

Copyright © 2016 by Academic Publishing House *Researcher*

Published in the Russian Federation
European Researcher
Has been issued since 2010.
ISSN 2219-8229
E-ISSN 2224-0136
Vol. 111, Is. 10, pp. 524-535, 2016

DOI: 10.13187/er.2016.111.524
www.erjournal.ru



UDC 37

Movies: the Audience Favorites

Alexander Fedorov ^a

^a Rostov State University of Economics, Russian Federation
Dr. (Education), Professor
E-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

Abstract

Modern screen art over its success to the use of folklore, myth, synthesis of the natural and supernatural, and a consistent orientation toward the most popular plot schemes. Their metaphorical appeal is not to the rational but to the emotional, through identification with the magic power of heroes and standardization of ideas, situations, characters and so on in compensation for dreams not realized in life, there are illusions – happy endings. In movies, TV shows, and music videos' rhythmic organization, viewers' feelings are influenced as much by the order of changing shots as by the content of productions.

On the basis of the foregoing, it can be concluded that the media texts of popular culture obliged to a variety of factors for its success. These include: reliance on folklore and mythological sources, constancy metaphors, focus on consistent implementation of the most persistent plot schemes, the synthesis of the natural and the supernatural, the appeal not to rational and emotional, through the identification of (imaginary transformation in of active characters merge with the atmosphere, the aura of works), “magic power” of heroes, standardization (replication, unification, adaptation) ideas, situations, characters, etc., mosaic, seriality, the compensation (of the cherished illusion, but not come true desires), the happy ending, the use of such rhythmic organization movies, TV shows, clips, where the feeling of the audience with the content of the frame affects the order of their shift; intuitive guessing subconscious audience interests, etc.

Keywords: hermeneutical analysis, Soviet, USSR, Russia, screen, audience, film, film studies.

1. Introduction

Russian cinema today is, like Russia itself chaotic, unpredictable and full of contrasts. No one can tell if the country will become an equal among equals on the world's professional stages by the beginning of the 21st century, casting off its poor role as a supplicant to Western artistic leaders.

Anyone who knows even a little history is aware that Russia was virtually outside European civilization for 75 years of XX century. The Communist regime firmly controlled all spheres of life for a sixth of the planet's citizens. In spite of totalitarian pressure, however, Russian culture managed to survive. The best books of Mikhail Bulgakov and Anna Ahmatova, the symphonies of Dmitry Shostakovich and Alexander Prokofiev, the films of Andrei Tarkovsky and Vassily Shukshin were created in the years of the most rigid censorship.

Despite bans, prisons and gulags, the artists leaned to speak to their readers and spectators in

some sort of *language of initiates*. Music, without clearly defined plot, made it much easier to do this. Writers, directors and actors were forced to talk about many things in hints and symbols, taking advantage of legends, fairy tales and parables.

Russian authorities of the 1960s through the 1980s officially supported the publication and distribution of classical literature – the works of Lev Tolstoy, Alexander Pushkin, Nikolai Gogol, Ivan Turgenev, Anton Chekhov, etc. The best film directors knew this, and were aware of weakened censorial control applied, at times, to screen adaptations. Consequently, the period saw *The Nest of Noble Family* (1968) based on Turgenev novel and *Uncle Vanya* (1971) based on Chekhov's play, directed by Andrei Konchalovsky.

There were also *Station's Employee* (1972, using Pushkin's prose) directed by Sergey Soloviev, *Dead Souls* (1984, from the Gogol novel) directed by Mikhail Schweitzer, and others. Nikita Mikhalkov, making films based on Chekhov (*Unfinished Piece for Mechanical Piano*, 1976) and Ivan Goncharov (*Several Days in the Life of Oblomov*, 1980), succeeded in telling more about the situation in Russia – and the national character – than the majority of his colleagues whose pictures dealt with the country's modern life. Oblomov embodies the paradoxes of mysterious Russian soul: intelligence, talent and an innate sense of beauty go poignantly hand in hand with passivity, laziness, sleepy inaction and abstract dreaming...

The Russian cinematic fairy tale also has old traditions, founded by Alexander Row (*The Frosty Fire, Water and Cooper Trumpets, Morozko*, etc.) and Alexander Ptushko (*The Stone Flower, Sadko*). Until recently, however, fantasy films had to submit to two unwritten rules: all except a few were made for a children's audience, and the action had to take place in ancient times, in a faraway kingdom. The first rule dictated an understandable style for the fairy tale, with vivid, clear pictures and vocabulary, and villains looking not very fearful but on the contrary, usually, funny and harmless. The second rule was very seldom infringed, because magicians, witches, demons and other fairy characters – according to “highly placed” thought – could be perceived as an embodiment of the authors' mysticism intruding on a modern background. In these cases, when magic and witchery were admitted into our days (as in *The Snowy Fairy Tale* by E. Shengelaya and A. Saharov), unintended associations and parallels appeared.

In the word, the production of films similar to *The Omen* by Richard Donner and *The Shining* by Stanley Kubrick for the Russian screen couldn't be even imagined until 1980-s. Now the situation has turned 180 degrees. Russian screen are full of foreign and indigenous horror films and fearsome tales that chill the blood. Vampires, demons, witches and others evil spirits have become frequent guests on video and cinema circuits from Moscow to the very frontiers...

Remarkable Russian actors – Oleg Dal (1941-1981), Vladimir Vissotsky (1938-1980), Anatoly Solonitsin (1934-1982), Vladislav Dvorzecki (1937-1978), Nikolai Grinko (1920-1989), Alexander Kaidanovsky (1946-1995) – very often played heroes who stood beyond the usual circle of life on the screen of the 1960-s and 1970-s. The Fairy Ivans, fools and intelligent outsiders of Oleg Dal. The hot-tempered, contentious, furious romantics of Vissotsky. The inspired, always doubtful or cynical, devastated heroes of Solonitsin (Andrei Tarkovsky's favorite actor)... These were in opposition to the artificial characters distilled in the retort of Socialist Realism.

Censorship was ruthless to the filmmakers. Important scenes, phrases and frames were cut out of many movies. Yet Tarkovsky's *Andrei Rublev* (1966), despite all the alterations, extolled Russian culture and closely connected with the Orthodox faith, while Elem Klimov's *The Parting* (1981) remained an angry accusation of the political system of the time, aspiring to destroy this same culture and religion.

After the widespread destruction of temples and churches in the 1920-s and 1930-s, Russian culture became a peculiar national religion; as the only source of spirituality, it allowed people who could not stand slavery to maintain a dream of Beauty during the hardest years.

Indisputably, politics had a highly negative influence on the development of Russian culture and education, but the classical legacy of art helped people to survive. Every new truthful book or film of the masters was perceived throughout the country as a desirable breath of cool wind. I remember how the books of Alexander Solzhenitsyn were handed around, how the films of Marlen Hutsiev or Gregory Chuhrai, in the 1960s, were discussed till voices became hoarse. And what events for Russian viewers in the 1970s were screenings of masterpieces by Federico Fellini (*Amarcord, Orchestra Rehearsal*)!

Another paradox of Russian life is that all people hoped for and aspired to the “light future”,

yet their ranks included dissenters who were Slavophiles, craving a return to the Russia of 1913, and dissenters of Western orientation who wanted a rapprochement with America, while the majority of the so-called “common people” faithfully waited for a near-Socialist paradise of well-being and, in the name of this, were ready to tolerate “temporary” hardships. Today a lot of Russian politicians try to find some “middle way” between capitalism and socialism where, to trust the premises of fashionable leaders, harmony will reign. In the political, economical currents some Russian filmmakers thoroughly lost their bearings, becoming victims of the whirlpools, submerged stones and shallows. Having got rid of censorship and having been given *carte blanche* in freedom of thought, they began to throw onto the screen what they apparently believed were commercial and brave statements, but which in fact were monotonous, non-competitive films. The freedom didn't evoke the expected abundance of masterpieces, because bitter truth alone isn't enough for the creation of a work of art. Talent is also needed, and it is everywhere in deficit.

Some Russian cineastes, finding it harder and harder to work in the Motherland in a condition of permanent economic crisis, are gathering under Western's roofs. It is rather logical: Russian filmmakers hope that West will become a gate to the world screen for them; at home indigenous movies are being forced out by American production everywhere. Only the most entertaining Russian films manage to survive the competition in such conditions, but they, as usual, copy U.S. pictures and don't hold any special interest as art. Undoubtedly, such work in the West requires a certain attention to the producers' wishes and an orientation toward middle-of-the-road European and American viewer's tastes. Well, don't judge and you will not be judged...

The words of Russian great writer Gogol about the *Bird-troika* – Russia – therefore turned out to be really prophetic: “Russia, where are you rushing to? Give the answer. No answer”.

2. Material and methods

The main materials for this article was the area: the books, articles and films. The methods of theoretical research: classification, comparison, analogy, induction and deduction, abstraction and concretization, theoretical analysis and synthesis; and methods of empirical research: collecting information related to the research subjects. Effectiveness of such methods has been proven as the Western (R. Taylor, D. Youngblood, A. Lawton et al.), And Russian (N. Zorkaya, E. Ivanyan, A. Kolesnikova, M. Turovskaya) researchers. I used also the method of hermeneutic analysis of the cultural context of media texts (Eco, 1976; Potter, Thai, 2016; Silverblatt, 2001, 2016). This method connected with the key concepts of media literacy education (media agencies, media categories, media language, media technologies, media representations, media audiences etc.)

3. Discussion

Modern screen art over its success to the use of folklore, myth, synthesis of the natural and supernatural, and a consistent orientation toward the most popular plot schemes. Their metaphorical appeal is not to the rational but to the emotional, through identification with the magic power of heroes and standardization of ideas, situations, characters and so on in compensation for dreams not realized in life, there are illusions – happy endings. In movies, TV shows, and music videos' rhythmic organization, viewers' feelings are influenced as much by the order of changing shots as by the content of productions.

American critic Richard Corliss noted that for the creators of many Hollywood movies plot is a thing of past, and these movies are more thrilling than satisfying. Their main impact on most of the youthful public lies in the expect special effects making spectators gasp in surprise or freeze with fright. This *dynamic cinema*, according to Corliss, put higher demands on viewers, because we have to follow every frame of a shot waiting for the trick (Corliss, 1990). These features of mass culture reveal themselves in some favorite movies of the Russian audience. They are clear embodiments of the above-mentioned *phenomenon of mass success* tendencies.

The action in these films moves from one short episode to another (in order not to be boring to viewers) with sensational informativeness: event take place at various exotic locations in a cruel world of pirate's drug dealers, Mafia men, racketeers and prostitutes. Psychological pressure is active – throughout the stories the idea that sly enemies (inner and external) are scheming is repeated over and over. Now something mean is planned, now somebody is robbed; now positive heroes are attacked...

The main hero of these movies is an almost magical, fairy-tale character. Cute, strong and

smart, he comes out of all supernatural situations safe and sound (an excellent motif for identification and compensation). Many episodes' touch human instincts and emotions (such as fear). There's even continuity, as each story supposes an endless number of sequels. In spite of an absence of technical shine and the presence of numerous mistakes of taste or sense, the common components of these motives are rather professionally presented: fights, chases, shootings, pretty women, alarming music, strong feelings, a minimum of dialogue, a maximum of movement, and other attributes of action films. Other favorites of Russian public are made with similar attitudes and qualities...

Much more firmly than in cinema, these features of mass culture show themselves on Russian TV. Ideally, television should be various, unobtrusive, rich in visual information, and pluralistic without dull teaching and officiousness. Only lately has Russian TV started developing aesthetics for its entertainment packages, rejecting the different demands of the public. There are some intellectual and game shows – even some mass-culture programming – made on professional level. But the border between artistic and inartistic is often erased in a tendency toward documentary, one-day value, “open” formats that reproduce something in its process of becoming an event. This peculiarity of mass communication is an obstacle in determining the aesthetic distance. For examples, platitudinous music videos are shown all the time on Russian TV; if a viewer didn't have taste preferences; this could penetrate deep enough into his mind to unconsciously determine them...

The authors of some research accused popular culture creators that they have used improper methods of psychological pressure (constant repetition of the facts, regardless of the truth), distortion of facts and trends, selection of the negative features in the image of political opponents, “sticking labels”, “rouge guidance”, “playing folksy”, a reference to the authorities in order to justify a lie, etc. But mass media text creators always been as 1) honest professionals who build their own stories based on humanistic values, 2) persons who prone to political conformism, and 3) momentary conjuncture artisans.

In fact, media texts relating to the mass (popular) culture, have success is not due to the fact that they supposedly targeted only at people with low aesthetic taste, subject to psychological pressure, easy to believing the lie, etc, but because their authors are responsible for real, worthy of respect and study the needs of the audience, including – information, compensatory, hedonistic, recreational, moral, etc.

The emergence of the “industrial society with absolute inevitability leads to the formation of a special type of culture – the culture of commercial, mass, ... satisfying on the basis of modern technologies a fundamental human need for harmonization of the psychic life of the people” (Razlogov, 1991, p.10). At the same time, mass culture, inconceivable without the media, it is a natural component of modern culture as a whole, to which belongs the majority of all works of art created in the world. It can be considered as an effective way of involving the masses of viewers, listeners and readers in a variety of cultural processes as a phenomenon born of the latest technology (first of all – communication), the global integration and globalization (the destruction of local communities, and the erosion of regional and national borders, and so on).

This definition of mass (popular) culture, in my view, logically fits into the context of the functioning of the media – the systematic dissemination of information (via the media, print, television, radio, film, sound / video, Internet) among the numerically large, dispersed audiences for approval spiritual values and providing ideological, economic or organizational impact on the estimates, opinions and behavior of the people.

V. Propp (Propp, 1976), N. Zorkaya (Zorkaya, 1981), M. Turovskaya (Turovskaya, 1979), O. Nechay (Nechay, 1993) and M. Yampolsky (Yampolsky, 1987) have shown convincingly that the total successful works of mass culture requires the calculation of their creators in the folk style of aesthetic perception, and “archetypes of fairy tales and legends, and their associated archetypes of folk perceptions, meeting, give the effect of the integral mass success favorites” (Zorkaya, 1981, p.116).

Indeed, the success of the audience is very closely linked with the mythological layer of the product. “Strong” genres” – thriller, science fiction, western – always based on the “strong” myths” (Yampolsky, 1987, p. 41). Unusual relationship, but the “real” events – one of the fundamental archetypes (based on underlying psychological structures that affect the conscious and subconscious) fairy tales, legends, – is very important for many popular media texts. O. Nechay, in

my opinion, very correctly noted the important feature of mass (popular) culture – the adaptation of the forms of folklore in society. That is, if the author's text ideal emerges through reality (in the center of the plot – the hero-personality), socio-critical text gives a character taken from the life around (common man), the mass culture are ideal norms in the real environment (Nechay, 1993, pp. 11-13).

However, the biggest influence on the audience has a TV mass culture, focused on the creation of large multi-month (or even perennial!) series of programs and serials. There are “systemically important properties of serial: 1) the duration of the narrative, 2) intermittent him, 3) special story organizations often-series requires a specific identity of their structure and replication of individual blocks, 4) availability through characters, regular characters (or groups of such heroes)” (Zorkaya, 1981, p.59). Plus, these specific properties of TV-show organization as frequency, headings, software, dosing, translational (providing increased sociability).

In addition, the creators of media texts of popular culture take into account emotional tone of perception. The monotony plot situations often lead the audience to the suspension from contact with the media text. That's why professionals arise change episodes, causing shock and soothing reaction, but certainly a happy ending, giving a positive detente. In other words, we can divide of many popular media texts – easily and painlessly – into blocks (often interchangeable). And these blocks were linked clearly thought-out mechanism “emotional extremes” – the alternation of positive and negative emotions caused by the public.

It is worth noting that in many cases, the creators of the mass media texts consciously simplify, trivialize their life untouched by the material, apparently hoping to bring that part of the youth audience, which is now enthusiastically develops computer games, built on those or other actions of the virtual violence. And this, no doubt, has its own logic, because even N. Berdyaev quite rightly wrote that “the masses not attached to the goods and cultural values, and culture is difficult for mass audience in the noble sense of the word, but the technique a relatively easy for them” (Berdyaev, 1990, p. 229).

At the same time, relying on folklore, entertainment, seriality and professionalism of the authors is not sufficient for the success of a large-scale media text of mass culture, as well as the popularity depends on the hypnotic, sensual impact. Instead of primitive devices to the tastes of the masses, professionals guessed “secret subconscious interest in crowd” at the level of “irrational heroism and intuitive illumination” (Bogomolov, 1989, p. 11).

The same subjects, getting to the ordinary artisan or, for example, to S. Spielberg, transforming, collect a variety of audiences on the scale. Masters of popular media culture perfectly use the effect of “layer cake”: the creation of the works for multi-level perceptions, calculated on the perception of people of various age, intelligence and taste. There are a kind of semi-stylization, semi-parody interspersed with semi-really with countless allusions to the classic films of past years, direct quotations, with references to folklore and mythology, etc.

For example, for some viewers the text of Spielberg's *Indiana Jones* will be tantamount to the vision of the classic *The Thief of Bagdad*. And for the others, more sophisticated in the media culture – fascinating and ironic journey into the realm of folklore and fairy-tale archetypes, cinematic associations, unobtrusive parody. The film *Frantic* might well be perceived as an ordinary thriller about the disappearance of the wife of an American scientist, who came to the Paris medical conference, but can be perceived as a kind of rethinking and mischievously stylized heritage rich tradition of the detective genre, *noire* thrillers and gangster sagas – from A. Hitchcock to the present day, and even – as a veiled autobiography, directed by Roman Polanski ...

Thus, one of the distinctive features of the present socio-cultural situation in (addition to the standardization and harmonization) is the adaptation of a popular media culture specific *art house* language. Video clips are the good example for perception characteristic of mass audience. It would seem that there was a paradoxical situation: music video very often used the opening of the avant-garde media – whimsical, kaleidoscopic, ragged assembly, complex associative, solarization, the transformation of volumes, shapes, colors and light, flashbacks, rapids, and others special effects. But the audience for them (as opposed to an audience of elite masterpieces and the avant-garde) is very big, mass.

In my opinion, this is not controversial. For example, the youth audience can perceive of post-modern standards, allusions and associations just in a short duration of the clip, because a quick change of plans installation, resilient, dynamic audiovisual rhythm is acceptable even for the

most inexperienced in the language of the media person. And this is also effect of pluralistic popular media culture, designed to meet the differentiated audience requests.

The therapeutic effect, the phenomenon of compensation is also important for the success of mass media texts. Of course, personality often wants to get away the emotion from the film, which he/she did not have enough in life. And it is absolutely natural. And Sigmund Freud wrote that “culture must mobilize all its forces to put a limit aggressive primary urges to humans and slow down their displays by creating the necessary psychological reactions” (Freud, 1990, p. 29).

However, some researchers doubt this compensatory function of mass culture. For example, American scientists studied the effects of the behavior of young viewers, depending on the availability of movies viewed in violent episodes, the levels of aggressiveness were measured for 7 days, the analysis of which led researchers to the conclusion that the negative impact of these tapes (Parke, et al. 1977, pp. 148-153).

But, in my view, another sociological concept looks more convincing: there is no direct cause-and-effect relationship between movies and crime, although we can see a great impact in terms of stimulating aggressive tendencies faced by people with unstable or mental disorders, with a weak intelligence.

4. Results

It is interesting to see how audience preferences changing with respect to one of the most common media texts – films. Remember how those or other works of different levels and genres estimated ten, twenty, thirty years ago, some of them became the favorites of the public. I take the long-term results of the survey of the popular cinema magazine *Soviet Screen*. I will compare the most active audience preferences (readers of *Soviet Screen*) with the average public tastes (box-office).

At the same time, of course, I must bear in mind the conditional nature of these figures. Unfortunately, the Russian society in the 1950s -1980s did not open: distortions were characterized not only reports on the crops of grain and cotton, but also sociological studies, and sociology of science itself was in the grip of strong ideological dogmatism. It often happened that the tickets sold, for example, on the French criminal parody *Fantomas* took place in official documents under the guise of income from Soviet cinema... But, of course, the excellent box-office of Russian comedy *Brilliant Hand* (1969) and action *Pirates of the Twentieth Century* (1980) it is impossible to question.

The differences between viewers opinions' profiles of different decades are substantial. In the late fifties and sixties, the Soviet audience chooses (in the *Soviet Screen's* survey) the best films of the year is mainly notable works of art (*The Fate of Man* (1959) by S. Bondarchuk, *Serioja* (1960) by G. Daneliya & I. Talankin, *Clean Sky* (1961) By G. Chuhray, *Nine Days in One Year* (1962) by M. Romm, *Hamlet* (1964) by G. Kozintsev, *We'll Live till Monday* (1968) by S. Rostotsky).

I am convinced that such a choice audience besides the artistic quality of the films, not least due to the time uplifting, arose in the era of the “thaw” mass faith young audiences in a final and irrevocable overcoming past “errors” and “mistakes” in the progressive construction of a “bright the future”. Although this historical and cultural period was contradictory and inconsistent, film critics of those years basically gave viewers loyal artistic landmarks, maintaining significant works of art that in some way reflected in the audience likes and dislikes.

“Thaw” seemed to disclose the true talent of limitless possibilities. Very expanded film production: 102 films in 1958 instead of 10-12 in the early 1950's. Mikhail Kalatozov (1903-1973), Sergey Urusevsky (1908-1974), Mikhail Romm (1901-1971) found its second wind in their cinematic careers. Bright, impressive director debuts of Gregory Chuhray (1921-2001), Marlen Hutsiev, Georgy Danelia: movies of these debutants received prizes at festivals, the audience and the press were discussed about. In the early 1960s confidently declared themselves Andrei Tarkovsky (1932-1986), Vasily Shukshin (1929-1974), Sergei Parajanov (1924-1990), Elem Klimov (1933-2003), Larisa Shepitko (1938-1979), Andrei Konchalovsky, Mikhail Kalik and Mikhail Bogin...

But at the same time, the film of Marlen Hutsiev *I Am Twenty* was banned for several years. The young characters of this film honestly tried, but naive and romantic, to understand the history, the present and themselves... The ambiguity of those years there has been, perhaps, all those who he wrote of “the era of Khrushchev”.

Instead, the idea predominated loyalty to the leader began to cultivate the idea of collectivity as in "lower", and the "higher" spheres of life. Joyous scenes of factory and amicable collective teams, school classes, families strong, conquerors of virgin lands, workers of district committees and regional committees flooded the "average" movies late 1950s – early 1960s. Instead, almost completely extinct historical-biographical genre, like mushrooms after rain multiplied lyrical comedy, detective, drama and melodrama, thoroughly revived forgotten by the time.

Thrown from the rostrum of the slogan "Our children will live under communism!" implicitly or directly defined the ideological orientation of many films. Of course, the authors of these pictures trying to avoid the extremes of the previous years – the apparent distortion of facts, outright lies, etc. But still in the course of "sticking labels", "guidance rouge", and "vulgar games"...

One of the ideas dominated considerable number of films that time was intended to assure the audience that in order to "catch up and overtake" remains only one last effort, the existing minor flaws can be corrected as soon as possible "healthy team." Cinema conveyor 1960s (especially their first half), followed by its predecessor the 1930's and 1940's was infused with propaganda exalted ideals of universal enthusiasm, determined struggle, cheerful and quick to overcome any difficulties and obstacles. The enemy, however, was different: instead of "enemies of the people", pests and spyware sixties film heroes fought mainly from the harsh environment, easily removable disadvantages in everyday life. It was not easy to imagine the entertainment picture, devoid of this ideological "stuffing"...

As in previous decades, to mass culture in the late 1950's - early 1960's was characterized by political confrontation, clearly noticeable even in such seemingly exotic picture as *Amphibian Man* (1962), the authors of which, along with the spectacular underwater camera did not forget about the criticism of the "cruel laws of bourgeois society."

With the advent of Leonid Brezhnev began a gradual pullback to the "thaw" position. A solid "shelf" of banned talented films (*Electricity Homeland* by L. Shepitko, *Angel* by A. Smirnov, *The Commissioner* by A. Askoldov, *Andrei Rublev* by A. Tarkovsky, *Assya's Happiness* by A. Konchalovsky) formed by the end of the 1960's. Kremlin campaign of "pacification" of the Czechoslovak democracy (1968-1969) followed by a tightening of censorship and a new blow to the "unreliable" intellectuals. Such famous filmmakers as H. Gabay, M. Kalik, M. Bogin emigrated from Russia... Perhaps, 1968 year became a kind abroad, leaving behind the hope for reform, set back in fear of the "Prague Spring". This was the beginning of a powerful offensive of the conservative forces in all directions.

In fact, a film needed a society that is slowly but surely went on extensive way to the socio-political and cultural crisis? Cinema of problems of "moral anxiety"? Cinema, satirically presents abominations life? Enough joking... Of course, Soviet cinema of 1970s needed a very different model of "manual", obedient superiors movie, ready for all the most reckless call "from above" obsequious to take the salute. Cinematograph of 1970s, how it was understood by the then leaders, desperately needed the film coming out of the servile principle of "What would you like?"

By that time, promise on building by 1980 the material and technical base of communism were recognized voluntarist. Stopped in mind an explicit "limes" exaggerated slogans calling in a few years to overtake America in all major economic indicators. Prospects were pushed into the indefinite future. By the end of the 1970s it came down to the "winged" thesis everywhere are reminded that the economy of "mature socialism" must be economical...

But it would be wrong to say that Soviet popular culture of 1970d - first half of the 1980s entirely consisted of conformist films. A. Tarkovsky, V. Abdrashitov, E. Klimov and some others try to say their independent words in cinema art.

But as in previous years, Soviet mass culture flourishes in a historic theme. Total ideological trend towards straightening sharp corners, transforming the story into an endless series of victories, used well-proven in the past reception "figure of silence" (or, in other words, "selection", the selection of only winning a propaganda term trends). At that time, there were so-called "closed zone", which was not accepted even mention. For example, many real historical figures are automatically excluded from the film-plots. A similar fate was with problems associated with mass repression during collectivization, 1930s-1940s, etc. The attempt to understand the story without retouching, openly and honestly (*Test on the Road* by A. German, *The Commissioner* by A. Askoldov) met while in the dense bureaucratic-reinsurance bayonets.

In a strong documentary *Star of Vavilov* (1985) by S. Dyachenko A. Borsyuk the first time in

Russian cinema lifted the veil of silence surrounding the vicious activities of Academician Lysenko and his supporters dearly cost the country's agriculture. Alas, all the previous years, the movie carefully avoiding the subject, producing iridescent films on how the personal initiative of energetic young business man executives breaks down any barriers (*A man in his place*, 1973; *With joy and courage*, 1974).

The curious metamorphosis there have been on the Russian screen and in the interpretation of the theme of Stalinism. The anti-stalinist film by Gregory Chuhraja *Clean Sky* (1961) won the main prize of the Moscow Film Festival and earned success with the audience, but... in 1970s has been securely hidden on the shelf - away from cinemas and television screens. Since the mid of 1960s any mention of the bloody crimes of Stalinism practically disappeared in the Soviet cinema. The image of Stalin from film to film became more and more impressive and solidity, which eventually led to *Victory* (1985) by E. Matveev and *Battle for Moscow* (1985) by Y. Ozerov.

Almost until Gorbachev's perestroika some film directors seeking to reflect the story without gloss front, objectively and truthfully, it was necessary to build many of their works on line hints and allegories, and even in parabola form. A classic example of the historical and political overtones – the wonderful film *My Friend Ivan Lapshin* (1981) by A. German, which tells the dramatic time of 1930s.

But the most bitter truth, as we know, is much more expensive than a sweet lie. Trouble Russian historical cinema previous decades was that instead of talking about what had happened, he was all the time trying to dream on what could happen in an ideal circumstances, issuing these dogmatic fantasy for reality.

So, although the ordinary mass culture film implies (and usually does) rather significant box office success, it does not pretend to be mandatory laurels rolling leader. Moreover, I will take the liberty to say that there is even a non-cash mass culture - an inevitable consequence of the desperate lack of professionalism and creative authors of insolvency.

At first glance, there is a clear contradiction here: how is it - mass culture and without a mass audience? But in practice, everything is easier: opus, originally conceived as a mass culture, actually turns helplessly as dull and boring, that suffers a financial collapse. In the West, this also occurs quite often...

Of course, it would have been very naive view of the relationship "media - audience" in a unilateral way: the audience tried to view of Andrei Tarkovsky and Alexei German, but Ministry of Cinematography gave the way for popular culture only. For example, the concentration of the audience senses to love experiences had a kind of therapeutic sense, allowed to transfer to the authorities that permitted the channel all the negative emotions that have accumulated in real life (especially the female half of the audience).

But do they themselves did not have the audience craving for this kind of vivid, emotional spectacle?

The fact of the matter is that we need sometimes for strong emotional shocks - whether on a detective or love story. However, it is believed that the mass success of the messages and the success of true preferences - things sometimes different. Millions can read, listen to some media text, but the positive appreciation of these media text is another thing. Or, on the contrary, the opinion of a specialized readers may not be the benchmark for the overall situation, since not all people read newspapers and have such a steady commitment to culture, to fill out forms and send them to the editor.

This is partly true. For example, the film chronicles the lead in the questionnaire does not mean the same championship in the Russian box office, where the first place firmly hold the film entertainment plan. And it is natural, because the profile of the best films of the year meet, as a rule, the most active viewers.

However, the total rental statistics confirm the randomness of readers ratings of *Soviet Screen*. Almost all (with few exceptions) the leaders of the Russian screen of 1960s - 1980s in some manner entered the top twenty according to the survey of the magazine. Thus, the *Pirates of the Twentieth Century* (1980) by B. Durov, become a truly champion (86.7 million spectators for the first year), took to the eleventh place in a magazine profile. Melodrama *Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears* (1980) by V. Menshov, which has sold over 84 million tickets, - in the first place. Comedy of L. Gaidai *Prisoner of the Caucasus* (1967) and *The Diamond Hand* (1969), collected on 76 million fans turned out in the seventh and eighth places. A dozen leaders were operetta

Wedding in Malinovka (1967) by A. Tutyshkin (74 million viewers and eighth place in the magazine's readers), *Crew* (1979) by A. Mitty (71 million) and *Shield and Sword* (1968) of V. Basov (68 million), got the second place in a poll of readers. The same can be said about the *Headless Horseman* (1976) by V. Vaynshtok (68 million viewers), *The Dawns Here Are Quiet* (1972) by S. Rostotsky and *Amphibian Man* (1962) by V. Chebotarev and G. Kazanski (65 million viewers).

In general, the results of the total rental entertaining movies since the late 1960s, more and more often become leaders. And in all these years, the most popular genres has always been comedy *Gentlemen of Fortune* (1972) by A. Sery (65 millions), *Ivan Vasilyevich Changes Occupation* (1973) (60 millions) by L. Gaidai, *Afonya* (1975) by G. Daneliya (62 millions), *Office romance* (1976) by E. Ryazanov (60 millions); adventure, detectives, *Crown of the Russian Empire* (1974) by E. Keosayan, *Tavern on Pyatnitskaya* (1976) by A. Faintzimmer (54 millions), *Petrovka 38* (1980) by V. Grigorev (53 millions). *Ten Little Indians* (1988) by S. Govoruhin (33 millinons); melodrama *Stepmom* (1973) by O. Bondarev (59 millions), *Queen of the Gypsies* (1976) by E. Lotjanu (64 millinons), *Guys* (1982) by I. Babich (38 millions), etc.

As a result, it can be concluded that the Soviet Screen's viewers-readers' preferences sufficiently representative reflect the tastes of the general audience. And in terms of genre, "cash" and "personal" leaders are very similar: since the late 1960's to 1980's the comedy, action adventure and melodrama dominated regardless of the change of years.

However, there are significant differences. Among the box-office favorites the films of high artistic level were very rare, but we can see a lot of original works of art in the list of the prize-winners of Soviet Screen.

Here is interesting evolution of personal preferences of the public. In the 1960's in the top ten of Soviet Screen includes such outstanding works as *Welcome, or No unauthorized entry is prohibited* (1964) by E. Klimov, *The Road* (1954) by F. Fellini and *Ashes and Diamonds* (1957) by A. Wajda...

Since the beginning of the 1970 tastes of the audience, of course, began to change in a different way - in the first place in Soviet Screen's film winners are increasingly mediocre artistically tape (*Stepmother*, *Young wife*, *Guys* and others.). Serious cinema (*The Beginning* by G. Panfilov, *The Red Tent* by M. Kalatozov, *Monologue* by I. Auerbach, *Red Kalina* by V. Shukshin, *Romeo and Juliet* by F. Dzeffirelli, *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* by S. Pollack) takes the lead much less.

My twenty years of experience in Youth film club and a special course on media culture in several universities, suggests that, at least since the mid 1970s, the preferences of young viewers were just close to leaders of *Soviet Screen*: *Irony of Destiny* (1976), *Office Romance* (1978), *Railway Station for Two* (1983), *A Cruel Romance* (1984) by E. Ryazanov, *Young Wife* (1979) by L. Menaker, *Moscow Does not believe in tears* (1980) by V. Menshov, *You cannot dream...* (1981) By I. Frez...

By the way, the success of movie of I. Frez is explained by the fact that for decades the Russian films on the so-called youth theme almost always had considerable success with audiences, but with them, and there were all sorts of metamorphoses. Alas, in some pictures about young people (*Minors*, *This is What We Do Not Pass*, *Found Guilty*, *My Anfisa* and others) did not even attempt to approach the analytic drama of M. Osepyan *Three Days of Victor Chernyshev* (1968).

The second half of the 1980's - early 1990's drastically changed the theme of the youth cinema. If the well-known film by J. Raizman *And if this is love?* (1962) affirmed the right of students to friendship and love, not overshadowed by petty-bourgeois gossip, then in the late 1970's - early 1980's this right was already the undisputed (*At the end of the world*, *Draw*, *School Waltz*, *You cannot dream...*). It was about the diversity, the complexity of thought and feeling young, their contradictory relationship with each other, to adults, to the first independent steps, victories and defeats. And finally, the "perestroika" and *Little Vera* (1988) by V. Pichul became the first sign in a series of subsequent films defending the right to freedom of young sexual relations.

But, as they say, not a single sex: in a shot in the second half of the 1980 *Outsiders* by S. Bodrov openly spoke of society's fault for crippled lives of young characters, you feel useless freeloaders. Faced with spiritual callousness and bureaucratic world of adults, children from the provincial amateur ensemble willy-nilly trying to adapt to the world, and paid him the same indifference...

Breaking the barriers of censorship provoked a stormy tide exposing and convictions of films

on youth theme, Russian cinema has tried to catch up. The story of those years (*Arsonists*, *Accident - daughter of cop*, etc.) were transferred from the latrine in the cooler, from dilapidated barn – in the darkness of the cellar. Violence, drug addiction... Scene motives of the famous *Stuffed* (1983) by R. Bykov also been put on stream and perfected, as they say, "one hundred percent". School-exposing the subject enlarged picture *Blackmailer*, *Temptation*, *Publish*, *Dolly*, etc.

The appearance of this kind of new conjuncture in the films about youth, in my opinion, was quite natural: the filmmakers who have received long-awaited opportunity to speak openly about their everyday concerns, hastened to shout, throw on the screen all that bothered them for years. Alas, in most cases it was a superficial journalism, made up of collections of similar scenes, moving from one film to another, which negates the critical pathos declared straightforward ideas.

As a result, in the mid 1990s came the inevitable tide of youth film wave.

About two dozen "youth" films annually came out on Russian screens in 1989-1991. And in 1992 - even thirty. But since 1993 a gradual decline occurred.

Among these films met sometimes worthy of the work of talented artists (*Dyuba-dyuba* by A. Hwan, *Love* by V. Todorovski, *Nastya* and *Heads and Tails* by G. Danelia), but overall, I think, found the desire to reorient youth topic in the direction of pure entertainment, you know, unfortunately, not at the level of Robert Zemeckis (*Back to the future*), or Claude Pinoteau (*Boom*), and in the spirit of kitsch.

When the Russian political and economic system of the 1970s - 1980s tried to mask the numerous cancers demagogic talk and promises, it caused a massive rejection, especially among young people. The mood of frustration, passive, often not fully aware of the silent protest of young looking output. And found his passion in the "no" rock music, entertainment films, immerse the viewer in a fabulous and fascinating world with active, purposeful, suffering and finds happiness heroes...

If on the screen and appear problematic movies, they often found themselves in a situation "least favored" as in the box office. As a result, the following happened: the critic has lost the confidence of the reading Film viewers. And, choosing between dull, ponderous "custom-made" films and entertainment, even a low level, the audience inevitably inclined to the latter.

What movies have received the lowest scores of spectators? In the 1970s worst were called films, in fact, very weak (*Last Days of Pompeii* (1973), *Hello. River* (1979)). Boring and bad work is not saved by the rolling and the questionnaire the failure of even a spectacular and entertaining genre...

From 1980 to 1985 Soviet Screen did not dare to publish a "black list" of audience dislikes. This break, in my opinion, is not accidental. At the turn of the 1970s - 1980s most sharply delineated cinema crisis and the rental system. During the seven seals were data on circulation patterns and their assigned categories of quality, extremely sparingly published sensations...

Then in the top ten of the magazine editorialized profiles settled tape-burning, more than superficially reflect the real political and historical events (*Event of 36-80 Square*, *Victory*, etc.).

And if each new series about the adventures of the beautiful *Angelique* gathered about forty million viewers, it became a real box-office champion "soap" Mexican melodrama *Yesenia* (1971), attended by about a hundred million viewers for the first year of the demonstration. She is ahead of even such acclaimed champions as *Pirates of the Twentieth Century* and *Disco Dancer*.

Of course, typical of popular culture phenomenon of compensation - a natural result of the viewer's contact with art make up the missing human feelings and emotions. This popular movie differentiated and is designed for people with different tastes. Sometimes the impact of the next blockbuster based on the professionalism of the director, the actors, the operator, composer, artist, able to create a bright, attractive shape sight. Or so, at first glance, paradoxical option: the film is bad and has been forgotten, and the music is so good to him that continues to be performed and the public likes.

However, the general trend of viewing thrust to mass culture, no doubt, and remained at the turn of the twenty-first century. Just out of cinema audience moved to the home screen.

5. Conclusion

So, on the basis of the foregoing, it can be concluded that the media texts of popular culture obliged to a variety of factors for its success. These include: reliance on folklore and mythological sources, constancy metaphors, focus on consistent implementation of the most persistent plot

schemes, the synthesis of the natural and the supernatural, the appeal not to rational and emotional, through the identification of (imaginary transformation in of active characters merge with the atmosphere, the aura of works), “magic power” of heroes, standardization (replication, unification, adaptation) ideas, situations, characters, etc., mosaic, seriality, the compensation (of the cherished illusion, but not come true desires), the happy ending, the use of such rhythmic organization movies, TV shows, clips, where the feeling of the audience with the content of the frame affects the order of their shift; intuitive guessing subconscious audience interests, etc.

References

1. Berdyaev, N.A. (1990). The destiny of man in the modern world. *New World*. № 1, 207-232.
2. Bogomolov, Y.A. (1989). Movies on every day... *Literary Gazette*. № 24, 11.
3. Corliss, R. (1990). Dina-movies attacking. *Video-Ace Express*. N 1, 8.
4. Eco, U. (1976). A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
5. Freud, S. (1990). Dissatisfaction of culture. *Cinema Art*. № 12, 18-31.
6. Nechay, O.F. (1993). Film education in the context of literature. *Specialist*. № 5, 11-13.
7. Parke, R.D., Berkowitz, L., Leyens, J.P., West, S.J., Sebastian, P.J. (1977). Some Effects of Violent and Nonviolent Movies on the Behavior of Juvenile Delinquents. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. N.Y. Academia Press, № 10, 148-153.
8. Potter, W.J., Thai, C. (2016). Conceptual Challenges in Designing Measures for Media Literacy Studies. // *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 2016, Vol. (1), Is. 1, pp. 27-42.
9. Propp, V.Y. (1976). *Folklore and Reality*. Moscow: Art, 51-63.
10. Razlogov, K.E. (1991). Paradoxes of commercialization. *Screen and Stage*. № 9, 10.
11. Sherkovin, Y.A. (1973). *Psychological problems of mass communications*. Moscow: Thought.
12. Shestakov, V.P. (1988). *Mythology of XX Century*. Moscow: Art.
13. Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
14. Silverblatt, A. (2016). Reflections on Information Literacy. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 2016, Vol. (1), Is. 1, pp. 54-71.
15. Turovskaya, M.I. (1979). Why does the viewer go to the movies. *Genres of Movie*. Moscow: Art, 319 p.
16. Usov, Y.N. (1993). *Basics of screen culture*. Moscow: New School.
17. Usov, Y.N. (1995). *In the world of screen arts*. Moscow: SVR-Argus.
18. Yampolsky, M. (1987). Polemic notes about the aesthetics of the mass of the film. *Transcript of the meeting of the "round table" of film critics*. Moscow, 31-44.
19. Zorkaya, N.M. (1981). *Unique and Replicate*. Moscow: Art.

УДК 37

Кинематограф: фавориты аудитории

Александр Федоров ^а

^а Ростовский государственный экономический университет, Российская Федерация
ул. Инициативная, 48, Таганрог, Ростовская область, 347936
Доктор педагогических наук, профессор
E-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

Аннотация. Современное искусство экрана над своим успехом обязано использованию фольклора, мифологии, синтезу естественного и сверхъестественного и последовательной ориентации на наиболее популярные сюжетные схемы, обращением не только к рациональному, но и к эмоциональному (в том числе – посредством идентификации с волшебной силой героев), стандартизации идей, ситуаций, характеров и т.д.; а в качестве компенсации не реализованных в жизни желаний, возможно, иллюзорный,

но счастливый конец. В фильмах, телевизионных шоу и музыкальных видео ритмическая организация зрительских чувств находится под влиянием быстрой смены событий. На основании вышеизложенного, можно сделать вывод, что медиатекстам массовой культуры свойственны разнообразные факторы успеха. К ним относятся: зависимость от фольклора и мифологических источников, постоянство метафор, наиболее устойчивых сюжетных схем, синтез естественного и сверхъестественного, призыв, скорее, не к рациональному, а к эмоциональному, через идентификацию, магическую силу героев, стандартизацию (тиражирование, унификацию, адаптацию) идей, ситуаций, персонажей и т.д., мозаику, серийность, компенсацию, счастливый конец; использование такой ритмической организации фильмов, телевизионных шоу, клипы, где на чувства аудитории влияет порядок смены кадров; интуитивное угадывание подсознательных интересов аудитории и т.д.

Ключевые слова: исследование, герменевтический анализ, советские, СССР, России, экран, зрители, фильм, аудитория.