

The Influence of Masterpieces of World Cinema on the Creative Worldview of the Filmmaker

Vladimir S. Malyshev

Doctor of Arts, Professor

Abstract: The essay focuses on the analysis of the creative process, an important aspect of art studies. In this particular case, the author examines how the aesthetic experience of artistic phenomena influences the formation and evolution of a filmmaker's style and worldview. As a rule, studies devoted to well-known filmmakers analyze various stages of their creative paths, their artistic language, and important biographical information that supplements and enriches our understanding of a particular personality. Here the author's attention is drawn to the initial creative impulse received by a filmmaker in his or her younger years after watching a masterpiece of world cinema, and to its influence on the formation of particular ethical and aesthetic principles. On the basis of his personal communication with such established film directors as Marlen Khutsiev, Lev Kulidzhanov, Vadim Abdrashitov, Otar Ioseliani, Eldar Ryazanov, Sergei Soloviev and Vladimir Khotinenko, the author correlates the films which became important events in the development of filmmakers' personalities with their own artistic styles developed in the course of several decades of creative activity. The essay's subject is relevant to young cinematographers who are just starting their creative journey, as well as to professional film critics and film historians.

Key words: filmmaker's biography, artistic creativity, film direction, Russian cinema, Gosfilmofond, masterpieces of world cinema

The personality of the artist has occupied the minds of philosophers, writers, and psychologists for the entire period of the development of human culture. A variety of perceptions of the "world view" by the creative personality, the issues of creation of the work of art, inspiration, and mastership were present in the works of Plato, Thomas Aquinas, S. Freud, C. G. Jung, J. Ortega y Gasset, J. Maritain, L. Vygotsky, and many other thinkers. When the art of filmmaking appeared, a lot of works were written devoted to famous film directors. Such works analyze, as a rule, the stages of their creative process, peculiarities of artistic style, and details of lives enriching our knowledge about the movie director. The value of theoretical works of the

filmmaking art experts should be noted (such as S.M. Eizenstein¹, G. Mo. Kozintsev², L. Buñuel³, I. Bergman⁴, F. Fellini⁵ and others), as well as their numerous interviews, where one can find the story about creative searches, and many details of a private and personal nature, disclosing the peculiarities of the spiritual world of a creator.

The present article presents only one, but an important fact from the biography of the number of outstanding film directors of the domestic moviemaking industry, and a full life description of them definitely deserves separate research. Actually we talk about the key issue for the screen art – the role and value of the initial creative pulse which occurs when watching the masterpieces of world cinema, which later became the basis of the world perception, ethical and the esthetic principles of film art experts. For young filmmakers starting their creative journey and frequently lost in the modern information-saturated environment, this subject is of great importance. With a high degree of accessibility to different media sources, it is possible to see almost any cinematographic work without going outside. This situation can be evaluated as, on the one hand, a favorable factor assuring wide opportunities for self-education, an expansion of perspective in the area of the global filmmaking process, and the accumulation of the intellectual potential in general. On the other hand, the same informational freedom, with easy access and a lot of movies of variable quality, can be negatively reflected in the level of analytical reflection, of a critical attitude to films. In this article, in which the key to raising the issue was personal communication with outstanding film directors, an attempt is made to compare peculiarities of perception of the movie that became an event in development of the film director's personality, with the features of the artistic style of an expert. Probably, the ability to see and hear something really important in the 'polyphony' of the modern artistic environment, which was absorbed by the remarkable experts in their young age, would help the ingénue film directors in the selection of personal esthetic preferences, in the determination of their creative destiny.

In conversations with the great experts of domestic filmmaking, the initial point of discussions was the issue of the one film out of all the masterpieces of world cinema that was decisive for the dialog partner, one way or another. During such film watching, the great artists appeared to be vigilant when speaking about the past and in viewing the future of the film art

¹ Ehjzenshtejn S.M. Izbrannye proizvedeniya: v 6 t. [Selected Works: in 6 v.] – M.: Iskusstvo, 1964.

² Kozincev G.M. Sobranie sochinenij v 5 tt. [Collected Works in 5 v.] – L.: Iskusstvo, 1983.

³ Bunyuehl' o Bunyuehle [Bunuel about Bunuel]. – M.: Raduga, 1989. – 384 p.

⁴ Bergman I. ZHestokij mir kino [Cruel world of cinema]. – M.: Vagrius, 2006. – 464 p.

⁵ Fellini F. Delat' fil'm [Make a movie]. – M.: Iskusstvo, 1984. – 287 p.

development. Film directors' insights and revelations in this regard are sometimes very surprising and accurate. One can say that this is the moment of a dialog of two characters in one person – the film director, our immediate contemporary, and a young guy having watched one of the first movies in his life.

Frequently, to be more precise with the frequency detecting consistency, the film directors spoke about movies they watched in childhood or youth. In the recent past, that could include a major part of the 20th century, when the movie in the USSR was surprisingly not such an accessible art form. In particular, this is typical for the period from the end of the 1920s to the beginning of the 1960s. Just a few films were made, and only a few foreign movies made it to Soviet distribution. Actually, watching any foreign movie became an extraordinary event for the future film expert, affecting sometimes the choice of occupation and the esthetic preferences of those working in filmmaking.

In 1990s, during a crisis of the domestic filmmaking, Gosfilmofond, as the place of storage of historical memory and of artistic heritage depository, became the place of creative communication for many film directors, especially of the older generation. Gosfilmofond was visited by Marlen Khutsiev, Stanislav Rostotsky, Eldar Ryazanov, Lev Kulidzhanov, Vadim Abdrashitov, and Vladimir Khotinenko and many others. They shared their feelings about movies, the filmmaking art, and the occupation of film director.

Complicated simplicity of morals. Marlen Khutsiev and “Chapaev” by Vasilyevs brothers

Marlen Martynovich Khutsiev, one of the patriarchs of domestic moviemaking, is still a working film director. The best confirmation of the fact was a retrospective of his movies on TV in October 2015. Movies of Khutsiev are in demand as they are up to date. “Spring on Zarechnaya Street” (1956) was his first movie, not taking into account the diploma film “Urban planners” (1950), and is not only nostalgic but topical. Probably because in the 21st century with all its peculiarities and absolutely different atmosphere to experience during the youth of Khutsiev, people of complicated destiny are in high demand, people of instinct with inner integrity, individuals with ethical dilemmas, those who retain an optimistic view of life. Such characters in Khutsiev's movies express the state and period of the society life called “thaw” – a time of great expectations after dramatic hardships.

Currently, there is great demand for the ethical thaw as a form of compensation for the toughness and severity which had appeared in the art, pragmatism and moral destruction at the edge of cynicism and beyond it affected the depreciation of the movie esthetics. Genres of movies, the thriller, horror, supernatural, disaster, melodrama, art house, philosophic films, psychological drama, humor of various types and levels, including black comedy – too many to count, compete for the audience. What else is required? Why do we say “There's nothing to

watch...” at the standard mass audience level? Sometimes there is nothing to object or refer spectator to classic. What is really needed is a complicated simplicity of story about the human lives in the time flow, warmth, and sympathy, close attention to an individual; lifeline, an assurance that both individual and society are able to improve. The phenomenal success of “I Am Twenty” (1964) demonstrated that the creative vector of Khutsiev had not changed; however, his vision became more vigilant; questions to himself, to the character and time became more serious than in the first movie. The truth that “time creates a person” is kept but a person must change his context, make it better. It is a heavy job, but that is the goal of life and youth with its moral maximalism, which is seldom too high. Such maximalism uncovers conscience.

“Byl mesyats may” (It was May) (1970) is a movie about the fact that war ended with victory persisting in people’s hearts; it lives on in memories, images. This is natural, as human memory, the ability to remember, realize, and understand, is a brilliant feature of an individual and a generation. Movies of Marlen Khutsiev are complicated and absolutely clear. This characterizes his late movies even more, “Epilogue” (1983) and “Infinity” (2015).

The movie “Chapaev” was an important event in his life, which Marlen Khutsiev described as a folk song. The definition is very accurate – the folk song, as a genre, discloses the individual, his soul, and his dreams. Such assessment is close to the statement of the Vasilyev brothers, that expresses the main idea of the movie: “We want to show people who move events, and events that move and disclose these people. Interaction of these two lines – individual and events – is the central creative task... Together with the actor, through the actor we want to agitate the audience, we want spectators to love our characters and hate our enemies”⁶. The same super-objective determines the creativity of Marlen Khutsiev, does it not?

Lives of real people. Lev Kulidzhanov and “The Grapes of Wrath” by John Ford

Movies of Lev Aleksandrovich Kulidzhanov, “The House I Live In” (1957), “When the Trees Were High” (1961), “Crime and Punishment” (1969) were and still are valuable, loved by filmgoers. They are full of warmth and dramatic quality, of life’s pleasures and human suffering.

L. Kulodzhanov highlighted John Ford’s “The Grapes of Wrath” (1940) – as a milestone work of the American film director. It would be naïve to look for some direct “effects” or clear parallels in the work of these two artists of different generations, who worked in different countries and different conditions. However, great directors always share something similar, and this is, first of all, the level of artistic thought. There may be different schools, different styles, different plots, different positions, but there is something in common among the entire world of the expert community – this is the level of the world picture perception, the professional level

⁶ Masterpieces of the Russian movies. – M.: RF Goskino, NII of Film art, 2000. Pp. 133.

and the extent of creative intelligence of an individual. Film experts interpret this on a scientific level; spectators have their own experience, their own degree of perception, and their own criteria. It is good that these evaluations often coincide relative to the lives and work of the great artists.

The biography and creativity of Lev Aleksandrovich Kulidzhanov is well known and well studied. His place in the hierarchy of the film artists is closely connected with the life of his wider generation. Men born in 1924 (The director was born in March 1924) gave their lives for the Motherland in the Great Patriotic War. Those who survived would have been burdened with greater ethical responsibility. Because of his health condition, Lev Kulidzhanov was not called up to the army; therefore he felt a responsibility for the dead ones, which was presented in his movies “It started like this...” (1956), “The House I Live In” (1957), “Father’s House” (1959), “Lost Photo” (1960), “When the Trees Were High” (1961), “Blue Notebook” (1963), “Crime and Punishment” (1969), “Start Minute” (1972), “Not afraid to die” (1991), and “Forget-me-nots” (1994).

The parents of Kulidzhanov were purged, and these dramatic events in his life could not help affecting the formation of the ethical vector of his creativity. His movies carefully open up the inner world of an individual; they tell about the hard life of real people. In this regard his two works about Lenin and Marx – “Blue Notebook” and “Karl Marx: The Early Years” are not a tribute to cinematographic formality. Kulidzhanov sees the human and the dramatic in his characters, rather than ideological features and public leadership. His way in occupation that became his mission, a process of self-fulfillment and attainment of creative maturity, coincided with the first years after the war, a rather difficult time for art. This was the time of the highest demand to himself, highest demand from the audiences, colleagues, reviewers, and the authorities, that had administrative power and sometimes had a decisive voice in the life of movies and artists.

Despite all obstacles, accidental or regular, the artist succeeded and made his way with good grace. Kulidzhanov was not damaged by the 5th Meeting of the Filmmaking Union. Being a “man of the sixties” in spirit, which means a person of great inner freedom, he kept a belief in people, finding in real people, as well as in his characters, kindness as the basis of an active life. And it should be noted that despite high positions and intense public activity, Kulidzhanov was striving to and was able to help people. That is not his creative merits, but is included in the list of his high personal qualities.

Philosophic clarity of reality. Vadim Abdrashitov and “City Lights” of Charlie Chaplin

Vadim Abdrashitov watched “City Lights” (1931) by Charlie Chaplin when he was twenty years old, the romantic age of the young man. He was so impressed that decades later he said: “I

did not formulate but understood that this was remarkable movie, great movie, that this was the category of high art". What is the way for young person, even a teenager, to realize the great artistic and ethical scale of the movie? Probably, due to the acuity that will become part of the bright and original talent of the film director? Or "City Lights" shines a light into the depths of the heart? That is true; great movies rely on illuminating the heart but only when the heart is able to shine. It would be nice to state metaphoric thought: when people watch a movie then the movie looks into people choosing its own people, to whom it is addressed.

Philosophical movies by V. Abdrashitov, first of all, made in 1982 and 1984 – "The Train Has Stopped" and "The Parade of Plants", attracted the attention of reviewers and audiences, because these movies had an artistic view on the problem, an understanding of issues that engaged people in any time.

The philosophic component of the movies is so powerful and so clear that the movies are discussed as public events rather than simply interesting films. Besides, as time has gone on, it becomes more and more clear that Abdrashitov detected moral diseases of the society in the stagnancy period, but also diseases that mankind would struggle with because they are very dangerous they mimicking, and have chronic nature. It is about the moral destruction of society and individual, that the spiritual search is painful but is the only true way to stay a human being.

It is neither a mistake nor an assumption to say that the great artist always speaks about the main event in the life whatever movie he makes: philosophic parable as "City Lights", or melodrama. Abdrashitov says: "Chaplin is a Renaissance man, of the scale of Leonardo da Vinci, a man who was able to do everything, absolutely everything".

Movies by Vadim Abdrashitov are simple in form, which confirms their high creativity. In response to statements of some reviewers that his movies are attributed to art house, he said: "I think that my movies and movies of Mindadze can hardly be attributed to this so-called trend. I want to underline – so-called, because we always spoke clearly and distinctly and always meant the future spectators. Our movies, when they were well distributed, they were demanded by the audience. So I cannot attribute my films to art house. I suspect that art house today is when a movie is not composed, is not coordinated, there is disorder between thoughts and emotions, and sometimes with picture, focuses for the sake of focuses – that is what is called art house".

"For new horizons in the film language" is the name of the award received by Vadim Abdrashitov for "Servant" (1988). Probably, it is not the main prize in the collection of his awards, taking into account that horizons of a person going forward are always new. "I'm very excited about what goes after the film end," says Abdrashitov. These words can be considered the message to young filmmakers: the movie is a performance to a certain extent, actually and ultimately it is the possibility to understand the world and yourself.

Time polyphony. Otar Iosseliani and “L’Atalanta” by Jean Vigo

Sometimes when we watch a movie from the middle of last century, one notices its spiritual and ethical unity with later films of other film directors from different countries. Such a spiritual affinity is probably the main component of the art of filmmaking of all arts, and of the entire civilization process. Every next step in creativity continues the way already made. This does not mean that cinematography has linear development, based on one pattern and algorithm found once and forever. There are cases when film language and director philosophy transcended the period and was realized decades later. Superficially simple but great movies have a difficult but great destiny.

That is what happened with “L’Atalanta” by the brilliant Jean Vigo. The first night of “L’Atalanta” was in 1934, and the full director version was shown at the beginning of the 1960s. According to the English journal “Sight & Sound”, in 1962 the movie took 10th place among the best movies of all time, and in 1992 it took 5th place. Viewers do not need to know this assessment of reviewers to have their own opinion about the qualities of the film. From the first shots, the viewer gets the feeling of life joy that fills the movie. A happy, almost pastoral ending, seems to be (and is) the only possible end to the movie, while in many other films the end is socially and ethically false.

The movies of Otar Iosseliani do not have happy endings. But there is, as in “There once was a singing blackbird” (1970), an absolute confidence in the life flow presented at the highest degree of creativity. We do not see any events, disasters, anything at all remarkable. But we observe and realize something more: “life, tears and love”, the spiritual search of the young character. The movie title, which is fantastically correlated with the film, is taken from Georgian folklore; the movie by Jean Vigo is based on the plot that could be taken from a fairy tale by Charles Perrault. Both directors of different movie ages are united by their own vision of the world. “Everyone can have their own method,” says Iosseliani, “I treat movie making and the process flowing in time due to my feeling of rhythm, attitude to passages of my time feeling required for the object concerned, and I impose this time on you. I can’t consider your slow or fast motion because I compose my movie according to the laws that I invented for myself and that relate to the musical form. For example, I try to escape the sonata form, i.e. collision of two opposite forms, in the theory of music is also called the struggle, development, collision and work-out. And on the contrary, I take as a sample polyphonic composition, fugue with counterpoint, with repeated themes, with latent themes coming at the forefront”.

Thinking about Iosseliani’s remarks, we understand that they are applicable to “L’Atalanta”. Jean Vigo died in 1934, when he was only 29 years old, the year when

“L’Atalanta” was shown and when Otar Iosseliani was born, who immigrated to France in 1982. For moviemaking, Vigo left the Sorbonne; Iosseliani came to cinematography from mathematics. With sorrow and pain, and wisdom, the way that only an artist and passionate person could, Otar Iosseliani said, “It’s a pity that we all are short-lived; it’s a pity that Vigo is not with us today. It would be nice to talk to him, to chit-chat and have a cup of tea....”

Heart music. Eldar Ryazanov and “The Great Waltz” of Julien Duvivier

Director monologues about seen and re-watched movies of the past sometimes have unexpected reveals. As a rule, directors say that the first movie they remember forever they watched in childhood, sometimes in their youth. Thoughts of Eldar Aleksandrovich Ryazanov about “The Great Waltz” by Julien Duvivier correlate with the thoughts that in the 1930s, before the most dangerous war in the history of mankind, the most delicate, tender, musical, comedic, and lyrical movies were made in different countries. Thus, “L’Atalanta” by Jean Vigo was made in 1934, “The Great Waltz” by Julien Duvivier in 1938, and “Volga, Volga” by Grigory Aleksandrov was made also in 1938. These are absolutely different movies, though they have something in common — they tell about happiness, about the delicacy of beauty, about the require freedom of the soul of man. This main statement was clearly read in the ideological weight of the comedy by Aleksandrov, as well as in the brilliant idea-free film of Duvivier, and in the touching movie by Vigo. Cinematography warned about the possibility of losing this beauty, the artist’s intuition allowed then the hearing of the tectonic roar of history. It was also heard by those who made “The Great Waltz”, including the great actress Miliza Korjus and composer Dmitry Temkin, who made musical arrangements of the works of Johann Strauss for the movie. They were Russian emigrants who left their Motherland due to different reasons. “To a certain extent it was a Russian movie” said Vitaly Vulf in one of the programs of his cycle “Silver globe”.

For domestic audiences, the first real comedy made after the war was “Carnival Night” by Eldar Ryazanov, shown in 1956 and presented an atmosphere of the flow of spirits, joy, happiness, with young love denying indolence and routine. In his book “Not summarized results” Eldar Ryazanov wrote: “I was going to make a realistic, not only funny but ‘poisonous’ movie, where social motives – disclosure of Ogurtsov – would be predominant. It means that I attempted to make satirical comedy first of all satirizing fool-bureaucrats sitting in the wrong place. It would be nice, I thought, if the movie provokes laughter and bitterness. Though Pyryev headed me toward more conditional film-performance, where brilliance, music, carnival would make the flow of spirits and Ogurtsov would be only ridiculous, funny, without scaring anybody. Vivid, comic manner of Ilyinsky from Pyryev’s point of view was ideal for such interpretation. Though Ivan Aleksandrovich did not deny the satirical component of the movie, he supposed

that the grotesque and buffoonery would enhance satire. I was sure (then and now) that the so-called realistic satire is more accurate, more stinging, more ponderous”⁷.

There is no need to argue with an expert. However, the satirical component of the movie was hardly the main one for viewers. But the musical element would never lose its beauty. Eldar Aleksandrovich Ryazanov is probably the only satirist in whose movies music is much required and organic to the extent that it almost becomes a character. Comedy dramas of Ryazanov make you laugh till you cry. To the commotion of the spirits made by melodies, songs and poems heard in the movies. Eldar Ryazanov speaks about the remarkable movie of Julien Duvivier “The Great Waltz” with great panache. This movie was first shown in our country in 1940 and then was back in distribution after twenty years. It was seen and loved by millions of people. The old pre-war movie is a timeless classic.

The spirit of modernity and dialogs of times. Sergey Solovyev and “The Lady with the Dog” by Iosif Kheifits

In his thoughts about “The lady and the dog” (1960), Sergey Solovyev started with touching and dramatic memories about childhood, when did not “violin”, though he didn’t want to have. For seven years he considered studying playing the piano, after which “... I was given a piece of paper that I studied, everybody played and I announced performers”. After he became a famous, bright and original film director, he filled his movies with music very organically – when appealing to the Russian classic literature and when making his cult-favorite trilogy: “Assa” (1987), “Black rose is an emblem of sorrow, red rose is and emblem of love” (1989) and “The house under the starry heaven” (1991). As well as the language, music absorbs and reflects all new, required for this time. It is important for the director to understand the principle of selection of the life material, feel public and cultural demand, the spirit of the times. This principle was used, for example, in Italian neo-realism and affected the Soviet movie industry of the “thaw period”.

“The lady with the dog” by Iosif Kheifits made at “Lenfilm” in 1960 for the 100th anniversary of Chekhov’s birth also demonstrated the mood of the times, the humanistic spirit of 1960s, shown on the screen a new insight on the man, the sight of his inner delicacy, a complicated spiritual life. Therefore the genre of the movie is difficult to define: the brief but true love story of Anna Sergeevna and Gurov cannot be pushed into the limits of either melodrama or romantic comedy.

The Trilogy of Solovyev reflected the spirit of the new time, sounding severe. The way of marvelous, dramatic, great, not fully understood, not to say about the complete implementation of the “Soviet project” was over. The entire atmosphere of reality was condensed to thunder

⁷ Ryazanov E.H.A. *Nepodvedennye itogi [Inconclusive Results]*. – M.: Vagrius, 2007. – 688 p.

density. The words of Viktor Tsoy song “We expect changes, our hearts require changes” rattled in the movie “Assa”, and society believed that changes would come and would be joyful. And the film director Solovyev heard the far sounds of thunder, which soon would shake the sky right above the head, above the million demonstrating in squares, above the one sixth of the Earth covered by the USSR. “Assa” made in 1987, anticipated the “crazy” nineties. Nobody escaped this feeling, who passed through those decades with open eyes. A film director is not a politologist, futurologist, or visionary. He speaks about current events in the society, examining and demonstrating what is going on in people’s hearts.

The logic of thinking about the urgency of creativity of Sergey Solovyev can hardly include all his movies, as their great part is screen adaptation of domestic classics – Chekhov, Pushkin, Tolstoy. Russian literature is very cinematographic, as seen by the number of indicators starting from the plot, imagery of characters, saturation and the dynamic of dialogs, and finishing with the most delicate vividness and uniqueness of each word.

Screen adaptation of classics for Solovyev is not an escape from the Soviet era or current liberal-democratic-patriotic modernity. This is much more a dialog with time arranged by the film director. “I have very large stylistic classification of my preferences, my movies are absolutely different; however, in the entire wide range, it is important not to fall down into such unbending irresponsibility relative to myself”, says Solovyev.

Via screen adaptation of the Russian classics, the film director attempts to explain modernity. His own understanding of modernity! And to express his own cultural, spiritual protestation against the archaic, obsolete, and outmoded in this modernity.

Internal surrealism. Vladimir Khotinenko and “Un Chien Andalou” by Luis Buñuel

The monologue of Vladimir Khotinenko about the cult-favorite film of Luis Buñuel, was a philosophically deep conversation about moviemaking, himself, life and death, and art. “I’m not a movie expert”, says the director. Probably, therefore the limits of his statement are so wide, that it is so internally free. The director does not examine anything purposely, does not step to the area of the movie science, he just says: “...I always stated that I’m consistent Buñuel-lover, and in general I make surrealistic movies.” “For me this is not just my favorite movie, this is the decisive movie – “Un Chien Andalou”. And one more thought, very important: “Surrealism has come inside, it has gone into people’s relations. Far away...” But actually what has gone? Or to be more correct, what has come to people’s relations created by movie tools so powerfully developed by Buñuel? The complicated form was followed by the complicated artistically presented feelings. Multilayered, non-obvious reasons and consequences, the mystery of the man’s soul life has come.

Vladimir Khotinenko talks about Buñuel's influence as being about "irradiation with talent", about similarity of the world feeling and paradoxical affinity spread in time and space, about wonderful and therefore seldom "rhyme" of creativity. Surrealism has gone into people's relations. This is confirmed by movies and TV series made by the film director starting from the middle of the 1980s – "Mirror for a Hero" (1987), "Patriotic comedy" (1992), "Makarov" (1993), "Moslem" (1995), "Priest" (2009), "Dostoevsky" (2011), "The Possessed" (2014) and others. Being loved by people and appreciated by professionals, these films are hard to correlate with the work of any other great directors. They are special. They are independent of so-called trends, tendencies and any directly understood effects. Is it unexpected to say – as well as the movie of Luis Buñuel? Everything really valuable is not similar to something else really valuable. It should not be similar, otherwise cinematography would have died as the art. Not pretending to present even the shortest essay of life and creativity of Vladimir Khotinenko, let us mention two facts of his life. In his youth, he worked at the Pavlodar tractor plant as the artist designer (not very mass occupation), and then he was commissar of the youth organization "Grinabel", where he had a uniform and weapons. The organization included both hooligans and regular guys. The organization was famous all over the Soviet Union; the experience of offenders' correction was successful, as was the experience of the future film director; upbringing. "I can be wrong, but I believed that since the time when I was formed, I made surrealistic movies. Not to say that Russia has ideal "soil" for this. We live in the absolutely surrealistic world, and actually any film is surrealistic, one way or another".

In the summary it should be noted that most film directors speak rather subtly about the direct influence on their creativity of those movies that they repeatedly watched in Gosfilmofond (State movies fund). This is clear; experts of that level do not need to speak about the external decisive effect of their creativity, but no two effects are alike. Shakespeare, for example, influenced the entire world of playwriting, Pushkin – the entire Russian literature. Charlie Chaplin – the world of cinematography, thus, influence is an enlarging concept. It seems that one film is small in comparison with thousands of wonderful movies that significantly affect one individual and entire people, their national self-consciousness. However, according to O.A. Krivtsov, philosopher-esthete, "any 'insignificant' details of private life become fantastically complicated only in comparison with the scale of acting personality. In this case interpretation of all life events is filled in with different, special sense"⁸. Therefore for young moviemakers, who will probably become great personalities, it is important to "tune" their intuition so as not to miss their own movie in the flow of film products.

⁸ Krivtsov O.A. *Ehstetika [Aesthetics]*. – M.: Aspect-Press, 1998. – 430 p.

REFERENCES:

1. Bergman I. ZHestokij mir kino [Cruel world of cinema]. – M.: Vagrius, 2006. – 464 p.
2. Bunyuehl' o Bunyuehle [Bunuel about Bunuel]. – M.: Raduga, 1989. – 384 p.
3. Kozincev G.M. Sobranie sochinenij v 5 tt. [Collected Works in 5 v.] – L.: Iskusstvo, 1983.
4. Krivcun O.A. EHstetika [Aesthetics]. – M.: Aspekt-Press, 1998. – 430 p.
5. Ryazanov EH.A. Nepodvedennye itogi [Inconclusive Results]. – M.: Vagrius, 2007. – 688 p.
6. Fellini F. Delat' fil'm [Make a movie]. – M.: Iskusstvo, 1984. – 287 p.
7. EHjzenshtejn S.M. Izbrannye proizvedeniya: v 6 t.[Selected Works: in 6 v.] – M: Iskusstvo, 1964.