

DZIGA VERTOV

Author(s): David Bordwell and DZIGA VERTOV

Source: *Film Comment*, SPRING 1972, Vol. 8, No. 1 (SPRING 1972), pp. 38-42

Published by: Film Society of Lincoln Center

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43752889>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Film Society of Lincoln Center is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Film Comment*

JSTOR

DZIGA VERTOV

an introduction by David Bordwell



Until a few years ago, Dziga Vertov was only dimly visible in the imposing collective shadow of Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Dovzhenko, and Eisenstein. Since the Twenties, critics and historians tended, rather inconsistently, to dismiss Vertov either as a Russian Lumière, passively recording reality, or as a monomaniacal formalist. In France, Eisenstein partisans were quick to attack Vertov for a lack of stylistic invention: Jean Mitry, believing the objectivity of the camera to be a pleasant fiction, claimed that Vertov refused "to compose reality before the camera," and Léon Moussinac asserted as early as 1928 that "Vertov substitutes reality itself for a feeling about reality." On the other hand, English disciples of Eisenstein found Vertov "an austere fanatic . . . obsessed with form" (Thorold Dickinson) and, despite his "virtuosity," "rather out of date" (Paul Rotha, 1930).

Such verdicts, while unconsciously recognizing the basic tenets in Vertov's aesthetic, scarcely do justice to a filmmaker who seems from our perspective today a vital, if eccentric, figure. It is clear now that Vertov's rambunctious manifestos, theories, and films were an essential part of the creative explosion that propelled the Soviet cinema of the 1920's to world prominence. Moreover, the man who coined the phrase and the concept of *cinéma-vérité* and who in 1923 prophesied television and multimedia can hardly be considered "out of date." When Leacock speaks of a "Living Camera" and Godard quotes Vertov in *WIND FROM THE EAST*, one is made acutely aware of the modernity of a theorist and filmmaker whom critical tradition has relegated to the status of a flamboyant fanatic. Not only, then, does Vertov's career typify the aspirations, energies, and eventual defeat of the Soviet avant-garde, but his work remains of capital importance to film history as a whole.



Vertov, like Pudovkin and Eisenstein, was a curious mixture of scientist and artist. Born Denis Kaufman, in Poland in 1896, he began writing poetry at the age of ten and for a while attended the Bialystok Music Conservatory; later, while studying medicine in Moscow, he wrote poems and satires. (It was perhaps during this period that he adopted the pseudonym Dziga Vertov—from the Ukrainian "spinning top" and the Russian "turning.") From his medical studies and his literary activity stems the characteristic Vertov duality of scientific control and artistic impulse, two preoccupations which

fused in a concern with the idea of montage. Science, poetry, and music blended in his sound-recording experiments in the "Laboratory of Hearing" which he set up in St. Petersburg in 1916. He later recalled this work, which resembled contemporary experiments of Russian and Italian Futurists, as "a fascination with a montage of stenographic notes and sound recording—in particular, a fascination with the possibility of documenting sounds in writing, in attempts to depict in words and letters the sound of a waterfall, the noise of a sawmill, in musical-thematic creations of word-montage."

From this it was only a step to the cinema. "One day in spring 1918—return from a station. In my ears there persisted the gasps and puffing of the departing train . . . Overheard curses . . . A kiss . . . An exclamation . . . Laughs, whistles, bells, voices . . . And, continuous throughout, thoughts: it is necessary to find a machine which is capable not of describing but registering, of photographing these sounds. Otherwise one cannot organize or assemble them. They fly, as time flies. But perhaps a camera? . . . To register what one sees. To organize not the audible world but the visible world? Is that the answer? And at this moment, a meeting with Mikhail Koltzov who offered a job in the cinema." Through Koltzov, Vertov became an editor for the newsreel section of the Moscow Cinema Committee. Vertov the technician was to master the challenges of this new means of registering parts of reality, while Vertov the artist was to discover in the assemblage of these parts a new medium of formal expression.

Not that the discovery belonged to him alone. Between 1910 and 1918, the montage idea was distinctly in the air in avant-garde art. This was the time of Boccioni's Futurist sculpture, Braque's and Picasso's cubism, and Apollinaire's fragment-poems. The Russian Futurists had experimented with assemblage-principles in many media: Malevich's early cubistic, collage-like paintings, Tatlin's sculptures of real materials projecting spikily into space, Meyerhold's theatrical productions which systematically decomposed classical texts, Mayakovsky's machine-gun bursts of verse, and even the linguistic researches of the Formalist literary critics had all prefigured a technique of fragmentation and recombination of materials that was later to dominate the Soviet avant-garde. When the Revolution came, the Futurists welcomed it eagerly and put themselves at the disposal of the Bolshevik regime by designing posters, working on agit-trains, fighting in the Civil War, and organizing a new culture for the new state.

The pressing political demands of the moment thus caused most artists to temporarily put aside their experiments with montage, but Vertov's job as compiler of newsreel footage gave him a unique opportunity to apply principles of assemblage to the new medium of film. Between 1918 and 1921, Vertov edited the first Soviet newsreel series KINONEDELIA (CINEMA WEEKLY), supervised the newsreels shot on the Civil War front, compiled footage for two long films, THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION (1919) and BATTLE AGAINST CZARISM (1920), put together several shorts for the agit-trains, and, in late 1921, climaxed his apprenticeship with a thirteen-part HISTORY OF THE CIVIL WAR. At first, he was simply ordering casual footage. "KINONEDELIA," he recalled, "hardly distinguished itself from preceding newsreels; only the subtitles were Soviet. The content never changed—always the same parades, the same funerals." Gradually, though, Vertov realized that even such material could be arranged in significant patterns, and artistic expression could supersede the mechanical linking of shots. By 1921, Vertov had experimented with one- and two-frame shots, tinting, and the shooting of original footage. With the stabilization of the Soviet government and the end of the Russian blockade, many avant-garde artists were ready to return to their experiments, and Vertov was by this time firmly in their midst.

The beginning of the 1920's witnessed enormous controversy among Soviet artists. It was a time of attack, regrouping, and counterattack, of manifestos, journals, and heated public debates. The issues at stake were large ones. What kind of art was best for the Soviet people? What was the artist's role in Soviet society? Vertov, who had gathered a following of zealous young documentarists, took a firm position in the "Council of Three" manifesto (1920), which attacked theatrical and literary films as "impotence" and "technical backwardness" and compared an interest in narrative film to an interest in one's own backside. Dr. Vertov had examined the commercial cinema and diagnosed its disease as malnutrition: Soviet film was gorging itself on ersatz drama. The only remedy was a healthy diet of real life, in the form of the newsreel-documentary. Two years later, Vertov got a chance to try a cure: in January of 1922, Lenin ordered the establishment of a fixed ratio between Soviet documentary and entertainment films (this ratio was called Leninist proportion). Within four months, Vertov released the first issue of KINO-PRAVDA.

"In their own time," Vertov later wrote of his KINO-PRAVDA episodes, "these funny experiments evoked not laughter but a storm of controversies, ideas, and plans." The twelve issues of KINO-PRAVDA released in 1922 were usually popular with audiences, but Vertov's experiments—e.g., mixing footage from various sources to make a point, using specially-designed inter-titles—drew the fire of the press and those whom Vertov called "the apostles of cinema." In December of 1922, the "Council of Three" renamed itself the "Kino-oki" ("Cinema-Eyes") and issued a vitriolic manifesto in defense of Vertov's work. "We declare that the old romance



Museum of Modern Art/Film Stills Archive

DZIGA VERTOV

films, theatrical films, and the like have leprosy! Don't let your eyes go near them! Don't let your eyes touch them! Fatal! Contagious!" The Kino-oki proposed a new cinema, based on technology ("We introduce the creative joy in each mechanical job, we marry men to their machines"), poetry ("Long live the poetry of the changing, moving machines!"), and music ("We are in search of a cine-tone-scale"). The manifesto's discussion of the cinematic "interval" prefigures the montage experiments of Vertov and others in the following year: "The intervals (passages from one movement to another) and not the movements themselves constitute the material (elements of the art of movement)."

By 1923, Vertov was allied with Vladimir Mayakovsky's avant-garde LEF group, which gathered together the Constructivist artists Rodchenko and Stepanova, the philologists Brik and Shklovsky, the Futurist poets Krouchonykh and Pasternak, and the theatre directors Meyerhold and Eisenstein. The activities of the LEFists during 1923 show that the time of montage had come. In that year, Rodchenko first utilized photomontage to illustrate the journal *Lef* and Mayakovsky's volume *About This*; Meyerhold's production of *Lake Lyul* used area lighting to switch the audience's attention from one episode to another; Eisenstein's production of *Every Wise Man* featured a technique he called "montage of attractions"; and Vertov's next numbers of KINO-PRAVDA pressed further with explorations of the powers of film montage. The thirteenth episode, dedicated to the anniversary of the revolution, is considered by Vertov's Soviet biographer Abramov a turning-point in Vertov's development because the film was "the first documentary speaking of the country's present, past, and future in language of artistic journalism. The chronicle scenes were not

used solely for their information or newsreel value. For the first time, they served as historical documents: They were put in a film which could be compared to a poem." Besides juxtaposing events from various times and places, Vertov utilized titles designed by Rodchenko to reinforce the theme of revolution.

The editing experiments of KINO-PRAVDA seem to have decisively determined Vertov's Kino-Eye aesthetic, which was first fully expressed in the July issue of Mayakovsky's *Lef*, two months after Eisenstein's "Montage of Attractions" essay had appeared in the same journal. Vertov's article, "Kinoks—Revolution," is a melange of visions, jottings, poems, epigrams, prophecies, and theoretical points, all written in Vertov's brand of incantatory Soviet manifesto style. From the opening poem ("Intestines of experience/Out of the belly of cinematography slashed/By the reef of revolution. . .") to the final prediction of "Newsreel Radio News," the essay, however erratic and willful, represents the first extensive statement of Vertov's theory of the Kino-Eye.

Nothing is clearer from Vertov's "Kinoks—Revolution" essay than the tension between his notion of cinema's scientific precision and his awareness of the camera's purely creative dimensions. At one extreme, Vertov has a very Futurist faith in the power of the movie camera to capture reality completely. "I am eye," proclaims the manifesto, "I am a mechanical eye. I, a machine, am showing you a world, the likes of which only I can see. . . My road is toward the creation of a fresh perception of the world. Thus I decipher in a new way the world unknown to you." In part, this is the world of casually-caught spontaneity. Vertov recalled that he originated the Kino-Eye when, after performing in a film, he did not recognize his own face on the screen: "First thought of the Kino-Eye as a world perceived without a mask, as a world of naked truth." But the camera does not merely copy what we glimpse at odd moments; thanks to the resources of various shooting-speeds and lenses, the camera perfects, fulfills human vision. Moreover, like all machines, the camera can be made constantly more efficient: "We cannot make our eyes better than they have been made, but the movie camera we can perfect forever." True to his Futurist alliances, Vertov sees the camera as the epitome of modern technology, a mechanically accurate, scientific registering of the world.

Simultaneously, though, Vertov maintains that by editing, cinema organizes reality into a kind of totally expressive truth, a systematic "research into the chaos of visual phenomena filling the universe." Like Eisenstein, Vertov emphasizes that a series of images can totally grip the viewer's attention: "The eye obeys the will of the camera." In addition, given montage's power to cleave time and space, one can make large-scale points by the juxtaposition of shots; citing KINO-PRAVDA NUMBER 13, Vertov points out that footage shot in different places over a four-year period can be combined into one meaningful sequence. But Vertov doesn't stop with Kuleshov's recognition of montage's narrative powers, for, anticipating Eisenstein's intellectual montage,

Vertov sees that "This unusual flexibility of edited structure allows to introduce [sic] into a movie continuity any political, economic, or any other motif." By the end of the essay, montage has become a means of ordering virtually the entire cosmos: "This is I, apparatus, maneuvering in the chaos of movements, recording one movement after another in the most complex combinations. Freed from the obligation of shooting 16-17 shots [i.e., frames] per second, freed from the frame of time and space, I coordinate any and all points of the universe wherever I may plot them."

Thus Vertov's Kino-Eye theory consists of two components: "1) The Eye, disputing the visual concept of the world and offering its own 'I see' and 2) Kinok-editor, who organizes for the first time what had been so perceived into minutes of life structure." This tension between mechanical objectivity and artistic shaping is by no means unique to Vertov; a similar dichotomy exists in many LEFist works. Such a tension reflects the burgeoning Soviet society's need to justify the artist's role in the life of men and yet recognize the indisputable control the artist exercises over his work.



Vertov's films and polemics of the 1922-1923 period thus take their place as part of the preparation for the astonishing creative outburst that shook the Soviet cinema from 1924 to 1930. With Kozintsev and Trauberg's OKTYABRINA, Kuleshov's MR. WEST IN THE LAND OF THE BOLSHEVIKS, and Eisenstein's STRIKE (all 1924), the montage style was introduced into Soviet cinema. With POTEMKIN (1925), MOTHER (1926), BY THE LAW (1926), THE END OF ST. PETERSBURG (1927), and ZVENIGORA (1927) the style reached its maturity, but by the time of OCTOBER (1928), STORM OVER ASIA (1928), ARSENAL (1929), THE NEW BABYLON (1929), THE GENERAL LINE (1929), and EARTH (1930), montage seemed to many observers merely an end in itself and the bureaucrats' purge of the "formalists" began.

Just as Vertov had helped create the montage style, so his applications of it during this period roughly corresponded to the general trend toward greater experimentation. His feature-length production, KINO-EYE (1924) has an almost crushing structural symmetry, paralleling old and new, youth and age, city and country, disease and health, dissipation and courage. KINO-PRAVDA NUMBER 21 (1924), dedicated to Lenin's memory, pays still more attention to form and style. Broken into three sections, each with its theme carefully built up out of compiled footage, LENIN KINO-PRAVDA uses tinted shots and rhythmically cut inter-titles to evoke specific emotional responses.

Vertov's next feature, STRIDE SOVIET! (1926) contains parallelisms as neat as KINO-EYE's (yesterday and today, capitalism and socialism), but the famous "heart of the machines" sequence, a vibrating montage of mechanical devices, marks a new virtuosity in Vertov's craft. He began acknowledging his artistic intent: a 1925 number of KINO-PRAVDA was labelled a "cine-poem" and STRIDE SOVIET! was subtitled a "symphony." Similarly, Vertov claimed that A SIXTH

OF THE WORLD (1926) was a "lyrical cine-poem"; Abramov compares the film's theme-and-variations form, its verselike inter-titles, and its patriotic fervor to the poetry of Mayakovsky and Whitman. Comparable poetic and musical affinities dominate ELEVENTH YEAR (1928), which turned the construction of the Dniepr dam into a metaphor for Soviet solidarity. Vertov's symbolic superimpositions and his recapitulation, at one point, of key-images from earlier sections of the film reveal the distance he had traveled from the simple reportage of KINONEDELIA. The dispassionate film technician had become a lyrical cine-poet and -composer.

Vertov's formalism reaches giddy heights in THE MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA (1929). Ostensibly a trip through Moscow from dawn to dark, the film is as much an essay on cinema as a tour of a city. Vertov had used the film process as a subject before: one episode of KINO-PRAVDA begins with a reel of film being threaded onto a projector, and in A SIXTH OF THE WORLD Vertov had included a film-within-a-film. But MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA is his only full-length dissertation on the crucial problem of his Kino-Eye theory: the relation of cinema to reality. People in a movie theatre onscreen watch the movie we're watching. Then we watch a cameraman making the film we're watching. Glimpses of everyday life, at first bluish pure "city-symphony" spontaneity, are again and again bracketed by Vertov's reminders of the apparatus of cinema at work. On one level, Vertov wittily attempts to integrate film-making with Soviet life as a whole: a woman putting on her slip is compared to a camera's replacing its lens; hair-cutting is juxtaposed with film-cutting, sewing machines and type-writers with editing machines.

On another level, though, Vertov presents us with an introspective meditation on the ability of film to transform reality. His flaunting of almost every cinematic device (variable speeds, dissolves, split-screen, prismatic lenses, multiple superimpositions) becomes an assertion of the absolute power of the camera. Vertov plays with point-of-view (we see a drunk, then we see the camera filming the drunk) and editing: we are brought up short when, during a burst of frantic movement and frenzied cutting, the frames freeze into a procession of stills moving from a long-shot of the city to a close-up of an old woman; suddenly we are shown a close-up of a child *on a strip of film*. We are now in the editing room, where these bits of real life are assembled at will. At another point, in anticipation of LA CHINOISE, a man audaciously points a camera at us; in the lens we can see the reflection of the camera which is filming that camera. Long before the Marxist film theorists of *Cahiers du Cinéma* and *Cinéthique* called for a cinema which declares its sources in a context of production and consumption, Vertov was mounting a continuous *autocritique* of film-making.

By the end of the film, when a Brobdingnagian cameraman turns his lens toward the tiny crowd beneath, we accept Vertov's demonstration: not only is the Kino-Eye a vital part of life but it offers a way to transcend our vision of life. And yet the world of THE MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA, shorn of psychology, motivation, even causality, exists only

on film; with this startlingly modern work, Vertov abjures the scientific registering of "real life" and explores film as art, artifice, and artifact.



Vertov was unusual among serious filmmakers of the period in that he impatiently awaited the coming of sound; perhaps because of his "Laboratory of Hearing" experiments, he held that visual montage must be complemented by aural montage. The "Kinoks-Revolution" manifesto had already hinted at a synesthetic blend of sound and image: "The ear peeks, the eye eavesdrops." In 1929, Vertov wrote that sounds could be edited as easily as images, and "their editing can make them in harmony or not in harmony, or can mix them in necessarily diverse combinations." It was with eagerness, then, that he began work on his first sound film, ENTHUSIASM or SYMPHONY OF THE DONBASS (1930). Here Vertov tested his theory of sound montage by recording natural sounds and editing them as flexibly in synchronization, in parallelism, in counterpoint—as if they were images.

Although the experiment attracted interest in Europe, it was not popular in Russia. More successful with Soviet audiences was THREE SONGS OF LENIN (1934), generally considered Vertov's masterpiece. Structured on contrasting songs sung by women of Uzbekistan, the film glides freely through time and space to link the women and their music with the life of Lenin. Vertov scoured Soviet archives for newsreels, filmed spontaneous on-the-street interviews, and tracked down recordings of Lenin's speeches; yet he transformed all this raw reportage into a lyrical meditation comparable to Mayakovsky's poem *Vladimir Ilyich Lenin* of ten years before. Images recur like leitmotifs from song to song; sound and image sometimes converge, sometimes separate; dramatically apt settings reinforce the effect of Vertov's specially shot material. "This intervention on the director's part," Abramov observes, ". . . constitutes his renunciation of theories of passive, contemplative recording of reality and reproduction of life 'as it is.'" Built out of much stock footage but composed like a poem or a song-cycle, THREE SONGS OF LENIN marks Vertov's reconciliation of documentary reportage with formal control.

But sound was not the only change in Soviet cinema between 1929 and 1934. The pressure that had been on the extreme leftist artists since the middle Twenties increased powerfully. By 1929, Trotsky had been exiled and Stalin was overseeing the first Five Year Plan; Mayakovsky's *Lef* and *New Lef* had collapsed; and the Association of Proletarian Writers was dictating literary activity. The intensity of the opposition was driven home to the avant-garde by the restraints placed on Mayakovsky; such stifling was generally believed to have triggered his suicide in 1930.

In the same year, *Izvestia* attacked Dovzhenko's EARTH as "counterrevolutionary." The film industry was now under the control of Boris Shumyatsky, who discouraged montage experiments and emphasized story and acting. In 1932, the Central

Committee took power over all artistic activity in the U.S.S.R. and decreed that socialist realism was to be the official style of Soviet art. As a result of this, a new kind of Soviet film emerged—what Luda and Jean Schnitzer euphemistically call the “prose films” (as distinct from the “poetry” of classic montage), or in Dwight Macdonald’s more precise name, the “Stalin school.” Between 1932 and 1934, there appeared Ermler and Yutkevich’s COUNTERPLAN, Pudovkin’s A SIMPLE CASE and DESERTER, Kozintsev’s ALONE, Dovzhenko’s IVAN, and the Vassielevs’ CHAPAYEV. The victory of socialist realism was made abundantly clear at the January 1935 First Congress of Film Workers, which presented the ugly spectacle of the 1920’s montage masters, in an orgy of confession, promising to repent and in turn denouncing each other for formalism.

Vertov’s position in all this furor seems to have been ambiguous. THE MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA and ENTHUSIASM were scarcely socialist realism and prompted even Eisenstein to rap Vertov’s knuckles for “formalist jackstraws and unmotivated camera mischief.” Thus, between 1930 and 1934, Vertov was forced to turn out several essays defending himself against charges of formalism. But Vertov had also once advocated realism of a sort, and THREE SONGS OF LENIN, perhaps because it had a clear structure and a sanctified subject, was acceptable to the cultural bureaucrats. A 1935 anniversary volume on the Soviet cinema notes that Vertov was “among the early advocates of Soviet themes,” compares his early work favorably to Kuleshov’s, and congratulates him on THREE SONGS OF LENIN. Perhaps the ambivalence of Vertov’s position at this time is best revealed by the ranking of awards concluding the 1935 Film Workers congress: Vertov’s seventeen years of work in the Soviet film industry was rewarded by the Order of the Red Star—far below the honors accorded to the more tractable Vassiliev, Pudovkin, and Dovzhenko, but nonetheless a notch above the current pariahs, Eisenstein and Kuleshov.

But even this degree of favor in 1935 doesn’t seem to have benefited Vertov in the long run. In 1937, he made his last independent film, LULLABY, another “cine-song,” this time on the theme of motherhood; it is reported to have many of the traits of THREE SONGS OF LENIN. After this, he compiled SERGEI ORDZHONIKIDZE (1937) and, apparently, made THREE HEROINES (1938), a documentary dedicated to women aviators. After struggling to realize several projects, Vertov returned to the craft of his youth—the editing of war newsreel footage. His one large work of the period, FOR US, THE FRONT! (1941), was severely cut. From 1946 to his death in 1954 he edited the newsreel NEWS OF THE DAY. Few artists of Vertov’s generation opted for the alternatives offered by Mayakovsky’s suicide and Meyerhold’s death in a labor camp; most simply adhered to policy. For Vertov, there was only the quiet humiliation of obscurity. What could be more shameful for the Vertov of the spunky manifestos than cranking out Stalinist newsreels? Writing of himself in the third person, he observed, with both humor and self-pity: “The tragedy of Vertov is that he didn’t know how to grow old.”

42 SPRING 1972



From what little of Vertov’s work that is available in the United States today, it is hard to make sound critical judgments; we must simply hope to see more of his films and read more of his writings. But I believe there is already a *prima facie* case for a Vertov reevaluation. His strident manifestos had a crucial effect on the development of Soviet cinema, forcing Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Eisenstein, and the FEX group to work out their own approaches more conscientiously. In a larger context, Vertov’s films represent the successful transference of Constructivist theories from art to the cinema, and his theoretical essays still pose basic questions about film technique and its relation to life and politics. He is a grandfather of *cinéma-vérité*: in the Twenties it was only KINOPRAVDA, the name of a newsreel, but by 1940, he saw it as an autonomous aesthetic method: “By the Kino-Eye, for the Kino-Eye, but with the truth of the means—that is cinema-truth.” His notion of the Radio-Eye (“a means of abolishing distances between men”) anticipates television as a mass medium. And, taking his theories to a fanatically logical conclusion, he envisioned a montage of visual data, acoustic data, tactile data, and olfactory data—what we would call mixed media—which would culminate in universal telepathy, “the stage where we will surprise and record *human thoughts*.”

Vertov is, in short, one of the first and most intellectually vigorous artists in documentary film. Yet in the end his bloodthirsty polemicism, his technical ingenuity, his visionary prophecies, and his hunger for a scientific registering of reality remained secondary to the lyrical temperament of a poet and a composer. “My complex way,” he explained, “leads in the long run to the same complex simplicity that we find in the smile and the pulse-beat of a child.”

DZIGA VERTOV FILMOGRAPHY (1896-1954)

1918-1919 KINONEDELIA (CINEMA WEEKLY), 43 issues. **1919** ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION, 12 reels. BATTLE AT TSARITSYN, 3 reels. THE MIRONOV TRIAL, 1 reel. UNSEALING THE RELICS OF SERGEI RADONEZHISKY, 2 reels. **1921** AGIT-TRAIN, 1 reel. **1922** HISTORY OF THE CIVIL WAR, 13 reels. TRIAL OF THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES, 3 reels. **1923-1925** GOSKINOCALNDAR, 55 issues. KINOPRAVDA, 23 issues. **1924** DAYOSH VOZDUKH, 1 reel. KINO-EYE (LIFE UNAWARES), 6 reels. **1926** STRIDE, SOVIET!, 7 reels. A SIXTH OF THE EARTH, 6 reels. **1928** THE ELEVENTH YEAR, 6 reels. **1929** THE MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA, 6 reels. **1930** SYMPHONY OF THE DON BASIN (ENTHUSIASM), 6 reels. **1934** THREE SONGS ABOUT LENIN, 6 reels. **1937** LULLABY, 7 reels. IN MEMORY OF SERGO ORDZHONIKIDZE, 2 reels. SERGO ORDZHONIKIDZE, 5 reels. **1938** GLORY TO SOVIET HEROINES, 1 reel. THREE HEROINES, 7 reels. **1941** IN THE REGION OF HILL A. BLOOD FOR BLOOD, DEATH FOR DEATH, 1 reel. NEWSREEL CAMERAMEN UNDER FIRE. **1942** FOR YOU, THE FRONT! 5 reels. **1944** IN THE ALA-TAU MOUNTAINS, 2 reels. YOUNG PEOPLE Vow, 3 reels. **1944-1954** NEWS OF THE DAY, 55 issues.