UDC 94.930.85(477.43)1920/1930

https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6300-2026-4(46)-1125-1134

Baran Bohdan Mykolaiovych assistant of the Department History of Ukraine, Archeology and Special Branches of Historical Sciences Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University. Ternopil, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8245-0202

STATE IDEOLOGY AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE STRUCTURE, CONTENT, AND DIRECTION OF UKRAINIAN CINEMA IN THE 1920S AND 1930S

Abstract. This article examines the historical preconditions for the emergence of cinema and the evolution of its perception from a technical marvel to a fully-fledged art form. **The aim of the article** is to analyze the role of the ideological factor in the development of Ukrainian Soviet cinema in the 1920s–1930s. The research methodology is based on historical-genetic, comparative, and cultural analysis, as well as on the study of cinematic texts, archival documents, and periodicals of the era.

The scientific novelty lies in establishing that cinema in Soviet Ukraine during the first decades of its existence served as an instrument of state ideology aimed at shaping the "new man": an atheist, a collectivist, and a supporter of communist values. Particular attention is paid to the functions of cinema as a means of propaganda, education, and scientific-educational activity in the context of widespread illiteracy. It was found that the themes of films were strictly regulated by party institutions: priority was given to revolutionary-historical plots, the glorification of leaders (Lenin, Stalin), and criticism of religion, individualism, and the capitalist way of life.

Conclusions. The study found that the Soviet authorities deliberately used cinema as a powerful psychogenic and manipulative tool to influence public consciousness. Its synthetic nature, mass appeal, accessibility to an illiterate audience, and ability to create a plausible illusion of reality transformed cinema into the "tenth muse" of the totalitarian era. Cinema not only reflected ideological attitudes but also actively constructed a new social reality, shaping stereotypes, behavioral norms, and images of the enemy and the hero. The study confirms that under the Soviet system, the art of cinema lost its autonomy and became part of the state propaganda apparatus. The practical significance of this work lies in the possibility of using its results to develop courses in cultural history, media studies, and visual anthropology, as well as for further study of the mechanisms of ideological influence on mass consciousness in totalitarian societies. Prospects for further research lie in a comparative analysis of Soviet and Western cinema of the interwar period, as well as in the study of the reception of ideological narratives by various social groups in Ukrainian society of the 1920s–1930s.

Keywords: cinema, cultural history, ideology, Soviet Ukraine, 1920s–1930s, agitation, propaganda, cult of personality, cinematic art.

Баран Богдан Миколайович асистент кафедри історії України, археології та спеціальних галузей історичних наук Тернопільського Національного Педагогічного Університету ім. Володимира Гнатюка, Тернопіль, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8245-0202

ДЕРЖАВНА ІДЕОЛОГІЯ ТА ЇЇ ВПЛИВ НА СТРУКТУРУ, ЗМІСТ І НАПРЯМКИ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО КІНЕМАТОГРАФУ У 1920–1930-Х РОКАХ

Анотація. У статті розглянуто історичні передумови виникнення кінематографу та еволюцію його сприйняття від технічного дива до повноцінного мистецтва. **Мета статті** — проаналізувати роль ідеологічного фактора у розвитку українського радянського кінематографу в 1920–1930-х роках. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на історико-генетичному, компаративному та культурологічному аналізі, а також на вивченні кінематографічних текстів, архівних документів і публіцистики епохи.

Наукова новизна полягає у встановленні того, що кінематограф у Радянській Україні перших десятиліть свого існування був інструментом державної ідеології, спрямованим на формування «нової людини»: атеїста, колективіста, прихильника комуністичних цінностей. Особливу увагу приділено функціям кіно як засобу агітації, освіти та науково-просвітницької діяльності в умовах масової неписьменності. Виявлено, що тематика фільмів строго регламентувалася партійними установами: пріоритет надавався революційно-історичним сюжетам, прославленню лідерів (Леніна, Сталіна), критиці релігії, індивідуалізму та капіталістичного способу життя.

Висновки. У результаті дослідження з'ясовано, що радянська влада свідомо використовувала кінематограф як потужний психогенний і маніпулятивний засіб впливу на суспільну свідомість. Його синтетична природа, масовість, доступність для неграмотної аудиторії та здатність створювати правдоподібну ілюзію реальності перетворили кіно на «десятю музику» тоталітарної епохи. Кінематограф не лише відображав ідеологічні установки, а й активно конструював нову соціальну дійсність, формуючи стереотипи, норми поведінки та образи ворога й героя. Дослідження підтверджує, що в умовах радянської системи кіномистецтво втратило автономію й стало частиною державного пропагандистського апарату. Практичне значення роботи полягає у можливості використання її результатів для підготовки навчальних курсів з історії культури, медіадосліджень та візуальної антропології, а також для подальшого вивчення механізмів



ідеологічного впливу на масову свідомість у тоталітарних суспільствах. Перспективи подальших досліджень вбачаються у порівняльному аналізі радянського та західного кінематографу міжвоєнного періоду, а також у вивченні рецепції ідеологічних наративів різними соціальними групами українського суспільства 1920–1930-х років.

Ключові слова: кінематограф, історія культури, ідеологія, радянська Україна, 1920–1930-ті роки, агітація, пропаганда, культ особи, кіномистецтво.

Problem statement. Despite considerable attention to the history of cinema, the mechanisms of transformation of Ukrainian Soviet cinema of the 1920s and 1930s from a technical novelty into a powerful tool of ideological influence remain insufficiently studied. A particular challenge is the analysis of the interaction between the artistic explorations of early directors and state control over film production, which requires a comprehensive study of archival documents, newsreels, and journalism of the era. The reasons why cinema became the "tenth muse" of the totalitarian era, as well as the methods of covert propaganda in the films of this period, require further consideration in the context of the formation of the "new man."

Purpose of the article. To analyze the role of ideological factors in the development of Ukrainian Soviet cinema in the 1920s and 1930s. Based on historical, genetic, and cultural analysis, to determine how the synthetic nature of cinema, its mass appeal, and accessibility to an illiterate audience were used by the authorities for propaganda, education, and manipulation of public consciousness. To prove that under the Soviet system, cinema lost its autonomy and became part of the state propaganda apparatus aimed at promoting communist values, atheism, and the cult of personality.

Presentation of the main research material. Achievements in various fields of science, including optics, chemistry, mechanics, and the mastery of photography techniques, laid the foundation for the emergence of cinema. The first film screening took place on December 28, 1895, at the Grand Café in Paris, when brothers Louis and Auguste Lumière showed a short film called The Watering Can. This day is considered the starting point in the history of cinema. It is worth noting that in St. Petersburg, films were shown two years earlier. The first movie camera was presented at a congress of Russian naturalists by Joseph Timchenko, a mechanic at Odessa University, but at that time his invention was not appreciated [1, pp. 90-92]. On September 30, 1896, the first film was shot in Ukraine. It was a documentary by Alfred Fedetsky about the transfer of the miraculous Kursk Icon of the Mother of God "The Sign" to the Pokrovsky Monastery in Kharkiv [2, pp. 136-145]. Therefore, this date is considered the birthday of Ukrainian cinema.

The Paris screening, followed by Edison's demonstration in New York, thrilled audiences: the movement and dynamics of the frames were perceived as a magical spectacle. At the same time, the euphoria of the first impression frightened the critically

minded part of the audience. From the very beginning, polarized attitudes toward the new technical marvel formed, ranging from idealization to complete rejection.

Soviet film researchers, echoing each other, interpret pre-revolutionary and foreign cinema negatively. However, it should not be forgotten that these were only the first attempts: primitive plots, poor editing, and unnatural acting can be explained by a lack of experience in film production. At the same time, the first films were also criticized by contemporaries. Peter Schepelern notes that some members of the intellectual elite saw cinema as "the end of civilization," calling film screenings vulgar spectacles that had nothing to do with art [3, pp. 4-6]. Indeed, films were initially presented alongside other forms of entertainment. For example, in Kyiv, during the opening of M.A. Shulze-Benkovskaya's Museum-Panopticon in 1902, the Lumière brothers' invention was demonstrated alongside performances by actors, mediums, illusionists, and card sharps. Film screenings were often the final part of circus performances or were shown in fairground booths [4, pp. 27-30]. The conveyor belt method of film production, which was practiced at that time by foreign owners of film equipment, was aimed precisely at such an undemanding audience. As a result, this new entertainment was not accepted by highly educated people, whose disappointment with the quality of films and screening conditions cemented their dismissive attitude toward cinema, which was also classified as an "ominous manifestation of modernity."

This situation indicates that technological progress in the late 19th and early 20th centuries outpaced the level and pace of cultural development. In other words, cinema emerged in a society that was not yet ready to adequately perceive it.

Over time, young cinema began to break away from the realm of fairground and carnival entertainment. The excitement caused by this technical innovation gradually faded. Filmmakers were faced with the task of attracting viewers using other methods. Further experiments in the field of cinematography, in particular editing, changing angles, and improving film quality, yielded results. The work of screenwriters became increasingly important. The decision to improve and diversify the themes of films had a positive impact on the perception of cinema. By the end of the 1920s, Soviet cinema had achieved significant success in this area. Films by local directors were increasingly called "masterpieces," and the term "cinematic art" started to be used to describe cinema. A qualitatively new level of film production and state support led to the popularization of the "tenth muse." The popularity and appeal of cinema bridged the gap between mass and elite culture. The first movie theaters, or more precisely, enclosed spaces for showing films, began to be called "illusionists." The etymology of this name points to a specific feature of cinema as the creation of a new reality, an illusion of true reality. In this context, cinema is compared to a dream, which is also an irrational picture of the world, a kind of illusion of reality [5, p. 105]. V. Skuratovsky emphasizes that previously, "contemplation" of hidden mental processes was only possible in dreams, which are a symbolic transmission of the "inner language" to those

layers of consciousness where they can be perceived and remembered. The process of filmmaking is a technical achievement that materializes a person's "inner language." The researcher calls cinema "an X-ray of the human soul" [6, pp. 65-88]. Indeed, when analyzing individual film plots, it becomes obvious that cinema allows us to visualize what has long belonged exclusively to human consciousness.

According to N. Igoshkina, cinema gave everything visual reality and, in terms of its breadth of coverage and depth of penetration into reality, in terms of its power of influence on the viewer through both sight and hearing, surpassed other arts. The expressive power of cinematic imagery expanded both the sphere of artistic exploration of life, its new aspects and phenomena, and the sphere of aesthetic experience [7, pp. 149-154]. It was the synthetic nature of cinema that removed the limitations and conventions that were characteristic of individual arts and contributed to the success of cinema.

One cinema researcher, E. Cousteau, saw the power of the new art form in its popularity, which was driven by trivial, everyday reasons. Watching a movie is much cheaper than going to the theater, and movie plots are more accessible to the most limited audiences. Movie-goers in the 1920s were ordinary people, often illiterate and uneducated. Movies simply and easily conveyed the essence of the events taking place on the screen to the viewer.

A distinctive feature of the new art form was its mass appeal, as watching films did not require physical exertion or intellectual effort, but instead brought pleasure. Portability and relative low cost contributed to the rapid spread of cinema, which, in turn, allowed millions of viewers of different nationalities in different parts of the Soviet Union to enjoy watching films. Films always found their audience, as the themes of the works were quite diverse: from scientific and educational films to comedy-drama bestsellers, which were aimed at different age groups. Watching a film together consolidated the community, forcing people to empathize. The great merit of cinema lies in its ability to tell a story in a simple and convincing way. The ease of perception of the film and the intensity of the impressions from watching it left a deep mark on people's minds. The film could inspire, make you think, teach, convince, and sometimes even change a person's worldview. By incorporating moral norms, principles, values, and orientations, cinema influences the education of both individuals and the general public.

In addition to its ideological and entertainment functions, cinema also served a scientific purpose. With the help of filming, scientists were able to study natural phenomena, investigate the characteristics of chemical reactions, and so on. The invention of cinema made it possible to create not only scientific films, but also educational films in various fields. In other words, cinema in the 1920s served to spread materialistic ideas, while promoting scientific progress and education.

S. Lysetsky, reflecting on the problems of contemporary national film production, aptly characterizes the ability of film to influence the consciousness of the population. The researcher notes that the dominance and massiveness of screen images can pressure people into forming certain stereotypes and images that are actively absorbed by viewers, becoming a benchmark for tastes and concepts. Everything depends on what is embodied in the cinematic image and in what form [8, pp. 109-115]. Thus, cinema has a powerful psychogenic effect, as it can simultaneously contribute to the spiritual uplifting of the audience and lead to vulgar brainwashing or the cultivation of aggression. In addition, the psychogenic effect of cinema in the first decades of its existence had a greater impact due to its novelty.

The ability of cinema to quickly and purposefully influence the general public led to its ideological involvement in a number of countries. Another matter is the level of state control and the possibility of existing autonomously. The totalitarian system left cinema no chance to develop independently.

The ability of cinema to "communicate artistically with a large number of people at low cost" attracted the attention of the authorities. An interesting resolution on the VUFKU report states that "today, verbal theater does not reflect the pace of life and cannot fulfill the tasks set before it, so it is necessary to shift the focus to cinema, which meets these requirements and has great agitational and propaganda significance" [9, p. 15]. Similar opinions were expressed by artists loyal to the new government. In particular, S. Eisenstein noted: "Our cinema is not a means of peacemaking, but a means of combat. Our cinema is, first and foremost, a weapon when it comes to the clash of ideologies, and, above all, a tool when it is called upon to perform its main function – to influence and transform" [10, p. 4].

The filmmakers' position is explained by the fact that film production requires significant financial costs and therefore cannot exist without the support of the state, which has nationalized all resources and property. Cinema is both an art and an industry. The latest technical achievements are used in cinematography. Film equipment, film, film studios, and laboratories are costly items in the creative process, not to mention personnel costs, including training relevant specialists and paying them for their work. Even the most commercially successful film cannot cover these expenses, so state intervention is vital for the existence of this industry. Economic dependence on the authorities contributed to the development of cinema in the direction desired by the party. From the very beginning, Soviet cinema was supposed to become socialist. After analyzing the theory of film editing, S. Trimbach concludes that with the help of individual fragments recorded in reality on film, it is possible to create a fundamentally new image of reality. In this way, art proved its ability to master reality and revolutionize it by projecting it onto the consciousness of the viewing audience. This was precisely what the Bolshevik regime needed [2, pp. 136-145]. Bolshevik ideology called for the destruction of the previous system in all spheres of life and the

establishment of a new, Soviet way of life. Cinema was no exception. Previous spiritual values were erased and new ones were created that corresponded to the requirements of the time and Bolshevik morality. This is confirmed by practical advice on the organization and work of the Society of Friends of Soviet Photography and Cinema, which was published in 1930. Under the title "Film is the best agitator," it described the film "The Old and the New," which shows how, in a traditionally oriented rural environment where the legacy of the past was deeply rooted, new forces have awakened and "united in a strong revolutionary core – the collective farm" [11, p. 5]. The film convinces the viewer that independent farming is a regressive phenomenon and that only collectivization can bring the village to a qualitatively new level of development. The main task of Soviet cinema was to instill new, correct views in the viewer, to educate them in the communist spirit, to make them a conscious participant in socialist construction [11, pp. 6-7]. First and foremost, this concerned new storylines.

The thematic focus of Soviet cinema in its early years was limited to several points: 1) informing workers about events on the fronts of the civil war and the construction of the Soviet state; 2) popularizing Bolshevik slogans; 3) spreading knowledge about scientific and technical inventions and works of classical culture. These tasks were carried out through the creation of newsreels, feature films, and propaganda films. At the same time, only those literary works that described the disenfranchisement of workers and class struggle were adapted for the screen.

According to political authorities, newsreels were supposed to be a kind of screen newspaper, reflecting the latest news, reproducing and explaining events and the political course of the state. Soviet newsreels focused on the image of V.I. Lenin, who appeared on screen more than twenty times with various speeches, festive addresses, or marching in a column, speaking at a rally. It was these fragments that were used throughout the entire existence of the Soviet Union. The main purpose of the chronicle was to convert the viewer to Bolshevik ideas by focusing the audience's attention on certain issues, using real footage from the lives of the population.

The latest achievements in science and technology were used to spread Bolshevik ideas, as traditional means of propaganda, such as the publication of brochures and books, lectures, and explanatory work, did not produce the desired results. The educational and propaganda role of cinema was obvious given the widespread illiteracy of the population, as film became the only source of ideologically balanced information. Precisely because of its comprehensibility and accessibility to the general public, cinema became the leading means of agitation, education, and cultural guidance.

The mistakes made in the first propaganda films sometimes had the opposite effect. The promising slogans that appeared on the screens in a primitive manner were negatively perceived by the population. Taking into account the shortcomings of

propaganda films, politicians and cultural workers came to the conclusion that publicity in films should be more subtle and hidden.

One of the leading themes of Soviet ideology was the spread of atheism as the worldview of the new society. The anti-religious campaign played perhaps the most important role in Soviet propaganda, with newspapers, magazines, lectures, and explanatory events aimed at re-educating the population in the spirit of atheism. Cinema did not require an literate audience, so it was best suited for this mission. Anti-religious themes were particularly acute in films intended for rural audiences. The peasantry, as the bearer of a traditional worldview, underwent a painful and lengthy transformation into "people of the new era." Each film was intended to convince viewers of the fallacy of Christian doctrine and the regressiveness of its way of life. Usually, films for rural areas depicted a drunken priest who led an immoral lifestyle and profited from the contributions of his parishioners. The discrediting of clergy was intended to turn the population away from religion. The believers in these films are elderly people who cannot shake their convictions. The younger generation was supposed to become not only atheists, but also active fighters against religion.

Cinema played an important role in implementing a broad program to highlight key moments in history. A series of films was devoted to the party's liberation of the people from imperial oppression, the establishment of Bolshevik power, and the struggle of workers, peasants, and soldiers for the progressive ideas of the Communist Party. Films depicting the revolution and civil war occupy an important place. Chronicle and propaganda films, movie posters, slogan films, and documentaries covering historical events were the initial stage of Soviet cinema. The first historical and revolutionary films include S. Eisenstein's Battleship Potemkin, V. Pudovkin's Mother, and O. Dovzhenko's Arsenal. The films listed above focus the viewer's attention on events that have already taken place, correctly programming their consciousness and forcing them to perceive reality as the only possible option for the development of society. This was achieved by contrasting the positive socialist world with the negative capitalist world. The desired effect was achieved by highlighting primitive images characteristic of the capitalist world, in particular cunning, insidious, stingy, depraved, and immoral capitalists who try in every way to harm the Soviet people. The game of opposites forced foreigners to be perceived only as bitter enemies.

On the other hand, the leaders of the world proletariat were portrayed in the most positive light. By the 20th and 21st anniversaries of the revolution, the films Lenin in October (1937), The Man with the Gun (1938), and The Great Glow (1938) were released, idealizing the images of V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin. The artistic images of the "geniuses of humanity" were intended to create a positive and heroic image that would evoke admiration and praise. Cinema played a significant role in shaping the cult of personality around Joseph Stalin. Newsreels and feature films actively glorified and idolized him.



An important task of cinema was to reflect the economic policy of the Soviet government. Films appeared that depicted the process of collectivization and dispossession of the countryside, industrialization of the city, the interconnection between industry and agriculture, and the fight against pests. These film campaigns looked attractive and even heroic. The films were intended to highlight a new attitude toward work. Socialist competition and heroes of labor became extremely popular themes.

No less significant were films that demonstrated the new proletarian way of life, new ideals, and new working-class culture. Films were released about new revolutionary holidays, communist subbotniks, workers' leisure time, the activities of labor communes, the opening of clubs, and so on. Cinema, placed under strict state control, carried out any orders from the party. Thus, the 1930s, marked by the establishment of Bolshevik totalitarianism, were to be portrayed on screen as a happy era of socialist construction. Cinema was supposed to show the population the communist ideal of a person to be emulated and aspired to. In addition, films from the period of the creation of collective farms were supposed to foster a sense of collectivism: in films, a united, friendly collective always prevailed, while a lone individual, an individualist, was perceived as its enemy.

Thus, Soviet cinema was used as an effective means of manipulating public consciousness. This ability can be explained by its synthetic nature, which lies in the combination of visual, audio, emotional, technical, and other factors. The multifunctionality and mass appeal of cinema confirmed its leading place in the art of the 1920s and 1930s. The Bolshevik government used cinema in every way possible as a means of totalitarian propaganda, affirming the new communist worldview, values, norms, and spreading the new proletarian way of life.

References

1. Sokolenko, L. (1993). Khto vynayshov kino [Who invented cinema]. Zoloti vorota – Golden Gates, 3, 90–92 [in Ukrainian].
2. Trymbach, S. (1998). Kino [Cinema]. Suchasnist – The Present, 5, 136–145 [in Ukrainian].
3. Shepelern, P. (1995). Mystetstvo, yake vodnochas – industriia [Art that is simultaneously an industry]. Kur'ier YuNESKO – UNESCO Courier, 9–10, 4–6 [in Ukrainian].
4. Rybakov, M. (1996). Desiata muza v Kyievi [The tenth muse in Kyiv]. Ukrainska kultura – Ukrainian Culture, 9–10, 27–30 [in Ukrainian].
5. Shevniuk, O. (2002). Ukrainskyi i svitovyi kinematohrafy [Ukrainian and world cinematography]. In Ukrainska i zarubizhna kultura [Ukrainian and foreign culture] (pp. 105–106). Kyiv: Znannia [in Ukrainian].
6. Skurativskyi, V. (1996). Kino – yak «vidkryttia» liudyny [Cinema as a "discovery" of man]. Filosofska i sotsiolohichna dumka – Philosophical and Sociological Thought, 1–2, 65–88 [in Ukrainian].
7. Ihoshkina, N. (2003). Kinomystetstvo yak vydh khudozhnoi tvorchosti [Cinema as a form of artistic creativity]. Praktychna filosofiia – Practical Philosophy, 2, 149–154 [in Ukrainian].

8. Lysetskyi, S. (2006). Industriia chy mystetstvo? [Industry or art?]. Suchasnist – The Present, 2, 109–115 [in Ukrainian].

9. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv upravlinnia Ukrainy [Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Power and Government of Ukraine]. (1924). Fond 1238: Vseukrainskyi trest kinopromyslovosti [All-Ukrainian Trust of Film Industry]. Opys 1, Sprava 18: Zvit pro diialnist VUFKU, lystuvannia z Narkomosvity USRR pro vstanovlennia kilkosti stipendiativ instytutiv, tekhnikumiv i robitfakiv, orhanizatsiiu hromadskoho perehliadu kinofilmiv ta inshykh pytan [Report on VUFKU activities, correspondence with the People's Commissariat for Education of the Ukrainian SSR regarding the number of scholarship holders at institutes, technical schools and workers' faculties, organization of public film screenings and other matters] (286 leaves) [in Ukrainian].

10. Luchyna, N. (1968). Kino – mystetstvo milioniv [Cinema – art of millions]. Kyiv: Mystetstvo [in Ukrainian].

11. Foto y kino. Hromadskist na seli. Orhanizatsiia y robota oseredku TDRFK: praktychni porady [Photography and cinema. Public in the countryside. Organization and work of the TDRFK center: practical advice]. (1930). Kharkiv: Ukrteakinovy dav [in Ukrainian].

Література

1. Соколенко Л. Хто винайшов кіно / Л. Соколенко // Золоті ворота. – 1993. – №3. – С. 90–92.

2. Тримбач С. Кіно / С. Тримбач // Сучасність. – 1998. – № 5. – С. 136–145.

3. Шепелерн П. Мистецтво, яке водночас – індустрія / П. Шепелерн // Кур'єр ЮНЕСКО. – 1995. – №9–10. – С. 4–6.

4. Рибаков М. Десята муза в Києві / М. Рибаков // Українська культура. – 1996. – № 9–10. – С. 27–30.

5. Український і світовий кінематографи // Шевнюк О. Українська і зарубіжна культура. – К. : Знання. – 2002. – С.105–106.

6. Скуратівський В. Кіно – як «відкриття» людини / В. Скуратівський // Філософська і соціологічна думка. – 1996. – №1–2. – С. 65–88.

7. Ігошкіна Н. Кіномистецтво як вид художньої творчості / Н. Ігошкіна // Практична філософія. – 2003. – №2. – С. 149-154.

8. Лисецький С. Індустрія чи мистецтво? / С. Лисецький // Сучасність. – 2006. – №2. – С.109–115.

9. Центральний державний архів вищих органів управління України (ЦДАВО України). — Фонд 1238. — Всеукраїнський трест кінопромисловості. — Опис 1. — Справа 18. — Звіт про діяльність ВУФКУ, листування з Наркомосвіти УСРР про встановлення кількості стипендіатів інститутів, технікумів і робітфаків, організацію громадського перегляду кінофільмів та інших питань. — 1924. — 286 арк.

10. Лучина Н. Кіно – мистецтво мільйонів / Н. Лучина. – К. : Мистецтво, 1968. – 48 с.

11. Фото й кіно. Громадськість на селі. Організація й робота осередку ТДРФК : практичні поради. – Х. : Укртеакіновидав, 1930. – 63 с.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 25.03.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 13.04.2026