

DRAFT: NOT FOR CITATION WITHOUT
PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

NUMBER 142

FILMS WITHOUT FILM:
THE BIRTH PANGS OF THE SOVIET CINEMA

Richard Taylor

Conference on
THE ORIGINS OF SOVIET CULTURE

Sponsored by
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Wilson Center

May 18-19, 1981

FILMS WITHOUT FILM: THE BIRTH PANGS OF THE SOVIET CINEMA

Richard Taylor

(University College of Swansea, U.K.)

Most Soviet histories of the Soviet cinema begin with a quotation attributed to Lenin, 'Of all the arts, for us the cinema is the most important'. Like that other famous statement on the arts that is attributed to Lenin, 'Art belongs to the people',¹ this remark comes down to us through hearsay, through an attribution recollected in the relative tranquillity of later years, at a time when the remark itself had some political utility.² We should therefore treat it with some caution, at least as an expression of Lenin's view at the time. The real significance of such statements lies in the very political utility that they later acquired, when the longer term political function of the arts on Soviet society was being classified as a prelude to the 'cultural revolution' that was to accompany the first Five Year Plan, and when, following the path indicated by Stalin,³ political arguments were to be conducted by reference to citation from Lenin, rather as earlier generations, in western Europe at least, had resorted to arguments that revolved around differing interpretations of the Bible.

I have dealt at greater length elsewhere with the general problems that faced the Soviet cinema in the early post-Revolutionary years and, especially, in the Civil War period, 1917-21, and I shall therefore only summarise the position in this paper.⁴

The first and most obvious question is why the Bolsheviks took the cinema with such apparent seriousness. It is clear from the context, and from subsequent developments, that the Lenin quotation refers, not to the artistic qualities of the film, but to its potential as a weapon of agitation and propaganda. As such, the cinema had many points to recommend it. First, it was the only mass medium available in an era when radio and television were still waiting to be fully developed and exploited. In this connection, the cinema had certain advantages that were to survive the advent of the other mass media. As a silent medium the cinema communicated its message through predominantly or purely visual stimuli: its message had therefore to be simple and direct and, as a visual medium, its impact on the audience was, potentially at least, more profound. Untrammelled by limitations of language or literacy, a film could be shown (assuming the availability of the necessary technical facilities and this was, of course, a big assumption) anywhere in the Soviet Union and its message immediately comprehended. In a country with such a varied linguistic and cultural heritage and such a backward educational level, the cinema was a godsend to the new authorities. One Soviet source commented: 'The cinema is the only book that even the illiterate can read'.⁵

In addition, the cinema was, by the standards of the time, a highly mechanised medium. The resources for the production and reproduction of film were expensive and highly centralised, and therefore relatively easy to control. A film could be sent

out into the provinces and the central authorities could be reasonably certain that performances in Murmansk and Baku, Vladivostok and Minsk, would be virtually identical. The same could not be said, for instance, of a travelling theatre troupe. The cinema was therefore seen to be more reliable. Because of what came later to be called its 'mechanical reproducibility', the cinema was also seen as a great unifying force precisely because audiences in different places could, at least in theory, see the same film at the same time.

The connection between the cinema and technology further enabled the authorities to link themselves in the popular mind with mechanisation and with progress: 'The cinema is a new outlook on life. The cinema is the triumph of the machine, electricity and industry'.⁶ Like machinery, the cinema was perceived to be a dynamic form, unlike, for example, the poster, which, even in the modified form of a ROSTA window, remained predominantly static: 'The soul of the cinema is in the movement of life'.⁷ It is small wonder, then, that Lunacharsky claimed that 'The power of the cinema is unbounded'.⁸

That, however, was the theory: the 'great silent', as it was called, was to be the art form of the Revolution. Trotsky was to argue in 1923 that, whereas the Church in feudal society and the tsarist vodka monopoly in the period of capitalist transition had served as opiates to oppress the people, in socialist society the cinema could serve as the great liberating educational force.⁹ But, in the years 1917-21, the Soviet authorities had to face more immediate tasks of political survival.

Hence Lenin's astonishment when the Hungarian Soviet government under Béla Kun nationalised immediately all places of entertainment including cabarets.¹⁰

By 1917 the cinema had already established its credentials as the most popular form of entertainment for the urban population of the Russian Empire. But the industry was almost entirely in private hands and produced little other than 'psychological salon dramas' and the 'love intrigues' that were later to be so violently denounced. The Provisional Government had initiated, albeit somewhat tentatively, an official newsreel designed to bolster public morale and strengthen the war effort. The Bolsheviks wanted to go further. Fear of their intentions drove most of the leading figures of the pre-Revolutionary cinema, from entrepreneurs like Khanzhonkov to stars like Vera Kholodnaya first into hiding and then into exile. Those who left assembled in the Crimea which, partly because of its relative tranquillity and partly because of its climate, became for a brief period something akin to the Hollywood of that period, a makeshift would-be El Dorado.¹¹ The majority of those who fled south later went into emigration, taking with them much-needed resources, talent and expertise. Those who stayed behind in the cities of the north did so because they regarded the Bolsheviks as a passing, albeit irritating, phenomenon. Assuming that, given the precarious position of the Bolsheviks, the Revolution would be over and done with in six months, that the ancien régime would be restored and that life would return to what they had come to regard as 'normal', they took precautions to ensure that their equipment and materials did not fall into the hands of the Revolutionary authorities.

They concealed their films and projection equipment from officialdom and frequently buried things in the ground, hoping to recover them when the going was good. It never was, of course, and this means that the Bolsheviks were unable to realise the potential of the established cinema network for their own political purposes. As the supply of film stock (all of which had to be imported) dwindled due to the blockade, cinema theatres fell into disrepair¹² and electricity supplies were cut off,¹³ the situation deteriorated even further.

Moves to nationalise the cinema were tempered by the fear that such a move would cause further retrenchment and disruption. Instead, local authorities were permitted and, in some cases, encouraged, to take over a number of the cinemas in their area.¹⁴ This action provoked a hostile reaction and a policy of non-cooperation from the entrepreneurs' association,¹⁵ and this reaction confirmed the Bolshevik authorities in their reluctance to nationalise. A Cinema Sub-Section was however established within the Extra-Mural Department of Narkompros.¹⁶ Although resources were limited, the flight of so many of the personnel hitherto active in the cinema left an increasing proportion of cinema enterprises, de facto if not de jure, in the hands of organisations supporting the new régime. During the Civil War, the Petrograd Soviet's film section, P.O.F.K.O., spread its influence throughout the north western provinces and assumed the acronym Sevzapkino. Similarly, by 1919 the Moscow Soviet's film section had expanded to the point where Lunacharsky deemed it appropriate to re-name the section the All-Russian Photographic and Cinematographic Section (V.F.K.O.) and to take it directly under the wing of his own commissariat.¹⁷ Headed by D.I. Leshchenko, the former chairman of the Petrograd

organisation, the new section was to provide the basis for the nationalisation that was finally decreed on 27 August 1919.¹⁸ But nationalisation on paper was not the same as nationalisation in practice: there is evidence to suggest that the introduction of state control over even the central organs was not completed until late 1920¹⁹ and, of course, the re-emergence of the private sector under NEP was to delay the exercise of complete political control even further.²⁰

Nationalisation of the organisation would, in any case, only provide a framework for political activity. As Lunacharsky himself put it:

We need cadres of workers who are free from the habits and strivings of the old bourgeois entrepreneurial hacks and are able to elevate the cinema to the heights of the artistic and socio-political tasks facing the proletariat, especially in the current period of intensified struggle.²¹

In 1919 the State Film School was established in Moscow under Vladimir Gardin, one of the few directors of the pre-Revolutionary cinema to have stayed behind.²² As resources were limited, and film stock, in particular, was in short supply, the Film School concentrated on producing the short agitational films known as agitki. Of the 92 non-newsreel films produced by Soviet film organisations in the period 1918-20, 63 were agitki and most of them were less than 600 metres in length, or less than thirty minutes when projected.²³ The function of the agitka was to convey a simple message on a single subject with directness and economy. The genre had a decisive influence on the stylistic development of the Soviet film: the essence of economy and dynamism in the visual presentation of material was developed in the principles of editing, or 'montage'. The simple visual message had to attract and hold the attention of the audience and leave it with an impression of dynamism and

strength. These principles were embodied in different ways in the theoretical readings of Lev Kuleshov, in the documentaries and manifestos of Dziga Vertov's Kinoglaz (Cine-Eye) group in the films of Shub, Eisenstein, Pudovkin and the FEKS group, notably Kozintsev. All these people cut their cinematic teeth in the fury of the Civil War.

The shortage of film stock meant that none could be wasted on experiments: what was shot had to be successful. For this reason Lev Kuleshov and his Workshop at the Film School spent much of their time in rehearsals, developing and refining his theory of the naturshchik, the actor with no conventional training, by miming the so-called fil'my bez plënki or 'films without film'.²⁴ In so doing, they laid the foundations for many of the techniques with which the Soviet cinema of the 1920s is so closely associated: as Pudovkin, one of Kuleshov's pupils, wrote later: 'We make pictures - Kuleshov made the cinema'.²⁵

But, whatever the longer term advantages that were to be drawn from the experiences of this period, this was clearly no way to fight a Civil War - not, at least, to fight to win. Given that the conventional cinema network was largely hors de combat, the Bolsheviks were forced to turn elsewhere. To meet what was in effect a dire emergency they adopted emergency measures. Their needs were greatest in the front-line areas: they needed to maintain the morale of their soldiers fighting at the front and to counter-act the effects of white propaganda activities amongst the populations of newly recaptured areas. They needed a highly mobile and effective weapon and they chose to create a fleet of agit-trains.²⁶

The first such train, named after Lenin, went into action among Red Army units in August 1918. It proved to be so successful that Trotsky ordered five more.²⁷ In January 1919 a special Commission was established to operate the planned fleet. Each train was distinctively and brightly decorated with paintings and slogans.²⁸ Artists of the calibre of Mayakovsky, El Lissitsky and Malevich were employed, but their efforts were not always rewarded with success. Some of the initial designs were too abstract or fanciful to be readily understood by a mass audience, particularly one composed largely of illiterate and backward peasants. Dziga Vertov, who travelled on the 'October Revolution' train under Kalinin as political commissar, described the effect of these paintings:

It was not only the painted-up Cossacks depicted on the sides of the train whom the peasants called 'actors' - so too were the horses, simply because they were wrongly shod in the picture.

The more remote the place, the less the peasants grasped the overtly agitational meaning of the pictures. They examined every picture carefully and every figure separately. Whenever I asked them if they liked the drawings, they would answer: 'We don't know. We are ignorant folk - illiterate.

But this does not stop the peasants, when talking among themselves, sniggering unequivocally at the horse 'actors'.²⁹

Each train carried a small library, a printing-press for the production of pamphlets, newspapers and posters, an exhibition room and a film section. The aim was both to distribute and to gather material. The cinema facilities played a significant part in attracting audiences to the trains. Most peasants had never before seen a moving picture (or, indeed an image of a human being!) and the effect was often very powerful. But Vertov agreed that many peasants were confused by the 'theatricality' of many agitki:

they were after all unaware of the conventions by which the cinema of fiction conveyed its message. Nevertheless, in the first year of its existence, the 'October Revolution' had provided 430 film showings for a total audience above 620,000 people.³⁰

The agit-fleet also included the steamer 'Red Star', which spent three months in 1919 sailing down the Volga. The political commissar was Molotov and the Narkompros representative Krupskaya.³¹ The fact that people of the rank of Molotov, Krupskaya and Kalinin were spared from the centre for these tasks underlines their political importance. According to Krupskaya, 'Ilyich was rearing to go himself but he could not leave his work even for a moment'.³² The cinema played an important rôle for the 'Red Star' too. On its first voyage 199 film shows attracted 255,300 people, and on its second voyage in the summer of 1920, 202 shows attracted more than 294,000 people.³³

Important though the agit-fleet was in forging new techniques of agitprop activity and in developing the new Soviet film style of dynamic montage, it would be foolish to imagine that, during the Civil War period, the emerging Soviet state was criss-crossed with travelling power-houses of propaganda. Even the places visited seem, at least in some cases, to have emerged unscathed. Perusal of the Torsten Lundell collection of provincial Russian newspapers held at the Carolina Rediviva University Library at Uppsala, Sweden, is very revealing in this respect.³⁴ When the 'October Revolution' visited Irkutsk in 1919 its arrival and activities remained unreported in the local Soviet press, which was more concerned with reiterating that 'Starvation, cold, misery and epidemics are the natural off-spring of imperialism and its allies'.³⁵ It is a significant comment

on the state of the conventional cinema network at this time that the first thing that disappeared from the local newspapers when the Red Army arrived and Svobodnyi Krai (Free Region) became Sovetskaia Sibir' (Soviet Siberia), were the cinema advertisements. Since the cinemas had previously been indulging their audiences with Innocence, Daughter of the Moon and The Fall of Pompeii, this is perhaps hardly surprising.³⁶

By the end of the Civil War the cinema was still very much in a state of flux. With benefit of hindsight we can see that many important steps were taken towards the creation of a distinctively Soviet cinema during this transitional period. First of all, the nationalisation decree of August 1919 laid the foundation of the institutional framework of the Soviet film industry. Although it was to be another ten years before the Party was to assume effective political control, a start had been made. The State Film School, the first such institution to be created anywhere in the world, began training, albeit on a very limited scale, the first cadres of Soviet film workers. By the end of the 1920s it would be pouring forth large numbers of technically qualified people. The desperate shortages of film stock and equipment, the need to cope with unheated studios and decrepit theatres, instilled into the new Soviet cinema a sense of economy in the use of resources that was to elevate cutting - or montage, surely the distinctive feature of the 'golden era of Soviet film' - to a central place in the later theoretical pronouncements of the varying schools of film-making that emerged around Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Eisenstein, Vertov, Shub or the FEKS group. Most of these people had first entered the cinema in this period and several

of them had played an active part in the film work of the agit-trains. The period 1917-1921 therefore represents for the Soviet cinema a period of birth pangs. Even as late as 1921 the longer term consequences of Civil War developments in the cinema could not be accurately foreseen, for the film was still very much the 'art of the future'.³⁷

But, if the achievements of the new Soviet cinema were still largely theoretical rather than practical, its theoretical achievements were nonetheless significant. One important pointer for the future, whose exact significance it would be difficult to exaggerate, was a collection of essays published by the State Publishing House in Moscow in 1919 under the auspices of Narkompros. Under the title Kinematograf. Sbornik Statei (The Cinematograph. A Collection of Essays) the collection dealt with several aspects of the rôle of the cinema in the creation of a new post-Revolutionary Soviet society. It was the first such collection of essays to be published anywhere in the world and this is in itself an indication of the importance attached to the cinema by the Soviet authorities.

The unsigned editorial that introduced the collection made the task of the Soviet cinema clear:

Having won power and embarked upon a fundamental transformation of all spheres of social life, the labouring classes must tear this weapon from the hands of their exploiters and force it to serve them, their own interests, the great cause of socialism.

For this, however, the cinema must take upon itself the task of the true enlightenment and cultural education of the masses - the deepening of the class-consciousness of the proletariat, the strengthening of comradely solidarity among the workers, the elevation of the revolutionary heroism with which is imbued the whole struggle of the working class for its emancipation and for the emancipation of all mankind.³⁸

According to this editorial, 'Truth and beauty must replace on the screen the seductive lies and embellished ugliness of the recent past.

A mood of struggle and faith in victory must seize the hearts of the audience'.³⁹

The first, and shortest, essay in the collection elaborated on this theme: written by Lunacharsky, it was entitled 'The Tasks of the State Cinema in the R.S.F.S.R.'.⁴⁰ 'It is', he wrote, 'not simply a matter of nationalising production and film distribution and the direct control of cinemas. It is a matter of fostering a completely new spirit in this branch of art and education'.⁴¹ He continued, 'We must do what nobody else is either able or willing to do. We must remember that a socialist government must imbue even film shows with a socialist spirit'.⁴² Lunacharsky, whose position as People's Commissar for Enlightenment gave him ultimate overall responsibility for the cinema, was well aware of its financial difficulties. He therefore appreciated that, 'In the present impoverished state of the Russian economy we cannot count on... competing with foreign films or replacing Russian private films. In the end we might perhaps even borrow this kind of material'.⁴³ On the other hand, the cinema had to be 'imbued with a socialist spirit' and, 'There is absolutely no doubt that in this respect far more newsreel footage must be shot'. The competing aims of commerce and ideology were to hant the Soviet cinema into the 1930s. The eventual solution is foreshadowed in Lunacharsky's understandable if, from the artist's viewpoint somewhat ominous, conclusion:

With our limited time and resources we must not mess around too much and, in choosing between two pictures of roughly the same importance and value, we must make the one that can speak to the heart and mind more vividly from the standpoint of revolutionary propaganda.⁴⁴

The editors and Lunacharsky himself thus set the framework. Subsequent essays developed particular themes and it is clear from

the editors' introductory remarks that the whole collection was intended merely as the first issue of what was supposed to be a regular journal. The back cover advertises the next issue Svetopis' (Light Play), which was never published. Not all the essays in Kinematograf are of equal importance.⁴⁵ But several presage the debates and polemics of the later 1920s.

The second essay in the collection, by F. Shipulinsky, was entitled 'The Soul of the Cinema (The Psychology of the Cinematograph)'.⁴⁶ The author was concerned to distinguish the unique features of the cinema which 'sees everything, knows everything and shows everything to every one'.⁴⁷ The message of a film was transmitted to the viewer through a linked series of images. The rapid movement of these images through a machine that projected them for the audience on to a screen produced for that audience the impression of movement. The human eye could only take in a limited amount of information at any one time and the cinema 'therefore leaves us only with distorted, inexact and unclear images which are not impressed on our consciousness'.⁴⁸ Indeed the projector's purpose was to keep the film going at a speed that would protect the audience from a clear perception of individual frames. Such a perception would disturb the image/message flow and break the cumulative effect of the film. As an integral part of the flow the individual frames act as 'milestones on the broad path followed by our imagination',⁴⁹ but in isolation the clear perception of an individual frame is like running into a brick wall.⁵⁰ In this argument we find the fundamentals of later principles of montage. More important at the time was that Shipulinsky, by distinguishing the unique features of the cinema, had established for it a place as

a legitimate art form alongside, or perhaps even replacing the theatre. Since the human eye perceived reality as it perceives the images in a film, as a continuous narrative of dimly remembered individual incidents given coherence only by reference to the whole, Shipulinsky concluded that the cinema was the ideal art form for the realistic depiction of life itself. He concluded, in Gogolesque fashion:

The soul of the cinema is in the movement of life.
The hum of the unfolding film is like the hiss of a troika
passing over the potholes as it rushes along life's road
with the poet of our imagination seated in it.⁵¹

The third essay, by S. Shervinsky and entitled 'The Essence of the Cinematographic Art',⁵² was also concerned, as the title suggests, to delineate the distinguishing features of the new art form. He developed further the idea of editing: the cinema consisted in 'alternation of facts' (cheredovanie faktov). The film therefore relied upon a chain of succession. The collision upon which drama depended was as alien to the cinema as Shipulinsky's clear perception of the individual frame. Cinema was therefore not theatre. For Shervinsky silence was an essential characteristic of the cinema as art form, as it was to F. Kommissarzhevsky, the author of the fifth essay, 'The Screen and the Actor', who was concerned to demonstrate the importance of movement in the expression of a character's internal emotional state. It was a lesson that was not lost on Kuleshov and his naturshchiki or, indeed, on Meyerhold and his theory of biomechanics.

In the seventh essay A. Toporkov examined the relationship between 'The Cinematograph and Myth'.⁵³ The cinema had justifiably been called 'the art of the Hottentots'.⁵⁴ It had demonstrated its potential by heroicising the present: its heroes were types rather than individuals: 'Individualism has not touched the cinema and this

is only to the good'.⁵⁶ The cinema was thus a mass art form for the 20th century in the same way that the drama had been a mass art form for the ancient Greeks. It displayed the same mythical quality of universality and the same claim to (and general acceptance as) the truth:

From illusion it becomes reality, truth and even the norm.⁵⁷ The cinema as myth-maker presented the hero as a moral example for the mass, whereas other cultural forms, because of their socio-economic associations, reflected the diversification of society into classes. Only the cinema was a uniting force: it alone united myth and reality, good and bad. 'The cinema is illusion, recognised as truth'.⁵⁸

The tenth and last essay in the collection returned to the themes raised by Lunacharsky. In his 'The Social Struggle and the Screen',⁵⁹ Kerzhentsev started from the premiss that, 'The mass created the cinema's success'.⁶⁰ As it was already a mass art form, the cinema's task was to involve the mass. A state cinema should involve mass participation: Birth of a Nation was cited as the model.⁶¹ It should take its themes from the pages of the Communist Manifesto ('Open the first page of the Communist Manifesto and you will find dozens of themes',⁶¹) or the history of the workers' and peasants' struggle. The principal task was however to 'achieve the transformation of the cinema from an instrument of amusement and entertainment into a means of education'.⁶³ Here the role of the newsreel was to be pivotal. It could harness the natural curiosity and thirst for knowledge of the masses to the advantage of the authorities. The newsreel 'is an indispensable tool which, in five to ten minutes, will provide audiences of all nationalities with an unforgettable

illustration of the benefits of the October Revolution'.⁶⁴ The Soviet newsreel (pace Vertov's later claims about showing 'reality as it really was') was 'in essence a cine-newspaper, which should not only respond to everything that happens, but should also illuminate it from a definite point of view'.⁶⁵

The conflicts that might arise from determining precisely whose point of view was to prevail - the film makers' or the Party's - were still in the future. As I have already argued, the shortages of basic essentials in the 1917-1921 period made all the arguments not only theoretical but hypothetical. The Kinematograf collection is important, however, not only as the first collection of its kind, not only as a clear statement of the Party's requirements, but as the seed of future theoretical debates and polemics. The germ of subsequent arguments about montage are to be found within its pages, as are the battles over the relative merits of documentary or fiction film.

As Kerzhentsev concluded: 'Practice will show what changes will have to be made to the present programme'.⁶⁶ The cinema was not yet the 'most important of the arts' - it was still the 'art of the future'.

NOTES

1. Conversation recalled by Klara Zetkin and cited in: N.I. Krutikova (ed.), Lenin o kul'ture i iskusstve (Moscow, 1956), pp. 519-20.
2. From a conversation between Lenin and Lunacharsky in 1922, recalled by the latter in: G.M. Boltianskii (ed.), Lenin i kino (Moscow, 1925), pp. 16-17.
3. I.V. Stalin, Problemy Leninizma (Moscow, 1925).
4. R. Taylor, 'A medium for the masses: agitation in the Soviet Civil War', Soviet Studies, XXII, no.4 (1971), pp. 562-74; idem, The Politics of the Soviet Cinema, 1917-1929 (Cambridge University Press, 1979); idem, 'From October to October: the Soviet political system in the 1920s and its films', in M.J. Clark (ed.), Politics and the Media (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1979), pp. 31-42; idem, 'Agitation, propaganda and the cinema: the search for new solutions, 1917-21', in N.A. Nilsson (ed.), Art, Society, Revolution: Russia 1917-1921 (Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm, 1979), pp. 237-63.
5. Cited in: A. Goldobin, Kino na territorii S.S.S.R. (Po materialam provintsial'noi pressy) (Moscow, 1924), p.64.
6. I. Sokolov, 'Skrizhal' veka', Kino-Fot, 25-31 August 1922, p.3.
7. F. Shipulinskii, 'Dusha kino', in: Kinematograf. Sbornik statei (Moscow, 1919), p.20.
8. A.M. Gak & N.A. Glagoleva (eds.), Lunacharskii o kino (Moscow, 1965), p.46.
9. L.D. Trotskii, Voprosy byta. Epokha 'kul'turnichestva' i ee zadachi (Moscow, 1923), Ch.3.

10. A. Iufit (ed.), Lenin. Revoliutsiia. Teatr. Dokumenty i vospominaniia (Leningrad, 1970), p. 199.
11. The atmosphere of the period is evoked in Nikita Mikhalkov's film Raba liubvi (Mosfilm, Moscow, 1978).
12. Cf. H. Carter, The new theatre and cinema of Soviet Russia (Chapman & Dodd, London, 1924), p.240.
13. Taylor, The Politics of the Soviet Cinema, pp. 47, 65.
14. Ibid., pp. 43-8.
15. For the decree see: Vestnik otдела mestnogo upravleniia komissariata vnutrennikh del, 1918, No.3, p.1. For the reaction see: Kinogazeta, 1918, No.3; Mir ekrana, 26 April, 1918, p.1; Proektor, 1918, no.1/2, p.1.
16. Taylor, The Politics of the Soviet Cinema, pp. 44-5.
17. Loc. cit.
18. Izvestiia V.Ts.I.K., 2 September 1919.
19. A.M. Gak (ed.), Samoe vazhnoe iz vsekh iskusstv. Lenin o kino, 2nd edn. (Moscow, 1973), p.52.
20. Until after the first Party conference on the cinema, held in Moscow in March 1928. The proceedings were published in: B.S. Ol'khovyi (ed.), Puti kino. Pervoe vsesoiuznoe partiinoe soveshchanie po kinematografii (Moscow, 1929).
21. Cited in: 'Vysshaia kinoshkola strany. Beseda s A.N. Groshevym', Iskusstvo kino, October 1969, p.41.
22. V.R. Gardin, Vospominaniia (2 vols., Moscow, 1949-52), Vol.1, pp. 167-70, and also: V. Vishnevskii, 'Fakty i daty iz istorii otechestvennoi kinematografii (Mart 1917-dekabr' 1920), Iz istorii kino, 1 (1958), p.71.

23. Based on information in Sovetskie khudozhestvennyye fil'my. Annotirovannyi katalog (4 vols., Moscow, 1961-8), Vol.1, pp. 5-26.
24. L.V. Kuleshov, Stat'i. Materialy, (Moscow, 1979), pp. 133-46;
L.V. Kuleshov, A. Khokhlova, 50 let v kino (Moscow, 1975), pp. 36-47; V.I. Pudovkin, 'Masterskaia Kuleshova', Iskusstvo kino, January /February 1940, pp. 85-7.
25. Pudovkin's introduction to: L.V. Kuleshov, Iskusstvo kino, (Moscow, 1929), p.4.
26. See above, note 4.
27. V. Karpinskiĭ (ed.), Agitparpoezda V.Ts.I.K. Ikh istoriia, apparat, metody i formy raboty (Moscow, 1920), p.6.
28. E.A. Speranskaia (ed.), Agitatsionno-massovoe iskusstvo pervykh let Oktiabria (Moscow, 1971), pl. 113-30.
29. S. Drobashenko (ed.), D. Vertov. Stat'i. Dnevnik. Zamysli (Moscow, 1966), pp. 89-90. A photograph of the said horses can be found in: E.I. Vertova-Svilova & A.L. Vinogradova (eds.), Dziga Vertov v vospominaniakh sovremennikov (Moscow, 1976), p.12.
30. L.V. Maksakova, Agitpoezd 'Oktyabr'skaia Revoliutsiia' (1919-20 gg.), (Moscow, 1956), p.11.
31. N.K. Krupskaia, 'Po gradam i vesiam sovetskoi respubliki', Novyi mir, 1960, No.11, pp. 113-30.
32. N.K. Krupskaia, Vospominaniia o Lenine (Moscow, 1957), p.424.
33. Gak, p.229, n.188.
34. I am indebted to the British Council (Younger Research Workers' Interchange Scheme) for funds to consult these materials.
35. Sovetskaia Sibir', 17 December 1919.

36. Respectively advertised in: Russkii vostok (Chita) 29 March 1919; Mysl' (Irkutsk), 4 March 1919; Svobodnyi krai (Irkutsk), 25 February 1919.
37. Cf. G.M. Boltianskii, 'Iskusstvo budushchego', Kino, 1922, No.1/2, pp. 6-7.
38. Kinematograf. Sbornik statei (Moscow, 1919), pp. 3-4.
39. Loc. cit.
40. 'Zadachi gosudarstvennogo kinodela v R.S.F.S.R.', ibid., pp. 5-7.
41. Ibid., p.5.
42. Loc.cit.
43. Loc.cit.
44. Ibid., p.7.
45. For instance: A. Sidorov, 'Kinematograf i izobrazitel'nye iskusstva', pp. 27-32; V. Sakhnovskii, 'Fantasticheskoe v repertuare kinoteatrov', pp. 39-43; A Chebotarevskii, 'Kinematograf, kak metod', pp. 54-62; and N. Tikhonov, 'Kinematograf v nauke i tekhnike', pp. 63-85.
46. F. Shipulinskii, 'Dusha kino (Psikhologiya kinematografii)', pp. 8-20.
47. Ibid., p.8.
48. Ibid., p.11.
49. Ibid., p.19
50. Ibid., p.16.
51. Ibid., p.20.
52. S. Shervinskii, 'Sushchnost' kinematograficheskogo iskusstva', pp. 21-6.
53. A. Toporkov, 'Kinematograf i mif', pp. 44-53.

54. e.g. by Kornei Chukovsky in his Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaiia literatura (Moscow, 1910), p.26.
55. Toporkov, op.cit., p.45.
56. Ibid., p.46.
57. Ibid., p.47.
58. Ibid., p.52.
59. V. (i.e. P.M.) Kerzhentsev, 'Sotsial'naia bor'ba i ekran', pp. 86-94.
60. Ibid., p.86.
61. Ibid., p.87.
62. Ibid., p.88.
63. Ibid., p.89.
64. Ibid., p.91
65. Loc. cit.
66. Ibid., p.94.