

Copyright © 2024 by Cherkas Global University



Published in the USA  
International Journal of Media and Information Literacy  
Issued since 2016.  
E-ISSN: 2500-106X  
2024. 9(1): 171-194

DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2024.1.171  
<https://ijmil.cherkasgu.press>



## Western Cinema on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen* Magazine (1969–1985): Biographies and Portraits of Western Actors and Directors

Andrei Novikov <sup>a, \*</sup>, Danila Zakharov <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Kosygin State University of Russia, Russian Federation

<sup>b</sup>Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics, Russian Federation

### Abstract

Based on content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of texts published during the “stagnant” period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969–1985), the authors came to the conclusion that the principle of choosing cinematic personalities to paint portraits of Western actors and directors in 1969–1985 remained stable in the *Soviet Screen*.

This magazine readily wrote about “progressive filmmakers” who went unnoticed in negative statements against the USSR and participation in anti-Soviet films. Especially if these filmmakers came to the Moscow International Festival and spoke positively about the Soviet Union.

One of the favorite subjects of the *Soviet Screen* within the framework of foreign themes is Western actors as “victims of Hollywood”, evidence of the “tragedy of the artist in the bourgeois world.”

But if any of the famous Western actors was involved in the creation of anti-Soviet films and/or films “glorifying the American military,” the magazine could strike him with “heavy artillery” on its pages.

However, there were many less politicized articles about Western actors on the pages of the magazine.

As for interviews with Western filmmakers, as in previous years, the *Soviet Screen* magazine selected interlocutors from among the most “progressive artists.” For example, among American filmmakers, the first place was given to Stanley Kramer. The progressive political position was also emphasized in interviews with Sydney Pollack, Norman Jewison, Ellen Burstyn, Jessica Lange and other Western directors and actors.

In general, during the period 1969–1985, the ideological positions of the *Soviet Screen* magazine remained unchanged.

**Keywords:** *Soviet Screen* magazine, Western cinema, film criticism, ideology, politics, reviews, articles.

### 1. Introduction

Based on content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of texts published during the “stagnant” period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969–1985), the authors came to the conclusion that the principle of choosing cinematic personalities to paint portraits of Western actors and directors in 1969–1985 remained stable in the *Soviet Screen*.

---

\* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [andrew\\_novi@mail.ru](mailto:andrew_novi@mail.ru) (A. Novikov)

This magazine readily wrote about “progressive filmmakers” who went unnoticed in negative statements against the USSR and participation in anti-Soviet films. Especially if these filmmakers came to the Moscow International Festival and spoke positively about the Soviet Union.

One of the favorite subjects of the *Soviet Screen* within the framework of foreign themes is Western actors as “victims of Hollywood”, evidence of the “tragedy of the artist in the bourgeois world.” In this vein, the magazine wrote, for example, about Judy Garland (1922–1969) and Marilyn Monroe (1926–1962).

But if any of the famous Western actors was involved in the creation of anti-Soviet films and/or films “glorifying the American military,” the magazine could strike him with “heavy artillery” on its pages. This fate awaited the Hollywood actor and director John Wayne (1907–1979).

Of course, about some actors and actresses (for example, about Yves Montand (1921–1991) and Simone Signoret (1921–1985), who were “fined” after the Czechoslovak events of 1968), *Soviet Screen* did not have anything positive to write about before the onset of “perestroika” possibilities.

However, there were many less politicized articles about Western actors on the pages of the magazine.

As for interviews with Western filmmakers, as in previous years, the *Soviet Screen* magazine selected interlocutors from among the most “progressive artists.” For example, among American filmmakers, the first place was given to Stanley Kramer (1913–2001). The progressive political position was also emphasized in interviews with Sydney Pollack (1934–2008), Norman Jewison, Ellen Burstyn, Jessica Lange and other Western directors and actors.

In general, during the period 1969–1985, the ideological positions of the *Soviet Screen* magazine remained unchanged.

## 2. Materials and methods

The research methodology consists of key philosophical provisions on the connection, interdependence and integrity of the phenomena of reality, the unity of the historical and the social in cognition; scientific, film studies, sociocultural, culturological, hermeneutical, semiotic approaches proposed in the works of leading scientists (Aronson, 2003; Bakhtin, 1996; Balazs, 1935; Bibler, 1990; Casetti, 1999; Demin, 1966; Eco, 1976; Eisenstein, 1964; Gledhill, Williams, 2000; Hess, 1997; Hill, Gibson, 1998; Khrenov, 2006; 2011; Lotman, 1973; 1992; 1994; Mast and Cohen 1985; Stam, 2000; Villarejo, 2007 and others).

The project is based on a research content approach (identifying the content of the process under study, taking into account the totality of its elements, the interaction between them, their nature, turning to facts, analyzing and synthesizing theoretical conclusions, etc.), on a historical approach-consideration of the concrete historical development of the declared theme of the project.

*Research methods:* complex content analysis, comparative interdisciplinary analysis, methods of theoretical research: classification, comparison, analogy, induction and deduction, abstraction and concretization, theoretical analysis and synthesis, generalization; methods of empirical research: collection of information related to the subject of the project, comparative-historical and hermeneutic methods.

## 3. Discussion and results

### *Articles on the history of Western cinema*

In general, it can be noted that there were few materials on the history of Western cinematography on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* in the period 1969–1985.

Basically, these were quite positive articles about the work of directors and actors of the era of the Great Mute: Georges Méliès (Yakubovich, 1984b: 22); David Griffith (Yutkevich, 1981: 14-15; Yakubovich, 1984a: 22); Max Linder (Trauberg, 1982: 18); Greta Garbo (Rubanova, 1982: 16-17); Asta Nielsen (Trauberg, 1983: 18).

In rare cases, these were notes about actors of a relatively recent time period: Gerard Philipe (Amlinsky, 1983: 18-19) and Johnny Weissmuller (Krah..., 1983).

In this regard, the materials of the *Soviet Screen* practically did not differ from those that were published on the pages of the magazine in the 1960s.

### *Biographies and portraits of Western actors and directors*

The principle of choosing cinematographers for writing creative portraits of Western actors and directors in 1969–1985 remained the same in the *Soviet Screen*. One could write mainly about “progressive filmmakers” (almost) unnoticed in negative statements against the USSR and

participation in anti-Soviet films. Even better, if these filmmakers came to the Moscow International Film Festival and spoke positively about the Soviet Union.

In this regard, the figure of Charles Chaplin (1889–1977) was still out of competition (Chaplin ..., 1969; Khutsiev, 1976: 20-21; Yakovlev, 1978: 20-21), since a witness to the grandiose changes and cataclysms of modern times, Chaplin was able to see, deeply understand the social processes of our era and reflect them in films (Yakovlev, 1978 20-21). “Chaplin is immortal because he is you and me, that part of our soul where someone else’s pain and disorder, human misfortune and sadness will always find a response” (Khutsiev, 1976: 21).

Film critic E. Kartseva (1928–2002) on the whole respectfully spoke on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* about the creative path of the Hollywood classic William Wyler (1902–1981), praising his films *Dead End* (USA, 1937), *The Little Foxes* (USA, 1941), *The Best Years of Our Lives* (USA, 1946). At the same time, the article by E. Kartseva emphasized that the significance of Wyler's work is not limited to the artistic merits of his films. There is one more, extremely important circumstance. Wyler has staged commercial films more than once, but in all his many years of work in the cinema he has not directed a single reactionary or deliberately tendentious work. On the contrary, during the years of the democratization of public life in the United States under Roosevelt, Wyler was one of those who created critical, social films (Kartseva, 1969: 13).

Traditionally, the *Soviet Screen* also had a positive attitude towards “the most progressive” (after Chaplin, of course) of American directors – Stanley Kramer (1913–2001), since the work of this outstanding master has always permeated and continues to permeate the progressive ideas of humanism, the rejection of cruelty, violence, and the humiliation of human dignity. ... he has always been and remains a decent person and an honest cinematographer, aware of his responsibility to people, to contemporary society (Andreev, 1983: 16-17).

After the drama *The Chase* (USA, 1966) was shown on Soviet screens, its director, Arthur Penn (1922–2010), was also enrolled by the Soviet film press in the ranks of “progressive filmmakers”, although the film critic (at that time not yet a professor and culturologist) M. Yampolsky clarified that “here, Penn's realism was shackled by traditional Hollywood thinking. On the one hand, *The Chase*, which tells the tragic story of how Sheriff Calder tries to resist the collective madness of the inhabitants of a small Texas town who lynch a man and fails, the theme of social injustice, the helplessness of the law in a world of cruelty and violence, is loudly stated. On the other hand, the film sings a hymn to a noble loner, ... a servant of the law, so familiar to the audience from the same Hollywood stereotypes” (Yampolsky, 1978: 16).

M. Yampolsky was even more critical of A. Penn's film *Bonnie and Clyde* (USA, 1967): “The movie is complex, contradictory. ... Everything would be simple if the main characters were not bandits, calmly using weapons. Trying to destroy the mythology of gangster cinema, Penn this time quite consciously created a new mythology. This is especially clear in the example of how a director who is not afraid of violent scenes presents scenes of murder. ... The aestheticization of the material is emphasized not only by the cold visual beauty of the film, but also by the special elegance of the clothes of the characters” (Yampolsky, 1978: 16).

As a result, M. Yampolsky concluded that the struggle with the mythology of American cinema eventually turned into a new myth for the director. The fetters of the system, which Arthur Penn wanted but could not break, led this talented American director to a sad conclusion about the inevitability of these fetters (Yampolsky, 1978: 17).

The work of the director Joseph Strick (1923–2010) was highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*, as his film *Interviews with My Lai Veterans* (USA, 1971) “is impossible to watch without excitement. In it, American soldiers, participants in the massacre of the civilian population of the village of Song My in Vietnam, tell about their crimes from the screen. ... Joseph Strick, one of the famous American directors, turned to documentaries for a reason. His denunciatory American way of life, sharply critical position was determined ... when the unusual film *The Savage Eye* (USA, 1959) was released on the screens of cinema and television ... The theme of man's loneliness in the bourgeois world ran through the entire film. The cruel world was shown with hatred, bitterness and contempt. ... The active social and critical position that pervades Joseph Strick's work, his desire to make maximum use of the expressive possibilities of fiction and documentary cinema make him one of the most brilliant representatives of the new American cinema art, which entered the struggle against reaction and militarism” (Abramov, 1972: 18).

A completely different assessment on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* was received by the work of director David Cronenberg, so it “reflects the deepest crisis of bourgeois consciousness. In his

feverish imagination, monstrous fantasies pass incessantly, interspersed with no less terrifying realities of today. The "free" world is trying to manipulate the feelings and thoughts of millions of viewers. ... Horror films of the "Canadian butcher" are just one of many forms of influence of bourgeois ideology on the mass audience. At all costs, at any cost, they try to distract him from the real problems of the capitalist society of unemployment, social inequality, and the arms race" (Komov, 1982: 18).

The only Western screenwriter about whom two large positive articles were published in the Soviet Screen was one of the "fathers of neorealism" Cesare Zavattini (1902–1989): "First of all, we associate with this name Italian films, works of a progressive direction ... In fact, this outstanding screenwriter, both in Italy and abroad, was rightly considered the "brain of neorealism": after all, about fifty films... Together De Sica and Zavattini created masterpieces of Italian cinema" (Bogemsky, 1972: 14-15).

Film critic G. Bogemsky (1920–1995) emphasized with pleasure that C. Zavattini was not only a screenwriter and theorist of the new Italian cinema, not only the author of hundreds of articles, essays, reports, not only the "brain", but also the "hands" of cinema – he, endowed with a sober, truly popular common sense, a practitioner, an indefatigable worker. ... Cesare Zavattini is faithful to the choice he once made – always and everywhere he is on the side of the new, progressive, just (Bogemsky, 1979: 19-20).

Among the Italian directors of creative portraits on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, Vittorio De Sica (1901–1974) (Solovieva, Shitova, 1976: 18-19), Luchino Visconti (1906–1976) (Solovieva, Shitova, 1977: 18-19), Francesco Rosi (1922–2015), Federico Fellini (1920–1993) (Bobrova, 1983: 17-18) and Michelangelo Antonioni (1912–2007) (Bogemsky, 1981: 17).

So E. Victorova, logically emphasized the political/ideological component in the work of F. Rosi: "Politics that became cinema. The civic passion that has become cinema – this, I think, is the pathos of Rosie's work. Many of his films have become a model of political cinema, having a lasting transformative impact on other progressive masters of the West, on young Italian directors. ... This and his consistent appeal to the life of the peasants is a deep interest in the historical, spiritual destinies of people from the people. And next to it is a no less consistent exposure of the bourgeois authorities and the mafia. ... The idea of overthrowing the social evil of exposing Italian and international reaction in the name of the triumph of justice and truth, in the name of a future without weapons, without wars, continues to dominate Francesco Rosi, an artist, a man of great civic courage and talent" (Victorova, 1982: 17-18).

It should be noted here that if the *Soviet Screen* spoke highly of V. De Sica and L. Visconti before (Bozhovich, 1967; Rubanova, 1966: 19; Shitova, 1962), but the frequent criticism of the work of F. Fellini and M. Antonioni, which the magazine allowed itself in the 1960s, was replaced by other trends.

In particular, the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920–1995) wrote about the films of Michelangelo Antonioni in a quite positive way, noting that Antonioni's paintings showed the tragedy of loneliness, spiritual callousness, lack of understanding between people in the bourgeois world. Concepts that only psychologists and sociologists had previously used, such as "human alienation", "lack of communication" have come into use in film criticism (Bogemsky, 1981: 17).

And film critic O. Bobrova emphasized that "the recognized masterpieces of Fellini ... are not only the stages of his work, but also the stages of the development of language, poetics and even cinema theory. Becoming a phenomenon of world cinematography, each of these films at the same time became an occasion for fierce disputes about the fundamental problems of cinematography, directly or indirectly reflecting certain aspects of modern Italian reality, refracted through the prism of the personality of a very large and original artist. Fellini is one of the most talented, original and one of the most controversial cinematographers of the West: tragic, gloomy, restless and at the same time bright, life-affirming, poetic; complex, confusing and entangled in the contradictions of capitalist reality, but also one of the most implacable critics of capitalism. He combines full-blooded everyday realism with conventionality, symbolism, and the grotesque. Reality is filtered through the lyrical self of the artist, and is colored now with soft humor, then with sincere and warm sympathy for the poor and destitute, then turns into a terrible phantasmagoria of chaos, angrily satirical exposure of the existing order" (Bobrova, 1983: 17-18).

Among the French directors, *Soviet Screen* also tried to choose, first of all, "time-tested" classics.



For example, film critic A. Braginsky (1920–2016) wrote about René Clair (1898–1981) as follows: “We have before us an amazing example of a director who did not succumb to the temptations of a fast-moving fashion, did not repaint from a “conservative” to an “innovator” and vice versa, who managed to maintain throughout his life a sequence of aesthetic tastes dictated not only by his own positions in art ... All the work of René Clair confirms the idea that cinema, even entertaining, should elevate a person, help him understand himself. Isn't it characteristic that in none of his films René Clair ever humiliates a person. He makes fun of negative characters – and nothing more” (Braginsky, 1979: 16-17). At the same time, René Clair was a true artist-creator. It is not only that he united in one person a director and a screenwriter, but also that his films constitute a special world where everything is connected by the unity of outlook and style, an integral, though changing, evolving conception of reality (Braginsky, 1981: 18).

Film critic V. Dmitriev highly praised the work of Alain Resnais (1922–2014), including *My American Uncle* (*Mon oncle d'Amérique*. France, 1980), including this picture among his best works (Dmitriev, 1984: 20). And N. Pankratova spoke warmly about the films of Jacques Demy (1931–1990) (Pankratova, 1977).

In general, the work of Francois Truffaut (1932–1984) was rated quite highly (albeit with reservations) in the *Soviet Screen*:

“Truffaut is reproached: starting with a masterpiece and from the heights of a universally significant theme – *400 blows* (*Les quadrants coups*. France, 1959) are remembered by all – he embarked on the path of concessions. They reproach him: he makes films for the market. This is true. And not so. Films for the market? Certainly. Sensitive and engaging. Welcomingly accessible in its form. Willingly keeping within the limits of traditional “coffee” genres ... There are dangers here, and Truffaut did not escape them. Sometimes he is cutesy; flirting with unpretentiousness. Flaunts the amount of art spent on trifles. But moreover, this art itself is genuine” (Soloviova, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

*400 Blows* is his first feature film, “which informed the world about the birth of an outstanding director ... But neither a successful debut nor the opportunity to tell about the sorrows of his childhood in the first work brought complete satisfaction. ... Truffaut said that one must be cunning and dexterous in order to dodge the embrace of sentimentality. But it seems to me that in *Stolen Kisses* (*Baisers volés*. France, 1968) he outwitted himself. In the grace and ease with which the director touches the fate of the young man, there is no pathos, but there is nothing truly touching either. ... *Wild Child* (*L'Enfant sauvage*. France, 1970) seems to be made in opposition to *Stolen Kisses*. There are no smiles in him, no “arts” – he is serious to the point of didacticism, to the point of scientificity. ... Comic form of *Pocket Money* (*L'Argent de Poche*. France, 1976), a seemingly gliding touch on the problem gave some viewers (and experts, perhaps, too) the impression that a kind of bourgeois complacency prevails in the picture ... Truffaut ... shows adults that they, either chuckling or nervously angry, in essence, simply ignore the world of children” (Alexandrov, 1977: 4).

It is interesting to note that the *Soviet Screen* in the first half of the 1980s wrote quite positively about Luis Buñuel (1900–1983), although before the “perestroika” times not a single one of his films appeared in the mass film distribution of the USSR (*The Modest Charm of the Bourgeoisie / Le Charme discret de la bourgeoisie*. France-Italy-Spain, 1972) was only released in Soviet theaters in 1987).

Film expert T. Vetrova reasonably wrote that Buñuel’s films resist detailed interpretation, because they embody that magical “secret” in the art of cinema, which, as the director himself repeatedly emphasized, is the essence of poetry for him and is characteristic of every true work of art. ... In his latest films, close in genre to comedies and filled with toxic irony towards the bourgeoisie, the rebellious spirit of denial prevails, however, it does not interfere with a close, vigilant look at things, their essence, their underside. ... Luis Buñuel has a rare gift of constant search, which invariably endows his art with an attractive force. A wise master never teaches with his paintings, using the right of an elder – he simply talks about what worries him in a person, in society, shows what he does not want to put up with, against which he does not get tired of rebelling. His art is imbued with true humanism, although this humanism is expressed, as a rule, in the form of a fierce rejection of the bourgeois world (Vetrova, 1980: 16-17).

In a more traditional for the “ideologically consistent” Soviet film studies, the then editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Orlov (1935–2021) wrote about L. Buñuel, arguing that this figure is complex, contradictory. His work reflected the dialectics of the time that gave birth to him.

It contains the tragedy of skepticism and pessimism, so characteristic of many talented artists of the bourgeois world, but it also contains a vividly expressed protest against everything that prevents a human being from unfolding and blossoming, sincerely expressed compassion, hope, faith in the high ultimate destiny of the individual (Orlov, 1984: 20).

Article by film critic M. Sulkin about the director Wolfgang Staudte (1906–1984) was more ideological. It stated that “The fate of Staudte in Federal Germany was difficult. After all, the main products of German cinema are “commercial films”: westerns, erotic paintings, works that poison the viewer with the poison of revanchism. ... In this situation, in order to get at least some opportunity to implement an important topic, Staudte had to make compromises, yielding to the requirements of the producers” (Sulkin, 1984: 21).

Approximately in the same vein, the *Soviet Screen* wrote about the work of another famous German director Kurt Hoffmann (1910–2001): “In the film *We are geeks* (*Wir Wunderkinder*. FRG, 1958), pamphlet and drama, satire and variety art, lyrics and comedy were mixed. ... in the filmmaker's work, films that combine buffoonery and burlesque with sharp political content are replaced by frankly entertaining films. They have the same techniques, the same brilliant mastery of cinematic form, a cascade of witty tricks, subtle powers of observation. But the object worthy of ridicule disappears, the big social theme, the caustic irony that make up the strength of the director. But in the comedy *Ghosts in the Spessart Castle* (*Das Spukschloß im Spessart*. FRG, 1960) “different genres are mixed, a musical comedy, political satire, a drama from the “count's life”, or, rather, a parody of it, an incredible adventure, an eccentric clowning... But a funny, light and cheerful performance made not only laugh, but also think. what Hoffmann hates and ridicules is burgher complacency, saber-rattling. Kurt Hoffmann once again demonstrated his brilliant ability to talk cheerfully about serious things, funny about sad things, caustically and evilly about, with which it is impossible to put up with” (Vesely..., 1973: 16).

Thinking about creativity Margaret von Trotta, film critic E. Gromov (1931–2005), noted that she “has a feminine insight, she knows how to look deeply into the essence of the phenomena she depicts and is not in a hurry with conclusions and assessments. ... I am attracted by the seriousness and anxiety that permeate Margareta von Trotta's reflections on the complex, contradictory problems of our time ... It is complex and contradictory, this is her path. And it is not easy for her to resist the pressure of commercial cinema. How difficult it is to win your audience, to achieve wide public recognition. I would very much like her to stay in the saddle, so that her name remains among the names of progressive masters of foreign cinema” (Gromov, 1985: 20-22).

An article about the work of the Swedish director Bo Wiederberg (1930–1997) fully reflected the Soviet ideological demands of the 1970s. It emphasized that Wiederberg became one of the greatest filmmakers in Sweden because his film *Crow's Quarter* (*Kvarteret Korpen*. Sweden, 1963) described with documentary veracity about the atmosphere that prevails in a family of ordinary workers, *Odalen-31* (*Ådalen'31*. Sweden, 1969) is dedicated to one of the most significant episodes in the history of the Swedish labor movement, and *Elvira Madigan* (Sweden, 1967) tells about the tragedy of lovers who find themselves in a hopeless situation from – for the sanctimonious morality of bourgeois society (Asenin, 1973: 4-5).

One of the favorite plots of the *Soviet Screen* in the framework of foreign topics is Western actors, like “victims of Hollywood”, evidence of “the tragedy of the artist in the bourgeois world” (Chto..., 1969: 17). In this vein, the magazine wrote about Judy Garland (1922–1969) and Marilyn Monroe (1926–1962) (Chto..., 1969: 17).

And if any of the Western actors was involved in the creation of anti-Soviet films and/or movies “glorifying the American military”, the magazine could strike at him on its pages with “heavy artillery”. Such a fate awaited Hollywood actor and director John Wayne (1907–1979), who made “blacklists” of progressive figures in American cinema and did not hesitate to include his personal enemies in them – people, neither which social movements are not involved (Makarov, 1970: 16-17).

A logical condemnation in the magazine received the film by J. Wayne *The Green Berets* (USA, 1968): “The anti-human nature of the militant was so obvious that a sharply negative reaction from the progressive public immediately followed. ... The essence of this dirty film is the glorification of aggression in Vietnam, an attempt to compose an anthem in honor of the killers and saboteurs from the so-called special forces, wearing green berets, thugs whom even bourgeois journalists compare with the SS. ... The film cost the author nothing – the Pentagon provided free military equipment, people, advisers and the territory of the training camp ... for filming.

The Pentagon bet on the right horse; Wayne repeatedly declared himself "a soldier you can count on", and once even loudly demanded that an atomic bomb be dropped on the Soviet people" (Makarov, 1970: 16-17).

But the work of another famous Hollywood actor – Charles Bronson (1921–2003) was not so unambiguously assessed in the *Soviet Screen*.

On the one hand, it was noted that Charles Bronson's stunning triumph was brought by the lead role in the film *Death Wish* (USA, 1974). But *Death Wish* "impresses fans who like to surround cars crashing into each other in a tight ring and stare at people sprawled on the pavement. ... But with the growth of products like *Death Wish*, the audience with such tastes is becoming more and more" (Chudov, 1975: 13).

But on the other hand, it was emphasized that moviegoers willingly watch movies with the participation of Bronson, because they are waiting for obligatory sharp spectacles, when in the center of everything there is a hero who is fluent in karate or kung fu, throwing a knife with equal dexterity or doing dizzying tricks by helicopter... Yes, Bronson's films did not become an art phenomenon, they did not go beyond genre stereotypes. And yet let us look again at that tired, intelligent face. Behind narrowed eyes, a firm gaze, there is undoubtedly something more than what can be seen in the image of Bronson's hero (Avdeenko, 1979: 18).

But still, as before, the main stake of the foreign department of the magazine *Soviet Screen* was made on the so-called "progressive filmmakers" who were not seen in films that were undesirable for Soviet ideology.

So on the pages of the magazine it was stated that Laurence Olivier (1907–1989) undoubtedly has the reputation of a great artist. Excellent technique, impeccable command of the voice, unusually beautiful and strong. Perfected plasticity of movement. ... The talent of reincarnation. An unlimited range of roles... He is a living classic (Slova..., 1969).

Approximately in the same positive spirit, the articles about Burt Lancaster (1913–1994) were sustained (Kartseva, 1970: 16-17; Frolov, 1979: 18): Lancaster creates a whole gallery of portraits, almost always they are people of active action, strong, courageous: they uncompromisingly defend the ideals of goodness and justice. The actor prefers films that make viewers seriously think about the most burning problems, and in the first place – war and peace. ... The persistence with which Lancaster developed the key theme of his work, anti-war, for many years is truly worthy of admiration and respect (Frolov, 1979: 18).

Anti-war sentiments were also accentuated in the creative portrait of Marlon Brando (1924–2004), who, in the role of the sheriff in *The Chase* (USA, 1966) expressed moods of discontent and protest against the ugly phenomena of American reality (Lyndina, 1972: 16).

Film critic E. Lyndina (1933–2022) further wrote with admiration that in 1969, Brando publicly expressed his protest against the attitude towards blacks that was established in America ... Marlon Brando is not limited to speaking from the podium. He openly participated in Negro demonstrations. He called the assassination of Martin Luther King "the most vile atrocity of the century." He was among the participants in the anti-war campaign against Washington. He starred in *Queimada* (Italy-France, 1969) by Gillo Pontecorvo, a film dedicated to the problems of the national liberation movement. He opposes films that glorify the Vietnam War. Remaining a bourgeois artist, ... he expresses in his works and public speeches the anxieties of today's America, the pain for people maimed by a world of evil and violence, the disappointment in ideals that have proven false and fake (Lyndina, 1972: 16-17).

Recognizing that the singer and actor Dean Reed (1938–1986) was significantly inferior to Hollywood stars in skill, N. Lagina wrote in the *Soviet Screen* that following Pete Seeger, Joan Baez and other singers who gave their talent to the fight for peace, Dean Reed became a frequent visitor to various American (and later not only American) prisons. But it was not possible to hide him in prison for a long time – his courageous art evokes too wide a response (Lagina, 1972: 14).

An active democratic civic position and anti-war activity came to the fore in the materials of the magazine about the actress Jane Fonda (Frolov, 1980; Rezinkov, 1973).

Here it was noted with satisfaction that although Fonda at first fell into the plan of the bourgeois aesthetic concepts of Roger Vadim, who considers cinema a means of emancipating viewers from traditional morality and therefore frankly showing sexual scenes in his films, but then she changed her mind and joined the movement for rights Indians and Negroes, for ending the war in Vietnam (Rezinkov, 1973).

In a very positive and again clearly "ideologically consistent" manner, the *Soviet Screen* also analyzed the creative path of another famous Hollywood actor – Kirk Douglas (1916–2020), one of whose most famous characters is the legendary Spartak, with fighting with society, he does not seek contacts with lies, he denies society, confident that it can become different and will someday become better, more righteous. That is why he is able to rally the people humiliated and crushed by slavery (Lyndina, 1971: 16-17).

Film critic R. Sobolev (1926–1991) also highly appreciated the work of another Hollywood star – George Scott (1927–1999), the greatest actor of contemporary cinema in the USA: the connection with time, the interest in the problems that American society lives in, characteristic of Scott's work, completely reveal the secret of his success. But Scott's exceptional professionalism cannot be underestimated (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

In connection with the release of the large-scale production of S. Bondarchuk's *Waterloo* (Italy-USSR, 1969), the *Soviet Screen* turned on its pages to the work of the American actor Rod Steiger (1925–2002), who brilliantly played a role in this drama Napoleon: "Turning, turning points of human destinies – this is Rod Steiger's favorite topic. ... In Napoleon, as Steiger paints him, there is no aristocracy, even more so, "gentlemanliness". A heavy body, an unshaven face, a filthy overcoat, heavy boots – all this would fit a soldier more than an emperor. He is impatient, impulsive and passionate. He does not want to wait, he is used to quick and brilliant victories. ... At the same time, the actor shows that the dictator is already internally broken. He is no longer the same as he was during the victorious march through Europe. ... Steiger also avoids another extreme in the depiction of Bonaparte, also quite common – the desire to belittle this image. Steiger is not trying to make a great man small. On the contrary, Rod Steiger's Napoleon is a strong man who survived the inevitable collapse" (Zhezhelentko, 1973: 14-15).

Laudatory articles in the *Soviet Screen* were devoted to the famous actor Dustin Hoffman, whose characters are more likely victims of bourgeois society, rather than fighters against its injustices (Barabanova, 1971: 17). At the same time, about very different in design, Hoffman's best roles are united by a subtle penetration into the spiritual world of the "little man", with his defenselessness and cunning, nobility and courage, with his indestructible hope for the future (Shaternikova, 1984: 18-19).

Positive articles in the *Soviet Screen* were also devoted to other English-speaking actors popular in the 1970s: Paul Newman (1925–2008) (Doroshevich, 1984: 18-19), Robert Redford (Avdeenko, 1977: 14-15), Jack Nicholson (Antonov, 1977), Peter O'Toole (1932-2013) (Belyaeva, 1976: 16-17) and Peter Ustinov (1921-2004) (Tirdatova, 1985: 21).

Among the Hollywood actresses, film critics of the *Soviet Screen* singled out Elizabeth Taylor (1932–2011) (Bereznitsky, 1975: 16-17), Audrey Hepburn (1929–1993) (Dularidze, 1975: 16-17), Barbara Streisand (Avdeenko, 1978: 18-19), Jessica Lange (Glazkov, 1983: 9), Judy Davis (Sulkin, 1983: 9) and Faye Dunaway (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

At the same time, for example, it was emphasized that Faye Dunaway is a talented actress, capable of amazing transformations, able to create deep, psychologically complex images, that perhaps one of the most outstanding actresses in the history of American cinema (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17). And the rise of Jessica Lange's career is gratifying also because the actress disposed of her talent not in the way the movie businessmen "programmed" but as her civic conscience tells her" (Glazkov, 1983: 9).

The same "progressive" principle of selecting people for the publication of their creative portraits was observed in the *Soviet Screen* in relation to French actors.

Of course, about some French actors and actresses (for example, about Yves Montand (1921–1991) and Simone Signoret (1921–1985) who "fined themselves" after the Czechoslovak events of 1968), the *Soviet Screen* could not write anything positive.

But there were relatively many completely or less politicized articles about actors.

So film critic I. Yanushevskaya (1925–1989), co-author of V. Demin wrote in the book *Jean Marais* that "a man of great artistic taste", Jean Marais (1913–1998) understood that the time of his romantic heroes, knights without fear and the reproach passed, and he decided to remain in the memory of the audience the way the screen captured him (Yanushevskaya, 1983: 18-19).

The article about another patriarch of French cinematography, Jean Gabin (1904–1976), was also very positive: "Gabin of the thirties returned to the viewer of pre-war Europe a condensed reflection of his anxieties, his sense of life under threat, and this was the high meaning of poetic realism, of which Gabin was the first actor. ... the current hero of Gabin is a living, in the flesh



manifestation of that very “senior”, “superior”, father and boss, who should be more visible, whom you can rely on – he knows how to do it. He will tell you what to do, and you just do it. This myth has its own charm and its own temptation” (Solovieva, Shitova, 1972: 14-15).

With great respect for the talent of Lino Ventura (1919–1987), an article by film critic V. Demin (1937–1993) was also written: “The previous roles of this famous actor have created a solid pattern in our perception, we are used to seeing him in the guise of a thug and a gangster. Meanwhile, today's Ventura is not at all what he was just recently, and in general, over the twenty years of his work in the cinema, he has experienced a rather serious creative evolution. ... At first he played the pure incarnation of evil, then strong, but doomed, lost people, and in the most recent years he became the character of a farce comedy, almost a hell, where the figure of a superhuman bandit is ingeniously ridiculed and ridiculed” (Demin, 1975: 16-17).

One of the favorites of the *Soviet Screen* was undoubtedly Jean-Louis Trintignant (1930–2022). Film expert I. Rubanova noted that this actor likes to play modesty on the screen, guessing in it unspent kindness, bitterness of loneliness, hidden romanticism, and sometimes carefully hidden complexes. “Modesty, which this actor understands so well, is unequal to dull ordinaryness or dull colorlessness. Behind the inconspicuous, moreover, fundamentally ordinary appearance of his heroes, hidden dramas rage, enthusiastic dreams flare up, and bold claims boil. ... [but] the role of Marcello Clerici in the film by the Italian Bernardo Bertolucci *The Conformist* (*Il Conformista*. Italy-France-FRG, 1970) based on the novel by Alberto Moravia, Trintignant proved that he was able to rise above soothing illusions. ... Previously, the actor played those who, sentenced to conformity by class, were torn from the fetters of conformism. ...

Trintignant's Clerici is not a man who has become a fascist, which in the context of the film is equivalent to a murderer, but a man who aspires to be a fascist, who plays a fascist” (Rubanova 1972: 16-17).

And, of course, I. Solovieva and V. Shitova (1927–2002) are right: Trintignant had his “finest hour” when Claude Lelouch shot him in *A Man and a Woman* (*Un homme et une femme*. France, 1966): it would seem that the actor, who started slowly and modestly, should have finally missed the chance. In *A Man and a Woman* he was received in great demand: the audience, especially the spectators, he gave what they wanted and lacked. He was a “star” – a personalization of the dream of reliability, which enters into your everyday life in the guise of a real man: strong, kind, patient, understanding, with a light and firm character. ... The artist did not take a chance: it's good or bad, but he is not from the material from which “stars” are obtained (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

At the same time, “if you isolate from the excessively complex and talented picture of Bernardo Bertolucci *The Conformist*... the large, tough and simple thought present in it, if you think about what exactly Trintignant plays in it, you will hear all the same reasoning about reliability. Reasoning from the opposite. Trintignant plays here a traitor and the logic of betrayal. The hero betrays out of fear, out of self-interest, but above all, he, a liberal living under fascism, betrays out of fear of being “not like everyone else.” For fear of being left alone, not betraying where it was supposed to, Trintignant played it, conveying the ferocious “black humor” of such a turn” (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

Warmly and respectfully, I. Solovieva and V. Shitova also wrote about Alain Delon (Solovieva, Shitova, 1976: 18-19). To some extent, we can agree with the fact that the hero of Alain Delon most often turned out to be a modern individualist who challenged society only in order to take a more prosperous place in this society, a man with a double bottom and double morals, an eternal opportunist, so impudent and reckless that this excitement often fails him, he is so carried away by the game itself, directly by the race, that it often rushes past the prey, unable to stop until the opponent's bullet or the iron hand of the law catches up with him, until he fails to run, to limit of car speed his own heart (Makarov, 1981: 18-19).

Very positively was presented in the *Soviet Screen* and creativity Philipp Noiret (1930–2006) (Polskikh, 1977), Jean Rochefort (1930–2017) (Soviet..., 1976), Michel Piccoli (1925–2020) (Dularidze 1975: 19); Michel Bouquet (1925–2022) (Soviet..., 1976), Victor Lanoux (1936–2017) (Braginsky, 1982: 18), Jean-Pierre Léaud (Chertok, 1973: 15), and Gerard Depardieu (Braginsky, 1981: 17).

In particular, film critic A. Braginsky (1920–2016) perspicaciously argued that in the person of Gerard Depardieu a bright, original actor of a purely modern warehouse appeared on the film horizon of France. An actor in whom young people saw the typical features, signs of today's hero, who outwardly may seem rude, mundane, “simple”, but spiritually sensitive, often easily hurt,

deeply experiencing the contradictions and ugliness of the reality surrounding him (Braginsky, 1981: 17).

But about the work of Jean-Paul Belmondo (1933–2021), a kind of discussion arose on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*.

In 1975, film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937–2023) wrote approvingly that one of the most famous French film actors of the post-war generation, Jean-Paul Belmondo, is finally presented in our box office with a picture that, for a first acquaintance, is called promisingly: *Magnificent* (*Le Magnifique*. France-Italy, 1973). And if the epithet given in the title does not fully correspond to the merits of the film itself, then at least it can be attributed to the actor who played the main role (Bogomolov, 1975: 3-4).

A year later, journalist A. Makarov also positively assessed Belmondo's work: “What explains the truly worldwide popularity of Jean-Paul Belmondo? Everywhere he is perceived as one of his own, that's probably the point. ... For all the incomprehensibility of his on-screen exploits, Belmondo is simple and accessible, he is the same person from a legend as the hero of large-circulation comics or grandmother's fairy tales. ... Belmondo is an actor capable of subtle and unobtrusive reincarnation. ... However, Belmondo carries a certain unified atmosphere of his personality through all his films. That is why even his invulnerable adventurers do not irritate him, a constantly living soul shines through the mask of luck and complacency. Which, by the way, often puts the qualities mentioned at the beginning into doubt, in any case, gives them additional psychological complexity. ... In his work, Belmondo brought to the screen the authenticity of the national character, the visible and tangible concreteness of the street, in the pathos of its ordinary, clueless, eternal life” (Makarov, 1976: 16-17).

In a similar vein, an article by film critic A. Braginsky, published in the magazine in 1979, was sustained: Jean-Paul Belmondo: an oblong face with sharply defined lips, a broken “boxing” nose. But the expressive dark eyes of the actor can be both sly, and formidable, and tender, and mocking – in a word, to express the whole gamut of human feelings and moods. Belmondo moves beautifully, his body is trained, he gladly shows his biceps and muscular torso. But there is also “something” in him that Gabin saw, and this “something” makes Jean-Paul a favorite of the audience – he is talented (Braginsky, 1979: 16-17).

But in 1983, the *Soviet Screen* (unexpectedly for Belmondo fans) published an article by film critic A. Plakhov with a telling title “What is “belmondism”?”, where the basic statement reflecting the negative perception of the actor's film images was the following: “I can't help but say what worries me. Increasingly, in films of this kind, we meet the cult of a muscular superman hero, not burdened with either conscience or compassion. Vulgarity, admiration of brute force, and sometimes very sophisticated cruelty characterize a number of other paintings with Belmondo's participation” (Plakhov, 1983: 17).

And here (albeit in 1985), film critic M. Chernenko (1931–2004) entered into a polemic with A. Plakhov with very convincing arguments: don't bother yourself. The mill of commercial plots is spinning – after all, Belmondo plays, with insignificant exceptions, and even then at the beginning of the journey, in the films of commonplace, “popular”, “mass”, in other words, undisguisedly entertaining, the same role – a man in danger, one and the same conflict – a man against fate, the same character – a man who can trust only himself, his reaction, his dexterity, his common sense, his muscles. At the same time, it doesn't matter which side of the law his hero is on – and Belmondo in the vast majority of his films plays either a policeman or a criminal. And, a strange thing, if you just put all these different films side by side ... if you peer at them, it turns out suddenly that the hero of Belmondo is not a superman at all, then he is very atypical, losing too often. In other words, a superman inside out, who is extremely uncomfortable in a strange world where good diligently imitates evil, and evil deftly pretends to be good. Moreover, if we ignore the stunning dizziness of chases and shootouts, the abundance of corpses and blood, then it may turn out to be no less unexpected that the hero Belmondo is “burdened” with both conscience and conscience, that somewhere deep inside lives in him an indestructible moral code that from time to time breaks through to the surface of the plot with an instant gesture of compassion, pity, inept and hasty nobility. Breaks through only occasionally – because the hero acts in situations where there is simply no one to turn to with this gesture, no one to give even a small fraction of humanity, kindness, attention. Occasionally – and also because just at such moments the hero of Belmondo is a loser, in a literal and figurative knockdown, because then he is waiting for him, defenseless, forgotten, another blow to the jaw, another pistol bullet, another gangster knife or, at best, police

handcuffs, in the most cruel way reminding him that all these sentiments, all these spiritual "oddities" are punishable in the most direct and immediate sense (Chernenko, 1985: 20-21).

The film critics of the *Soviet Screen* and the work of the famous French comedian Louis de Funes (1914–1983) were ambiguous.

Film critic I. Lishchinsky in an article entitled "The path of finds, the path of loss" wrote that Louis de Funes firmly occupied the comedy of France, making it more ridiculous and ... more monotonous (Lishchinsky, 1972: 18-19).

But for all that, behind the mask of de Funes, the audience discovered a figure – a dynamic entrepreneur of the so-called era of consumption, a person not only businesslike, but also intoxicated with efficiency. Everything in this world for him is just a stepping stone to fame, success, wealth. All kinds of plans ripen in his brain with extraordinary and, of course, excessive speed. Here he narrowed his eyes, smiled victoriously, his thin lips stretched to his ears, and he triumphantly looks at the enemy. The plan is ready – whether it is about a profitable marriage for a daughter, about a legitimate commercial operation or illegal transportation of jewelry and drugs. By the way, it does not matter whether de Funes plays a respectable businessman or the leader of a gang of gangsters. In any case, he is exactly adventurous and equally respectable. ... Louis de Funes turned out to be a comedic mirror of another phenomenon, about which Western politicians, sociologists, and journalists write so much today. The cult of things and the pursuit of things – these main features of the "era of consumption" are inseparable from the comic hero de Funes (Lishchinsky, 1972: 18-19).

Even more critical of the work of Louis de Funes was an article by film critic M. Yampolsky: "His hero is small, antipathetic, unkind, stupid, sometimes cruel. The plasticity of the actor is emphatically caricatured. Such a character does not at all seek to evoke even a shadow of sympathy. Of all the comic masks, he most resembles Pantalone from the Italian folk comedy – a smug rich old man, mean, evil, unscrupulous and always making a fool of himself. ... Funes introduced into the cinema and for a long time fixed in it a "one-dimensional" comic mask in its configuration. The laughter caused by the actor is laughter at the grotesque conceit and its constant fiasco. ... From the films with his participation, any warmth, humanity disappears, his roles become more and more buffoon, turn into a stream of unrestrained self-singing. An uncharismatic, pretentious character endlessly flickers on the screen, trying hard to make you laugh. Characteristically, that in the last films of Funes, that supply of satirical laughter, which caused the image of this narcissistic bourgeois, is almost completely depleted. External, eccentric comedy obscures the social content that was partly inherent in the work of this actor before. The artistic fate of Louis de Funes is interesting and instructive. The unusual mask created by this magnificent master has certainly contributed to the arsenal of world cinema comedy. But the initial limitations of the image created by the actor also contained the sources of his failures" (Yampolsky, 1978: 18-19).

But another French comedian – Pierre Richard, – according to A. Makarov, in any, the most incredible plot, he is certainly authentic and internally, in the sense that even his eccentric antics are always precisely motivated, and in terms of a purely worldly, one might say, everyday. ... He is ridiculous more than anything because, under the most incredible conditions, he does what he should have done, that he remains true to his human calling, his spiritual type and his spiritual disposition. The notorious softness of the intelligentsia, the anecdotal inability of a book reader and the humanist suddenly turn out to be not such weaknesses, they do not betray our hero, but rather strengthen him in his vitality, they do not serve as his vulnerable spot, but, on the contrary, the weapon with which the hero unconsciously defends his living soul (Makarov, 1983: 18).

Annie Girardot (1931–2011) was the favorite of the *Soviet Screen* in the 1970s, and four (!!!) articles were devoted to her work at once (Alexandrov, 1978: 5; Bernadsky, 1978: 16-17; Rubanova, 1973; Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

I. Solovieva and V. Shitova, in our opinion, rightly noted that Annie Girardot did not create what is called a "permanent actor character" on the screen, as did, say, Brigitte Bardot or Marilyn Monroe. She played women not only of different fates – they are different in her nature ... But every time she respects and conveys the independence of the character of her heroines, as she respects the laws of the genre, whether it be a tragedy or an everyday comic film. There is one thing in common in her heroines: the natural ability and willingness to understand. And one more thing in common in the heroines of the artist: each has its own spiritual self-active force. In a situation where it is easy to become a puppet, a victim of passions, a victim of circumstances, they are not puppets and not victims. Understanding and clarity hold them (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

Indeed, comedy *Acquaintance by marriage announcement* (*Run for me so that I catch you / Cours après moi que je t'attrape*. France, 1976) could be classified as mediocre without hesitation, if not for one circumstance. ... Annie Girardot managed to not only entertain us, but also captivate us. Without diminishing either the comedy or the cascade of the on-screen plot, she brought to her role something that marks almost every image she created – sometimes not even visible, but quite clearly tangible human authenticity. ... The vital authenticity of the images of Annie Girardot was clarified here by the features of the national folk character (Alexandrov, 1978: 5).

And indeed, very often Girardot is thinner, smarter, more significant than the material offered to her. ... endowing the widespread female type with the features of her individuality, she helps the viewer, who identifies himself with the movie character, to believe in the prevalence, universality of “extraordinary”. Ultimately, grow up in your own eyes. Add to this the amazing skill of the actress, her looseness, naturalness, absolute freedom of existence in the image – without any “gaps” between the performer and the character (Bernadsky, 1978: 16-17).

Romy Schneider (1938–1982) was another famous actress of French cinema, whose work was favorably evaluated by the *Soviet Screen*.

So on the pages of the magazine it was emphasized that this actress owes her success to her own originality, skill and, of course, spectacular appearance. ... The heroines of Romy Schneider, as a rule, fit perfectly within the boundaries of the average person's idea of life and happiness. ... The flowering of Romy Schneider's talent successfully coincided with the appearance of a series of films like *Love Story*, in which purity of feelings, sincerity, some sentimentality and nostalgia for lost ideals are very appealing to the Western audience, tired of both physical and moral nudity (Fomichev, 1978: 20-21).

And film critic I. Rubanova reasonably believed that Schneider's cinematic images from film to film became bolder, richer, more dramatic. ... Radiant beauty, lively and intelligent talent, impeccable professionalism... Romy Schneider deserved great fame, heartfelt veneration and deep respect. ... Morality is the word that best defines the art of Romy Schneider (Rubanova, 1982: 17-18).

The work of another star of French cinema, Catherine Deneuve, was also highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*: deep lyricism, acting intuition and an innate sense of beauty are noted in Catherine Deneuve by many directors with whom the actress has to work. It is this quality that clearly distinguishes Deneuve's individuality from the rich scattering of stars of the French screen (Abdrashitov, 1978: 20-21).

Due to the fact that several films with the participation of Mireille Darc (1938–2017) were released at once in the Soviet film distribution of the 1970s, the *Soviet Screen* found a place on its pages for a creative portrait of this talented actress: Mireille Darc is devoid of a halo, advantages and shortcomings of the acting “myth” – she has nothing to learn from. She is an ordinary pretty woman, elegant, graceful and intelligent. As an example of an ordinary pretty French woman, she is calm, smart, independent, knows her own worth and knows what she needs from life, while she knows how to avoid rational, boring businesslikeness and be extremely natural in her feelings, behavior, movement, tone. ... In essence, Mireille Darc from film to film, regardless of its genre and artistic level, plays variations of one image. Always identical in appearance, with the same short haircut and unchanging bangs, soft, traditionally feminine, she emphasizes the constancy of her heroine (Levashova, 1975: 18-19).

The works of Anna Karina (1940-2019) (Anna..., 1975: 16-17), Marie-José Nat (1940–2019) (Karlov, 1975: 14-15) and Nathalie Baye (Plakhov, 1985: 20-21).

In particular, film critic A. Plakhov wrote that “in the roles of her full dignity, uncompromising provincials, Nathalie Baye comes to one of the central themes of all Western cinema. We are talking about the position of a woman who tries to be independent in everything, but inevitably turns out to be dependent on social conditions and the moral atmosphere of society. ... The drama that colors the best roles of Nathalie Baye is hidden and spills out only at moments of high tension. ... Perhaps, even in the roles of her modest provincials, Nathalie Baye remains romantic – if only because her heroines do not become obedient victims of circumstances, but retain ideals and concepts of honor that seem hopelessly old-fashioned to others...” (Plakhov, 1985: 20-21).

Publishing creative portraits of actors and actresses of Italian cinema, *Soviet Screen* was true to tradition, giving priority to the classics.

In particular, film critic I. Rubanova argued that the legendary Anna Magnani (1908–1973) “became a heroine of the screen when, theoretically, she could least of all become one. Post-war



Italian cinema, in the name of truth, abandoned the canons of traditional cinema, its "stars" and its actors. The creators of the first post-war paintings called themselves neo-realists. They wanted to tell the truth, only the truth, nothing but the truth... Anna Magnani was not inferior to non-professionals in the life and everyday authenticity of her incarnations. Her appearance, gestures, reactions on the screen were exactly like their "raw emotionality". ... In fact, in almost all films she played the care of daily bread, the care of children, the care of her husband. For some reason, in the movies where Magnani starred, the man always needed her support. ... Beloved, her main motive – the motive of motherhood – acquired from Magnani such a wealth of psychological nuances. The second reality was the beginning of a second reality without ceasing to characterize a particular person" (Rubanova, 1975: 18-19).

Quite a lot of materials of different genres were devoted to the *Soviet Screen* and another star of Italian and world cinema – Sophia Loren. It was noted that she often had to play the character of a woman is somewhat vulgar and hectic, simple-hearted and treacherous, vengeful, faithful, sinful, but invariably attractive. ... in these works, Loren managed to demonstrate the mastery of disguise, comedic lightness, tact and great taste ... But, perhaps more importantly, they served as a kind of warm-up before taking off, which ensured Loren's place among the largest dramatic actresses in world cinema (Bernadsky, 1978: 16 -17).

One can also agree that in the first role, Lucia Bosè (1931–2020) albeit half a hint, she stated the main feature of her manner: the more tense the situation, the more restrained the reaction. Bosè's characters always, as it were, "remain silent", do not allow themselves to fully reveal themselves, and this imposes on them the stamp of significance, forcing them to assume an intense inner life. ... The acting "texture" of Bosè naturally attracted the directors of the "hard style". But ... she was often invited to comedy roles in simple pictures telling about "beautiful but poor", "poor but happy", where the same image of a nice girl with honest aspirations and a small dream of marrying a good guy varied" (Kopylova, 1972: 16).

As in the 1960s, *Soviet Screen* continued to write about the roles of Stefania Sandrelli (Basmanov, 1976; Bogemsky, 1979: 16-17).

Film critic G. Bogemsky, in our opinion, very accurately noted that Sandrelli had neither the aggressive beauty of Sophia Loren, nor the soft femininity of Gina Lollobrigida, nor the exotic charm of Claudia Cardinale, but somehow quietly, gradually it was she who became the expressor of the main features modern Italian on the screen... Each meeting with Stefania Sandrelli on the screen is interesting, but "I especially want to see her again in the image of an Italian contemporary – a simple woman with a difficult character and a difficult fate" (Bogemsky, 1979: 16-17).

He positively assessed the *Soviet Screen* and the work of younger Italian movie stars at that time: Florinda Bolkan (Florinda..., 1976: 18), Ornella Muti (Bogolepova, 1984: 18) and Eleanora Giorgi (Bogolepova, 1984: 18).

Among the actors of the Italian cinema of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, *Soviet Screen*, of course, relied on a prominent representative of the progressive "political cinema" – Gian Maria Volonté (1933–1994).

Film expert E. Victorova wrote about this outstanding actor as follows: "Volonté – communist, actor, fighter. He is hated by neo-fascists – they do not forgive him for participating in the class struggle of the proletariat. ... Gifted with a bright stage appearance, an exceptional talent for impersonation, penetration into the depths of the human psyche, the art of facial expressions, it was in the cinema that he managed to realize his enormous potential as an artist, able to move from heroism and romantic pathos to grotesque, satire, caricature, recreate on the screen authentic, reliable, psychologically accurate characters of people and, above all, images of fighters and rebels against social injustice, violence and evil. ... In the difficult conditions of the aggravation of ideological and class battles in the capitalist world, in the context of the crisis of leftist trends in politics, ideology, culture in Italy, the communist Volonté demonstrates the maturity of civic ideals in art through his life practice, his creative destiny" (Victorova, 1979: 16-17).

There were similar political accents in the article by the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920–1995) about the work of another Italian star, Franco Nero. It was stated here that this one of the most significant and serious actors of the Italian screen. ... It seems to us that the role of Matteotti is a kind of ideological program for a young actor and his success in it is a guarantee of further disclosure of the richest possibilities inherent in this interesting, thoughtful artist, who felt the urgent need that the progressive cinema of Italy feels in a positive hero. ... Italian progressive

cinema has acquired another gifted actor capable of embodying the image of an active and conscious fighter for justice (Bogemsky, 1974: 14-15).

At the same time, of course, the *Soviet Screen* did not forget to tell its readers about the work of famous Italian actors who specialized in comedy and tragicomedy in the 1970s: Alberto Sordi (1920–2003) (Lesovoy, 1969; Poklonov, 1976: 18-19), Nino Manfredi (1921-2004) (Bogemsky, 1983: 19-20; Yampolsky, 1977); Ugo Tognazzi (1922–1990) (Yampolsky, 1977: 14-15), Giancarlo Giannini (Bogemsky, 1983: 16-17).

In particular, film critic G. Bogemsky wrote that Manfredi's talent combines elements of sad and funny, tragic and comic, intertwined closely, as in life. Perhaps the main feature of Manfredi's characters is the human warmth they radiate. The heroes of Manfredi are humane, sometimes somewhat simple-hearted, they are distinguished by inner decency and purity, even when they are not perfect in their relations with society, law, and those around them. They are deeply democratic, truly people, they are able to believe in something (with a complete rejection of religion, we note), fantasize, live a dream (Bogemsky, 1983: 19-20).

And the film critic (at that time) M. Yampolsky, in our opinion, reasonably noted that “the ability to turn mediocrity into an object of close study is an unusually rare phenomenon in the world of cinema, because it contradicts the very concept of a movie star. ... The active, dynamic, sharp, almost clownish character of Tognazzi is empty and empty at the same time. Its external activity does not express anything – it is a roaring volcano charged with straw, spiritual amorphousness is hidden under a temperamental gesture” (Yampolsky, 1977: 14-15).

The *Soviet Screen* could not pass by the work of the extremely popular Italian singer and actor Adriano Celentano (Bogemsky, 1979: 18; Mudrov, 1984: 22).

In his article, G. Bogemsky wrote that Adriano is surprisingly plastic, as if thousands of elastic little springs are embedded in it. And this is explained by his innate musicality, which he is all imbued with: even when Celentano does not sing, but only moves around the screen or on stage, he seems to be subject to some kind of internal rhythm, some kind of melody living in him ... A significant event was for Adriano participated in the film *Serafino* (Italy-France, 1968) directed by Pietro Germi. ... he got the opportunity to work under a big director, playing the title role. And the results were significant: Adriano created a kind of comedic image of a country boy, hiding under the feigned rudeness, uncouth natural sharp mind, nobility, rejection of lies, greed and money-grubbing (Bogemsky, 1979: 18).

So, referring to the cinematography of Western countries, *Soviet Screen* in the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, for the most part, wrote about American, French and Italian actors.

The *Soviet Screen* wrote little about actors from other Western countries. In particular, positive portraits of actors can be mentioned here: Max von Sydow (1929–2020) (Mikhalkovich, 1983: 17), Harriet Anderson (Surkova, 1975: 6-7), Irene Papas (1926–2022) (Chernenko, 1985: 21) and Fernando Rey (1917–1994) (Belenky, 1976: 17).

- interviews with Western filmmakers

As in previous years, in the *Soviet Screen*, as a rule, interlocutors were selected from among the most "progressive artists".

Among American filmmakers, the first place was given to Stanley Kramer (1913–2001) (Bobikov, 1973; Chertok, 1971: 14-15).

The "progressive" political position was also emphasized in an interview with Sidney Pollack (1934–2008) (Chertok, 1972: 14), Norman Jewison (Andreev, 1985: 20-21), Ellen Burstyn (Ellen..., 1977: 16), Jessica Lange (Salner, 1985: 20-21).

And, of course, in an interview with Kevin Brownlow, one of the directors of the anti-Nazi film *It Happened Here* (UK, 1965): “Instead of a historical film from the Second World War, we began to make an anti-fascist grotesque film. In this film, outwardly objective, fascism was supposed to expose itself. But the main theme of the film is not fascists, but collaborators. The picture is addressed mainly to those “passive” people who flaunt that they are, they say, “not interested in politics” (Quoted in: Markov, 1972: 15).

A similar approach was taken to the choice of interviewed French, Italian, Spanish and West German filmmakers.

So the famous director Marcel Carné (1906–1996) told the correspondents of the *Soviet Screen* that “those who take on serious political topics open the way for the revival of French cinema. More recently, French producers did not even want to hear about a political film, but if the commercial success of some of these films opens a new, political direction in our cinema, this will

enable many directors to express themselves and their time” (Quoted by: [Chernenko, Chertok, 1972: 17-18](#)).

Politics and anti-fascist themes also came to the fore in an interview with Juan Antonio Bardem (1922–2002) ([Gerber, 1978: 16-17](#); [Vetrova, 1981: 18](#)), Yves Boisset ([Chertok, 1974: 12-13](#)), Ivo Gorani (1924–2015) ([Markova, 1971](#)), Florestano Vancini (1926–2008) ([Khovrin, 1974: 16](#)), Giuseppe De Santis (1917–1997) ([De Santis, 1980](#)), Valerio Zurlini (1926–1982) ([Chernenko, 1969: 16](#)), René Clement (1913–1996) ([Ignatov, 1983: 18-19](#)), Ricardo Cucciolla (1924–1999) ([Chertok, 1975: 12-13](#)), Giuliano Montaldo ([Montaldo, 1971](#)), Franco Nero ([Sulkin, 1982: 16-17](#)), Francesco Rosi (1922–2015) ([Talov, 1979: 15](#)), Peter Fleishman (1937–2021) ([Krasnova, 1984: 18-19](#)), Volker Schlöndorff ([Nadezhdy..., 1973: 17](#)).

In particular, the *Soviet Screen* quoted the words of Ricardo Cucciolla: “I wanted to convey to my contemporaries the greatness of the spirit of Gramsci, one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party” (Quoted from: [Chertok, 1975: 12-13](#)).

Even in an interview with Sophia Loren, the main focus was on her story about how the Italian fascists opposed the melodrama *Sunflowers (I Girasoli)*. Italy-France-USSR, 1970), in which the actress played the main role: “The film is a huge success. True, there were dissatisfied voices. They belong to those who cannot like the story of simple and honest people torn apart by war. These are the voices of the fascists. Did you know that in 1966 the Italian security service uncovered a conspiracy of South Tyrolean fascists? Hitler's successors marked their plan with the cipher “Sophie Loren” and planned the murder of the most prominent Italian actors and actresses as revenge for their participation in Italian anti-fascist films. They were going to start with me...” (Quoted from: [Senin, 1971: 18](#)).

But, of course, there were also benevolent interviews on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* without accentuated politicization: with Claude Jade (1948–2006) ([Claude..., 1981: 17](#)), Annie Girardot (1931–2011) ([Karaseva, 1984: 20-21](#)), Gina Lollobrigida (1927–2023) ([Markov, 1974: 19-20](#)), Claudia Cardinale ([Claudia..., 1980: 17-18](#)), Marcello Mastroianni (1924–1996) ([Dva..., 1969](#)), Sara Montiel (1928–2013) ([Kudrin, 1984: 19-20](#)), Michelle Morgan (1920–2016) ([Lipkov, 1972: 17](#)), Alberto Sordi (1920–2003) ([Galina, 1985: 20-22](#)) and others.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of texts published during the “stagnant” period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969–1985), the authors came to the conclusion that the principle of choosing cinematic personalities to paint portraits of Western actors and directors in 1969–1985 remained stable in the *Soviet Screen*.

This magazine readily wrote about “progressive filmmakers” who went unnoticed in negative statements against the USSR and participation in anti-Soviet films. Especially if these filmmakers came to the Moscow International Festival and spoke positively about the Soviet Union.

One of the favorite subjects of the *Soviet Screen* within the framework of foreign themes is Western actors as “victims of Hollywood”, evidence of the “tragedy of the artist in the bourgeois world.” In this vein, the magazine wrote, for example, about Judy Garland (1922–1969) and Marilyn Monroe (1926–1962).

But if any of the famous Western actors was involved in the creation of anti-Soviet films and/or films “glorifying the American military,” the magazine could strike him with “heavy artillery” on its pages. This fate awaited the Hollywood actor and director John Wayne (1907–1979).

Of course, about some actors and actresses (for example, about Yves Montand (1921–1991) and Simone Signoret (1921–1985), who were “fined” after the Czechoslovak events of 1968), *Soviet Screen* did not have anything positive to write about before the onset of “perestroika” possibilities.

However, there were many less politicized articles about Western actors on the pages of the magazine.

As for interviews with Western filmmakers, as in previous years, the *Soviet Screen* magazine selected interlocutors from among the most “progressive artists.” For example, among American filmmakers, the first place was given to Stanley Kramer (1913–2001). The progressive political position was also emphasized in interviews with Sydney Pollack (1934–2008), Norman Jewison, Ellen Burstyn, Jessica Lange and other Western directors and actors.

In general, during the period 1969–1985, the ideological positions of the *Soviet Screen* magazine remained unchanged.

## 5. Acknowledgments

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

## References

- [Abdrashitov, 1978](#) – *Abdrashitov, A.* (1978). Catherine Deneuve. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Abramov, 1972](#) – *Abramov, N.* (1972). Gnevnoe oko Dzhozefa Strika [The Wrathful Eye of Joseph Strick]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1972. 21: 18. [in Russian]
- [Alexandrov, 1977](#) – *Alexandrov, A.* (1977). Dolgaya, dolgaya ispoved' [Long, long confession]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 4. [in Russian]
- [Alexandrov, 1978](#) – *Alexandrov, A.* (1978). Syr bri i francuzskij harakter [Brie cheese and French character]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 5. [in Russian]
- [Amlinsky, 1983](#) – *Amlinsky, V.* (1983). Neyubilejnoe [Non-jubilee]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Andreev, 1983](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1983). Ne sklonivshij golovy [Not bowing his head]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Andreev, 1985](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1985). Horoshie idei Normana Dzhyuisona [Norman Jewison's Good Ideas]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Anna..., 1975](#) – Anna Karina: Ostavat'sya soboj [Anna Karina: Remain yourself] (1975). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Antonov, 1972](#) – *Antonov, O.* (1972). Yolande DuLuart: Nado imet' bol'shoe muzhestvo... [Yolande DuLuart: One must have great courage...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 14. [in Russian]
- [Antonov, 1977](#) – *Antonov, R.* (1977). Jack Nicholson. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5. [in Russian]
- [Aristarco, 1951](#) – *Aristarco, G.* (1951). Storia delle teorie del film. Torino: Einaudi.
- [Aronson, 2003](#) – *Aronson, O.* (2003). Metakino [MetaCinema]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Asenin, 1971](#) – *Asenin, S.* (1971). Vernye revolyucii [Faithful revolution]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17. [in Russian]
- [Asenin, 1972](#) – *Asenin, S.* (1972). Podskazano vremenem. Karlovy Vary-72 [Prompted by time. Karlovy Vary-72]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1977](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1977). Novyj supermif Gollivuda [New super myth of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1978](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1978). Mnogie amplua Barbary Strejzand [Many Roles of Barbara Streisand]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1979](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1979). Charles Bronson. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bakhtin, 1996](#) – *Bakhtin, M.* (1996). Sobranie sochinenij [Collected Works]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Barabanova, 1971](#) – *Barabanova, M.* (1971). Dustin Hoffman – “netipichnyj amerikanec” [Dustin Hoffman – “an atypical American”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17. [in Russian]
- [Basmanov, 1976](#) – *Basmanov, N.* (1976). Stefania Sandrelli. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]
- [Bazin, 1971](#) – *Bazin, A.* (1971). What is Cinema? Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [Belenky, 1976](#) – *Belenky, I.* (1976). Fernando Rey. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 17. [in Russian]
- [Belyaeva, 1976](#) – *Belyaeva, T.* (1976). Don Kihot iz Irlandii [Don Quixote from Ireland]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bereznitsky, 1975a](#) – *Bereznitsky, Y.* (1975). Mesto pod solncem [A place under the sun]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bereznitsky, 1975b](#) – *Bereznitsky, Y.* (1975). Poltora chasa udovol'stviya [An hour and a half of pleasure]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Bernadsky, 1978a](#) – *Bernadsky, R.* (1978). Metamorfozy i dejstvitel'nost' [Metamorphoses and Reality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bernadsky, 1978b](#) – *Bernadsky, R.* (1978). Samyj cennyj priz [The most valuable prize]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bernardo..., 1977](#) – Bernardo Bertolucci: Dialektika zhizni [Bernardo Bertolucci: The Dialectic of Life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1977. 19. [in Russian]



**Bibler, 1990** – *Bibler, V.* (1990). Ot naukoucheniya - k logike kul'tury: dva filosofskih vvedeniya v dvadcat' pervyj vek [From science-teaching to the logic of culture: two philosophical Introductions to the twenty-first century]. Moscow. [in Russian].

**Bobikov, 1973** – *Bobikov, A.* (1973). Stenley Kramer: V poiskah pravdy o cheloveke [Stanley Kramer: In Search of the Truth About Man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1973. 13. [in Russian]

**Bobrova, 1983a** – *Bobrova, O.* (1983). Fontamara: chto delat'? [Fontamara: what to do?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 8-9. [in Russian]

**Bobrova, 1983b** – *Bobrova, O.* (1983). Maestro Federico. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 17-18. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1971a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1971). Samorazoblachenie "sil'nogo cheloveka" [Self-disclosure of a "strong man"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 16-17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1971b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1971). Sdelano v Italii [Made in Italy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 13-14. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1972a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1972). Cesare Zavattini. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 14-15. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1972b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1972). Tak li prost "Serafino"? [Is *Serafino* so simple?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 14-15. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1973a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1973). Palatka na ploshchadi. Rabochij klass na ekrane Italii [Tent on the square. The working class on the screen of Italy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 14-15. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1973b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1973). Uzhasy po-ital'yanski [Horrors in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 18. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1974a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Amarcord. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 14. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1974b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Franco Nero: ot "zvezdy" – k borcu [Franco Nero: from the "star" to the wrestler]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 14-15. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1974b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Ital'yanskie portrety [Italian portraits]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 16-17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1975** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1975). Detektiv v Rime [Detective in Rome]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1979a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Adriano Celentano. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 18. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1979a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Stefania Sandrelli. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 16-17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1979b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Cesare Zavattini. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 19-20. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1979d** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Vestern-spagetti plyus komediya ["Western spaghetti" plus comedy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 12-13. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1980a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1980). Nashestvie mirazhej [Invasion of mirages]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 4-5. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1980b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1980). Neobychnaya sud'ba Gavino Leddy [The Unusual Fate of Gavino Ledda]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 4-5. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1981** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1981). Michelangelo Antonioni. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1983a** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1983). ...I romantichnyj Antonio [...And romantic Antonio]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 16-17. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1983b** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1983). Udivitel'nyj Nino Manfredi [Amazing Nino Manfredi]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 19-20. [in Russian]

**Bogemsky, 1985** – *Bogemsky, G.* (1985). Repeticiya shedevra [Rehearsal of a masterpiece]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 20-21. [in Russian]

**Bogolepova, 1981** – *Bogolepova, D.* (1981). Ornella Muti. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 18-19. [in Russian]

**Bogolepova, 1982** – *Bogolepova, D.* (1982). Melodii Nino Rota [Melodies of Nino Rota]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18. [in Russian]

**Bogolepova, 1984** – *Bogolepova, D.* (1984). Eleonora Giorgi. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 18. [in Russian]

**Bogomolov, 1975** – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1975). Mister muzhchina [Mister Man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 3-4. [in Russian]

- [Bozhovich, 1967](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1967). Vittorio De Sica. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1973a](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1973). Jean-Paul Belmondo. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1973b](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1973). Pokushenie. Kto zhertva? [Attempt. Who is the victim?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 13. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1979](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1979). Sochetanie talantov [Combination of talents]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1981](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1981). Gerard Depardieu. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1981. 20: 17. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1982](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1982). Victor Lanoux. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18. [in Russian]
- [Casetti, 1999](#) – *Casetti, F.* (1999). Theories of Cinema, 1945–1990, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- [Chaplin..., 1969](#) – Chaplin rabotaet nad novym fil'mom [Chaplin working on a new film] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 22. [in Russian]
- [Chernenko, 1969](#) – *Chernenko, M.* (1969). Valerio Zurlini: Protiv duhovnogo oskudeniya! [Valerio Zurlini: Against spiritual impoverishment!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16. [in Russian]
- [Chernenko, 1985a](#) – *Chernenko, M.* (1985). Amplua – Belmondo [Role – Belmondo]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Chernenko, 1985b](#) – *Chernenko, M.* (1985). Irene Papas. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 21. [in Russian]
- [Chernenko, Chertok, 1972](#) – *Chernenko, M., Chertok, S.* (1972). Marcel Carnet: Spasenie v politicheskom fil'me [Marcel Carnet: Salvation in a political film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1969](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1969). “Podsolnuhi”. Idut s'emki [Sunflowers. Filming in progress]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 10-12. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1971](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1971). Stenley Kramer: protiv bezumnogo mira [Stanley Kramer: Against the Mad World]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1972a](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1972). Ne tol'ko akter [Not only an actor]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1972b](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1972). Sidney Pollak: Moral'nyj krizis Ameriki [Sydney Pollack: America's Moral Crisis]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 14. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1974a](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1974). Jean-Louis Barrault: Kino – eto poeziya [Jean-Louis Barrault: Cinema is poetry]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1974b](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1974). Mario Filipp Azzopardi: pervyj fil'm [Mario Philipp Azzopardi: the first film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 17. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1974c](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1974). Yves Boisset: politicheskij detektiv [Yves Boisset: political detective]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1974d](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1974). Zhivye tradicii [Living Traditions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 18. [in Russian]
- [Chertok, 1975](#) – *Chertok, S.* (1975). Ricardo Cucciolla: Akter – lico politicheskoe [Ricardo Cucciolla: An actor is a political person]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Chto..., 1969](#) – Chto Gollivud sdelaal s Judy Garland [What Hollywood did to Judy Garland] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 17. [in Russian]
- [Chudov, 1975a](#) – *Chudov, V.* (1975). Fantastika shutit i oblichaet [Fiction jokes and denounces]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 17. [in Russian]
- [Chudov, 1975b](#) – *Chudov, V.* (1975). Podsněžniki v sentyabre [Snowdrops in September]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 13. [in Russian]
- [Chudov, 1975c](#) – *Chudov, V.* (1975). Strelyaj i ne razdumyvaj [Shoot and don't hesitate]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 13. [in Russian]
- [Claude..., 1981](#) – Claude Jade (1981). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 17. [in Russian]
- [Claudia..., 1980](#) – Claudia Cardinale (1980). *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [De Santis, 1985](#) – *De Santis, G.* (1985). Otryvki iz dnevnika [Excerpts from the diary]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Demin, 1975a](#) – *Demin, V.* (1975). Personazh – vremya [Character – time]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Demin, 1975b](#) – *Demin, V.* (1975). Trudno byt' mamontom [It's hard to be a mammoth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 16-17. [in Russian]

- [Dmitriev, 1984a](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1984). Lyudi protiv [People against]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1984b](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1984). Poiski i nadezhdy Alena Rene [The Quest and Hope of Alain René]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 20. [in Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1984](#) – *Doroshevich, A.* (1984). Paul Newman. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1975](#) – *Dularidze, L.* (1975). Prekrasnaya ledi Gollivuda [The Beautiful Lady of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1975. 15: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Dva..., 1969](#) – Dva chasa s Marcello Mastroianni [Two Hours with Marcello Mastroianni] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [in Russian]
- [Eco, 1975](#) – *Eco, U.* (1975). Trattato di semiotica generale. Milano: Bompiani.
- [Eco, 1976](#) – *Eco, U.* (1976). A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [Eisenstein, 1964](#) – *Eisenstein, S.M.* (1964). Izbrannye proizvedeniya [Selected works]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Ellen..., 1977](#) – Ellen Burstyn: “Vernite zhenshchinu v iskusstvo” [Ellen Burstyn: “Return woman to art”] (1977). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16. [in Russian]
- [Fedorov, 2014](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2014). Film studies in the university students' audience: from entertainment genres to art house. Moscow: ICO “Information for all”. 232 p.
- [Fedorov, 2015a](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2015). Film criticism. Moscow: ICO “Information for all”. 382 p.
- [Fedorov, 2015b](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2015). Russia in the mirror of the Western screen. Moscow: ICO “Information for all”. 117 p.
- [Fedorov, 2016a](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2016). The White Movement image in the mirror of the Russian and Western screen. Moscow: ICO “Information for all”.
- [Fedorov, 2016b](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2016). Western World in the Soviet and Russian Screen: From Epoch of Ideological Confrontation (1946-1991) to Modern Time (1992-2016). Moscow: ICO Information for All. 153 p.
- [Fedorov, 2017a](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2017). *Cinema Art* as part of a typical model of the Soviet humanitarian journals in the Cold War times. *Propaganda in the World and Local Conflicts*. 4(1): 52-61.
- [Fedorov, 2017b](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2017). Reflections: West about Russia / Russia about West. Film images of people and countries. Moscow: ICO Information for All. 280 p.
- [Fedorov, 2019](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2019). Cinema in the Mirror of the Soviet and Russian Film Criticism. Moscow: ICO “Information for All”. 214 p.
- [Fedorov, 2021a](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2021). 100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for all". 144 p.
- [Fedorov, 2021b](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2021). Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: “Information for all”. 102 p.
- [Fedorov, 2021c](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2021). Soviet science fiction movies in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: Information for all. 162 p.
- [Fedorov, 2022a](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2022). Soviet cinema in the mirror of *Crocodile* magazine. *Media Education*. 18(3): 356-369. DOI: 10.13187/me.2022.3.356
- [Fedorov, 2022b](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2022). Theoretical concepts of film studies in the *Cinema Art* journal during the perestroika era: 1986–1991. *Media Education*. 18(4): 574-599. DOI: 10.13187/me.2022.4.574.
- [Fedorov, 2022c](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2022). Luchshie i hudshie fil'my sovetskogo kinoprokata: mneniya chitatelej zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran* (1958-1991) [The best and worst films of the Soviet film distribution: the opinions of the readers of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1958-1991)]. Moscow. 330 p. [in Russian]
- [Fedorov, 2023](#) – *Fedorov, A.* (2023). Polish album: movies notes. Moscow: Information for all. 122 p.
- [Fedorov, Kornienko, 2023](#) – *Fedorov, A., Kornienko E.* (2023). The Ideological Topic in the Magazine *Soviet Screen*: 1957–1968 (Western Cinema Aspect). *European Researcher. Series A*. 14(1): 25-30. DOI: 10.13187/er.2023.1.25
- [Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022a](#) – *Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A.* (2022). Theoretical concepts of film studies in the *Cinema Art* journal in the first decade (1931–1941) of its existence. *Media Education*. 18(2): 169-220. DOI: 10.13187/me.2022.2.169.



[Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022b](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical concepts of film studies in *Cinema Art* journal in the first post-soviet years: 1992–2000. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 7(2): 355-397. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2022.2.355

[Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022c](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical concepts of film studies in *Cinema Art* journal: 1945–1955. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 7(1): 71-109. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2022.1.71.

[Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2023](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2023). Western Cinema on the Pages of the Magazine *Soviet Screen*: 1957-1968. *Media Education*. 19(2): 212-269. DOI: 10.13187/me.2023.2.212.

[Fedorov et al., 2017](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Gorbatkova, O. (2017). School and university in the mirror of Soviet and Russian cinema. Moscow: ICO Information for All, 2017. 152 p.

[Fedorov et al., 2019a](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Chelysheva, I., Gorbatkova, O., Mikhaleva, G., Seliverstova, L. (2019). School and university in the mirror of American, British, French, German and Russian movies. Moscow: ICO Information for All, 2019. 232 p.

[Fedorov et al., 2019b](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Gorbatkova, O. (2019). School and university in the mirror of Soviet and Russian cinema. Moscow: ICO Information for All, 2019. 172 p.

[Fedorov et al., 2023](#) – Fedorov, A., Camarero, E., Levitskaya, A. (2023). Theoretical concepts of film studies in *Cinema Art* journal: XXI century. *Media Education*. 3: 353-403.

[Fedorov et al., 2024](#) – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Novikov, A. (2024). Western cinema on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969-1985): reviews of Western films. *Media Education*. 1: 40-95.

[Florinda..., 1976](#) – Florinda Bolkan (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18. [in Russian]

[Fomichev, 1978](#) – Fomichev, I. (1978). Romy Schneider. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 20-21. [in Russian]

[Frolov, 1978](#) – Frolov, G. (1978). Put' v niz [Way down]. *Sovetskij ekran*: 6-7. [in Russian]

[Frolov, 1979](#) – Frolov, G. (1979). Burt Lankaster: "Vysokie idealy mira" [Burt Lancaster: "High Ideals of the World"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 18. [in Russian]

[Frolov, 1980](#) – Frolov, G. (1980). Jane Fonda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]

[Galina, 1985](#) – Galina, A. (1985). Alberto Sordi: v Moskve kak doma [Alberto Sordi: at home in Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 20-22. [in Russian]

[Gerber, 1978](#) – Gerber, A. (1978). "Ispytanie svobodoy". Juan Antonio Bardem ["The Trial of Freedom". Juan Antonio Bardem]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]

[Giuliano..., 1971](#) – Giuliano Montaldo: protiv neterpimosti [Giuliano Montaldo: Against Intolerance] (1971). *Sovetskij ekran*. 21. [in Russian]

[Giuseppe..., 1980](#) – Giuseppe De Santis: Bol' moego serdca [Giuseppe De Santis: Pain of my heart] (1980). *Sovetskij ekran*. 3. [in Russian]

[Glazkov, 1983](#) – Glazkov, A. (1983). Eta nepokornaya Dzhessika [This recalcitrant Jessica]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 9. [in Russian]

[Gledhill, Williams, 2000](#) – Gledhill, C., Williams, L. (eds.) (2000). *Reinventing Film Studies*. Oxford: Arnold & Oxford University Press.

[Gromov, 1985](#) – Gromov, E. (1985). Poisk istiny [The Search for Truth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 20-22. [in Russian]

[Hess, 1997](#) – Hess, D.J. (1997). *Science Studies*. New York: New York University Press.

[Hill, Gibson, 1998](#) – Hill, J., Gibson, P.C. (eds.) (1998). *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Ignatov, 1983](#) – Ignatov, A. (1983). Muza Rene Klemana [Muse of Rene Clement]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]

[Jean..., 1976](#) – Jean Rochefort (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]

[Karaseva, 1984](#) – Karaseva, E. (1984). Ozhidanie novykh vstrech [Waiting for new meetings]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 20-21. [in Russian]

[Karlov, 1975](#) – Karlov, A. (1975). Cel'nost' i prostota [Integrity and simplicity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 14-15. [in Russian]

[Kartseva, 1969](#) – Kartseva, E. (1969). Luchshie gody ego zhizni [The best years of his life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 13, 15. [in Russian]

[Kartseva, 1970](#) – Kartseva, E. (1970). Chelovek, kotoryj sohranil sebya [The Man who saved himself]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]



- [Khovrin, 1974](#) – Florestano Vancini: poka fashizm ne umret [Florestano Vancini: until fascism dies] (1974). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16. [in Russian]
- [Khrenov, 2006](#) – *Khrenov, N.* (2006). Zrelishcha v epohu vosstaniya mass [Spectacles in the age of revolt of the masses]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Khrenov, 2011](#) – *Khrenov, N.* (2011). Civilizacionnaya identichnost' v perekhodnuyu epohu: kul'turologicheskij, sociologicheskij i iskusstvovedcheskij aspekty [Civic Identity in a transitional epoch: culturological, sociological and art history aspects]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Khutsiev, 1976](#) – *Khutsiev, M.* (1976). Charlie Chaplin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Komov, 1982](#) – *Komov, Y.* (1982). Epidemiya uzhasov [Epidemic of Horrors]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 18. [in Russian]
- [Kopylova, 1972](#) – *Kopylova, R.* (1972). "Pervaya" i "vtoraya" Lucia Bosè ["First" and "second" Lucia Bosè]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16. [in Russian]
- [Krah..., 1983](#) – Krah "Tarzana" [The collapse of *Tarzan*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1983. 10: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Krasnova, 1984](#) – *Krasnova, G.* (1984). Peter Fleishman: "My dolzhny byt' na postu, nacheku!" [Peter Fleishman: "We must be on guard, alert!"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Kudrin, 1984](#) – *Kudrin, I.* (1984). Vstrecha s "Korolevoj shanteklera" [Meeting with the "Queen of Chanticleer"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 19-20. [in Russian]
- [Lagina, 1972a](#) – *Lagina, N.* (1972). Pevec i kinoakter [Singer and film actor]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 14. [in Russian]
- [Lagina, 1972b](#) – *Lagina, N.* (1972). Posleslovie k "Zvukam muzyki" [Afterword to *The Sound of Music*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Lesovoy, 1969](#) – *Lesovoy, M.* (1969). Ital'yanskij "chelovek vozduha" [Italian "man of air"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [in Russian]
- [Levitskaya et al., 2013](#) – *Levitskaya, A., Kornienko, E. Novikov, A.* (2023). Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen Magazine*: 1928-1930. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 8(1): 122-144. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2023.1.122
- [Levitskaya, 2022](#) – *Levitskaya, A.* (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in *Cinema Art Journal*: 1956-1968. *Media Education*. 18(3): 390-438.
- [Levitskaya, Fedorov, 2023](#) – *Levitskaya, A., Fedorov, A.* (2023). Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen Magazine* of 1925-1927. *Media Education*. 19(1): 71-96. DOI: 10.13187/me.2023.1.71
- [Lipkov, 1972](#) – *Lipkov, A.* (1972). Michèle Morgan: "O chem ya mechtayu" [Michèle Morgan: "What I Dream About"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 17. [in Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1972](#) – *Lishchinsky, I.* (1972). Put' nahodok, put' poter' [The way of finds, the way of losses]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Lotman, 1973](#) – *Lotman, Y.* (1973). Semiotika kino i problemy kinoestetiki [Semiotics of cinema and the problems of film aesthetic]. Tallin. [in Russian]
- [Lotman, 1992](#) – *Lotman, Y.* (1992). Stat'i po semiotike i topologii kul'tury [Articles on semiotics and topology of culture]. Vol.1. In: *Izbrannye stat'i*. Tallin. [in Russian]
- [Lotman, Tsvijan, 1994](#) – *Lotman, Y., Tsvijan, Y.* (1994). Dialog s ekranom [Dialog with the Screen]. Tallin. [in Russian]
- [Lyndina, 1971](#) – *Lyndina, E.* (1971). Zrelost' talanta i kanony Gollivuda [The maturity of talent and the canons of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Lyndina, 1972](#) – *Lyndina, E.* (1972). Pytayas' razorvat' seti... [Trying to break the networks...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1970](#) – *Makarov, G.* (1970). Portret "yastreba" [Portrait of a "hawk"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1976](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1976). Prishedshij s ulicy [Who came from the street]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1981](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1981). Igra i real'nost' [Game and reality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1982](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1982). Kraj sveta po-ital'yanski [The end of the world in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 8. [in Russian]

- [Makarov, 1983](#) – Makarov, A. (1983). Intelligent s zontikom v chernom botinke [An intellectual with an umbrella in a black boot]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 18. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1985](#) – Makarov, A. (1985). Skuchnaya istoriya [Boring history]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 10. [in Russian]
- [Markov, 1972](#) – Markov, S. (1972). Kevin Brownlow: “Eto sluchilos' zdes” [Kevin Brownlow: “It Happened Here”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 15. [in Russian]
- [Markov, 1974](#) – Markov, S. (1974). Fotoal'bom aktrisy [Photo album of the actress]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 19-20. [in Russian]
- [Markova, 1971](#) – Markova, F. (1971). Ivo Garani: Razoblachat' fashizm [Ivo Garani: Exposing fascism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- [Mast, Cohen, 1985](#) – Mast, G., Cohen, M. (eds.) (1985). *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [Metz, 1974](#) – Metz, C. (1974). *Language and cinema*. The Hague: Mouton.
- [Michel..., 1976](#) – Michel Bouquet (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24. [in Russian]
- [Mikhalkovich, 1983](#) – Mikhalkovich, V. (1983). Max von Sydow: kontrasty [Max von Sydow: contrasts]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17. [in Russian]
- [Moikin, 1974](#) – Moikin, N. (1974). Sidney Pollack: Byt' s temi, kto boretsya za spravedlivost' [Sydney Pollack: To be with those who fight for justice]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 20. [in Russian]
- [Mudrov, 1984](#) – Mudrov, A. (1984). Paren' s ulicy Glyuka [The guy from Gluck street]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 22. [in Russian]
- [Nadezhdy..., 1973](#) – Nadezhdy Volker Schlöndorff [Volker Schlöndorff's Hopes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1973. 11: 17. [in Russian]
- [Orlov, 1984](#) – Orlov, D. (1984). U Luisa Bunyuelya [At Luis Bunuel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 20. [in Russian]
- [Pankratova, 1977](#) – Pankratova, N. (1977). Jacques Demy. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983a](#) – Plakhov, A. (1983). Chto takoe “belmondism” [What is Belmondism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 17. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983b](#) – Plakhov, A. (1983). Strah, poshchadivshij dushu [Fear that spared the soul]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 5-6. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983c](#) – Plakhov, A. (1983). Zamknutyj krug. V mire duhovnogo krizisa [Vicious circle. In the world of spiritual crisis]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 17. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985a](#) – Plakhov, A. (1985). Gordye provincialki Natalie Bay [Proud provincial women Natalie Bay]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985b](#) – Plakhov, A. (1985). Trevoga i nadezhda [Anxiety and Hope]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985c](#) – Plakhov, A. (1985). V masshtabe melodramy [On the scale of melodrama]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 10. [in Russian]
- [Poklonov, 1976](#) – Poklonov, Y. (1976). Pod komedijnoj maskoj [Under a Comedy Mask]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1969](#) – Postanovlenie sekretariata CK KPSS “O povyshenii otvetstvennosti rukovoditelej organov pechati, radio, televideniya, kinematografii, uchrezhdenij kul'tury i iskusstva za idejno-politicheskij uroven' publikuemyh materialov i repertuara” ot 7.01.1969 [Resolution of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio, television, cinematography, cultural institutions and art for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire". 7.01.1969]. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1972a](#) – Postanovlenie CK KPSS “O literaturno-hudozhestvennoj kritike” [Decree of Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On Literary and Artistic Criticism"]. 21.01.1972. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1972b](#) – Postanovlenie CK KPSS “O merah po dal'nejshemu razvitiyu sovetskij kinematografii” [Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On measures for the further development of Soviet cinematography"]. *Pravda*. 22.08.1972. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1972. 19. [in Russian]
- [Rezinkov, 1973](#) – Rezinkov, V. (1973). Jane Fonda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [in Russian]
- [Rubanova, 1966](#) – Rubanova, I. (1966). Vsyo o Visconti [Everything about Visconti]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 19. [in Russian]

- Rubanova, 1972 – Rubanova, I. (1972). Talant skromnosti [Talent of modesty]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1973 – Rubanova, I. (1973). Annie Girardot. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1975 – Rubanova, I. (1975). Aktrisa na vse vremena [Actress for all times]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982a – Rubanova, I. (1982). "...A nado bylo nezhnost'yu" ["...But it was necessary with tenderness"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 9. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982b – Rubanova, I. (1982). "...Iz snega i odinochestva" ["...From snow and loneliness"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982c – Rubanova, I. (1982). "Eshche ne zamer smekh..." ["The laughter has not yet stopped ..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1985 – Rubanova, I. (1985). "Pro shchegla v zapiske pervoj..." ["About the goldfinch in the first note..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Salner, 1985 – Salner, P. (1985). Jessica Lange: zvezda zazhglas' v Moskve [Jessica Lange: a star lit up in Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Senin, 1971 – Senin, S. (1971). Sophia Loren: "Zhit' – znachit rabotat'". K vypusku na ekran fil'ma "Podsolnuhi" [Sophia Loren: "To live means to work." To the release of the film *Sunflowers*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18. [in Russian]
- Serebrennikov, 1977 – Serebrennikov, R. (1977). Skazki i real'nost' Zhana Mare [Tales and reality of Jean Marais]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [in Russian]
- Shaternikova, 1984 – Shaternikova, N. (1984). Goresti i nadezhdy "malen'kogo cheloveka" [Sorrows and hopes of the "little man"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1962 – Shitova, V. (1962). Luchino Visconti i ego fil'my [Luchino Visconti and his films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1977a – Shitova, V. (1977). Dalekoe blizkoe [Far near]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1977b – Shitova, V. (1977). Vlast' masterstva [The Power of Mastery]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1979 – Shitova, V. (1979). Sil'nye sily [Strong Forces]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1984 – Shitova, V. (1984). Pobeditel' ne poluchaet nichego [Victoriously gets nothing]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Sobolev, 1974a – Sobolev, R. (1974). Menyayushchijsya i neizmennyj [Changing and unchanged]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Sobolev, 1974b – Sobolev, R. (1974). Put' bez sluchajnostej [The path without accidents]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Sobolev, 1974c – Sobolev, R. (1974). Talant chelovechnosti [Talent of humanity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Solovieva, Shitova, 1972 – Solovieva I., Shitova, V. (1972). Jean Gabin i eshche odin Gabin [Jean Gabin and another Gabin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Solovieva, Shitova, 1973a – Solovieva I., Shitova, V. (1973). Eti troe segodnya [These three today]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 5-6. [in Russian]
- Solovieva, Shitova, 1973b – Solovieva I., Shitova, V. (1973). Mnogie i eshche dvoe [Many and two more]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]
- Solovieva, Shitova, 1976a – Solovieva I., Shitova, V. (1976). Alain Delon bez svoej teni [Alain Delon without his shadow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Solovieva, Shitova, 1976b – Solovieva I., Shitova, V. (1976). Signor Vittorio. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Stam, 2000 – Stam, R. (2000). *Film Theory: an Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sulkin, 1982a – Sulkin, O. (1982). 70 rolej Franco Nero [70 roles of Franco Nero]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Sulkin, 1982b – Sulkin, O. (1982). Trudnyj start [Difficult start]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Sulkin, 1983a – Sulkin, O. (1983). Ee blestyashchaya kar'era [Her brilliant career]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 9. [in Russian]
- Sulkin, 1983b – Sulkin, O. (1983). Fest-83: mezhdru proshlym i budushchim [Fest-83: between the past and the future]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16-17. [in Russian]



- [Sulkin, 1983c](#) – Sulkin, O. (1983). Takova sportivnaya zhizn' [Such is the sporting life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1984a](#) – Sulkin, M. (1984). O proshlom – radi budushchego [About the past – for the sake of the future]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 21. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1984b](#) – Sulkin, O. (1984). Pochti po Oruellu, ili Kak Gollivud “ekraniziruet” nashumevshij roman [Almost according to Orwell, or How Hollywood “screens” a sensational novel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Surkova, 1975](#) – Surkova, O. (1975). Harriet Anderson. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Talov, 1979](#) – Talov, I. (1979). Francesco Rosi: Ostayus' veren teme antifashizma [Francesco Rosi: I remain true to the theme of anti-fascism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 15. [in Russian]
- [Tirdatova, 1982](#) – Tirdatova, E. (1982). Otec i syn Dasseny [Father and son of Dassin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 18. [in Russian]
- [Tirdatova, 1985](#) – Tirdatova, E. (1985). Ot Lira do Puaro [From Lear to Poirot]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 21. [in Russian]
- [Trauberg, 1982](#) – Trauberg, L. (1982). Korol' smekha [King of laughter]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1982. 13: 18. [in Russian]
- [Trauberg, 1983](#) – Trauberg, L. (1983). Asta Nielsen. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 18. [in Russian]
- [Veselyj..., 1973](#) – Veselyj i grustnyj Gofman [Cheerful and sad Hoffmann]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1973. 11: 16. [in Russian]
- [Vetrova, 1980](#) – Vetrova, T. (1980). Luis Buñuel. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Vetrova, 1981](#) – Vetrova, T. (1981). “Ne pamyatnik, ne kamennoe izvayanie...” [“Not a monument, not a stone statue...”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18. [in Russian]
- [Victorova, 1979](#) – Victorova, E. (1979). Trudnye pobedy Volonté [Volonté's difficult victories]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Victorova, 1982](#) – Victorova, E. (1982). “Schitayu sebya realistom” [“I consider myself a realist”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Villarejo, 2007](#) – Villarejo, A. (2007). Film Studies: the Basics. London: Routledge.
- [Yakovlev, 1978](#) – Yakovlev, V. (1978). Vstrecha s legendoj [Meeting with a legend]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Yakubovich, 1984a](#) – Yakubovich, O. (1984). Griffit i drugie: har'kovskaya nahodka [Griffith and others: Kharkov find]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 22. [in Russian]
- [Yakubovich, 1984b](#) – Yakubovich, O. (1984). Novyj Mel'es: har'kovskaya nahodka [New Méliès: Kharkov find]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 22. [in Russian]
- [Yampolsky, 1977a](#) – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Issledovanie posredstvennosti [Study of mediocrity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Yampolsky, 1977b](#) – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Nino Manfredi. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [in Russian]
- [Yampolsky, 1977c](#) – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Sed'maya muza Zhaka Prevera [The seventh muse of Jacques Prevert]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Yampolsky, 1978a](#) – Yampolsky, M. (1978). Gipnoz mifa [Hypnosis of the myth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Yampolsky, 1978b](#) – Yampolsky, M. (1978). Maski Lui de Fyunesa [Masks of Louis de Funes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Yanushevskaya, 1983](#) – Yanushevskaya, I. (1983). “Staret' – eto velikolepno” [“Getting old is great”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Yutkevich, 1981](#) – Yutkevich, S. (1981). Kto vy takoj, David York Griffitht? [Who are you, David York Griffith?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Zhezhelenko, 1973](#) – Zhezhelenko, M. (1973). Rod Steiger: na perelome sudeb [Rod Steiger: at the turn of fate]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 14-15. [in Russian]