esadze (1934-2020) directed eight full-length feature films, of which "Love at First Sight" and "The Nylon Tree" are the most famous.

The satirical comedy-parable "Clicks", apparently, seemed too sharp in Moscow and the censors preferred to quietly "leave" it to Georgian TV.

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev remembered this "film, first of all, for its unusual intonation, perhaps different from the typically Georgian gentle humor and even from a number of ironically satirical attacks that were contained in the "Unusual Exhibition" (later Eldar Shengelaya will make a more caustic picture "Blue Mountains, or an Incredible Story") or in "Jug" and "Anara Town" by Irakli Kvirikadze. Probably, one could attribute the biting and sharpness of the statement in "Clicks" (by the way, the exact name for the caustic comedy) to the influence of the Moscow author Friedrich Gorenstein, who wrote the main works on the table, and at the end of the 1970s generally moved to the Federal Republic of Germany. ... in "Clicks" this "local Kafkianism, coupled with Beckettism" is still taught at the external – partially eccentric or satirical – level, and besides, it is disguised as more familiar Georgian short films about people and customs. But the witty finale ... sums up the absurd result of all this aimless and dull existence of "small people" for whom there is nothing valuable in life – only indifference, non-resistance, servility and sycophancy" (Kudryavtsev, 2008).

Flight of Sparrows. USSR, 1980. Director and screenwriter Teimuraz Babluani. Actors: Elguja Burduli, Teimuraz Bichiashvili, Rezo Esadze and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Georgian Soviet Republic.**

Teimuraz Babluani directed only four films, of which the film "The Sun of the Sleepers" was the most famous.

The black and white drama "Flight of the Sparrows" tells about the confrontation between two men, between whom a fight eventually breaks out...

Fun Conversation. USSR, 1958. Directed by V. Lyakhovetsky. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Apparently, the movie has not survived.**

The Grandfather of the Left Wing. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Osyka. Screenwriters Ivan Drach, Leonid Osyka. Actors: Nikolai Yakovchenko, Valentina Sperantova, Borislav Brondukov, Konstantin Stepankov, Antonina Leftiy, Anatoly Byshovets and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1974).**

Leonid Osyka (1940-2001) directed 11 full-length feature films, but only one of them – the drama “Troubled September” – managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

The main character of this drama is a pensioner, a former painter named Trofim.

Composer Vladimir Guba (1938-2020) described this film in the following way: “I thought a lot about the painting “The Grandfather of the Left Wing”. It is believed that she falls short of the talent of Leonid Osyka. The official ideology saw something unreliable in her. The important thing in the film is that, perhaps for the first time in Soviet cinema, he turned to the bourgeoisie (by the way, this word was rooted out, ridiculed, reviled). ... And it is this film, in my opinion, that concerns the middle class, which gives the society peace and balance. These are people who can seem extremely simple and have great experiences behind them. ... “The Grandfather of the Left Wing” was actually built on Yakovchenko. And in this I see the great courage of Leonid Osyka. Yakovchenko is the personification of the provincial type of people ... These are people who never bowed under the dictates of ideology, they denied it with their smile, their benevolent attitude to life. Oddly enough, for me this is a feat. In many people, we see a gloomy face, frowning eyebrows. The system did not break Yakovchenko. Leonid Osyka used and developed these qualities very tactfully. What is the reason for his search? As a rule, search is a breaking of a stereotype, tradition, the use of the latest cinematic techniques or their comparison. But there may be other searches - on the verge of a social taboo. That was his courage. So, he touched upon the sphere of the family, its internal problems. But then we were convinced that only the state is important, and the family is secondary” (Guba, 2001).

But if in the XXI century this film “The Grandfather of the Left Wing” is still remembered by some film critics, then by the audience it turned out to be practically forgotten ...

June, Early Summer. USSR, 1969. Directed by Raimondas Vabalas. Screenwriters Raimondas Vabalas, Itskhokas Meras. Actors: Vytautas Tomkus, Gediminas Karka, Elvira Zhebertavichyute, Kazimira Kimantaite and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1970).**

Raimondas Vabalas (1937-2001) directed 12 full-length feature films, the most famous of which were “Stairway to Heaven” and “Exchange”.

“June, Early Summer” is a psychological drama, the main characters of which are an engineer, a doctor, a priest and a schoolgirl. The censors from the USSR State Committee for Cinematography in this film, most likely, did not like the third character, not too desirable in the era of atheism ...

In the 21st century, this film was forgotten – both by film critics and by the audience...

Living Legends. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nodar Managadze. Screenwriters: Erlom Akhvlediani, David Javakhishvili, Nodar Managadze. Actors: Zurab Kapianidze, Temo Japaridze, Jemal Moniava, Temur Chkheidze and others. **In 1976 this film was shown only on the republican TV of the Georgian SSR. In Moscow, this picture was first shown only in 1988-1989.**

Nodar Managadze (1943-2006) directed ten full-length feature films. As a rule, his films were not successful with a wide audience, but sometimes aroused the interest of film critics and movie club audience.

The action of this philosophical drama takes place in Georgia in the 16th century ...

Nowadays, very few people remember about "Living Legends", and there are practically no audience reviews about it on the network...

Madness. USSR, 1968. Directed by Kalyo Kiisk. Screenwriter Victor Lorenz. Actors: Voldemar Panso, Yuri Jarvet, Bronius Babkauskas, Valeriy Nosik, Viktor Plyut, Kharijs Liepinsh, Leonhard Merzin and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In the 1960s - 1970s, it was shown only on the screens of the Estonian Soviet Republic. The premiere of the picture at the all-Union box office took place in 1987. As a result, during the first year of demonstration in cinemas "Madness" was watched by 0.7 million viewers.**

Kaljo Kiisk (1925–2007) directed 17 films, of which only “Naughty Turns” managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Kalle Kiisk's parable "Madness", released on a wide screen twenty years after filming, in 1987 already looked archaic in form. And the new generation of viewers found it difficult to understand why this film was once sent to the shelf. However, if “Madness” had miraculously appeared in the all-Union release in 1968, the author's allusions would have been clearer. After all, the plot about the Nazis, trying to find an English spy in a mental hospital, for Kalje Kiisk is only a pretext for the anatomy of the mechanism of power and violence.

Film critic Vera Zheltova, in her review noted that in "Madness" the plot "is, of course, curious in itself. But much more interesting is the figurative metaphorical structure of the film, its surprisingly thin, almost transparent stylistics, its philosophical and social fullness, which is only emphasized by the magnificent acting ensemble and excellent camera work” (Zheltova. 1987: 13).

Stepa-Captain. USSR, 1953. Directed by Alexander Kozyr. Screenwriters M. Maryanov, Alexander Pereguda. Actors: Vladimir Sudin, Valery Chernykh, Shura Buzilevich, Borya Davikov and others. **The film was intended for a children's audience and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. There is evidence that it, printed in a small print run, was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Apparently, the movie has not survived.**

Alexander Kozyr (1903-1961) managed to direct only three films, the last of which – a fantastic film about space flights "The Sky Calls" – entered the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Steppe Rolls (Uralsk is on Fire). USSR, 1975. Directed by Mazhit Begalin. Screenwriters Mazhit Begalin, Vladimir Kunin. Actors: Nartai Begalin, Vladimir Gusev, Vadim Zakharchenko, Mikhail Gluzsky, Igor Bogolyubov, Shakhan Musin, German Kachin, Viktor Avdyushko, Nikolai Rybnikov and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s and 1980s. There is information that it was shown in the republican box office of the Kazakh Soviet Republic in a small edition.**

Mazhit Begalin (1922-1978) directed seven full-length feature films, the most famous of which was "Song of Manshuk" (13.5 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas).

The drama from the times of the civil war "Steppe Rolls" ("Uralsk is on Fire") told about the battles for Uralsk in the times of the civil war. The picture was banned due to the "misinterpretation" of historical events and was first shown on TV only in 2002...

Theater of an Unknown Actor. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nikolai Rasheev. Screenwriters Nikolai Rasheev, Yuri Smolich (based on the work of the same name by Yuri Smolich). Actors: Vitaly Shapovalov, Evgeny Lebedev, Mikhail Kozakov, Emilia Milton, Elena Kamburova, Nikolai Merzlikin, Mikhail Golubovich and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s, but only got limited distribution on the territory of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.**

Nikolai Rasheev directed nine full-length feature films (among them – "Little School Orchestra", "Kings and Cabbage", "Apple in the Palm"), but his most famous work was the television "Bumbarash".

The film "Theater of an Unknown Actor" told about a theater troupe during the Civil War...

Here is how Nikolai Rasheev himself talked about the reasons for the censorship problems associated with this tape: "Ukraine had its own "climate", which, of course, had a direct relationship to the Dovzhenko Film Studio – there was idiotically tight control. It was impossible to break through something. I shot the film "Theater of the Unknown Actor" based on the story of the First Secretary of the Writers' Union, Shelest's personal adviser, Yuri Smolich. So this must happen – Shelest was accused of nationalism, Smolich was removed from the post of First Secretary, blacklisted as unprintable, and I was defeated. Although he worked with Smolich not because he held a big post, which he immediately told him about, but because I really liked his story of wandering actors".

Today's viewers treat the "Theater of the Unknown Actor" rather restrainedly: "Alas, you cannot attribute it to masterpieces. There is a feeling of some kind of sketchiness, unfinished film, although the concept is interesting in principle, the style resembles either "Bumbarash", or "Burn, burn, my star." Maybe hurt by censorship scissors? The actors are good. ... In general, you can watch it as a little-known page in the history of Soviet cinema" (B. Nezhdanov).

Two families. USSR, 1958. Director and screenwriter David Kandelaki. Actors: Salome Kancheli, Yusuf Kobaladze, David Abashidze, Georgy Gelovani and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Georgian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1959).**

Cinematographer David Kandelaki (1903-1960) directed only one film - "Two Families".

This melodrama tells the story of how a married couple adopts a child, but then the adoptive mother returns him to an orphanage ...

In the 21st century, this film was forgotten – both by film critics and by the audience...

Appendices

Appendix 1. Stereotypes of the Soviet Cinematographic Image of the War and Valentin Vinogradov's film Eastern Corridor (1966)

Eastern Corridor. USSR, 1966. Directed by Valentin Vinogradov. Scriptwriters Ales Kuchar, Valentin Vinogradov. Director of photography Yury Marukhin. Actors: Regimantas Adomaitis, Valentina Aslanova, Lyudmila Abramova, Viktor Plyut, Gleb Glebov, Elena Rysina, Valentina Titova, Vladimir Kashpur, Bronius Babkauskas, Voldemar Akuraters and others. **This wartime parable met with strong resistance from the censors and was eventually shown only in limited distribution.**

Valentin Vinogradov (1933-2011) in his life was able to direct only seven full-length feature films (the shooting of one of which – "Blue Wasteland" – was interrupted due to their ban). Two of his films ("The Day Turns Thirty" and "Letters to the Living") were among the thousand highest-grossing Soviet films.

The structure of ideological and obscene stereotypes of Soviet films on the war theme of the 1940s - 1960s was approximately as follows:

- *historical period, place of action*: any period of the war of 1941-1945, the USSR, Germany, and less often other countries;

- *the situation, household items*: military headquarters, equipment (tanks, planes, ships, trucks, etc.), front lines, trenches, dugouts of the Soviet military; modest dwellings and household items of peaceful Soviet inhabitants in occupation and behind, more comfortable dwellings, military equipment and household items of German and/or Western characters;

- *techniques for depicting reality*: more or less realistic (more common for films shot since the second half of the 1950s) or grotesque images (a characteristic feature of many comedies shot in the 1940s and post-war Stalinist epics such as "The Fall of Berlin") of people's lives during the war.

Most of the ordinary Soviet films on the war theme were built on simple dichotomies: 1) The hostile and aggressive imperialist "new order" of Nazi Germany and the peaceful, friendly Soviet system, the country of foremost manufacturers, athletes, happy children and cheerful builders of the light communist society; 2) Positive, ideologically correct (i.e. loyal to communist and patriotic ideas) characters and villains: the Nazis and their henchmen, with an ogre ideology of hatred for everything non-Aryan; 3) heroism/self-sacrifice and aggression/ betrayal; 4) honesty/honesty and deception/covariance; 5) plans (Soviet and Nazi) and results (defeat, although often delayed for the Nazis, victory, although often also delayed for Soviet characters);

Characters, their values, ideas, clothes, physique, vocabulary, facial expressions, gestures: positive characters: bearers of Soviet and communist ideas; negative characters: bearers of antihuman, Nazi and militaristic ideas. As a rule, characters are shared not only by their social status, but also by their material status. German characters (Nazis) are usually portrayed as rude and brutal, with a strong physique, harsh vocabulary, evil faces, active gestures and unpleasant laryngeal vocal timbres. They are dressed in military uniforms of the Wehrmacht and the SS, sometimes appear on the screen in their underwear (this is when they run out of a burning house or blown up dugout). Traitors/police reptiles are no better depicted than traitors/police who reptile to Nazi masters: disgusting, sometimes miserable appearance, cruelty, drunkenness, degenerate

faces, nasty mimics, squealing voices, etc. They are dressed in stolen goods, often not in height...

The Soviet soldiers and officers are dressed, of course, poorer than the German ones on the screen: in battle/after the battle they are dressed in dirt and dust, in the hours of rest they try to look "by the book". At the same time, of course, there may be a situation when a Soviet soldier receives a reconnaissance mission: in this case, he changes clothes and looks indistinguishable from the Nazis. Soviet characters can be shown on the screen, both as pretty athletes and ordinary people. The main thing is that although they are cruel and irreconcilable to the enemy, but otherwise they are humane and responsive. Perhaps, from the point of view of literary canons, their vocabulary is not always correct, but they have good faces and looks and voices of a pleasant timbre.

Soviet civilians are usually portrayed as victims of Nazi aggression, suffering from evil occupiers and helping Soviet soldiers and guerrillas. The home front workers, despite all everyday difficulties, do "everything for the fountain, everything for the victory";

A significant change in the lives of the characters: negative characters (Nazis, their accomplices) begin to implement their inhumane ideas (armed aggression, massacres of defenceless people, explosions, bombings, terrorist acts and other crimes);

The problem arose: the life of positive (Soviet) characters, as well as the life of an entire nation under threat. Searching for a solution to the problem: armed struggle between positive characters and negative ones.

Solution of the problem: mass heroism of the Soviet people, destruction/arrest of negative characters (Nazis and their accomplices), victory of positive characters (intermediate or final), return to peaceful life. The victory of the Soviet army over the Nazi was always presented on the screen not only as a victory of the great people defending their homeland from external aggression, but also as a victory of the only true communist ideology, the Soviet system over the Nazis / Fascists, imperialists, traitors, etc.

The research material is an Soviet film on the war topic: "Eastern Corridor" (1966), the excellent example of art house. The main method is a hermeneutic analysis (including ideological, identification, iconographic, plot and character analysis, etc., using the technologies developed by C. Bazalgette (Bazalgette, 1995), A. Silverblatt (Silverblatt, 2001: 80-81), W.J. Potter (Potter, 2001) and U. Eco (Eco, 2005). We have also analyzed film critics' response to this film.

"Eastern Corridor" was largely based on the conquests of the best wartime films. Like "Ivan's Childhood", the visual language of the "Eastern Corridor" is distinguished by exquisite black and white graphics, imbued with a complex game with space and symbols. But this is the case when the cinematheque quotation (visual motifs of early films by Andrzej Wajda, Miklós Jancsó, Andrei Tarkovsky, military themes of the Czech "new wave" ("... and The Fifth Rider is Fear", "Wagon to Vienna", "Diamonds of the Night"), black-and-white parables of Ingmar Bergman in the late 1950s – early 1960s, etc.) was organically included in the film, without damaging its existential meditation, philosophical and visual originality.

However, as a result, the film was not at all what the authorities expected it to be and was met with hostility not only by party officials, but also by quite liberal film critics.

Here is how V. Vinogradov's film was evaluated, for example, in the article of 1968 written by T. Ivanova: "The "Eastern Corridor" belongs to the number of those films, after watching which it is necessary to look into the abstract: to understand the sequence of events, to simply understand what is going on. As if some simple picture was cut into many pieces, big and small, diligently mixed, shaken up – and a new bizarre puzzle pattern was laid out (curiously enough, that here T. Ivanova practically word for word anticipates the claims expressed in 1974 by critics of A. Tarkovsky's film "Mirror" – A.F.). This is the general compositional structure and the same solution, even a purely visual one, of each

individual episode. The wooden hand, which is suffering from the above, is exposed from under the flowing mass of grain – it is a crucifixion, a cross with a broken bar; the bizarrely curved snag occupies the screen, is given in different angles, hypnotizes our imagination – it is the beginning of the scene on the river. Truly, it would be like a puzzle in a puzzle, a rebus in a puzzle. After all, and all this can, of course, be understood. But we can't avoid one question, it's a question about the inner obligation of such a form, about the artistic justification of the mixture of cruel naturalism and visual sophistication that reigns on the screen. ... There will be many other scenes, but in the first of them something very important for the overall atmosphere of the picture will be completely discovered. This is an abundance of cruel effects. It is the extravagance of the surroundings. It is a sophisticated skill of the operator. Taken together, this is the aestheticization of naturalism" (Ivanova, 1968: 94).

So it is only surprising that after two years on the shelf, the film "Eastern Corridor" is still in the so-called "limited distribution" of 1968... Of course, the expressive, dreamlike style (torn editing with interrupted half-word dialogues and events in the spirit of the French nouvelle vague, deep compositions of the frame, nervous, abrupt movements of the camera, bizarre play of light, shadows and the whole range of shades of black and white).

And the parable plot of Valentin Vinogradov's film today can be easily presented in an erratic manner of R. Volobuyev, who decided that "Eastern Corridor" is "Reservoir Dogs" about the Belarusian guerrillas, shot, apparently, under the impression of Bergman & French new wave at the same time and knows what else, with the music of M. Tariverdiev and completely crazy cameraman work. Heroes in the Nazi prison try to understand who gave them away through the system of flash backs (by the way, they don't understand them to the end). Everything is built on two equally stingy things: Christian symbols and such a cold, pathological, as if Bergman's eroticism. That is, the collaborator rapes a peasant girl in the elevator, and the elevator is a former church, and she painfully crawls on the grain to the crucifixion. The young Valentina Titova is going to be electrocuted by the ruthless Nazi jocks in her white shirts, they say: "Take off your clothes. ... There is also a daughter of a Jewish scientist who looks like a parody of Anna Karina (actress of many films of J.-L. Godard of the 1960s – A.F.) and walks through the concentration camp in a short black dress and high heels. Concentration camp in general is rather a metaphorical thing – people come there, go away, everything is almost on a voluntary basis. And also – only Nazis sit in the film. Heroes either stand, casting shadows, or lie with broken legs. If the hero sits down, it is almost a transition to the dark side. In the end, the director goes completely mad: the destruction of the Minsk ghetto was filmed in the form of a formalized expressionist mystery, with a wildly pigeon-like camera span along a complex trajectory, in the background it means that people are drowning, in the foreground – a completely naked blonde woman is running around and arguing with God" (Volobuyev, 2008).

However, Volobuyev's ironic enthusiasm once again confirms U. Eco: "Texts aimed at quite definite reactions of more or less definite readers (be they children, soap opera lovers, doctors, lawabiding citizens, representatives of youth "subcultures", Presbyterians, farmers, women from the middle class, scuba divers, pampered snobs or representatives of any other imaginary social and psychological category), are in fact open to all sorts of "erroneous" decodings" (Eco, 2005: 19).

Therefore, both the six-decade rejection of T. Ivanova's "Eastern Corridor" in 1968 and his stalk rejection by R. Volobuyev in 2008 does not cancel the opinion of A. Shpagin, which I share: "Valentin Vinogradov, an absolute heretic, who overtook his time the edict by thirty years. In Vinogradov's film "Eastern Corridor" the city occupied by the Germans is presented in the spirit of an absurd carnival, where all the usual signs and stereotypes are shifted from their places. Each action is twisted into nonsense, into chaos. And only a concentration camp has some semantic beginning – one can at least feel oneself in it

among prisoners like you and try to escape – in an unclear and paranoid "freedom", where everyone suspects each other. "Give me another war! – One of the characters in the film shouts at the wall, and he or she is no longer able to figure out whether he or she is a stranger. Here is already such a detachment that the diva is given – something similar in the late 1960's you can see only in Czech cinema about the war!" (Shpagin, 2005).

A. Shpagin's quote contains inaccuracies. The mentioned character in the prison shouts out a much more dangerous phrase for censorship: "Give me a normal war! Without hostages! So that they do not beat off the bladder, so that living rats are not stitched up in the intestines!" This cry becomes even more acute in the context of the film because the "Eastern Corridor" opens with a frame quote of Field Marshal Keitel's order, calling the German army to the most brutal actions against Soviet soldiers and guerrillas precisely because they do not want to follow the rules of "normal war"... The authors of the "Eastern Corridor" unequivocally assert that there is no "normal war", it is always inhumane, it always suppresses an individual with violence and fear.

Undergrounders and guerrillas from the "Eastern Corridor" are afraid and suspicious of everyone and everyone, and are ready to destroy anyone – whether a man or a woman – with the slightest shadow of doubt... Here comes the counterpoint with the chased voice of the announcer, which reads on the radio victorious reports on the exploits of the underground and guerrillas... But it's only on the radio all clear and simple – black and white, heroes-patriots and non human enemies... In fact, there are also some Nazis, such as the prison governor, who are prone to ironic philosophical dialogues about the "executioner and the victim" with their prisoner-artist.

These scenes are especially authentic because of the fact that the Nazi is played by the Lithuanian V. Akuratė, who has been in the service of both the German army and Stalinist camps... And among the guerrillas – such as Lobach (performed by R. Adomaitis, he here resembles something like Eugene Urbansky) – a stranger among all, suspected of treachery, he is powerfully and passionately moving towards the inevitable death...

Referring to the interpretation of the military theme in the cinema of the Czech "new wave", J. Lukeš correctly noticed the importance of demythologizing and disturbing motives in the films "...and the Fifth Rider is Fear" (1964), "Long Live the Republic" (1965), "Wagon to Vienna" (1966), "Diamonds of the Night" (1964), etc.

But "especially this influence is noticeable in the "Shop on the Square" (1966), whose directors Ján Kadár & Elmar Klos put the viewer in front of the principal dilemma of moral responsibility of a man who succumbed to the pressure of power (Lukeš, 2002).

I believe that in the "Eastern Corridor" this problem was manifested with the same force: the pressure of the authorities (Nazi, Soviet, underground, etc.), reaching the apotheosis during any war, breaks the fates of the characters, each time forcing them to make a hard choice, sacrifice, but in the end still turning them into puppets of history...

In spite of accusations of cruel naturalism, the authors show even the most terrible scenes (terror, executions, torture) without any bloody and terrible details... At the same time, they do not lose at all in emotional impact.

This is especially noticeable in the scene of the Holocaust – the mass extermination of Jews by the Nazis, drowning in the bubbling streams of water: no realistic details – it is a mystery of death and confrontation with it by prayer... Yeah, the religious theme sounds desperately brave in the "Eastern Corridor".

The beautiful heroine played by Valentina Titova tells her sculptor husband that he looks like an apostle Peter (let us remind you that the one with the weakness of the spirit has denied Christ three times). However, after his wife's arrest by the Nazis, the sculptor did not flee to the partisans, believing that this would betray his beloved woman. Showing Michelangelo's "The Last Judgment" to his friends, the sculptor finds there his "own" face

– the face of a horrified sinner who no longer has the strength and will of God – neither to fight, nor to renounce, nor even to live...

Religious symbolism in the spirit of Renaissance painting is also noticeable in the compositions of many shots, especially in the cathedral and in the former church, which was turned into a granary. With bitter irony and allusions towards the intellectuals of the sixties who lyrically praised the "commissars in dusty helmets", the collaborators are shown in the "Eastern Corridor". And the editor-in-chief of the local newspaper, who probably wrote something pathos about a bright communist future a year ago. And an artistic bohemian adapting to the new regime...

A special place in the Eastern Corridor is occupied by female characters. Erotically attractive, ready for self-sacrifice, they remain inaccessible (at least in the frame) for male characters... Valentin Vinogradov uses music on the principle of total contrast. In Tariverdiev's melody there are light notes of hope, and despair reigns on the screen. When even an incredibly successful underground escape from the Gestapo office immediately turns out to be a fatal meeting with an old acquaintance who, it turns out, is under Nazi surveillance...

Following the methods developed by U. Eco, I will distinguish three "series", or "systems", which are significant in the work: *the ideology of the author, market conditions that determined his idea, the process of writing / creating, narrative techniques* (Eco, 2005: 209). *In my opinion, this approach is quite consistent with the method of analyzing media texts by C. Bazalgette (Bazalgette, 1995), based on such key words of media education as "media agencies", "media categories", "media technologies", "media languages", "media representations" and "media audience", as all these concepts are directly related to the ideological, market and structural and content aspects of the analysis of media works.*

As an example of the analysis of the media text, let me take Valentin Vinogradov's art house film Eastern Corridor (1966), which was created contrary to the stereotypes of the Soviet cinematographic image of war. This will allow us to identify both the ideological, social, and historical context of the time when this film was created and its structure. The authors' ideology in the socio-cultural context (dominant notions: "media agencies", "media representations", "media audience").

By the main authors of the media text in this case we will understand the director and screenwriter Valentin Vinogradov (1933-2011), screenwriter Ales Kuchar (1910-1996), cameraman Yuri Marukhin (1938-2001). By the time the Eastern Corridor (1966) was created, the Soviet cinema had already accumulated a considerable base of works related to the topic of the Second World War (among the most notable ones was the "Secretary of the District Committee", "She defends the Motherland", "Zoya", "Two Soldiers", "At 6 p.m. after the war", "The Fall of Berlin", "The Feat of the Scout", "The Star", "Cranes Flying", "The Living and the Dead", "Ivan's Childhood", "Calling for Fire on Me", etc.), including films "guerrilla series", staged in Belarus ("Girl looking for her father", "Through the cemetery", etc.).

Among them most often were dramas, but not so seldom – detectives, melodramas and even comedies. The authors of the "Eastern Corridor", contrary to the existing stereotypes, practically for the first time in the history of Soviet cinema have proposed a different ideological concept of the military theme: war as the destruction of the humanistic human beginning as a whole.

Of course, already in "Ivan's Childhood" (1962) A. Tarkovsky (by the way, his was classmate of V. Vinogradov, whose future author of "Eastern Corridor" even played a role in the course work) piercingly sounded the motive of the devastating impact of the war on the psyche of the child.

The authors of "Eastern Corridor" went further, convincingly proving that the war is a double-edged sword, crippling the souls and hearts of all parties involved in it...

Even the title of the movie is allegorical. It is known that Nazi Germany on the eve of the outbreak of World War II insisted that Poland gave it a "eastern corridor" 1 mile wide for free, extraterritorial communication with the Koenigsberg enclave. In 1939-1943, a kind of "eastern corridor" (apparently, to the world domination) for the Third Reich became not only Poland, but also a large part of Eastern Europe, including, of course, the Belarusian lands...

On the other hand, the Baltic States, the western part of Ukraine, Belarus and Poland both in 1939-1941, and in the war/post-war years were considered as the "eastern corridor" of the Soviet geopolitical force in Europe. Since 1945, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other Eastern European countries have been included in this corridor (in the slightly softened regime of the "socialist camp countries").

Market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating a media text (dominant concepts: "media agencies", "media categories", "media technologies", "media audience").

The philosophical parable "Eastern Corridor" was created in the times of the "thaw", when Soviet artists received, though dosed and under censorship, but still a "sip of freedom". Since film production (as well as other production) in the 1960s was entirely state-owned, the question of commercial profit from film distribution, although it was on the agenda, was not entirely dominating.

There was a so-called state order for topics important for the state ideology, such as revolutionary, military, historical and biographical, etc. It is logical that within the framework of the military topic, not only action movie such as spy detectives "The Feat of the Spy" or "Far from the Homeland" were allowed, but also films that were not originally designed for the mass audience, but were significant for the annual "thematic plan".

Thus, one can be sure that the "Eastern Corridor" was in the thematic plan of the "Belarus Film" studio on the usual section of guerrilla dramas telling about the heroism of the Soviet people during the occupation.

Structure and methods of narration in media text (dominant concepts: "categories of media", "media technologies", "media languages", "media representations").

By the time of the creation of the "Eastern Corridor" in addition to the ordinary, already forgotten today films, were put such outstanding films as "Cranes Flying" (1957) by M. Kalatozov and S. Urusevsky, "The Ballad of the Soldier" (1958) by G. Chukhrai, "Ivan's Childhood" (1962) by V. Bogomolov, A. Tarkovsky & V. Yusov, "The Living and the Dead" (1963) by K. Simonov and A. Stolper. Each of these films punched a significant gap in the cinematic office of the stereotypes: The dramatic fate of the "wrong" from the point of view of the communist orthodox Veronica ("Cranes Flying"), the tragic image of the young front scout Ivan, who was deprived of childhood and turned into a ruthless vigilante ("Ivan's Childhood"), bitter episodes of the crushing defeat of the Soviet army in the summer of 1941 ("The Living and the Dead")...

However, even in these films, the traditional canons of clear separation of characters into positive and negative ones were not violated. As S. Kuznetsov has correctly noticed, "Eastern Corridor" is a film about the guerrilla war in Belarus, looking at which you understand the Soviet censors who decided to protect the people entrusted to them from such a strong shock. This is not just another standard military movie with dashing shootings and good Leninist secretaries of the underground district committee, but a tough and frightening mystical picture in which not only such trifles as a traitor, but also the motives for the behavior of almost all the characters, acting as if in the field of unknown forces, guiding, transforming and, ultimately, killing them, remain unclear. A dark and

mysterious film, some episodes of which are imprinted in memory forever in order to come up with an obsessive nightmare in a random trip (Kuznetsov, 1999).

I should add that throughout the film the authors create an ambivalent feeling of ominous appearance and phantom unreality of action.

In my opinion, "Eastern Corridor" is the forerunner not only of A. German's guerrilla drama "Checking on the Roads" (1971), but also of his own fantasmagoric "Kristalev, the Car!" (1998). Moreover, in some episodes of Valentin Vinogradov's parable there are clear parallels with "Stars and Soldiers" ("Csillagosok, katonák", 1967) by Miklós Jancsó and "The Death of the Gods" ("La caduta degli dei", 1968) by Luchino Visconti with their fascinating plasticity and eroticism in the orchestration of violence.

I think if "Eastern Corridor" had been shown at any West European film festivals in the late 1960s, it almost certainly became the same triumphant, as "Cranes Flying" or "Ivan's Childhood". But, alas...

After the "Eastern Corridor" creative fate of Vinogradov clearly did not take shape. Outstanding directorial talent was not allowed to reveal itself, and he was forced to make film compromises, shooting "regular cinema" ("The Earthmen", "White Dance").

Yuri Marukhin, a brilliant cameraman of the "Eastern Corridor", shot several more films that were interesting in terms of their visual solution ("The Tomb of the Lion", "The Chronicle of the Night"), and then he also had a snooze and began to do something standard...

In recent years, Russia has produced many films and serials about the war. And the authors of these movies, not feeling the censorship of pressure, reveal to us the dramatic pages of the "fateful forties"...

But even against this background, seemingly forever forgotten and scolded, the "Eastern Corridor" today does not look outdated – neither in terms of film language nor in terms of problems. "Manuscripts", indeed, do not burn...

When I published this article about the film "Eastern Corridor" in the journal "Questions of Cultural Studies" (Fedorov, 2011: 110-116), I received a short letter from Valentin Vinogradov himself: "Dear Alexander! I read your amazing, dear to me work about my woeful "Eastern Corridor" with a feeling of rare cordial joy. This feeling has not visited me for many years. It comes to me only when I discover a kindred soul, a like-minded person. Thank you very much and bow to you. V. Vinogradov. 23.05.2011".

I called immediately Valentin Vinogradov and thanked him for such kind words. We agreed that he would give me a big interview about "Eastern Corridor" and his works in general. But, alas, it didn't come true: on July 15, 2011, Valentin Vinogradov passed away...

Appendix 2. Alexander Ivanov: “I Played a Major Role in the Destroyed Movie ‘Moment of Truth’ (‘In August of 1944’)”

Alexander Ivanov's acting career was quite short – from 1974 to 1986. During this time, he played roles in two dozen films (*Goal Choice*, *Pseudonym: Lukach*, *Close Distance*, *Life is Beautiful*, *Sashka*, *From the Life of Alexander Blok*, *Red Bells*, *The File of a Man in the Mercedes*, etc.). But his main role in the film adaptation of the famous novel by V. Bogomolov *In August of 1944... (Moment of Truth)*, alas, has remained unknown to the audience...

In March 2020, the channel "Film History" published a small note entitled "*In August of '44.../Moment of Truth* (USSR, 1975): a film that will never be seen by viewers" (Fedorov, 2020) that 400,000 people have read.

There are almost no memories of the details of the shooting process of this unfortunate destroyed film at the moment. The existing publications, as a rule, are reduced to describing the conflict between the film director V. Žalakevičius (1930–1996) and the writer V. Bogomolov (1926–2003).

The performer of one of the three main roles in this film – Alexander Ivanov – agreed to give this exclusive interview.

– *How did you get to the shooting of the film "Moment of Truth"?*

I'll start a bit from a distance. After graduating from school in Krasnodar with a gold medal, I entered the Moscow Institute of Oil and Gas Industry, participated in the institute amateur activities. Studying there in the third year, I accidentally learned that the crew of the TV series *Walks in the Tormerents* needs extras. So I was on the set for the first time and even played a small episodic role. And so after the end of filming a former classmate of famous Russian actor and film director Sergei Bondarchuk – Adiba Shirakhmedova – came to me and invited me enter to the State Institute of Cinematography, because this year in the studio of Sergei Bondarchuk there were vacancies, and the maestro was looking for talented guys... So, quite unexpectedly for myself, in the fall of 1973, I was on the entrance exams for the additional actor's set in the Institute of Cinematography. Successfully passed the creative competition and was accepted for the first year. For insurance the first month I even combined studies in two universities, but then finally decided, making a choice in favor of State Institute of Cinematography.

I was completely involved in the learning process... And then one day I was again found by Adiba Shirakhmedova, who then worked as a second director at famous Soviet film director V. Žalakevičius, and offered me to read the script of the film based on the novel *In August 1944...* and at the same time pay attention to the role of Lieutenant Andrei Blinov. I chuckled – overnight – read and the script, and then the novel, which was then very popular, and, of course, caught fire desire to play in this film.

Soon the tests were scheduled: Žalakevičius himself gave me the lines, and in the end he chose me to play Lieutenant Blinov. And Adiba Shirahmedova persuaded Sergey Bondarchuk (who was not only a Master, but also the head of the department in the State Institute of Cinematography) to give me a one –year free schedule for filming in the film *Moment of Truth*, which was filmed mainly in Lithuania (Vilnius, Druskinikai) and at the field site "Belarusfilm" in Smolevichi.

– *Have you seen the previous films of V. Žalakevičius before the shooting of "Moment of Truth"?*

Yes, I've seen Žalakevičius' films, especially his picture *Nobody Wanted to Die* (1965), made a strong impression on me, and as I understood later, *Moment of Truth* was shot in this truthful, tough, ascetic, male style. In my opinion, it turned out even stronger than in *Nobody Wanted to Die*.

– *How did V. Žalakevičius conduct rehearsals with you? What were his requirements for acting? How, in general, were the shootings held?*

At the time of filming I was twenty years old, and the director's efforts all sought to portray the truth of life. Look at the faces of the Russian boys in old photographs who went to the front from the school bench. Don't they look like boys? The war has put off its tragic imprint. The costume-makers, makeup artists and prop guys did a great job. We've prepared a worn – out, "sighted" uniform. The plan was to focus on old photos from the war years, not the statutory rules.

For example, in the scene of the group's first exit into the woods there was a "ritual" of preparation: our trio gave to driver Khizhnyak documents enclosed in caps, a belt with a buckle and an automatic rifle. In the right pocket was placed "Walter", behind the trouser belt "Nagan", and in the left pocket of the TT, which on the slang of the individuals was called "mallet" – as an effective striking weapon in the hand-to-hand weapon. In addition, we have always been in good physical shape – with us almost daily engaged in sambo and tactical techniques of counterintelligence veteran detective Colonel Blinkov, who was a consultant on the shoot. I asked him once: "Why the TT, it's not a sighting weapon?" He replied that, firstly, it's a statutory weapon for officers and, secondly, it's an indispensable close combat weapon. Everything was done on a very serious level, not as an example of the current war movie fiction.

Imagine – the first exit of the film crew for life, in the forest. Fog, five o'clock in the morning, sunrise is just beginning. And here is a one-and-a-half meter, at the wheel of which – driver Khizhnyak (B. Brondukov), goes to the field, stops ... Body tarpaulin is reclining, from there jumps Alekhin (S. Shakurov) and commands: "Lieutenant Blinov! Follow me!" I'm running after him. The glade is empty. I look around – nobody, I say: "Captain Alekhin! Captain Alekhin!" Silence... And suddenly strong hands from behind intercept my throat and begin to choke me... I resist, my hand breaks down, and the camera shoots my face, pressed to the ground, on which you can see the bushes of ripe strawberries, specially planted props... And so the camera slowly slides on my face, strawberries and passes on the hand of the hero Shakurov. And then his close-up and calm voice: "Quiet, Lieutenant, the forest does not like noise"... Thus, the entire scene was built by the director in action, and played the phrase of my character, addressed to Tamantsev: "Why don't you like this forest? Berries all around, mushrooms"...

Closer to the finale was another key scene – the director asked to shoot an episode of the military combing of the forest to release the guys from the military school – blush, muzzle. They were in new military uniforms sitting at a long wooden table, and from the edge sat and ate his porridge my character – skinny, tightened "wolf". And then Colonel Polyakov (Nikolai Trofimov) came out of the staff tent, called: "Lieutenant Blinov!" and sent him back to the woods with Alekhin and Tamantsev, when from the general was already given a command to start a army operation ...

Here V. Bogomolov made a comment to Žalakevičius about the behavior of my character, who, having received an order from the colonel, turns around not by statute. I psychologically justified the behavior of my character in this scene by the fact that he had

previously felt as if suspended from the final operation to catch saboteurs, was in an anxious wait. And suddenly – such a chance! And Blinov in a joyous impulse allowed himself to forget about the statute for a second...

In general, the preparatory period in *Moment of Truth* was quite long. At first we shot scenes of passages through the streets of Vilnius, it helped us to enter the atmosphere of the film and gradually psychologically prepared us for shooting in key episodes. Because of the filming of the entire "Lithuanian" expedition Žalakevičius did not fit into the schedule, artists sometimes had to paint the yellow leaves of trees to take the autumn look and give the opportunity to stretch the filming period on nature until autumn...

I was hot back then, doing martial arts, trying to do everything myself. And one day – during the shooting of the jump from the second floor window to the passing "Dodge" – twisted his leg, and was mercilessly scolded by Žalakevičius for giving up the understudy.

V. Žalakevičius all the time emotionally charged us actors, he explained the role is no longer words (as is known, he spoke in Russian with a Lithuanian accent), but gestures, plasticity. He was an outstanding director who saw every frame in all its imagery, including acting speech, mimics, plastics, composition, light and color. He always knew exactly what he wanted to achieve from all the participants in the filming, and was able to convey his vision to each of us. When he and I looked at the film's working materials on the editing table, he made me very precise comments on the nuances of my role, seeking from me a full "empathy" in the character's character.

– *How did your relationship develop with the director and the actors on the set? After all, many of them were already celebrities, and you at that time were a very young actor.*

V. Žalakevičius treated me very warmly, in Vilnius he introduced me to the creative elite there – cinematographers, artists, sculptors ... The actor's ensemble *Moment of Truth* was outstanding. In terms of acting I learned a lot from Sergey Shakurov, Anatoly Azo, Nikolai Trofimov, Borislav Brondukov. Almost all summer of 1975 we spent together, became friends. In relation to me, a novice actor, from their side there was absolutely no arrogance of the masters. We talked on equal terms.

It turned out that B. Brondukov was then filmed in two films at the same time – in *Moment of Truth* and in the film by Emil Lotyanu *Tabor goes into the sky*, so he had to constantly in Vilnius to move from one film set to another... And we went to him visit and watched as they sang and danced gypsies ...

– *It is widely known that writer V. Bogomolov was dissatisfied with the film footage shown to him: "And these are counterintelligence?! Unshaven, in dirty uniforms... The officers' uniforms aren't ironed, the cloaks are stale, and the boots are dirty. ... I won't put my name under this film. Change the names of the heroes... Well, do what you want!" Moreover, he wrote a letter to the director of the film studio "Mosfilm" N.T. Sizov: "Dear Nikolai Trofimovich! 1) I do not object to the continuation of the studio's work on the film adaptation of "Moment of Truth" of V. Žalakevičius or with the invitation of another director (as suggested by the studio), provided that the main idea of the novel, the system of images and prevent stunned and westernized characters. 2) As I told you 16.02.1975, repeated and confirmed the day before yesterday in a letter to the Chief Editor of the Soviet Goskino D. Orlov, I agree to any use of the material shot last year by the studio without mentioning my name in the credits and mentioning my novel".*

– *What can you say about it? In particular, about "westernization of characters"? Did you know during the filming of the conflict between director and writer?*

Yes, I learned about this conflict when shooting was stopped, although I had not met with V. Bogomolov himself. Of course, we can say that in *Moment of Truth* there was a kind of "westernization", to put it in modern language, because Žalakevičius (as opposed to the director's version of M. Ptashuk) tried to get away from literalism in his interpretation of the novel, putting its pages into action. But, for example, Nikita Mikhalkov was easily allowed to take off a real western in *He's his own among strangers*. And the hard truth of *Moment of Truth* caused rejection... Well, for example, in the final of the film there was a frame, when the camera was shooting Alekhin lying with his head punctured (the German saboteur was trained to beat on the slaughter), and the flies were already coming down on the blood, and it was not clear whether he was alive or not... Yes, it is hard, but it is true...

In my opinion, Žalakevičius saw in the characters certain prototypes, namely: Alekhin – as if a famous chess player – analyst, master of calculations of different variants and moves. Tamantsev, Taman... – a hero, a stately, confident, powerful. Blinov is a rookie, for whom much is new... Through mistakes and miscalculations young, green, but on the move gaining experience, which led him to the final junction, where he shot the main enemy. And all in all, three heroes, each unique, but together – power. And there wasn't much to look at from the westerns – it was deep and our way...

– *Have you seen the film materials?*

– The shooting of the film was already virtually completed. And even more. There was only one staff scene left to shoot with General Egorov and something else in the *Mosfilm* pavilion, and after B. Babkauskas died they were looking for a double actor. It was time for this – the set was being built on *Mosfilm*. That's where it all started... And the film in draft was almost ready. Deadline for the film was in a hurry, because everything that was filmed in Vilnius and Druskininkai had to be remade, because of the chemical failure of some film footage. Žalakevičius' friends from the Lithuanian Film Studio joined in. By that time the group had already moved to the *Belarusfilm* field in Smolevichi. And at night I moved from Lithuania to Belarus and back, as all the passages of Blinov in the city by director A. Grikevičius (1935–2011) and operator D. Pečiūra. Because of the outgoing time, the expedition was brought a mounting table and sent an editor, and V. Žalakevičius was mounting all the material on the way out. I watched the material on the assembly table with the director, there was also a review of the defective material so that I could take into account the shortcomings of the filming.

We returned to Moscow with the film almost ready. I missed a year of classes and immediately plunged into my studies waiting for a call to sound...

– *How and when did you find out that shooting the film was stopped? What was the reaction of the film crew?*

Our entire crew was set up to get the best results, everyone was confident that we were involved in the production of an outstanding piece of art. And when we were told in the autumn of 1975 that the shooting of *Moment of Truth* had been put on hold (that was the wording at first), it certainly upset everyone...

– *Have you had any friendships with the director and participants since 1975?*

Alas, somehow everything fell apart ... We were already looking forward to the future success of *Moment of Truth* – festivals, meetings with the audience and so on. And then were so upset that even to speak and remember our "dream project" was painful... It

probably separated us... True, with actress Elena Safonova, we then met again and again at Institute of Cinematography, where she entered the acting department ...

– *Have you seen a film adaptation of Bogomolov's novel of 2001?*

– I tried to watch it, but immediately realized that M. Ptashuk's film turned out to be illustrative, verbose, in my opinion, much worse than that of Žalakevičius. And the cast, to put it mildly, was inferior to our...

– *Did you realize then that the role of Lieutenant Blinov could be your big acting hour?*

Of course I did. And I was filled with pride and joyful expectation when in 1975 with my own eyes I saw on the wall of one of the central cinemas of my native Krasnodar advertising poster *Moment of Truth* with my photo as Lieutenant Blinov. Of course, if this film was released on the screens of the country in 1976, it would have been a triumphant success. And my acting biography would certainly have been different...

– *And what happened after you graduated from Institute of Cinematography?*

Unfortunately, S. Bondarchuk – in contrast to S. Gerasimov – almost did not practice shooting his students in their own films, although once I took off with his master in a small episode in the film I. Talankin *Goal Choice*, and then he invited me to a small role of Commandant of Winter in his *Red Bells*, where my partner in one of the scenes was Franco Nero ...

Thus, on the course I was the first to get the main role, but as a result, on the defense of my diploma in 1977 was shown only in the play (the role of Gaev in *The Cherry Orchard*) without film work. But after the blow of the ban on the movie *Moment of Truth*, I did not break, played in the theater – studio of the Cinema Actor, worked in the cinema, on dubbing.

I had another acting chance – shooting in a film dedicated to the centenary of Alexander Blok (*And the eternal battle... From the life of Alexander Blok*, 1980, directed by D. Barshchevsky – A.F.). I starred in the title role, a lot of hope for this work, expecting that this picture will be an event. But, unfortunately, the film turned out to be directed, illustrative and did not cause any public resonance...

And then I left *Mosfilm* (the last film with my participation was shot in 1986) and went to work in the Russian Orthodox Church. At first I worked as a church gardener, then I started to do ecological landscape design for the improvement of Moscow churches and the Holy Trinity Sergius Lavra. These works have been awarded at the Best Yard in Moscow competition. Then I was able to recreate the traditions of making lamps from colored glass, porcelain and bronze: now my works are available in almost all Christian churches around the world, including in Jerusalem and Athos. I have been awarded orders of the Russian Orthodox Church, medals and certificates of various exhibitions of ecclesiastical art for my ecclesiastical services, so it is possible to consider that in the ecclesiastical environment I have self-realized ...

(Alexander Fedorov asked questions to Alexander Ivanov)

Filmography

Banned Soviet feature films (1951-1991) that have been sitting on the "shelf" for more than five years or were stopped while they were still being made

Agony. USSR, 1974/1975. Directed by Elem Klimov. Screenwriters Semyon Lungin, Ilya Nusinov. Actors: Alexey Petrenko, Anatoly Romashin, Velta Line, Alisa Freindlich, Leonid Bronevoy, Boris Ivanov, Alexander Romantsov, Yuri Katin-Yartsev, Pavel Pankov, Nelly Pshennaya, Mikhail Svetin, Vladimir Osenev, Boris Romanov and others. **Film was not released in the 1970s in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1985, as a result, it attracted 18.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Always on the lookout! (In the North, in the South, in the East, in the West). USSR, 1973. Directed by Efim Dzigan. Screenwriters Efim Dzigan, Vadim Kozhevnikov. Actors: Tatiana Lennikova, Alexander Degtyar, Pyotr Chernov, Nikolai Alekseev, Alexey Presnetsov, Sergei Martynov, Vladimir Sokolov, Viktor Pavlov, Dalvin Shcherbakov, Maya Menglet and others. **Filming was stopped after the first episode was ready. Their continuation was banned. The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In 2010, this picture (or rather, its completed first series) was shown at the Russian Archival Film Festival.**

Bad Anecdote. USSR, 1966. Directed by Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov. Screenwriters: Alexander Alov, Leonid Zorin, Vladimir Naumov (based on the story of the same name by F.M. Dostoevsky). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Viktor Sergachev, Georgy Georgiu, Alexander Gruzinsky, Elizaveta Nikishchina, Pavel Pavlenko, Gleb Strizhenov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. spectators. **The film was banned and was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in 1987, as a result, it gathered 1.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Blue Wasteland. USSR, 1972. Directed by Valentin Vinogradov. Eight-episode TV movie. **The director managed to shoot only four episodes. The film was banned and destroyed.**

Checking on the Roads. USSR, 1971. Directed by Alexey German. Screenwriter Eduard Volodarsky (based on military prose by Yuri German). Actors: Rolan Bykov, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Vladimir Zamansky, Oleg Borisov, Fedor Odinokov, Nikolai Burlyaev and others. **The film was banned and was not released in the all-Union release until April 1986. According to the results of the first year of demonstration in cinemas, it was watched by 9 million viewers.**

Commissar. USSR, 1967. Director and screenwriter Alexander Askoldov (based on the story of V. Grossman "In the city of Berdichev"). Actors: Nonna Mordyukova, Rolan Bykov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Lyudmila Volynskaya, Vasily Shukshin, Lyuba Katz, Pavlik Levin, Dima Kleiman, Marta Bratkova, Igor Fishman, Otar Koberidze, Valery Ryzhakov, etc. **This film was prohibited. Premiere: 1987 (Moscow film festival screening) and 1988 (film distribution). As a result, it was watched by 3.5 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas.**

Conscience. USSR, 1968. Directed by Vladimir Denisenko. Scriptwriters Vladimir Denisenko, Vasily Zemlyak. Actors: Anatoly Sokolovsky, Viktor Malyarevich, Nikolai Oleinik, Nikolai Gudz, Alexander Dedukh, Vasily Bogosta, Vyacheslav Krishtofovich, Vladimir Denisenko and others. **The film was banned and was not shown on Soviet screens in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1989, the painting was restored from the only surviving copy, and in 1990 its belated world premiere took place at the Montreal International Film Festival.**

Conscience of the World. USSR, 1951. Directed by Abram Room. Screenwriter Lev Sheinin. Actors: Mikhail Astangov, Lyudmila Skopina, Valentina Ushakova, Arkady Tolbuzin, Nikolai Garin, Mikhail Bolduman, Rostislav Plyatt and others. **After a significant part of this film had already been filmed, its filming was banned, and the filmed material was sent to the archive.**

Farewell America! USSR, 1951. Director and screenwriter Alexander Dovzhenko (based on the book by Annabella Bucar "The Truth About American Diplomats"). Actors: Lilia Gritsenko, Nikolai Gritsenko, Alexander Polinsky, Grigory Kirillov, Vyacheslav Gostinsky, Nikita Kondratyev, Yuri Lyubimov, Lyudmila Shagalova, Grigory Shpigel, etc. **In the midst of filming (one of the two parts was completely filmed), this political drama was banned.**

Farewell Beyond the Line. USSR, 1981. Directed by Karen Gevorkyan. Screenwriters: Karen Gevorkyan, Alexander Divanyan. Actors: L. Manukyan, A. Mirakyan, V. Pluzyan, Levon Harutyunyan, Vruyr Harutyunyan, V. Martirosyan and others. **The film was banned in 1981 and was not released in the all-Union film distribution.**

Forest. USSR, 1980. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Motyl (based on the comedy of the same name by A.N. Ostrovsky). Actors: Lyudmila Tselikovskaya, Boris Plotnikov, Vyacheslav Kirilichev, Stanislav Sadalsky, Elena Borzova, Alexander Solovyov, Mikhail Pugovkin and others. **The film was banned in 1980 and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in May 1987.**

Formula of the Rainbow. USSR, 1966. Directed by Georgy Yungvald-Khilkevich. Screenwriter Yuri Chernyavsky. Actors: Nikolai Fedortsov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Savely Kramarov, Ivan Ryzhov, Frunzik Mkrtchyan, Georgy Vitsin, Lev Stepanov, Roman Tkachuk, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Grinko, Evgeny Shutov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. **The film was not released on a wide screen (although some reports went in limited rental on the Ukrainian territory). It was shown on TV only in post-Soviet times.**

Hare Reserve. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Rashev. Screenwriter Vasily Reshetnikov. Actors: Evgeny Lebedev, Alexander Kalyagin, Lev Durov, Alexander Khochinsky, Alexander Potapov, Vladimir Receptor, Irina Sokolova, Natalya Borovkova and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s, since it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Intervention. USSR, 1968. Directed by Gennady Poloka. Screenwriter Lev Slavin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Vladimir Vysotsky, Valery Zolotukhin, Olga Aroseva, Gelena Ivlieva, Efim Kopelyan, Rufina Nifontova, Vladimir Tatosov, Yuri Tolubeev, Valentin Gaft, Marlen Khutsiev, Georgy Shtil, Sergei Yursky, etc. **Film in the 1960s - 1970s in the Soviet film distribution was not released, as it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Kiev Frescoes. USSR, 1966. Directed by Sergei Parajanov. Screenwriters Sergei Parajanov, Pavel Zagrebelny. Actors: Tengiz Archvadze, Antonina Leftiy, Viya Artmane, Afanasy Kochetkov, Nikolay Grinko, Mikhail Gluzsky and others. **The shooting of this film was interrupted at the initial stage, further work on the film was prohibited.**

The Life and Ascension of Yuras Bratchik (Christ has Landed in Grodno). USSR, 1967. Directed by Vladimir Bychkov (with the participation of Sergei Skvortsov). Scriptwriter Vladimir Korotkevich (based on his own novel "Christ has landed in Grodno"). Actors: Lev Durov, Ilya Rutberg, Lev Krugly, Alexey Smirnov, Pavel Kormunin, Lyubov Rumyantseva, Anatoly Stolbov, Vladimir Vasiliev, Donatas Banionis, Valery Nosik, Victor Avdyushko and others. **Film in the 1960s - 1970s at the all-Union film distribution was not released because it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1989.**

Literature Lesson. USSR, 1968. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriter Victoria Tokareva (based on her own story "A Day Without Lies"). Actors: Evgeny Steblov, Leonid Kuravlyov, Inna Makarova, Valentina Malyavina, Evgeny Leonov, Larisa Pashkova, Lyubov Dobrzhanskaya, Gotlib Roninson, Victoria Fedorova, Nikolai Parfyonov, etc. **The film was banned and was not released in the all-Union film distribution. After the collapse of the USSR, it began to be shown on TV.**

The Lonely Voice of a Man. USSR, 1978. Directed by Alexander Sokurov. Screenwriter Yuri Arabov (based on the works of Andrey Platonov "The Potudan River", "The Secret Man", "The Origin of the Master"). Actors: Tatiana Goryacheva, Andrey Gradov, Vladimir Degtyarev and others. **The film was banned in 1978 and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987, as a result, it gathered 0.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Missing Letter. USSR, 1972. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriter Ivan Drach (based on the story of the same name by Nikolai Gogol). Actors: Ivan Mykolaichuk, Lydia Belozerova, Fyodor Strigun, Mikhail Golubovich and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s. The release of this picture took place in the late 1980s.**

Mistakes of Youth. USSR, 1978. Directed by Boris Frumin. Screenwriters Eduard Topol, Boris Frumin. Actors: Stanislav Zhdanko, Mikhail Vaskov, Marina Neyolova, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Karachentsov, Afanasy Kochetkov, Yuri Chernov, etc. **After filming ended, the film was banned and was not released. He appeared on Soviet screens only in October 1989.**

Moment of Truth (In August 44th ...). USSR, 1975. Directed by Vytautas Žalakevičius. Scriptwriter Vladimir Bogomolov (based on his own novel). Actors: Sergei Shakurov, Anatoly Azo, Alexander Ivanov, Bronius Babkauskas, Borislav Brondukov, Nikolai Trofimov, Mihai Volontir, Elena Safonova, Sergei Sazontiev, Boris Shcherbakov and others. **The film was banned when its shooting was 99% complete, and the director made rough cut. Unfortunately, the painting has not survived, as it was destroyed by order of the authorities.**

My Home is a Theater. USSR, 1975. Directed by Boris Ermolaev. Screenwriters Sergei Ermolinsky, Vladimir Lakshin. Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Valentina Malyavina, Galina Polskikh, Oleg Yankovsky, Oleg Anofriev, Boris Ivanov, Leonid Kulagin, Larisa Vadko, German Kachin, Konstantin Voinov, Igor Kashintsev, Vladimir Zamansky, Nikita Podgorny, Sergei Dreyden, etc. **Film in 1970- x years was banned and was not released in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Only Three Nights. 1969. Directed by Gavriil Egiazarov. Screenwriter Alexander Borschagovsky (based on his own story "Night"). Actors: Nina Gulyaeva, Valery Kozinets, Irina Korotkova, Vladimir Vorobey, Nikolai Grinko, Alexey Glazyrin, Oleg Efremov and others. **The film was not released in the all-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s, as it was banned. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1989.**

People Remain People. USSR, 1965. Directed by Dmitry Vuros (based on the novel of the same name by Yuri Pilyar). Actors: Lyudmila Davydova, Lyudmila Marchenko, Viktor Uralsky, Viktor Markin, Vladimir Zemlyanikin, Valerian Vinogradov, Marina Ladynina and others. **This TV movie was banned and was not shown to the audience.**

Price. USSR, 1969. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Kalik (based on the play by Arthur Miller). Actors: Mikhail Gluzsky, Alexandra Klimova, Leonid Gallis, Lev Sverdlin and others. **This television movie was banned and first shown on Soviet TV only in 1989.**

Seagulls over the Dunes. USSR, 1960. Directed by Gennady Poloka. Screenwriter Yuri Trifonov. **In the midst of the filming period, this picture was banned, filming was stopped ...**

Small School Orchestra. USSR, 1968. Directed by Alexander Muratov, Nikolai Rashev. Screenwriters: Vladimir Zuev, Alexander Muratov, Nikolai Rashev. Actors: Galina Shabanova, Svetlana Smekhnova, Sergei Vlasov, Viktor Totsky, Vladimir Khodzitsky, Vladimir Chinaev and others. **The film was shot for TV, but was never shown on central television in the USSR. It began to be shown on television only in the 21st century. There is, however, information that during the Soviet era this picture could sometimes be seen on local, non-capital channels.**

Spring for the Thirsty. USSR, 1965. Directed by Yuri Ilyenko. Screenwriter Ivan Drach. Actors: Dmitry Milyutenko, Larisa Kadochnikova, Feodosia Litvinenko, Nina Alisova, Gemma Firsova, Ivan Kostyuchenko and others. **The film was banned and was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1960s – 1970s. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in November**

1987, as a result, it gathered 0.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.

Starling and Lyra. USSR-Czechoslovakia-East Germany, 1974. Directed by Grigory Alexandrov. Screenwriters: Grigory Alexandrov, Alexander Lapshin, N. Pekelnik. Actors: Lyubov Orlova, Pyotr Velyaminov, Nikolai Grinko, Boris Kordunov, Boris Ivanov, Boris Zaydenberg, Rina Zelenaya, Rimma Markova, Svetlana Svetlichnaya and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In the 1990s, it was first shown on TV.**

Steppe Dawns (State Eye). USSR, 1953. Directed by Leon Saakov. Screenwriter Boris Bedny (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Iya Arepina, Lev Frichinsky, Nikolai Moskalenko, Yuri Sarantsev, Boris Runge, Rimma Shorokhova, Valentina Telegin, Leonid Kmit, Ekaterina Savinova and others. **The film was banned and never appeared on Soviet screens.**

Theme. USSR, 1979. Directed by Gleb Panfilov. Screenwriters Gleb Panfilov, Alexander Chervinsky. Actors: Mikhail Ulyanov, Inna Churikova, Evgeny Vesnik, Evgenia Nechaeva, Sergei Nikonenko, Natalia Selezneva, Stanislav Lyubshin and others. **The film was banned in 1979. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1986, as a result, she gathered 3.9 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Trizna. USSR, 1972. Directed by Bulat Mansurov. Screenwriters: Bulat Mansurov, Askar Suleimenova (based on Ilyas Dzhansugurov's poem "Kulager"). Actors: Kargambay Sataev, Kenenbay Kozhabekov, Bayten Omarov and others. **The film was banned and in the 1970s it was not released in the all-Union film distribution. The release of this picture in the USSR film distribution took place in October 1987, as a result, it attracted 0.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Unexpected Joys. USSR, 1972-1974. Directed by Rustam Khamdamov. Screenwriters: Andrei Konchalovsky, Friedrich Gorenstein, Rustam Khamdamov, Evgeny Kharitonov. Actors: Elena Solovey, Yuri Nazarov, Tatiana Samoilova, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Natalia Leble, Oleg Yankovsky and others. **The film was banned in the middle of the filming process.**

Vacation in September. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Vitaly Melnikov (based on the play by A. Vampilov "Duck Hunt"). Actors: Oleg Dal, Irina Kupchenko, Irina Reznikova, Natalya Gundareva, Natalya Mikolyshina, Yuri Bogatyrev, Gennady Bogachev, Nikolai Burlyayev, Yevgeny Leonov, etc. **This television film was banned in the year of its creation and was released on Soviet television screens only during the "perestroika" – in 1987.**

Victor Krokhin's Second Attempt. USSR, 1977. Directed by Igor Sheshukov. Screenwriter Eduard Volodarsky. Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Nikolay Rybnikov, Oleg Borisov, Alexander Kharashkevich, Victor Poluektov, Mikhail Terentyev, Lev Lemke, Antonina Bogdanova, Alexander Pashutin, Vladimir Zamansky, Leonid Dyachkov, Ivan Bortnik, etc. **All-Union film distribution was not released. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1987.**

Where the Mountains are White ... USSR, 1973. Directed by Askhat Ashrapov, Victor Pusurmanov. Screenwriter Satimzhan Sanbaev. Actors: Nurmukhan Zhanturin, Biken Rimova, Mukhtar Naimanbaev, Natalia Arinbasarova and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s and 1980s. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place in 1991.**

While the Dream is Mad. USSR, 1978. Directed by Yuri Gorkovenko. Screenwriter Vasily Aksenov. Actors: Nikolay Karachentsov, Lyubov Reimer, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Nikolay Grinko, Leonid Kuravlyov, Mikhail Boyarsky, Oleg Anofriev, Sergey Migitsko, Vladimir Basov, Rolan Bykov, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Steblov, Sergey Filippov, Kakhi Kavsadze, Artyom Ryzhetyan, Ivan Nikolai Parfyonov, Sergei Nikonenko, Rimma Markova, Lyudmila Shagalova, Gurgen Tonunts, Grazhina Baikstite and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s. The release of this picture on the screens of the USSR took place only in 1988.**

2. Feature Films (1951-1991), shown only in the cinemas of the Soviet republics

Clicks. USSR. 1973. Directed by Rezo Esadze. Screenwriters Friedrich Gorenstein, Rezo Esadze (based on the satirical stories of F. Gorenstein: "The Man in the Tree", "Non-Resistant", "On behalf of the Collective", "The Thinker"). Actors: Zurab Kapianidze, Ramaz Chkhikvadze, Kakhi Kavsadze, Leo Antadze, Rezo Esadze, Gia Peradze and others. **In 1974 this television movie was shown only on the republican TV of the Georgian Soviet Republic.**

Flight of Sparrows. USSR, 1980. Director and screenwriter Teimuraz Babluani. Actors: Elguja Burduli, Teimuraz Bichiashvili, Rezo Esadze and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Georgian Soviet Republic.**

Fun Conversation. USSR, 1958. Directed by V. Lyakhovetsky. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Apparently, the movie has not survived.**

The Grandfather of the Left Wing. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Osyka. Screenwriters Ivan Drach, Leonid Osyka. Actors: Nikolai Yakovchenko, Valentina Sperantova, Borislav Brondukov, Konstantin Stepankov, Antonina Leftiy, Anatoly Byshovets and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1974).**

June, Early Summer. USSR, 1969. Directed by Raimondas Vabalas. Screenwriters Raimondas Vabalas, Itskhokas Meras. Actors: Vytautas Tomkus, Gediminas Karka, Elvira Zhebertavichyute, Kazimira Kimantaite and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1970).**

Living Legends. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nodar Managadze. Screenwriters: Erlom Akhvlediani, David Javakhishvili, Nodar Managadze. Actors: Zurab Kapanidze, Temo Japaridze, Jemal Moniava, Temur Chkheidze and others. **In 1976 this film was shown only on the republican TV of the Georgian SSR. In Moscow, this picture was first shown only in 1988-1989.**

Madness. USSR, 1968. Directed by Kalyo Kiisk. Screenwriter Victor Lorenz. Actors: Voldemar Panso, Yuri Jarvet, Bronius Babkauskas, Valeriy Nosik, Viktor Plyut, Kharijs Liepinsh, Leonhard Merzin and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. In the 1960s - 1970s, it was shown only on the screens of the Estonian Soviet Republic. The premiere of the picture at the all-Union box office took place in 1987. As a result, during the first year of demonstration in cinemas "Madness" was watched by 0.7 million viewers.**

Stepa-Captain. USSR, 1953. Directed by Alexander Kozyr. Screenwriters M. Maryanov, Alexander Pereguda. Actors: Vladimir Sudin, Valery Chernykh, Shura Buzilevich, Borya Davikov and others. **The film was intended for a children's audience and was not released for the All-Union film distribution. There is evidence that it, printed in a small print run, was shown only on the screens of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Apparently, the movie has not survived.**

Steppe Rolls (Uralsk is on Fire). USSR, 1975. Directed by Mazhit Begalin. Screenwriters Mazhit Begalin, Vladimir Kunin. Actors: Nartai Begalin, Vladimir Gusev, Vadim Zakharchenko, Mikhail Gluzsky, Igor Bogolyubov, Shakhan Musin, German Kachin, Viktor Avdyushko, Nikolai Rybnikov and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s and 1980s. There is information that it was shown in the republican box office of the Kazakh Soviet Republic in a small edition.**

Theater of an Unknown Actor. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nikolai Rasheev. Screenwriters Nikolai Rasheev, Yuri Smolich (based on the work of the same name by Yuri Smolich). Actors: Vitaly Shapovalov, Evgeny Lebedev, Mikhail Kozakov, Emilia Milton, Elena Kamburova, Nikolai Merzlikin, Mikhail Golubovich and others. **The film was not released in the All-Union film distribution in the 1970s, but only got limited distribution on the territory of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.**

Two families. USSR, 1958. Director and screenwriter David Kandelaki. Actors: Salome Kancheli, Yusuf Kobaladze, David Abashidze, Georgy Gelovani and others. **The film was not released for the All-Union film distribution. It was shown only on the screens of the Georgian Soviet Republic (premiere – 1959).**

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov is the former President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (2003-2014), editor-in-chief of Journal “Media Education”.

He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences, Russian Union of Filmmakers and FIPRESCI.

He holds a MA degree from Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK, 1983), Ph.D.(1986) and Ed.D.(1993) degrees with an emphasis in film and media education from Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).

Postdoctoral affiliation: guest professor and visiting senior research scholar in: *Central European University* (Budapest, Hungary: 1998, 2006), *Kassel University* (Germany, 2000, grant DAAD), *Humboldt University* (Berlin, Germany, 2005, grant DAAD), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), *Kennan Institute* (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S., 2003), Mainz University (2010, grant DAAD), University of Frankfurt (2014, grant DAAD).

He is the holder of UNESCO Global Media and Information Literacy Award (2019) and many prizes for his books and scientific achievements.

He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Russian Science Foundation* (2017-2019), *Russian Foundation for the Basis Research* (2018-2020), *Federal Target Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science* (2010-2013), *Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science “Development of Science University Potential”* (2006-2008), *Russian President Program for Leading Scientific Schools* (2003-2005), *MacArthur Foundation* (USA, 1997, 2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2010); *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002), *The Russian Ministry of Education The Program “Russian Universities”* (2002); *Research Support Scheme* (2000-2002, USA); *Program “Civil Society”* (1998-1999, USA); *HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition* (1998, USA); *Education Program for the best text of university lectures* (1997); *Switzerland Scientific Foundation* (2000); *Russian Ministry of Education: research in humanities area* (1997-2000), DAAD (Germany, 2000, 2005; 2010; 2014), *Kennan Institute* (USA, 2003), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media culture and media education/literacy conferences: “Megatrends and media” (Slovakia, 2016, 2017), World United Nation Forum ‘Alliance of civilizations” (Media Literacy Section, Madrid, 2008), Council of Europe Conference “Media Literacy” (Graz, Dec. 2007), International Media Literacy Conference (Prague, Apr. 2007), UNESCO Media Education Conference (Paris, June, 2007), Information Technologies International Conference (Moscow, May, 2007), International Conference E-Citizen. (Moscow, Feb. 2006), UNESCO Conference on the Information Society (St.Petersburg, May, 2005), Conference of Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), National Media Education Conference: ‘Literacy & Liberty’ (AMLA: Alliance for Media Literate America) (Baltimore, U.S., June, 2003), World Congress ‘Toys, Games and Media’, University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe: Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME – Conference ‘Pedagogy and Media’ (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000), World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children’s’ Television Center Summit (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), Educating for the Media and the Digital Age: UNESCO International Conference (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), World Media Education/Literacy Summit (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), Media & Science Forum

(Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), Youth and the Media, Tomorrow: UNESCO International Conference (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997) and many others.

He is the author of 500 articles and 30 books about film history and film criticism, media culture, media literacy education. e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov

- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. *Audience* (USA), N 179, p. 20-22.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. *Audience* (USA), N 184, p. 40-41.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. *Audience* (USA), N 183, p. 15-17.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. *Audience* (USA), N 186, p. 14-16.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 100-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 93-95.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, p. 141-142.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 4, p. 38-41.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, p. 21.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 33-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. *Educommunication* (Belgium), N 55, p. 92-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. *Alma Mater*, N 11, p. 15-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p. 131-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagogie zur Mediaenpadagogik. *MERZ: Mediaen + Merziehung* (Germany), N 4, p. 256-261.
- Suss, D. (Eds.) *Media Education in 12 European Countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, p. 100-110.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. *Tilt* (Norway), N 4, p. 22-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). *Mediaenimpulse* (Austria), N 12, p. 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. *Media Education Journal*. (Scotland). N 37, p.20-21.
- Fedorov, A. (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, p.25-30.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.

- Fedorov, A. (2009). Media Education in Russia: A Brief History. In: Marcus Leaning (Ed.). *Issues in Information and Media Literacy: Criticism, History and Policy*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press, p.167-188.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Media Educational Practices in Teacher Training. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2010, Vol. 3, N 3, p.57-70.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Russian Media education Literacy Centers in the 21st Century. *The Journal of Media Literacy (USA)*. 2010. Vol. 57. NN 1-2, p.62-68.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Alfabetización mediática en el mundo. *Infoamérica*. 2011. N 5, p.7-23. http://www.infoamerica.org/icr/icr_05.htm
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Assessment of Students' Media Competence: Test Results Analysis. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 4, p.67-81. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Modern Media Education Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 1, p.73-82. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": the Novel and its Adaptation to Media Education Lessons in the Student Audience. *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 30. Nº 9-3, p.1579-1584.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Elevers grep om detektivfortellinger. *Tilt*. 2012. N 1. Mediepedagogene. <http://www.mediepedagogene.no/elevers-grep-om-detektivfortellinger>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Production Dynamics of Western Films Connected with 'The Soviet/Russian Topic'. *Film International*. 2012. N 2, p.53-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Hermeneutical Analysis of the Soviet Fantasy Genre of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation in Media Studies in a Student Audience. *European researcher*. 2012. N 11-3, p.2042-2055.
- Fedorov, A. (2013) The Image of the West on the Soviet Screen in the Era of the "Cold War": Case Studies. *European Researcher*. 2013. N 2. Vol.3, p. 497-507.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Ideological, Structural Analysis of the Russian Image Representation in the Cold War Times' Film 'White Nights'. *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p.1044-1050.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Image of Russia on the Western Screen: the Present Stage (1992–2013). *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p. 1051-1064.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Analysis of Media Stereotypes of the Russian Image in Media Studies in the Student Audience (example: the screen versions of Jules Verne's Novel "Michael Strogoff"). *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol.(83), Nº 9-2, pp. 1718-1724.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Hermeneutic Analysis of Soviet Feature Films of 1941-1942 on the Military Theme. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.358-371.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.168-175.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education Literacy in the World: Trends. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Moscow Media Education Centers for Non-professionals in the Media Fields. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Nazi Feature Films on the Russian Topic: Hermeneutic Analysis. *European Journal of Social and Human Sciences*. 2014, Vol. 3, Nº 3, pp.111-117.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian and Western Media Literacy Education Models. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, Nº 4-2, pp. 764-780.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian Image on the Federal Republic of Germany Screen. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 77, N 6-2, p.1194-1212.

- Fedorov, A. (2014). The Opinions of Russian School Students and Teachers about Media Violence. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 781-804. URL: http://www.erjournal.ru/journals_n/1399226928.pdf
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.918-929.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Ukraine. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.941-946.
- Gilbert, L., Fedorov, A. (2004). A Model for Media Education Research in Russia and the US. *Educational Media International*, Vol. 41, N 2, p. 157-162.
- Fedorov, A. et al. (2017). Directions, goals, tasks, author's concepts of audiovisual media interpretations of the topic of the school and university in the Russian cinema (1992-2017). *Media Education*. 4: 206-235.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). The Image of the white movement in the Western feature cinema (1931-2016). *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(1): 11-17.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(2): 75-107.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Leviathan and Sunstroke: opinions of the Russian film critics. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(1): 9-15.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Polish cinema in the mirror of the soviet and Russian film critics. *Media Education*. 2: 220-239.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet cinema in Cinema Art Journal. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(2): 79-89.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet film critics about soviet cinema: from censorship to Gorbachev's perestroika. *Media Education*. 1: 213-277.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). The Western World in Soviet and Russian Cinema (1946–2016). *Russian Education & Society*. 59(7-9): 319-464.
- Fedorov, A. (2019). Schools and universities in audiovisual media: experts opinions. *Communication Today*. 10(1): 110-122.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Camarero, E. (2016). Curricula for Media Literacy Education According to International Experts. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*. 17(3): 324-334.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Gorbatkova, O. (2018). The structural model of the contents of audiovisual media texts on school and university topic. *Media Education*. 56(1): 197-203.

References

- Anashkin, A. (1967). Success. Payback. Circulation. *Cinema Art*. 4: 80-85.
- Anninsky, L. (1986). Millstones of Truth. *Cinema Art*. 5.
- Anninsky, L. (1988). Quiet volcano. *My favorite actor*. Moscow: Art.
- Anninsky, L. (1990). Rearguard battle. *Soviet film*. 2.
- Anninsky, L. (1991). *The Sixties and We. Cinematography, which has become and has not become history*. Moscow: Cinema Center.
- Anninsky, L. (2006). *Late Tears*. Moscow: Eisenstein Center, VGIK.
- Antropov, V. (1996). Alien Dovzhenko? *Cinema Art*. 9.
- Balandina, N. (2018). "The Price" by Mikhail Kalik. At the end of the decade. *Theater Questions*. 1-2: 383-406.
- Banionis, D. (2012). "First there was pity for my wife". *Caravan of Stories*. 7. <https://7days.ru/caravan/2012/7/donatas-banionis-k-zhene-sperva-by-la-zhalost/5.htm#ixzz6FdtLF3W7>
- Bazalgette, C. (1995). Key Aspects of Media Education. Moscow: Association for Film Education.
- Belenky, I. (2019). *History of cinema. Filming, film industry, cinematography*. Moscow: Alpina, 2019.
- Berman, B. (1987). "Hare Reserve". Musical arrows of satire. *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 7: 12.
- Brashinsky, M. (2001). [Alexander Askoldov]. *Recent history of Russian cinema. 1986-2000. Cinema and context*. Vol. 1. St.Petersburg: Seans.
- Chernenko, M. (1987). Traces of the post-war years. *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 2: 12.
- Chinaev, V. (2010). *Commentary on the film "Small School Orchestra"*. <http://www.kino-teatr.ru/kino/movie/sov/79870/forum/#1052555>. 17.01.2010
- Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. (2010). Vol. 1. Moscow. 336 p.
- Competition-71. Results (1972). *Soviet Screen*. 10: 18-19.
- Demin, V. (1988). Rehabilitation. *Cinema Art*. 1988. 2: 25-26.
- Eco, U. (2005). *The role of the reader. Research on the semiotics of the text*. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 502 p.
- Erokhin, A. (1988). "While the dream is mad". Such is the cinema ... *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 12: 7.
- Erokhin, A. (1989). Are we free? *Soviet Screen*. 16: 4-6.
- Fedorov, A. (1986). "Morality is Truth". *Cinema (Lithuania)*. 11: 7.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Structural analysis of the media text: stereotypes of the Soviet cinematic image of war and V. Vinogradov's film "Eastern Corridor" (1966). *Questions of cultural studies*. 6: 110-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). *100 most popular Soviet television films and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers*. Moscow: Information for all, 146 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). *One thousand and one highest-grossing Soviet film: opinions of film critics and viewers*. Moscow: Information for all, 2021. 1134 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). *Soviet science fiction films in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions*. Moscow: Information for all, 170 p.
- Fomin, V. (1992). *"Shelf": Documents. Testimonials. Comments*. Moscow.
- Fomin, V., Grashchenkova, I., Ziborova, O., Kosinova, M. (2012). *The history of the film industry in Russia: management, film production, distribution*. Moscow: VGIK, 2759 p.
- Fomin, V., Mamatova, L. (2003). "Agony". *Russian Illusion*. Moscow: Materik, 2003.
- For success! (1967). *Cinema Art*. 2: 1-2.
- For success! (1968). *Cinema Art*. 1: 5-8.

- Furikov, L. (1990). Myths and reality of cinema audience preferences. *Kinomekhanik*. 3: 13-16; 4: 10-13; 5: 15-17; 6: 12-17.
- Gersheon, O. (2011). Unknown Vinogradov. Portrait of the Director. *Cinema Art*. 7.
- Gladilshchikov, Y. (1989). "Only three nights". Three Nights and Twenty Years. *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 5: 5.
- Gordeev, V. (2007). *Checking on the roads*. 03.07.2007. <http://www.ekrank.ru/film/493/>
- Gordeev, V. (2009). *Vacation in September*. 07.11.2009. <http://www.ekrank.ru/film/1817/>
- Gorelov, D. (2009). Four on the side – yours are not in Odessa-mom. *Russian Life*. 25.02.2009. <http://rulife.ru/old/mode/article/1171/>
- Gromov, E. (1988). Ice and Flame of Truth ("Theme"). *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art: 95-98.
- Guba, V. (2001). "The Grandfather of the Left Wing": on the border of social taboo. <https://ktm.ukma.edu.ua/2002/3/guba.html>
- Ilchenko, S. (1987). Sad arithmetic of a fun genre. *Smena*. 09.08.1987.
- "Intervention". *Forbidden Films (Shelf)*. Issue 2. Mikhailov, V. (ed.) (1993). Moscow: NT-Center.
- Ivanov, A. (2020). "I Played a Major Role in the Destroyed Movie 'Moment of Truth' (In August of 1944)". *Media Education*. 60(2): 358-363.
- Ivanova, T. (1970). "Harder" – "even harder" – "very harder"... *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, 1970: 90-95.
- Ivanova, V. (1987). "Forest". *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 4: 9.
- Ivanova, V. (1987). "My home is a theater". *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 4: 8.
- Kagarlitskaya, A. (1987). "Bad Anecdote". *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 12: 8-9.
- Karakhan, L. (1988). Variation on a theme. *Soviet Screen*. 2: 8-9.
- Khanyutin, Y. (1976). Film and the spectator in the system of mass communications. *Cinema Art*. 9: 33-52.
- Khloplyankina, T. (1987). Return of Victor Krokhin. *Soviet Screen*. 2: 8-9.
- Khrenov, N. (1981). Socio-psychological aspects of the interaction between art and the public. Moscow: Science.
- Kichin, V. (1988). Resentment is a bad counselor. *Soviet Culture*. 17.12.1988.
- Kireeva, M., Margolit, E. (2014). "Do the bandits sing like that?". 29.12.2014.
- Kosinova, M. (2016). Falling film attendance in the era of stagnation. Causes and effects. *Bulletin of the University*. 7-8: 271-276.
- Kovalov, O. (2010). *Gennady Poloka and his paradoxes*. <http://www.cinematheque.ru/post/143318/print/>
- Kovalov, O. (2011). We are in the "Lonely Voice of a Man". *Sokurov. Parts of speech*. Book. 3. St. Petersburg: Workshop "Seance".
- Kudryavtsev, S. (1997). "Agony". <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1329687.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (1998). *Ours Cinema*. Moscow: Duple-D: 410-443.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (1998). "Long farewell". *Ours Cinema*. Moscow: Duple-D: 55-57.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2008). "Clicks". 2008. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1411225.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2009). A total of 7250 Soviet films were shot for film distribution. 11.08.2009. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1729870.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2006). "Bad Anecdote". <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/266052.html>
- Kushnirov, M. (1998). *The Light Path or Charlie Spencer*. Moscow: TYARTA-Book Club.
- Kuznetsov, S. (1999). Yeralash, idiots and those who were not there. *Gazeta*. http://gazeta.lenta.ru/culture/10-06-1999_tavr.htm

- Kuznetsova, M. (2006). The story of Asya Klyachina, who loved but did not marry. *Russian Cinema*. <https://www.russkoekino.ru/books/ruskino/ruskino-0074.shtml>
- Levchenko, Y. (2010). "Theme" of Gleb Panfilov and the end of a dull era. *Cinematheque*. 18.02.2010. <http://www.cinematheque.ru/post/142362/2>
- Lipkov, A. (1988). *German, son of German*. Moscow: Cinema Center.
- Lipkov, A. (1988). Legends – allegories. *Cinema Art*. 10: 72-76.
- Lukeš, J. (2002). Czech "new wave" (1960-1968). <http://www.cinematheque.ru/thread/13064>
- Makarov, A. (1987). "Intervention". *Companion of the cinema-goer* 11: 2-3.
- Margolit, E. (1990). "The holy place is empty ..." *Cinema Art*. 1: 54-61.
- Margolit, E. (2003). "Checking on the roads". *Russian Illusion*. Moscow: Materik, 2003.
- Margolit, E. (2003). "Comissar". *Russian Illusion*. Moscow: Materik, 2003.
- Margolit, E. (2010). Commentary. "Small School Orchestra": premiere of an old film. <http://www.operaforums.ru/opera-news/18340-2259-malenkiy-shkolnyy-orkestr-premera-starogo-filma>. 8.12.2010.
- Margolit, E. (2012). *The Living and the Dead. Notes on the history of Soviet cinema of the 1920s-1960s*. St. Petersburg: Workshop "Seance", 560 p.
- Margolit, E., Shmyrov, V. (1995). *Seized Cinema*. Moscow: Duple-D, 133 p.
- Markov, N. (2019). *The system of state administration of Soviet cinema in 1963-1986*. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.
- Matizen, V. (2010). Always on the alert. *New Izvestia*. 4.02.2010.
- McCosland, D. (2012). "Commissar". *Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema: from "Stenka Razin" to "Hipsters"*. Moscow: Globus-press: 255-259.
- Miloserdova, N. (2010). Melnikov Vitaly Vyacheslavovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 302-306.
- Mokrousov, A. (2010). The party said "no need". Efim Dzigan at the White Pillars Festival. *Kommersant*. 22: 15. 09.02.2010.
- Mokrousov, A. (2010). Too loyal Dzigan. *Russian Journal*. 15.02.2010. <http://www.russ.ru/pole/Slishkom-loyal-nyj-Dzigan>
- Orkina, I. (2007). "Little Man" in Big History. The experience of everyday reading of the theme in the film "Commissar". *Cinema Studies Notes*. 85.
- Pavlova, I. (1986). Space of tragedy. *Smena*. 05.06.1986.
- Pinsky, B. (1990). Gift! *Soviet Screen*. 18: 4-5.
- Polskaya, L. (1987). "The lonely voice of a man". *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 10: 4.
- Potter, W.J. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Rassadin, S. (1967). Why? *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art: 190-196.
- Rondeli, L. (2013). *Cinema and its audience. Analytical chronicle of relationships (1969-2010)*. Moscow: VGIK, 450 p.
- Rosenblum, L. (1988). Wedding or Funeral? *Soviet Screen*. 4: 16-17.
- Rudenko-Desyatnik, A. (1986). Measure of understanding. *Soviet Screen*. 9.
- Ryazantseva, N. (2008). Unfortunately, short meetings. In: Abdullaeva, Z. *Kira Muratova: Cinema Art*. Moscow: New Literary Review.
- Shakurov, S. (2012). Interview with radio station "Mayak". 7.12.2012. http://www.sergey-shakurov.ru/KINO/kino_avgust44.html
- Shcheglov, D. (1997). Love and Mask. Moscow. "Shelf". *Documents. Testimonials. Comments*. Issue 3. Moscow: Materik.
- Shcherbakov, K. (1987). A Step Towards. *Cinema Art*. 11.
- Sherwood, O. (1987). The rate is greater than life. *Evening Leningrad*. 24.07.1987.

- Shilova, I. (2010). Alov Alexander and Naumov Vladimir. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 20-23.
- Shilova, I. (2010). Klimov Elem Germanovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 227-229.
- Shpagin, A. (2005). Religion of war. *Cinema Art*. 6. <http://kinoart.ru/2005/n6-article12.html#5>
- Shvydkoi, M. (1987). Is the whole world a theater? *Soviet Screen*. 6: 10.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Sizonenko, O. (1987). "Spring for the Thirsty". *Cinema Screen News*. 11: 5-7.
- Stishova, E. (1987). Lullaby. *Soviet Screen*. 21: 14-15.
- Stishova, E. (1987). Time and Choice. *Cinema Art*. 11.
- Surkov, E. (1986). Old new film. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 09.01.1986.
- Turovskaya, M. (1996). Films of the Cold War. *Cinema Art*. 9: 98-106.
- Turovskaya, M. (1979). Why does the viewer go to the cinema. *Cinema Genres*. Moscow: Art, 319 p.
- Vasiliev, A. (1989). Fifth corner ("Errors of youth"). *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 10: 5.
- Vickers, R. (1987). All of this would be ridiculous... *Cinema Screen News*. 7: 4-5.
- Voitenko, V. (2015). How conscience wins over ideology. *Day*. 07.05.2015. <https://m.day.kyiv.ua/ru/article/media/kak-sovest-pobezhdaet-ideologiyu>
- Volobuev, R. (2008). Bergman and Robin. *Afisha.ru*. <http://www.afisha.ru/blogcomments/2225/28.06.2008>.
- What the audience is watching (1987). *Soviet Screen*. 22: 5.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 4: 10.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 9: 5.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 14: 19.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 19: 9.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 4: 26.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 8: 19.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 15: 19.
- Wolfson, I. (1987). Date in twenty years. *Cinema Screen News*. 5.
- Yampolsky, M. (1987). Polemic notes on the aesthetics of mass film. *Transcript of the "round table" meeting of film critics and film critics, October 12-13, 1987*. Moscow: 31-44.
- Yankevich, M. (2020). "Missing Letter" is a nativity scene on the big screen. *Gazeta.ua*. 25.12.2020. https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/culture/_propavshaya-gramota-eto-vertep-na-bolshom-ekrane/1004941
- Yurenev, R. (1986). Praise to the unusual movie. *Soviet Screen*. 20: 7-8.
- Zemlyanukhin, S., Segida, M. (1995). *Home Cinematheque. National cinema. 1918-1996*. Moscow: Duple-D, 520 p.
- Zhabsky, M. (1978). Cinema Attendance in the Sociological Dimension. *Cinema and the City Spectator*. Moscow: 55–73.
- Zhabsky, M. (1983). Some topical problems of the sociology of cinema. *Social life of the film*. Moscow: 17-18.
- Zhabsky, M. (1998). *Cinema: the path from the film to the viewer*. Moscow, 267 p.
- Zhabsky, M. (2009). The phenomenon of the mass character of cinema. *Socio-cultural drama of cinema: Analytical chronicle (1969–2005)*. Moscow: Canon+.
- Zhabsky, M. (2020). *Sociology of Cinema*. Moscow: Canon+, 512 p.
- Zhabsky, M., Tarasov, K. (2019). Russian sociology of cinema in the context of the development of society. *Sociological Studies*. 11: 73-81.
- Zheltova, V. (1987). "Madness". *Companion of the cinema-goer*. 3: 13.
- Zorkaya, N. (1989). There is freedom – there is no joy. *Soviet Screen*. 8: 14-15.

Zorkaya, N. (1981). *Unique and Replicated: Mass Media and Reproduced Art*. Moscow: Art, 167 p.

Zorkaya, N. (2006). "Zastava Ilyich" by Marlen Khutsiev – the key film of the "sixties". *Word*. <https://www.portal-slovo.ru/art/35992.php>

Fedorov, A. Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: "Information for all". 2021. 102 p.

Monograph

Electronic edition

Publisher:

SM "Information for All"

E-mail contact (at) ifap.ru

<http://www.ifap.ru>

The full text of the monograph is freely available to download at:
<http://www.mediagram.ru/library/>

© Alexander Fedorov, 2021
e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru