VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

LINA KAMINSKAITĖ-JANČORIENĖ

CINEMA IN SOVIET LITHUANIA: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SYSTEM AND THE SHIFT IN FUNCTIONS
(1944–1970)

Summary of doctoral dissertation

Humanitarian sciences, history (05 H)

Vilnius, 2014

The Doctoral Dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University during 2007–2013.

Scientific Supervisor:

Assoc. prof. dr. Nerijus Šepetys (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

The Dissertation is being defended at the Council of Scientific Field of History
at Vilnius University:

Chairman:

Prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Members:

Prof. dr. Rasa Čepaitienė (Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Criticism – 03 H)

Dr. Agnė Narušytė (Vilnius Academy of Arts, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Criticism – 03 H)

Dr. Dangiras Mačiulis (Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Opponents:

Dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Dr. Skaidra Trilupaitytė (Lithuanian Institute of Culture Research, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Criticism – 03 H)

The Dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific
Field of History in Auditorium 211 of the Faculty of History of Vilnius University
at 3 p. m. on 28 March 2014.
Address: Universiteto g. 7, LT–01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the Doctoral Dissertation was distributed on … February 2014.
The Doctoral Dissertation is available for review at the Vilnius University Library.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

LINA KAMINSKAITĖ-JANČORIENĖ

KINAS SOVIETŲ LIETUVOJE: SISTEMOS RAIDA IR FUNKCIJŲ KAITA
(1944 – 1970 m.)

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka

Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2014 metai

Disertacija rengta 2007–2013 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

Doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetys (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas:

Prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Nariai:

Prof. dr. Rasa Čepaitienė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Doc. dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03H)

Doc. dr. Agnė Narušytė (Vilniaus dailės akademija, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03H)

Dr. Dangiras Mačiulis (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Oponentai:

Doc. dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Dr. Skaidra Trilupaitytė (Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2014m. kovo mėn. 28 d. 15 val. Istorijos fakulteto 211 auditorijoje. Adresas: Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2014 m. vasario mėn... d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

The Relevance of the Study

The research of film history has acquired multi-directional guidelines in the international historiographical thought. The widened concept of film in the 1980s inspired film to be researched not only from an artistic perspective but also to be explored as a socio-cultural, industrial, institutional and political phenomenon. The research results that have been developed or are developing under this concept have become integrated not only into the research of the development of film history but also research into popular, leisure, everyday and political history. It is for this reason that there is no need to argue for the relevance of the research of film history in international historiography.

Meanwhile in Lithuania, where the consideration of film from the position of art criticism is still the most prevalent approach taken, no emphasis has been placed on the phenomenon of film history. Taking into account the approaches to film history that have taken shape or are still under formation in the international community, and having integrated film research of the Soviet Union, this study proposes a new interpretational slant for the film processes that took place in Soviet Lithuania which encompassed the development aspects of film industry (production, distribution and exhibition) and Soviet system. A one-sided approach existing in Lithuania (film as art) and other circumstances mark the need for such research.

Within international research, increased attention has become focused towards East European film, whose geographic territory also encompasses the Baltic States (including Lithuania). It should be noted that Estonia is the most active country as regards the presentation of its discoveries and research; Latvia is catching up with Estonia, while the approach to film process in Lithuania is still an unsolvable riddle for the colleagues of neighbouring countries. This circumstance also determines the debates that have gone unnoticed in Lithuania. For example, in the conference that was held in Tallinn on 5–6 March 2007, which marked the first academic meeting of film researchers from Eastern Europe, the only report that was concerned with Lithuanian cinema tried to argue for the existence of Lithuanian cinema. The report did not attempt to reconstruct or analyse but to simply argue that despite Soviet occupation Lithuanian cinema did in fact exist, and that it was under formation and that it manifested certain features. Although the country itself did not exist, the nation, along with its culture was apparent, even if only within a

country that was part of the "empire". One more nonetheless intriguing fact is that Lithuanian cinema was, due to the silence it was shrouded in (lack of research), interpreted in this conference as "lost cinema". In other words, this cultural field practically does not exist in the awareness of westerners and our close neighbours. Although there is some vague knowledge of its (pre-)existence, Lithuanian cinema is lost to the present-day map of film research. While trying to evaluate this problematic state, questions related to survival in the future inevitably arise: what needs to be done to prevent this branch of Lithuanian culture – cinema – from being branded as "lost"? What should be done to make sure that it is discovered? How might it be made relevant? Finally, how should it be researched?

On one hand, this state of being "lost" lends meaning to the demands of Lithuanian film research within the context of international "curiosity". On the other hand, this "lost" state allows us to identify the main reason for its existence which stemmed from nowhere else but the local level. For example, the hitherto undeveloped Lithuanian film critics' attempt to conceptualise the evolution of Lithuanian cinema in 1993, eliminated the chance of it being introduced to a wider scope of Soviet culture. Therefore, Lithuanian historians in their inconsistent attempts content themselves with common "filmographic" reductive descriptions, while the reviews of individual works inertly concentrate on the search for "ideological" charge. Inertia can also be sensed in the wider discussions about how film functioned in Soviet Lithuania. It is a widespread belief that film is perhaps the most ideological form of artistic expression, and that it, more than anything else, carries the load of the political-ideological indoctrination of the society. However, efforts to glimpse the ways in which this expression functions do not exist. Therefore, such evaluations are frequently confined to the repetition of the clichés that are programmed in the Soviet ideological programme itself: "film is the foremost of all arts", "film is the art with the largest mass appeal".

This longstanding problematic tension, in which film has become stuck in an unresearchable binary opposition, has determined this "nobody's land/white stain's" condition. This condition, of course, was also determined by objective reasons. The intentions of historians are restricted by the fact that film belongs to a specific form of artistic expression which has its peculiar production reality, while the contextual specific nature of historical development – the Soviet period during which the development of a

Lithuanian film history that was amenable to the ideological and political programme took shape – is hard for film critics to grasp. It is because of these reasons that the diverse context of filmmaking and functioning finds itself at the interpretive crossroad where the two tendencies of film history and the Soviet period meet. At this crossroad Lithuanian cinema has, to rephrase the words of foreign film critics, become "lost" not only within international research but also within the contemporary memory of Lithuanian society and the research of Soviet Lithuanian culture. On the other hand, the detailed analysis of the historiography of Soviet film history enables us to maintain that this historiography has not yet been fully constructed, and it is for this reason that this research can be interpreted as research into the former periphery of the USSR that has not only local resonance but also international relevance.

The Problematic Questions of the Study

In the case of Soviet Lithuanian cinema, the applicability of the approaches of film history theory and of Soviet Russian historiography encounters some areas of difficulty. There is no consistent empirical research of Soviet Lithuanian cinema which could be developed upon. In Lithuania, in contrast to research into Stalinist Russia, we face a different socio-political and cultural context: occupation, repressions, guerrilla warfare, collectivisation, and a renewed campaign of propagandist/political indoctrination. In international historiography, the attention paid to the cinema of the Stalinist period begins to wane around the post-war period, i.e. during the time when Lithuanian cinema becomes industrially and functionally integrated into the management system of the Soviet cinema. Moreover, a further mitigating factor is that prior to the Soviet occupation, Lithuania had never had a fully working film industry model and because of that the processes of film production were a completely new phenomenon. This circumstance highlights the fifth threshold – Lithuania had never had a professional film community – this was created during the Thaw period of the Soviet times. The sixth, Lithuania only established a fully-fledged film industry model (film exhibition, distribution, production) during the post-Stalinist period; therefore it was precisely during this time that the institutional–bureaucratic hierarchy of the processes of film management and production was formed.

All the circumstances that have been mentioned here give rise to the slew of research-based questions which underpin this thesis. Although these questions relate to cinema as a socio-political phenomenon, they also cover the elements of film industry development: cinema network, the policy of repertoire and filmmaking. For example, the observations regarding the function of film within Bolshevik politics that were made by Richard Taylor and Nicholas Reeves raise further questions: what place did cinema hold in the common ideological and cultural politics in the post-war Lithuania? What means were employed to ensure its functioning? What films were exhibited? What films were watched and under what conditions were they watched? Last but not least, what films were made and by whom for the local Lithuanian film "market"?

No fewer questions arise as regards the model of film production. For instance, the film researcher Maya Turovskaya has observed that as a result of state policy during the late Stalinist period, an unnatural derivative or derivative distorting common process for film production took shape; one which is characterised by monopolisation, autocratism, the limitation of film production to only those films that suited the propagandist and ideological programme, and the creation of a film model that was based on the principles of social realism. What is more, according to Turovskaya, these elements remained practically unchanged throughout the entire Soviet period. Researcher George W. Faraday supports such viewpoint. Having adopted the suggestion of the predecessor, he distinguishes three essential features: state monopoly, bureaucratic control, and aesthetic and ideological Orthodoxality. Unlike in other countries, all the elements of film industry – production, distribution, exhibition – were in disposition of authorities, while the community of filmmakers functioned under the supervision of an institutionalised mechanism. The latter operated under the supervision of the highest authorities subordinate to the bureaucratic formation (vertical control). All creative intentions were bound by the only permissible aesthetic and ideological system that was under control of authorities.

At first sight it may seem that these approaches do not say anything new – the fact that in a country governed by Soviets all the fields of life and culture were under control has been articulated in Lithuania on more than one occassion. However, there is a need to highlight one aspect that is important for the organisation of cinema – in the Soviet Union unlike other countries, only one organisational framework was permitted for film

production – and this was based on the studio film production and film studio network; the latter of which was controlled at an institutional, bureaucratic and ideological level. Professional filmmaking was unable to explore avenues that were not bound by the formal controls of the authorities. Bearing all this in mind, it is natural that questions related to the formation and development of the institutional management model of film production should arise: what institutional structure did Soviet Lithuania "inherit"? How did the structure shift? How did film production evolve? What functions were imposed on film production? Finally, when did Lithuania become included into the USSR film industry model?

On the other hand, the afore mentioned observations by Turovskaya and Faraday primarily refer to the external model of the intentions of the Soviet authorities. If we were to pursue such observations, the shift (i.e. the shift "from below") that occurred in the position of the filmmaking community, would remain unexplored. Moreover, the processes that took place at the regional or peripheral level would remain in obscurity: how did the authorship intentions of Lithuanian filmmakers develop? Was there a friction between the ideological programme and the discrepancies in its implementation? What ideological and creative attitudes determined such friction? What part did the central (Soviet Russia) and peripheral (Soviet Lithuania) institutional mechanism of film management play in local film production? While formulating this group of questions we suddenly enter the sphere of film production control that embraces both the common institutional structure of an overseer (Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Glavlit, KGB, etc.) and specific institutional and administrational film elements. Thus it is still unclear how the control overseer, which operated on a number of levels, manifested itself in cinema? What institutional–administrational–bureauctratic model was apllied to film industry? Ultimately, what works of Lithuanian cinema received penalties? What shape did such penalties take?

Research Object, Aim and Tasks

The object of this study is industrial processes (distribution, exhibition, production) of the Soviet Lithuanian cinema within the systematic development and shifting functions of film.

The aim of this study is to present and research film as a multi-layered

phenomenon of the Soviet period which involves socio-cultural, ideological, political, creative, technological, economical and institutional levels.

In order to achieve the aim the following tasks were undertaken:

- to reconstruct the institutional structure of film management, its tasks and the genesis of the formation of film production and the Lithuanian filmmakers' community;

- having chosen a case study (post-war period), to thoroughly analyse and present the specific features of the policy of film distribution and exhibition;

- to present the guidelines and problems of the research of film exhibition and distribution policy during the post-Stalin and Thaw period;

- while examining the whole of film production (feature and documentary films), to identity the (non-)shifting of the concept of the functions of film production at a political, ideological and creative level; those frictions and divisions in the creative community which arise from the specifics of type of film production (feature, documentary film);

- to propose a model for the control mechanism of Lithuanian filmmaking by thoroughly researching the forms and expressions that the controlling motives took at an institutional, ideological and creative level;

- by applying the strategy of a two-way gaze, to disclose what frictions existed between management policy (from above) and its implementation in reality (from below);

- to ascertain, from the perspective of regional management policy (periphery – centre), what specific features existed in the industrial structure of the Soviet Lithuanian film and its management.

Theoretical Approaches and Methodological Tools of the Research

This inter-disciplinary research combines such research approaches as the theory of film history and Soviet culture or the structure of Soviet system. The concept of the system has been adopted from historian Arfon E. Rees, who perceives the Soviet system as the creation of institutional and practical structures. He divides the general system into smaller sub-systems: economical, political, social and cultural. According to Rees, "In order for the system to be integrated, certain means and management techniques are

employed. The system can be analysed in accordance with a dual strategy – how it functions effectively or ineffectively." Within this research these systemic and sub-systemic processes are related to a socio-political, economical and ideological structure. As a result, this study encompasses a number of levels of empirical research: institutional, industrial and ideological. By integrating the two-way gaze strategy of Rees: from above (intentions of activity) and from below (the limitation of activity), the system and sub-system is understood not as a homogenous environment but as an environment that is in constant change and transformation.

The choice of such a strategy of looking stems from existing research on Soviet culture which is itself not fully satisfied with the concept of an overseer of total Soviet control. Moreover, this strategy also factors in those discoveries that support the picture of a system that was in its very essence contradictory; discoveries which have become more increasingly widespread. For instance, Maksimenkov, the researcher of film processes of the Stalinist period, has observed that behind the theoretical and pragmatic Soviet mechanism of film management lay a true cultural policy that was accompanied by constant improvisations, corrections and vacillation between declarations. Unpredictable circumstances determined that illogical and barely explicable paradoxes became a constant feature. The cultural researcher Amme Walach supports this approach: "What was allowed during one year, was forbidden the next year and vice versa; things that were tolerated in literature, were condemned in painting; what one artist was permitted to do, could lead another artist to a sad ending; what one bureaucrat allowed, another could prohibit."

The longstanding Soviet film critic Valeriy Fomin also shares this impression of a contradictory and unpredictable reality, only he uncovers these contradictions in decisions made by peripheral political elite or cinema administrators. For example, a film could be shown in Georgia without causing any major tensions, while in neighbouring Azerbaijan that same film might face serious problems. In his comparison of the varying levels of creative freedom available in the Baltic countries, Fomin is convinced that the situation is Latvia was far less favourable than it was in Lithuanian or Estonia.

The latter insight leads us to the conclusion that in order to fully understand how the Soviet system operated in the field of culture, one has first to consider every case

individually. For instance, one must consider whether the field is cinema, fine art or literature and what location the art emerged from (e.g. Russia, Lithuania, Estonia or Latvia). In other words, no single consistent cultural policy existed. Consistency manifested itself only in the institutional framework but not reality. Therefore, this study is shaped by the three chosen strategic approaches of looking that encompass the intentions of authority (from above) and their (un)responsiveness (from below): the policy of the Soviet film industry, its aims and tasks; the shift in functions of films and the process of film making; the control of filmmaking; the control of the distribution of completed films and the frictions that arose as a consequence of such control. Such strategy allows us to take a look at the film processes that took place not in a closed environment but in a political and socio-cultural context, i.e. as a peculiar system/sub-system with its own functions.

The first approach looks into the details of the directives of the top institutions of the USSR and the LSSR and their (in)effectiveness; furthermore, it looks into the subordination of film authorities, institutional change and guideline execution. This enables us to present an image of the functions of the common Soviet film policy which covers the establishment of the nomenclature of film institutions, the impact of individual personalities of this nomenclature on the factors that determined LSSR cinema, its personnel policy, common film distribution strategies, the creation of film network and its development (defined as the process of *kinofikatsiyja*). The disclosure of this image helps us to understand what intentions existed for the securing of the aims of the sovietisation of the Lithuanian society, along with the scope of these intentions and their shift. Having disclosed the main tasks of the LSSR's film policy, it becomes easier to understand and pursue the development of the processes of film production (second approach), which covers the training of filmmakers, the unfolding of Soviet Lithuanian cinema production (the formation of the Lithuanian film studio and the shifting of its functions from documentary film to the creation of a base for feature film production). The third approach of the study delves into the process of film creation control and approval, and institutional (the policy of the executive institutions of the USSR and LSSR; the policy of film assessment and approval of films produced by the Lithuanian film studio; the influence of the top institutions of the LSSR) and creative frictions that arose as a result: the criteria for film assessment, the contradictory nature of these criteria

and the reasons that determined a film's (non)exhibition (defined as "shelving") and other strategies of control. There are a few circumstances that prompt that a deeper interest be taken into the control mechanism. These circumstances relate not only to an "ignorance" of the processes that took place in cinema but also to the wider framework of film production which covered a multi-step process: from subject to scenario, from scenario to production process, from production process to filmmaking, from filmmaking to screen access. Therefore, the reconstruction of the film control mechanism is carried out on the basis of an ideological, production, creative and institutional approach.

To implement this research, further methodological tools have been employed: reconstructive or descriptive tools based on empirical research, the critical analysis of different types of sources, conflict strategies and the strategies of informal relations. The latter was supported by a comparative method whose introduction allows us to grasp the transformations of different periods (Stalinist, post-Stalinist periods, the Thaw) and regional characteristics (Soviet Russia – Soviet Lithuania). To implement the research, further sources were employed: archive documents from the highest institutions (Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, LSSR Council of Ministers, Russian State Archive for Social and Political History, Lithuanian Special Archives and Lithuanian Central State Archives); documents from executive and supervisory bodies (the LSSR Ministry of Cinematography, LSSR Ministry of Culture, Glavk, LSSR Cinematography Committee, Goskino, Lithuanian Film Studio, Glavlit, KGB, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Russian Gosfilmofond of Russia, Lithuanian Archives of Literature and Art, etc.); interviews carried out on the basis of a semi-structured questionnaire (with filmmakers and the workers of the film sector and film studio) and published memoirs.

The Structure of the Study

The structure of this research, on the one hand, is based on the logic of the industrial film model: film exhibition, film distribution and film production; on the other hand, it resounds with the afore mentioned strategy of three gazes: the policy of the Soviet film industry, its aims and tasks; the shift in film function and the process of filmmaking; the control of filmmaking, film distribution and the frictions that arose as a

result of such control. Thus with regard to the specific nature of the object of this study and the context of its formation, shift and structural context, this study consists of three parts.

The first chapter reconstructs the policy of film management, film distribution and film repertoire, along with the development of the structure of institutional subordination during the Stalinist period. We identify the concept of film functions and its absorption at the highest management level of the LSSR. We analyse how these functions were absorbed and employed in executive bodies and what tasks were performed in order to implement and enforce film activity. By invoking economical and socio-cultural aspects, we analyse the aspects of the function of film in the every-day life of the post-war period: what strategies were employed to meet with the tasks of political indoctrination and whether these tasks reached their intended aim (audience); and if so, what reactions were received. Therefore, the possibility of film functioning within the society is examined by including those film technological aspects that have hitherto not been observed: the specifics of film network implementation (e.g. film equipment) and the (in)capacity determined by it; the limited nature of film exhibition (linguistic differences, shortage of film). Viewing film exhibition and watching from the perspective of specific socio-cultural and technological phenomenon, the features of the post-war film watching, which are ascribed to the trajectories of every-day life and leisure, are reconstructed. The included historiographic discoveries are widened, while the methodological proposals are examined by evaluating the possibilities for their application. Having presented the basic elements of post-Stalinist film distribution, the policy of film repertoire and the shift in film functions (telefication, the shifting policy of leisure time), hypothetical theses (therefore in need of empirical verification) are proposed to describe specific nature of film functioning of a later period.

With the second chapter we enter the genesis of the framework of film production. We identify the basic stages in the process of the establishment of the film studio. Moreover, we discuss the film studio management (nomenclature) and the formation of the kernel of filmmakers (e.g. personnel policy, the training of filmmakers), the transformations of the creative self-consciousness of the film community, the division of identities (the creators of feature and documentary films), and causes for their formation. We disclose the shift in the concept of documentary film's function (from an ideological

programme pursuer to art) and reconstruct the socio-political and technological aspects of documentary filmmaking. We delve into the transformations feature film experienced and the implementations and alterations of function imposed on it. All these aspects allow us to establish the main turning points of film production on an institutional (the Lithuanian studio becoming an integral part of the film industry of the USSR) and creative level (the ideological/programmed search for "form and content" and its discovery).

Having presented the genesis of the film studio (film production), the third chapter uses the aspect of film control to look into the ideological and creative reality of film production. We offer a methodological tool – the "control pyramid" on the basis of which we distinguish the control expression of ideological–political–informal power that is exerted at the production, institutional and informal levels. By reconstructing creative – ideological levels and invoking the analysis of the most illustrative cases, we discuss the functioning (and the reasons for) of the controlling filter of the pyramid, its effect on the individual stages of filmmaking (e.g. on script, filming, final film product), with the latter being widened by the influence of the distribution policy on the (non)exhibition of Lithuanian film production. We analyse the search for programme-based wordings, their contradictory application and the shift in this application as regards film related intentions and completed works. We identify the changes in the creative identity of filmmakers and emergent copyright protection at a peripheral and union level. This consistent analysis not only allows us to come closer to understanding the production, creative and ideological reality in which the film process took place, but also to identify for the first time those intentions and films that were victim to penalisation and prohibition.

Results and Conclusions of the Study

The application of the approaches of film history theory, which regard film as a multi-layered phenomenon of the Soviet period that covers the levels of film exhibition (creation of film network), distribution (formation of film repertoire), and film production, have allowed us to gain a better understanding of not only the main aims and tasks of the Soviet film policy (from above), but to also identify the reasons for failing to implement these aims or the resistance to the programme intentions (from below).

At the level of film exhibition and distribution, the main aim of the Soviet government during the post-war period was to assure film's functioning in society (*kinofikatsiyja*), as only after such assurance could film's integration into the common processes of society's Sovietisation become possible. To achieve such an aim, a peripheral institutional body was first established (institutional centralisation in 1946, the establishment of the LSSR Ministry of Cinematography), which had to ensure effective measures for film distribution (film network). However, the implementation of the authorities' undertakings – which were aimed at the Sovietisation of villagers – encountered an unforeseen challenge, i.e. the structural organisational model of Lithuania which was based on the system of individual farms. It was for this reason that one of the advantages that cinema wielded as a socio-cultural phenomenon – its ability to gather people for the purpose of social, political and ideological indoctrination – faded, becoming only a viable aspiration following the implementation of the processes of collectivisation. These circumstances reveal an unexpected paradox: although in pre-war Lithuania systemic processes analogous to those that took place in the Soviet Russia in 1920s and 1930s could be traced, the blind application of such processes, without prior assessment of the peripheral peculiarities, encountered with the inefficiency of these processes in reality. General *kinofikacyja* in Lithuania, occupied by the USSR, was an utopian aspiration of the Stalinist period. Even when the unforeseen obstacle was taken into account and considerable technological forces (portable film) were gradually invoked with the aim of ensuring film's functioning in society, countless further impediments were encountered at a practical and technological level: for instance, a shortage of electricity was replaced by a shortage of technical components, the latter – by a deficiency in mechanics and so forth. However, the reasons for such practical misfortunes were not a completely self-contained problem in the field of cinema but had a lot to do with the lack of attention paid by the Soviet Lithuanian authorities.

It was in 1948 that greater attention at the highest authoritative level was first shown to the matter of cinema. Although the highest administrational level of local authorities, under the pressure of directives, understood that attention needed to be paid to cinema, the representatives of the executive institutions had no real conception of the position that cinema should assume in the common cultural and ideological policy, nor did they know how to administrate cinema matters or how to turn film functioning from

the page into true reality. Therefore, the efforts of the authorities met with a level of chaos which was hard to control and with executives who were more concerned with entertainment – dances and concerts – rather than cinema.

The general *kinofikatsiyja* determined yet another peculiarity. A common function of film exhibition, defined with the purpose of cinema theatre, was distorted. The expansion of the film network, with its highlight on cinema's mass appeal and accessibility, was of prior importance; the quantity of film exhibition venues was constantly on the increase with no consideration given as to how a film would be screened. The conception of the cinema theatre was replaced by the anonymous cinema spot (stationary or portable). Within this concept of the "spot", the largest level of ideological-political efficacy was related to accessibility (a film's intrusion upon every-day – *kinofikatsyja*) paying only little attention to the primary prerogative of film exhibition – i.e. the activity of a cinema theatre's space. Therefore, the function of the cinema theatre as that of a "centre of culture" was only hypothetical and had nothing in common with the film watching environment and experience that existed in reality.

The situation within the policy of film distribution was no better. When assembling the funds for Soviet film production, the first obstacle encountered was linguistic in nature: the majority of the films were in Russian – a language most of the LSSR's inhabitants simply did not understand. This meant that it was simply impossible to achieve the anticipated effect of the political and ideological indoctrination of society through film. Even at those times when Soviet films were watched within the Lithuanian province (or, to be more exact, when they were available) certain cases of resistance to Soviet film production continued to occur.

Attempts to soften the crisis of the USSR film industry and the impact of the shortage of films on the film repertoire through the screening of "trophy" film production (1947–1949) from the countries occupied by the USSR soon manifested itself in Lithuania. The case of Kaunas "contraband" demonstrates that if there was a possibility to choose between Soviet and foreign film production, preference was given to the latter. On the other hand, the fact that the dissemination of "trophy" production in Lithuania was restricted and was aimed mainly at town-dwellers shows that a conscious effort was being made to broaden the gap between the village and the city. Village-dwellers, unlike town-dwellers, had to be content with Soviet film production. The

arrangement of the film repertoire which was presented to the latter was, no doubt, related to the primary aim of Sovietising villages, an aim based not only on the suppression of resistance against Communist authorities, but also on the instilling of the collectivisation processes and the adjusting of the peasantry's to the Communist management of agriculture. Having prohibited "trophy" film production in 1949, films that had been made earlier were showed repeatedly. The latter situation led to yet another crisis in cinema attendance in the Soviet Union as the repeated screening of films led to a scarcity of cinemagoers. This context reveals the situation that Soviet Lithuania found itself in: the planned implementation indicators which recorded cinema attendance figures showed that Lithuania held last place in the USSR during the entire Stalinist period.

This study provides an illustration of the situation in Soviet Lithuanian film policy, film distribution and exhibition: the poor management and control of film-related matters in executive institutions, the sluggish functioning of the film network, problems in film distribution and the poor conditions for film exhibition allow us to reconsider cinema's role as a handy tool for ideological and political indoctrination in the socio-political environment of Soviet Lithuania – the "foremost of all arts" was not that significant. In other words, this conclusion demythologizes the privileged position given to cinema within the common ideological–cultural programme. The so-called advantages of film – its "mass appeal" or "effectiveness" – were only a programme-based aspiration that granted film with mythical powers that had nothing in common with the processes that was taking place in reality. On the other hand, these discoveries provide the basis for broader considerations concerning the place of film as a visual expression in Lithuanian society. One has the impression that the aggressive implantation of film by the Soviet authorities, even though it was ineffective, resulted in the conception of film as a socio-cultural anachronism and cultural foreign body within Lithuanian society. In order to answer this question – whether such attitude took shape during the Soviet period or whether its origins lie in the pre-war period – a detailed empirical study reconstructing the policy of film exhibition, distribution and repertoire would have to be carried out.

The analysis of the specific features of film distribution and exhibition during the Thaw period strengthens this idea of regarding film as a "foreign body". Although the film repertoire policy became less restricted during this period and with the variety of

films on offer expanded, Lithuania remained last in the USSR according to film attendance rankings until the early 1960s.

In the structural framework of film production, the two stages have been distinguished: before 1954 and after 1954. The phrase until 1954 is considered to be the period of film studio's creation during which attempts were made to conceive what further actions should be taken to ensure the progress of film production. A few reasons determined that only documentary film was created in the base of film production that developed during the Stalinist period. This film type appealed more for the dissemination of ideology and demanded less technological means or money. The production of feature film in the film studio of the LSSR did not take place, on the one hand, due to the poor capacity of the USSR film industry and a lack of possibilities. Moreover, attempts were made to impose a common film production model over the newly occupied Baltic countries with Riga (Latvia) at its centre, and to simultaneously pursue the incorporation of local forces (actors, representatives of peripheral film professions, such as film designers, assistants, etc.) into the other film studios of the USSR where they would create adepts of socio-realism whose works were aimed at the local audience. On the other hand, documentary film prevailed due to the fact that Soviet Lithuania lacked not only technological possibilities but also artists capable of feature film creation. As had been the case for the film network, film production needed to be reinforced within the common processes of culture. Feature film production was a symbol of cultural prestige and capacity which provoked certain peripheral ambitions.

The essential turning point in the structural framework of the film studio of the LSSR took place in 1954, when the film studio assumed a final production model (a division for feature film production was established), where both feature and documentary films were produced. From now on the Soviet Lithuanian film studio became an integral part of the common system of studio network of the USSR. This factual date is considered to mark the end of the formation of a common film industry's model (one which produces, distributes, exhibits) in Lithuania. Even though Soviet Lithuania became capable of creating feature film in 1954, the first film that validated this capacity came out in 1957 ("The Blue Horizon").

The formation of the kernel of film studio founders underwent a few stages of development. Responding to the common personnel policy in LSSR and USSR, the

years 1945, 1948 and 1950–1951 saw the purge based on the examination of the ideological reliability and loyalty to the Soviet authorities. These campaigns resulted in a decrease in the already small number of Lithuanians capable of filmmaking. The larger part of these new comers consisted of experienced war camera men, the "front fighters", who had worked in various film studios of the USSR. As the socio-political circumstances changed in the 2nd half of the 1950s (the outcome of Beria's national personnel policy, Lithuanisation of personnel), the demand for the professional "internationality" faded and most of them returned to their former working places, while a handful of them remained to work in the margins of documentary film (commissioned films or films related to the popularisation of science). The later gap between the filmmakers and the epicentre of filmmaking (feature film) was determined not only by national tensions (Lithuanians – foreigners) or a professional lag but also by the fact that, as a rule, the representatives of documentary film comprised the kernel of the primary party organisation of the film studio. This circumstance and the fact that as regarded feature film production, priority was given to the Lithuanian filmmakers prepared by the VGIK (All-Union State Institute of Cinematography), resulted in long-lasting tensions between documentary and feature filmmakers. In the artistic hierarchy of the film studio, feature film directors held the highest status.

By giving priority to feature film production, the second stage of the formation of the kernel of the film studio's workers was associated with the preparation and coming of age of a professional generation of filmmakers in 1956–1960. However, it was not only studies at the VGIK on their own that assured an individual's right to work in the film studio but also the creative skills and competences they had acquired while working in the Lithuanian film studio itself. In time, the influence of this "privileged" factor (studies in the VGIK) subsided and the filmmakers of varying artistic capacity gradually began to hold higher positions.

On examining the development of the functions of documentary and feature films and their production, one sees that, on the one hand, the function of film production in the Stalinist period was to maintain the myth of Soviet reality that was intrinsic to the whole field of culture and information. This function was based on the establishment of the image (past and present) at the expense of the dismantling of current reality. Nevertheless, the production had to meet with local demands (film magazines,

standardised plots for the entire Union) and thus encountered unforeseen difficulties. The documentary films of the post-war period, whose task it was to conform to the canon of the representation of an ideological space (i.e. the visualisation of a constructed, staged and invented reality; the repetition of ideological clichés in support of the process of the ideologisation of the society), found it difficult to integrate the required programme "visualisations" into their works as such progress-witnessing objects did not yet exist in reality. Feature film, in the meantime, was faced with the difficulty of having to search for a "national" plot and colouring. The latter circumstance determined that attempts made in film production were unsuccessful, and as such these works did not leave any ideological or political indoctrinational resonances in society.

The conception of the functions of documentary film began to change in the 2nd half of the 1950s. During the Thaw period the community of documentary filmmakers of the Lithuanian film studio gradually raised the importance of the pre-Stalinist proposals made by the avant-garde filmmakers: "to objectivise the recording of reality". However, the attempts to record a non-controlled image of reality faced technological issues (heavy, immobile cameras). The second stage in the shift of the conception of documentary film, during which the status of a documentary filmmaker took shape, occurred in 1962–1966. The 1960s saw documentary cinema assume a triple role: as the supporter of the ideological programme (Stalinist canon was still being propagated), as a "portrayal" of reality (reportage filming), and as a work of art (as an authored documentary). As regards feature film, the main shift in this field is associated with the expression of national original character in the shape of film: the first feature films that attempted to mark the national film style appeared in 1959–1960 ("Adam Wants to Be a Man", 1959; "The Live Heroes", 1960).

The division for feature film, established in 1954, determined the end of the formation of a film industry model in the periphery; what is more, it led to the adoption of a film control model for the USSR that took shape at the end of 1930s. Having completed the reconstruction of the artistic–production–institutional–ideological levels of filmmaking, the construct of "control pyramid" was proposed which allowed us to systemise and methodically manage the expressions of filmmaking control that existed at that time, their interaction during different stages of filmmaking; it also enabled us to trace the continuity of control for the films that have been created. We dare to believe

that such a model, having assessed the local specific factors ("invisible level", informal relations), could also be applied to other peripheries of the USSR.

A more detailed look into the expressions of the control mechanism widens the common perception of the concept of censorship that is commonly applied to the control discipline of completed works (Glavlit). Such attitude allowed us to identify the control cases during a multi-layered process of film pre-production: rejected ideas, scripts, editing of the areas perceived as problematic during the process of filmmaking, re-editing of completed films, "shelving" of completed films, or the control of films in the process of their distribution. The detailed empiric research broadens the potential for the functioning of artistic film expressions and culture in general in society; and reveals the contradictory shift in the intentions of the authority's control, conflicting motifs behind these intentions and their effect on film production.

The two extreme film means of discipline, defined as "shelving" (non exhibition of a film throughout the entire film network of the USSR), coincided with an external political change: the mastering of a post-Stalinist programme, characteristic for the search for not only a new content but also form, led to the rejection of works based on an outdated programme ("When the Rivers Merge", 1961). In the meantime, the initiatives of liberalisation during the Thaw period were blocked by the prohibition of the film that attempted to expand the boundaries of reality's seeing ("June, the Beginning of Summer", 1969). A slightly more complicated and contradictory situation developed in the pre-production process. It can be seen that the censorship of the Lithuanian film studio's film production which determined the refusal of some scripts and editing of films under making, experienced a few stages of development.

The prevailing and unquestioned ritual incantation at the early 1960s – "untrue to reality" – was now replaced by the vice of "formalism" ("Cannonade", 1961). This diphthong of official censorship was joined by a third voice which argued for the shunning of complex artistic expression ("One-Day Chronicle", 1963), later making this more exact by welcoming expressions that had the quality of "accessibility", or, in other words, was "understandable to the masses" ("Ave, Vita!", 1969). The applicability of all these evaluation criteria that involved the revision of form and content had a contradictory nature. One has the impression that the brief yet loaded condemnation ("untrue to reality") was most commonly applied, while its meaning often depended on

the unpredictable "competence" of assessors (editors, nomenclature). This evaluation definition was basically the same for other processes of USSR film culture. The works shifted but not the estimation criteria. For example, the accusations levelled against "formalism" (it's "overloaded") – the vice the filmmakers of the Russian avant-garde were often blamed for in 1920s–1930s – both demonstrated the rejection of a more complex aesthetical language and limited the director's authorial intentions. At the turn of the 1970s, this policy was complemented by the conception of an altered economic film programme – from now on a film's semblance depended on "mass reception".

This research also identifies the expression of the tension between the periphery (LSSR) and the centre (USSR). It can be seen that the control framework in the periphery was more expressed during the initial stage of filmmaking (script preparation), while the decisions made by the centre influenced the process of filmmaking (editing of films) and the film's appearance on the screen. The essential defence of film ideas was manifest not only in the friction determined by "ideological programme" but also at the level of individual artistic vision (the authorial intentions of the filmmaker). If one were to compare the examples of film discipline between the USSR and LSSR, the position of Lithuanian filmmakers was slightly more restrained. If it was requested, films were edited; extreme conflicts between artists and the authorities determined by the defence of an author's ideas (i.e. the positions held by Kira Muratova or Andrei Tarkovsky) have not been traced. Therefore, the penalties in Soviet Lithuania were fairly moderate in nature (there's no evidence that any film had its exhibition completely forbidden in the public space of the LSSR, or that attempts were made to destroy a film).

Disertacijos reziumė

Nors ir justi šiokia tokia sovietų Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų demarginalizacija bendrame sovietmečio tyrimų kontekste, tačiau tenka pripažinti, jog kultūros tyrimai vis dar retenybė. Gręžtis į atskirą kultūros sritį – kiną sovietų Lietuvoje – verčia ne tik savaiminė būtinybė (tirti netirtą sritį), bet ir diskusijos, intensyvėjančios lietuvių istorikų bendrijoje, apie poreikį ir galimybes „mažųjų naratyvų" (pvz., kalbos, sveikatos, meno, kultūros) tyrimus integruoti į „didžiuosius naratyvus" (sovietmečio istoriją). Turint omenyje esamas lietuviškąsias mokslines aktualijas, kino istorijos (t. y. „mažojo naratyvo") tyrimo galimybės pirmiausia susiduria su išankstiniu šios srities vertinimu, įprastu supratimu, jog kinas priklauso meninės, estetinės raiškos tyrimų laukui (kinotyrai). Ši įsišaknijusi vienakryptė kino samprata, viena vertus, trukdo istorikams suprasti kino istorijos tyrimų galimybes, kita vertus, kinotyrininkų apleisti, neišplėtoti kino istorijos tyrimai nesuteikia galimybių pasinaudoti esamais rezultatais, integruoti kiną į platesnį sovietmečio kultūros tyrimų lauką.

Sprendžiant susidariusią probleminę įtampą gelbsti tarptautinės akademinės bendrijos patirtis. Pasirodo, ir pastarąją kankino tapati padėtis. Tačiau XX a. 9 deš. užsimezgusi intensyvi diskusija tarp skirtingų bendrijų (istorikų ir kino tyrinėtojų) nulėmė šios problemos sprendimą: siūloma išplėtota kino samprata, pagal kurią kinas suvokiamas kaip daugiasluoksnis procesas. Šis siūlymas įkvėpė imtis kiną tirti ne tik iš meninės perspektyvos, bet ir kaip sociokultūrinį, industrinį, institucinį, politinį, ideologinį reiškinį. Todėl tokioje sampratoje klostęsi / besiklostantys tyrimų rezultatai integruojami ir į kino istorijos raidą nusakančius, ir į populiariosios, laisvalaikio, kasdienybės, politinės istorijos tyrimus (t. y. į „didžiuosius naratyvus"). Žodžiu, tarptautiniame kontekste nebereikia įrodinėti, jog kino istorijos tyrimai aktualūs.

Taigi atsižvelgiant į tarptautinės mokslinės bendrijos patirtį, šiame darbe siūlomas naujas interpretacinis žvilgsnis į sovietų Lietuvos kino procesus. Tokia laikysena ne tik praplečia kino sampratą, bet turi ir papildomų pranašumų. Viena vertus, leidžia pasinaudoti tarptautinėje bendruomenėje susiformavusiomis ir besiformuojančiomis kino istorijos teorijos prieigomis, pritaikyti jas tiriant sovietų Lietuvos kiną. Kita vertus, pateikiant nuoseklaus empirinio tyrimo rezultatus gilinamas sovietmečio kultūros klostymosi supratimas. Vadovaujantis šiuo tarpdisciplininiu požiūriu, tyrimu bandoma

pasivyti, įveikti kelių dešimtmečių vėlavimą, pristatant kiną kaip daugialypio proceso rekonstrukciją.

Disertacijos objektas – sovietų Lietuvos kino industriniai procesai (platinimas, rodymas, gamyba / kūryba) sisteminėje raidoje ir funkcijų kaitoje. Aliekant empirinį tyrimą, darbe pirmą kartą nuosekliai analizuojami kino industriniai procesai, vadovaujantis užsibrėžtu tikslu – pristatyti kiną kaip daugiasluoksnį sovietmečio fenomeną, apimantį sociokultūrinius, ideologinius, politinius, kūrybinius, technologinius, ekonominius, institucinius lygmenis.

Tyrimo struktūra, viena vertus, grįsta kino industrinio modelio logika – kino kūryba / gamyba (angl. *production*), kino rodymas (angl. *exibition*) ir kino kūrinių sklaida (angl. *distribution*), kita vertus, atliepia pasirinktų trijų perpektyvų strategiją: sovietų kino industrijos politika ir jos tikslai bei uždaviniai, kino filmų funkcijų kaita, kontrolės sistemos raiška kine. Šieji procesai analizuojami, vadovaujantis dvikrypčių žvilgsniu: valdžios intencijos (iš viršaus) ir tų intencijų (ne) atliepa tikrovėje (iš apačios). Taigi, atsižvelgiant į išsikeltus uždavinius, darbą sudaro trys dalys.

Pirmajame skyriuje *Kino politika pokariu: struktūrų kūrimas ir sovietizacija?* rekonstruojama kino valdymo, kino sklaidos, kino repertuaro politika, institucinio pavaldumo sąrangos klostymasis stalininiu laikotarpiu. Identifikuojame kino funkcijų sampratą ir jos įsisąmoninimą aukščiausiame LSSR valdymo lygmenyje. Nagrinėjame, kaip tos funkcijos buvo perprantamos ir vykdomos vykdančiosiose institucijose, kokių uždavinių imtasi kino veiklai įgyvendinti ir vykdyti. Pasitelkiant ekonominius ir sociokultūrinius aspektus, nagrinėjame kino funkcionavimo pokario kasdienybėje aspektus: kokių strategijų imtasi politinės indoktrinacijos uždaviniams patenkinti, ar šieji pasiekė savą tikslą (auditoriją), jei pasiekė – kokių reakcijų sulaukta. Todėl kino funkcionavimo visuomenėje galimumas tikrinamas įtraukiant iki šiol nepastebėtus kino technologinius aspektus: kino tinklo diegimo specifika (pvz., kino demonstravimo įranga) ir jos nulemtas (ne)pajėgumas, kino filmų demonstravimo ribotumas (pvz., kalbiniai skirtumai, „filmastygis"). Kino rodymą ir filmų žiūrėjimą traktuojant kaip specifinį sociokultūrinį, technologinį reiškinį rekonstruojamos pokario kino žiūrėjimo ypatybės, priskirtinos pokario žmogaus kasdienybės, laisvalaikio trajektorijoms. Įtraukti istoriografiniai atradimai praplečiami, o metodologiniai siūlymai tikrinami įvertinant jų taikymo galimybes. Pristačius esminius postalininės kino sklaidos, kino repertuaro

politikos bei kino funkcijų kaitos dėmenis (telefikacija, kintanti laisvalaikio politika), siūlomos hipotetinės (todėl tikrintinos) vėlyvesniojo laikotarpio (atšilimo) kino funkcionavimo specifiką apibūdinančios tezės.

Antrajame skyriuje *Kino studijos genezė: dokumentinio, vaidybinio kino gamyba ir kūryba* žengiame į kino kūrybos ir gamybos sanklodos genezę. Identifikuojame esmines Kino studijos kūrimo(si) raidos slinktis. Aiškinamės Kino studijos valdymo (nomenklatūros) ir kino kūrėjų branduolio kūrimosi aplinkybes (pvz., kadrų politika, kino kūrėjų rengimas), kino bendrijos kūrybinės savimonės transformacijas, skylančius tapatumus (vaidybinių, dokumentinių filmų kūrėjai) ir jų klostymosi priežastis. Nustatome dokumentinio kino funkcijos sampratos kaitą (nuo ideologinės programos tenkintojo iki meno), rekonstruojame dokumentinio kino kūrimo sociopolitinius, technologinius aspektus. Gilinamės į vaidybinio kino transformacijas, vaidybiniam kinui primestų funkcijų įgyvendinimą ir kaitą. Visi šie aspektai leidžia nustatyti pagrindinius kino produkcijos lūžius instituciniame (Lietuvos kino studijos tapsmas integralia SSRS kino industrijos dalimi) ir kūrybiniame lygmenyse (programinė „formos ir turinio" paieška ir jos atradimas).

Pristačius Kino studijos (kino gamybos ir kūrybos) genezę, trečiajame skyriuje *Anapus ekrano: kino kūrimo ir filmų kontrolės sistema* gilinamės į kino ideologinę, gamybinę ir kūrybinę tikrovę, pasirinkdami kino kontrolės aspektą. Pasiūlome metodologinį įrankį – vadinamąją „kontrolės piramidę" – kurio pagrindu išskiriame kontrolinę ideologinės-politinės-neformalios galios raišką kūrybiniame-gamybiniame, instituciniame lygmenyse. Rekonstruodami kūrybinius ir ideologinius lygmenis, pasitelkdami ryškiausių atvejų analizę, aiškinamės piramidės kontrolinio „sieto" funkcionavimą ir to funkcionavimo priežastis, pasekmes atskiriems kino filmų kūrimo etapams (pvz., scenarijui, filmavimui, sukurtam filmui). Analizuojame grindžiamųjų programinių formuluočių paiešką, jų prieštaringą taikymą ir to taikymo kaitą filmų užmanymams ir pabaigtiems kūriniams. Identifikuojame kino kūrėjų kūrybinio tapatumo kaitą, besiformuojančią autorinę-kūrybinę gintį periferiniame ir sąjunginiame lygmenyse.

Šiame tyrime identifikuotos sovietų Lietuvos kino politikos, kino platinimo ir rodymo aplinkybės pokariu: menkas rūpinimasis kino reikalais vykdančiosiose institucijose, negebėjimas jų kontroliuoti, vangus kino tinklo funcionavimas, filmų

platinimo bėdos, skurdžios kino žiūrėjimo aplinkybės leidžia persvarstyti kino, kaip parankaus ideologinės ir politinės indoktrinacijos įrankio vietą bendroje sovietų Lietuvos sociopolitinėje aplinkoje: „svarbiausias iš menų" nebuvo jau toks svarbus. Kitaip tariant, šioji išvada demitalogizuoja kino priveligijavimą bendrojoje ideologinėje, kultūrinėje programoje. Menami kino privalumai – masiškumas, paveikumas – tebuvo programinė siekiamybė, kinui suteikiant mitinės galios, nieko bendro neturėjusios su tikrovėje vykusiais procesais. Kita vertus, šie atradimai suteikia pagrindą platesniems svarstymas, susijusiems su kino, kaip vizualinės raiškos vieta lietuvių visuomenėje. Susidaro įpsūdis, jog nors ir neveiksmingas, bet agresyvus sovietų valdžios kino diegimas, nulėmė jo kaip sociokultūrinio anachronizmo, kultūrinės svetimybės sampratą lietuvių visuomenėje. Norint atsakyti į klausimą, ar tokia laikysena susiformavo sovietmečiu, ar josios ištakos siekia prieškarį, reikėtų detalaus empirinio tyrimo, rekonstruojančio tarpukario kino rodymo, platinimo, repertuaro politiką. Kino kaip kultūrinio „svetimkūnio" įžvalgą sustiprina ir mestas žvilgsnis į kino platinimo ir rodymo ypatybes postalininiu laikotarpiu.

Kino gamybos struktūrinėje sąrangoje išskirti du etapai: iki 1954 m. ir po 1954 m. Etapas iki 1954-ųjų laikytinas Kino studijos kūrimosi laikmečiu, bandoma susivokti kokių veiksmų reikia imtis norint užtikrinti kino gamybos eigą. Stalininiu laikotarpiu besikuriančioje kino gamybos bazėje dėl keletos priežasčių kurtas tik dokumentinis kinas. Ši kino rūšis buvo parankesnė, lankstesnė priemonė ideologijos sklaidai, be to, reikalavo mažesnio technologinio pajėgumo, pinigų. Vaidybinio kino gamyba LSSR kino studijoje nevyko ir dėl SSRS kino industrijos menko pajėgumo ir dėl to, kad sovietų Lietuvoje nelabai būta ne tik kad technologinių galimybių, bet ir kūrėjų, galinčių vaidybinius filmus kurti.

Kaip ir kino tinklo diegtyje, taip ir kino gamybos reikaluose reikėta stiprinti šios raiškos padėtį bendruose kultūros procesuose. Vaidybinio kino gamyba-kūryba buvo kultūrinio prestižo, pajėgumo simbolis, kurstęs ir šiokias tokias periferines ambicijas. Todėl LSSR kino studijos stuktūrinėje sąrangoje pagrindinis lūžis faktiškai įvyksta 1954 m., kuomet LSSR kino studija įgauna išbaigtą gamybos modelį (įkuriams vaidybinių kino filmų gamybos poskyris), kuriame gaminami ir kuriami vaidybiniai, dokumentiniai filmai. Nuo šiol sovietų Lietuvos kino studija tampa integralia SSRS bendros studijų tinklo sistemos dalimi. Ši faktinė data laikytina ir bendrojo kino industrijos modelio

(gamina, platina, rodo) Lietuvoje kūrimo pabaiga. Nors 1954 m. sovietų Lietuva tampa pajėgi kurti vaidybinį kiną, tačiau pirmasis šį pajėgumą žymėjęs filmas pasirodo 1957 metais.

1954 m. įkurtas vaidybinių kino filmų poskyris lėmė ne tik kino industrijos modelio formavimo baigtį periferijoje, bet ir tai, jog tais metais permetamas SSRS dar 4 deš. pabaigoje susiformavęs kino filmų kūrimo kontrolės modelis. Atlikus kūrybinio-gamybinio-institucinio-ideologinio kino filmų kūrimo lygmenų rekonstrukciją, suformuotas „kontrolės pirmamidės" modelis mums leido susisteminti ir metodiškai suvaldyti buvusias kino kūrybos kontrolės sistemos raiškas skirtinguose kino filmo kūrimo etapuose bei apčiuopti kontrolės tęstinumą sukurtiems filmams. Drįstume manyti, jog toks modelis, įvertinus lokalius, specifinius judesius („nematomą lygmenį", neformalius santykius), taikytinas ir kitoms SSRS periferijoms.

Akylesnis žvilgsnis, besitelkiantis į kontrolės sistema, praplečia įprastai vartojamą cenzūros sąvoką, taikytą išskirtinai pabaigtų kūrinių kontroliniam drausminimui (Glavlitas). Tokia laikysena mums leido pirmą kartą identifikuoti daugiasluoksnio kino gamybos proceso „ikifilminius" kontrolės atvejus: atmesti sumanymai, scenarijai, kūriamų filmų taisymas, pabaigtų kino kūrinių perkūrimo atvejai bei sukurtų filmų „padėjimas ant lentynos", kūriniai, kontroliuoti kino platinimo procese. Detalus empirinis tyrimas praplečia kino ir apskritai kultūros, meninių raiškų funkcionavimo galimumą visuomenėje, atskleidžia valdžios kontrolės intencijų prieštaringą kaitą.

Academic publications / Moksliniai straipsniai

„Brežnevinio sąstingio" praeities deformacijos lietuviškuose kino ir televizijos vaidybiniuose filmuose (1968-1980 metai*)*, in: *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, Vilnius, t. 22, 2008, p. 104–116.

Istorikai ir filmai: istoriografijos raida ir prieigų kaita, in: *Vizualioji kultūra: problemos ir interpretacijos*, straipsnių rinkinys, *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis*, sud. Monika Saukaitė, t. 64, 2012, p. 189–202.

Publications of academic sources / Mokslinių šaltinių publikacijos

LSSR vaidybinio kino raida, in: *Genocidas ir rezistencija*, Nr. 1, 2009, p. 120–131.

Epizodai paskutiniam filmui. Režisierius Almantas Grikevičius, (kartu su dr. Aurimu Švedu), Vilnius: Vaga, 2013.

Trumpos žinios apie doktorantę

Lina Kaminskaitė-Jančorienė gimė 1982 m. birželio 3 d. Vilniuje. 2000 m. baigė Vilniaus 9-ąją vidurinę mokyklą, 2001–2005 m. mokėsi Vilniaus universitete, Istorijos fakultete, baigė Kultūros istorijos ir antropologijos bakalauro programą ir įgijo istorijos kvalifikacinį laipsnį. 2005–2007 m. tęsė studijas Vilniaus universitete, Istorijos fakultete ir įgijo istorijos magistro kvalifikacinį laipsnį. 2007–2013 m. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto doktorantė. Nuo 2011 m. Tarptautinės medijų istorijos asociacijos narė (IAMHIST), nuo 2012 m. Lietuvos kinematografininkų sąjungos narė, nuo 2013 m. Lietuvos kino centro prie Kultūros ministerijos Kino tarybos narė. 2012–2015 m. mokslinio projekto „Lietuvos kinas (1956–1990). Kūrėjai. Filmai. Kontekstai" viena iš įgyvendintojų.

Mokslinių interesų sferos: sovietmečio sociokultūriniai procesai, kino studijos, kino, televizijos ir mėgėjiško kino istorija, kino paveldo saugojimo strategijos. Moksliniai interesai derinami ir su praktine veikla: kartu su bendraminčiais įkūrė pirmąją Lietuvoje filmoteką (VšĮ „Meno avilys. Mediateka"), kurioje vykdomi kino tyrimų patirties mainai, rūpinamasi kino paveldo objektų saugojimu. Bendradarbiaujant su kino kūrėjais, inicijavo pirmą lietuvių kino paveldo kūrinių skaitmeninimo ir restauravimo projektą „Kino inkliuzai" („Lietuvių dokumentinio kino antologija").

Short Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate

Lina Kaminskaitė-Jančorienė was born on 3rd June in 1982, Vilnius. In 2001–2005 studied at Vilnius University, Faculty of History, and graduated with B.A. in cultural history and anthropology. In 2005–2007 she continued her studies at Vilnius University, Faculty of History, and graduated with M. A. in history. In 2007–2013 she was a doctoral candidate at Vilnius University's Faculty of History. Since 2011 has been a member of the International Association for Media and History (IAMHIST); since 2012 a member of the Lithuanian Amateur Filmmakers Union; since 2013 a member of Film Council of the Lithuanian Film Centre within the Ministry of Culture. From 2012 onwards she has been participating in the scientific project *Lithuanian Cinema (1956–1990). Creators. Films. Contexts*.

Scientific interests cover the socio-cultural processes of the Soviet period, film history, history of the cinema, television and amateur film, strategies for the preservation of film heritage. Scientific interest is combined with a practical activity: with the like-minded colleagues established the first *cinematheque* in Lithuania (public institution "Meno avilys. Mediatheque") whose activity involves the exchange of film research experiences and conservation of the objects of cinema heritage. Furthermore, in collaboration with filmmakers, Lina initiated the first cinematic project of restoration and digitization of Lithuanian films – *Cinematic Inclusions* (aka *Anthology of Lithuanian Documentary Cinema)*.