



International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw,
Poland 00-773
+48 226 0 227 03
editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

ARTICLE TITLE

TOTALITARIAN STATE AND TWO DECADES OF GEORGIAN
CINEMATOGRAPHY

ARTICLE INFO

Rusudan Kvaratskhelia. (2025) Totalitarian State and Two Decades of Georgian
Cinematography. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social
Science*. 2(46). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(46).2025.3283

DOI

[https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2\(46\).2025.3283](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(46).2025.3283)

RECEIVED

09 April 2025

ACCEPTED

16 June 2025

PUBLISHED

30 June 2025

LICENSE



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License**.

© The author(s) 2025.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

TOTALITARIAN STATE AND TWO DECADES OF GEORGIAN CINEMATOGRAPHY

Rusudan Kvaratskhelia

Associated Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Caucasus International University, Tbilisi, Georgia

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-4947-4233

ABSTRACT

The research discusses how the totalitarian state was being formed during two decades, on the example of Georgian cinema of 1920s and 1930s; the trends of the "new human" and those seen in change from avant-garde film process to socialist realism, created by totalitarian cinema. Propaganda cinema significantly empowered the ideological basis of totalitarianism. Based on the study of important archival materials and films (My grandmother, Jim Shuante, etc.), the methods of shooting and editing, angles and long panoramas, light and shadow, everything that characterized the innovators, are revealed.

In the 1930s, the Soviet Government needed cinema more than ever. The form of development of cinematography in the Soviet Union during the 20s, did not satisfy the authorities in any way.

The main theoretical-ideological basis of the "Cinema-Stalinism" (Kinostalinism) system revealed that Stalinist totalitarianism operated by considering the psychology of the masses. Therefore, the "people's" films created in the 1930s are not only part of the mass culture formed during that period, but also part of Stalin's state policy in creating the "new human".

In the 1930s, the Bolshevik State managed to establish total control over cinematography. The idea of cinema was "simplified" and the era of search for novelties was lost. The declared primitive cinematography, which only had a utilitarian, propaganda function, existed for quite a long time, almost until the 60s of the 20th century; and for a long time preserved in a part of viewers the myth of the main function of cinema - the "happy" world.

KEYWORDS

Totalitarianism, Cinema Process, Avantgarde, Ideology, Agitation, Propaganda, Georgian

CITATION

Rusudan Kvaratskhelia. (2025) Totalitarian State and Two Decades of Georgian Cinematography. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(46). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(46).2025.3283

COPYRIGHT

© **The author(s) 2025**. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

Introduction.

Creation of the "new human" (Kravchenko, 2018) was set as task for the Soviet State by Lenin in the first years after the Revolution. However, historians consider the end of the 1920s as the immediate beginning of the process of creating a person with a completely new consciousness. The key date, formally, can be considered 1929, which later Stalin called "the year of the greatest turning point".

In view of the economy, this meant the implementation of a plan of universal collectivization and accelerated industrialization; and in public life, the strengthening of repression against a certain wide community (who were referred to as "socially alien elements"). As for the humanitarian and cultural sphere, the so-called cultural revolution, i.e., the creation of a "new" style of Soviet art and life, began.

If the 1920s were characterized by a diversity of art forms, by the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, the government first limited this process and then began to destroy it; and gradually, the only permissible artistic direction transformed into the so-called "great style" (Ochiauri, 2022). In architecture, instead of forbidden constructivism, it is reflected by monumental and pompous Stalinist empire style and in literature, painting, music and cinematography - by social realism. Along with other means, art was used as a

tool for the formation of the new Soviet human (*Homo Sovieticus*), the process of creation of which, as researchers and artists noted (Berdyayev, 1960, p. 182), continued for several decades.

Under a dictatorial regime, propaganda can present black as white and white as black, since "counter-propaganda or objective information is completely unacceptable" (Zhelev, 1995, p. 235). Art, which served as a propagandist, had to also form new moral attitudes in the population. Unlike the previous social and moral norms, which implied the mutual responsibility of people to each other, as well as to conscience and natural human morality, the Soviet Government demanded responsibility only to its own ideology, which was personified in the powerful and just leader (Khatiashvili, 2022, p. 180).

According to the ideology, a person - a small cog in a giant state machine, had to completely obey the ideological direction of the state. Historians and cultural experts associate this period with the formation of totalitarian Soviet consciousness.

This policy was particularly active in the transformations carried out for eliminating illiteracy. In 1920, in the Soviet Union, where more than half of the population was illiterate or poorly educated, universal primary education was introduced, but not to expand the scope of thinking of the wider society, and not to make people acquire the ability to receive and analyze information independently. The main goal of the process was to make the official propaganda better understood by the population, to popularize Soviet newspapers among the masses and for the main Soviet slogans to be better perceived.

A special feature of the consciousness of the new Soviet human (which was still being formed at that time) was that they could not compare two images of reality: the confrontation of the first (which was offered by propaganda (including motion pictures)) with the second reality, which they saw in everyday life. Simply put, they could watch their neighbor being arrested and after calmly go to the cinema thinking that "in our country no one is being arrested if they are innocent." The inability to analyze these two realities (the real and the constructed) created a cognitive dissonance in his consciousness that characterized *Homo Sovieticus* during the time of existence of the Soviet government (and also during the subsequent period).

The inability, and often the unwillingness, to resist the centralized system of violence and propaganda is an important feature of the Soviet mass consciousness of the Stalinist era. Therefore, the culture of the 1930s is, naturally, a culture of total hypocrisy and it is this that led to the formation of one of the main features characterizing next Soviet generations – **formation of double thinking in people**. Seeing what was actually happening, a large part of society tried to adapt their consciousness and perception to the laws of official propaganda, because they were afraid of falling out of the social environment and the rigidly stratified Soviet social hierarchy.

The Soviet system's interest in cinema was inspired not by its cultural significance in the society or even by simple curiosity, but only by utilitarian goals - seizing and maintaining power, "transforming" the state, society and people according to the new model needed by the Bolsheviks. This attitude towards cinematography will become the basis of the Bolshevik policy for decades and the main function of the cinema will be limited to a means of agitation and propaganda of political ideas (Kontridze, 2022).

Materials and Methods.

From the point of view of the 21st century, it is very important to analyze some important aspects of the cinematography of the 20th century, which depict a rather voluminous picture of historical events and processes. Naturally, the presented paper does not aim to discuss the entire history of cinematography, but the choice of the research period – 20th -30th years, in this context, is obviously not accidental. This period is presented to us as a capacious fragment of the complex, internally contradictory development of cinema; A period when the game of life and death was in full swing around the cinematographers.

The research in the paper is based on a rather large amount of material. Theoretical works of H. Arendt, M. Mamardashvili, N. Berdiaev, Zh.Zhelev on fascism and totalitarianism. The research is mainly based on well-known, little-known and unknown materials from the archives of Georgia and Russia, the analysis of which paints a clear picture of the processes taking place in cinematography at that time. Some materials about Georgian directors were taken from the archives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, but it was possible to study only a part of their content, because the criminal cases are still classified and difficult to access. Nevertheless, on the basis of various articles of film specialists, critical reviews and theoretical works of research institutes, the reasons and tasks of the state funded film industry and the influence of mass taste on cinematography are discussed.

Based on the tasks and conditions set in the work, the research is mainly based on historical, comparative, semiotic and content analysis methodology.

Results and Discussion.

Bolshevik Ideology and Cinema Avantgarde (1920s)

1920s are a unique, extraordinary period in the history of Soviet cinema. Cinematography of that time was characterized by a number of peculiarities and the whole process of innovative searches, which never appeared the later period of Soviet cinema.

Soviet, including Georgian, film directors created such masterpieces of documentary and motion films, which are the keystone material of the history of cinematography (Kalandarishvili, 2014, p. 172). And this at a time when the new, still weak government demanded only one thing from cinema - to turn this field of art into a tool of propaganda and agitation. The reason for this was the unstable state of the Soviet government at the time, on the verge of collapse. The situation forced the Bolsheviks to turn to the mechanisms of the market economy to restore the public economy, to enable the people to feed themselves and thereby at least partially calm the agitated masses.

Naturally, all this had an impact on cinematography. The market space of cinema gradually began to revive. Since Soviet production was still weak, many foreign films appeared on the screens, pre-revolutionary films and a limited number of films with interesting plots for the audience were put into production. Despite the fact that many of them absolutely did not correspond to the Bolshevik ideology and the Leninist approach to cinema, the State was still unable to fully finance its own interests in such an expensive industry. Therefore, Soviet authorities had to come to cope with the fact of existence of a market system in cinematography, which was not focused on fulfilling the Party's instructions and served the audience with the goal of gaining maximum profit. Cinematography development strategy was also announced.

It was the State interests that led to need in screenings in Georgian cinema. During this period, the following films were released: *The Teacher* (1922, directed by V. Barsky) based on Al. Kazbegi's short story; *The Castle of Surami* (1922, directed by I. Perestiani) based on the short story of the same name by Daniel Chonkadze; *Father's Killer* (1923, directed by A. Bek-Nazarov) Al. Kazbegi's short story of the same title; *Three Lives* (1924, directed by I. Perestiani) based on the novel *The First Step* by Giorgi Tsereteli; *The Case of the Murder of Taniel Mklavadze* (1925, directed by I. Perestiani), based on E. Ninoshvili's short story *Knight of our Country*; *Who is to be Blamed* (1925, directed by A. Tsutsunava) based on the play of the same name by N. Nakashidze. (The materials about the director were obtained from the archives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, although only part of them could be published, because the criminal cases are still classified and difficult to access).

Films that aroused the great interest of the audience with their intense plots, bright and evil characters, mostly did not differ in diversity and novelty of the director approaches. However, at the same time, in the 20s, a period of new searches and experiments is taking place in the works of a number of directors, when the authors even use the elements of the artistic avant-garde, expressionism and cubism in creative form.

In 1929, director Kote Mikaberidze makes one of the most important films in the history of Georgian cinema, the satirical comedy *My Grandma*, which was banned until 1976.

My Grandma was supposed to be presented by its authors as an agitation against bureaucracy, but it turned out that the film depicted the Soviet bureaucratic system and showed the absurdity of the ideology. It was actually a mockery of the Soviet way of life. However, it should be noted that, just like other directors of the 20s and 30s, Kote Mikaberidze was also considered a director of Soviet political propaganda (Dumbadze & Dzanava, 2017). From 1939, he even was a member of the Party and in 1957 he was arrested for his anti-Soviet views.

The film *My Grandma* offers us an interesting interpretation of the expressionist vision and at the same time, it is radically different from all the films that were created before in Georgian cinematography. Expressionist art is imbued with pessimism and despair, with a sense of imminence of disaster. Mikaberidze writes in his memoirs: "...I worked to create such a film satire, the purpose of which would be to make fun of bureaucracy, mischief and protectionism. In order to implement this idea, I was secretly looking for a new, sharp expressive form characteristic of cinematography" (Personal File).

Not only Kote Mikaberidze, many innovative directors of the 20s - Dziga Vertov, Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Sergey Eisenstein, Alexander Dovzhenko, Grigory Kozintsev, - right by using new forms and progressive methods and techniques of classical cinema (instead of just entertaining performance), attempted to empower film rhetoric (pressure) and the political ideology. Sergei Eisenstein wrote about montage: "...form is always ideology. Also, the form always turns out to be the true ideology. It is an ideology that can really be used, and not the pretense ideology of senseless talks" (Eisenstein, 1964).

The deformed, completely distorted environment, the conditional disorder of the image, the unconventional closed compositions, which are so natural for expressionism, used in the film *My Grandma*, were unacceptable to the Soviet censors. Sergei Tretyakov, an experienced cinematographer sent from Russia to Georgia, warned Kote Mikaberidze at the discussion after the screening of the film: "An attempt to create an experimental comedy is the most difficult genre under Soviet conditions; satire and prosecution are side by side" (Personal files). In the end, the film was labeled as "anti-Soviet, formalist" cinema, was banned and only later it was recognized as a masterpiece of first Soviet, and then world and Georgian cinematography.

Under the conditions of the totalitarian system, documentary cinema was also popular, which was tasked with showing the successes and achievements of the Soviet government and discrediting the opponents of the government on the screen. Agitation with facts was an important part of the Bolsheviks' propaganda policy. For this purpose, short film magazines-chronicles were created throughout the 20s. Full-length documentaries were also of an agitational nature (Tikanadze, 1978).

Mikheil Kalatozishvili's documentary film *Salt for Svaneti*, which was shown on the screen in 1930, for only 4 days, today it is considered a masterpiece of poetic cinema of the 20th century.

Mikheil Kalatozishvili was not one of the ideologists. In the end, as an artist, he was a singer of truth, and his episodic pathos in some of his works bore only certain signs of complicity, not sympathy. A revolutionary explosion for the romantics of the 20s - a universal way of historical and social development and the cinematography turned into an instrument of world transformation and a means of agitation to put pressure on the audience as a "time machine of the future". For romantic consciousness, the future is conceived as something wonderful, concrete, tangible and real. And the present is vague and uncertain. That is why they tried to fundamentally remodel, transform and recreate it.

The film depicts the difficult life of the Svans (Svaneti - a remote highland mountainous region of Georgia) in harsh climatic conditions. In the region, among other problems, the natural shortage of salt was also causing problems. According to the story and the actual "five-year action plan", the Soviet government is helping Svaneti and building a new road that will connect the mountains with the lowlands.

Road construction, which will return salt to Svaneti and fundamentally change the life of the region, is the happy ending version of the picture of this tragic existence. And this new road is being built in ancient Svaneti by young people who appeared in director's imagination and in the new reality - "joyful and smart builders". However, Kalatozishvili's ideological vision is perceived not as a directly declared agitating position of the Soviet system, but as an ode to man - to man, who is a part of nature and a real hero in the period between birth and death.

Shooting and editing techniques, sharp angles and long panoramas from bottom to top and top to bottom, the use of contrasting light, give the film a colorful, charming expression. Very large views go beyond the real boundaries of objects and make everything abstract. The object is replaced by its feeling, using light and shadows and expressive montage, which will turn any small item or object into a symbol in the frame.

Those responsible for the Soviet ideology hated the film mostly because of the constructive structure and not because of the idea of the work itself. By the end of the 1920s, Soviet authorities realized that, despite their directives, cinema had begun to develop in a different direction and began a large-scale criticism of the Soviet system of film production and distribution. As a result of this campaign, in March 1928, the first All-Soviet Party Congress of Cinematography was held. The main criticism came against the so-called "commercial part" of Soviet cinematography. The plots of the films were also criticized because the types of heroes presented themselves from an individual rather than a social position. Only the dissolution of the old forms of public existence was shown; in the plots, the main motive was the love of a man for a woman with the loud name "sex issue"; themes such as infidelity and love triangles were said to be prevalent; the films were labeled as pseudo-historical love dramas and pseudo-stupid comedies. According to ideologists, "the beauty of heroism should replace the beauty of love." Viewer should not be instilled with the pleasure of a "beautiful lady", but should be influenced in such a way that they "hug a car and softly whispers to dynamo". The axis of the film should not be gender, but sociality, which should define ideals, mood and feelings. The main reasons were considered to be: script crisis and the harmful influence of foreign "film garbage", which "often remains a standard for Soviet-produced films in both ideological and artistic fields" (Party congress on cinema, 1928, p. 28).

The history of the cinema of the 1920s shows that, considering the interests of the talented and innovative cinematographers and the public, the cinema system in the country could be harmoniously managed even on the basis of market perspectives. But based on the instructions of the Party and Lenin's doctrines, another direction became relevant for the development of this field of art.

Social Realism and Simple Forms of Expression (1930s)

1930s was a period of powerful development, great changes and revolutionary upheavals, both in the history of mankind and cinema. "Mute", having acquired a voice, became even more powerful and gained more fans. It was in the 1930s that cinema established itself as an integral part of public life, actively responding to events and participating in them - American cinema was creating standards of values oriented towards a better future, which helped society to fight the hardships caused by the Great Depression (Yampolsky, 1982). At the same time, the fascist regimes taking over governments in Germany and Italy engaged in powerful agitation and propaganda activities, an important part of which was cinematography.

In the 1930s, the Soviet government needed cinema more than ever. The policy carried out in the country, which radically destroyed the foundations of public existence, had to have powerful propaganda support. It became clear that cinematography, which existed and developed under conditions of self-funding, did not fully respond to Party tasks, and often did not even come in ideological agreement with it (Beskin, 1928, p. 3). During this period, the Government raised a new type of person - submissive and intimidated by the existence of "enemies of the people", at the same time admiring and proud of the Soviet country, who loved the Party and the great leader – Stalin, the most.

At the end of 1920s, Stalin began to more actively persuade imperative interests in various fields of art, including the ideology of cinema. Eventually, he became the chief producer, censor, editor, and moviegoer who, while watching films in the Kremlin, personally "made corrections" to scripts and film titles. Creative flows weakened, many groups and avant-garde movements disappeared. The polylogue of the 1920s turned into a monologue structure of socialist realism.

"A form understandable by millions" was one of the main postulates of socialist realism. The film language of the avant-garde required an aesthetic training, difficult to understand by the proletariat. People mainly went to watch the films, melodramas and comedies with psychological and existential motives. Avant-garde films kept failing one after another at the box office. It was the primitive needs that led to the reduction of expression in the cinema and the extreme simplification of the forms of expression, which meant linear dramaturgy and film language.

Based on his own experience as a moviegoer, Stalin defined the main value - the film should be "simple and understandable for the mass audiences"; "Even the best films lose a significant part of their appeal because of one or two protracted scenes", only in this case will the "most important of the fields of art" bring real benefits to the regime and work successfully for the Stalinist "cultural revolution". Based on these decisions and right at that moment, the time of avant-garde and innovative experiments in Soviet cinema ended. The State no longer needs creative ideas and research from filmmakers. All cinema workers follow the ideological instructions of "Cinema-Stalinism" - an understandable, interesting and ideologically strong cinema should be created for the masses, which would raise a new person - obedient, intimidated and admiring.

In all soviet republics, cinematographic joint-stock companies were abolished and film organizations, like in the industrial fields, received the status of trusts. From now on, films were shot in the country only by film trusts included in the state cinematography system, headed by Soyuzkino; while the strictest censorship was appointed to forced film production, as permanent controller of processes (Fomin, 2019).

In the Stalinist system of cinema development, feature cinema was officially declared as the main type of production. The main socialist realist themes of that period are: Industrial construction, the labor heroism of the working class, the actions of the class enemy and its agencies and their neutralization; it was supposed to reflect the typical faces of the heroes of the new era and the historical path of the proletariat and the Communist Party (Our Cinema, 1931). Films - *In the Land of Avalanches* (dir. Siko Dolidze), *Hassan* (dir. Kote Mikaberidze), *The Desert* (dir. Nikoloz Sanishvili), *The Last Crusaders* (dir. Mikheil Chiaureli), *The Grumpy Man* (dir. N. Ghogoberidze), *Arshaula* (dir. D. Rondeli), *The Two Friends* (dir. I. Perestiani), *Friendship* (dir. S. Dolidze), *Ugubziara* (dir. D. Rondeli), *The Musician* (dir. M. Gelovani), were dedicated to the topic of building collective farming and fight against the old way of life.

It is noteworthy that unlike Lenin, Stalin (the comparison is important if we compare two decades of cinematography) was very fond of cinema and was familiar with films, not only as a state official controlling a powerful propaganda weapon, but also as an ordinary viewer, appreciating an understandable and interesting plot and clear characters full of life; he loved adventure movies and comedies. Regardless of the genre, he criticized those films that were boring or too "long" for him, noting that "... even the best films lose their charm because of long scenes" (Documentation, Kremlin Cinema. Conversation 1934 October 7, 2005, p. 952).

Soviet films were to create an atmosphere of joy and happiness on the screen. In the collective farms, the peasants, once oppressed by the Kulaks, collect a huge harvest with singing and sublime emotions. The

comedy genre became popular (films: *Orange Valley* (dir. N. Shengelaia), *Winged Painter* (dir. L. Esakia), *Paradise Lost* (dir. D. Rondeli), *Late Bride* (dir. K. Mikaberidze), *Zhuzhuna's Dowry* (dir. S. Falavandishvili), *The Real Caucasian* (dir. M. Gelovani). Cinema created the strong image of a stable and happy, free country.

Viewers were constantly reminded how lucky they were to live in the happy times when good triumphed over evil, which they had to be thankful to the Bolshevik State and the Leninist-Stalinist Party for. In the background of this universal joy and euphoria, an important message was persistently heard from the screen - there are forces that constantly interfere with the happiness and freedom of the Soviet State. These forces are everywhere and are doing everything to hamper the building of socialism. The image of the external and internal enemy, in the form of a "harmful element", was everywhere: (films: *The Meeting* (dir. G. Gomarteli), *Cell 79* (dir. Z. Berishvili), *Homeland* (dir. N. Shengelaya), *Shakir* (dir. L. Esakia), *Goodbye* (dir. G. Makarov), *Across the River* (dir. Dz. Berishvili), *Divorce* (dir. G. Makarov). Films that featured appearance of an outside enemy, caused optimism and a feeling of imminent victory in the audience, since the Red Army, Soviet collective farmers and workers were presented in a fearless, invincible form. While the enemies, agents, saboteurs, fascists, on the contrary, appeared in comic images. Approach towards internal, "the enemy of the people". The image of the enemy of the people played an important role in the mobilization system of Stalinism. Such enemies looked for everywhere, "identified" and destroyed. All agitational and propaganda tools worked to establish an atmosphere of mass fear. Cinematography also played an important role in this process, showing the "difficult situation" and called on all the citizens of the Soviet Union to be alert for protecting the socialist future of the country. The masses were inspired that any communist, an experienced party worker hiding behind Leninist slogans, could be an enemy of the people, willing to sabotage, murder and even more with the aim to overthrow the Bolshevik power of the people. Moreover, the enemy could be in the neighborhood and even in the family.

In the 1930s, in all planned productions of the Soviet cinematography and of the top leadership of the Party, the necessity of films on historical-revolutionary themes could be seen. *American Girl* (dir. L. Esakia), *Dariko* (dir. S. Dolidze), *Savur-Mogila* (dir. I. Perestiani), *The Great Dawn* (dir. M. Chiaureli), *The Nail in the Boot* (dir. M. Kalatozishvili), *The Doomed* (dir. L. Push), *The Last Masquerade* (dir. M. Chiaureli) - these are the films that show the pseudo-history of the revolutionary movement, the heroic struggle of the Bolsheviks for power, the liberation of the people from the nobles and capitalists; White Guards and interventionists, traitors who "sneaked" into the Bolshevik Party and tried in every possible way to disrupt the revolution, etc. Historical-revolutionary cinema played significant role in creating a mythologized history of revolutionary events, which was interpreted according to the instructions of the Soviet Government and remained in the public consciousness for a long time.

In terms of falsification of historical events and the pathos-filled myth, Mikheil Chiaureli's film *The Great Dawn* is worth mentioning. In the film, Stalin is shown not only as an associate of Lenin, but also as an ever-present and caring friend who often continues or corrects Lenin's suggestions. Moreover, in the film he appears as the main actor of the October Revolution, defining the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the pre-revolutionary period, proclaiming the slogan of the seizure of power by armed force and giving the order to the soldiers to start the uprising. On screen, Stalin appears as a much more confident and wiser leader than his teacher.

It was not accidental that the films - *Arsena* (dir. M. Chiaureli), *Giorgi Saakadze* (dir. M. Chiaureli) and *Kajeti* (dir. K. Mikaberidze), dedicated to historical themes, were created; although the latter based on one of the chapters of *The Knight in the Tiger's Skin* epic poem. Their story was directly related to the policy of the Soviet State and its agitational and propaganda tasks. In each of these films, the story was interpreted by the government, where the historical characters told what the Soviet government had to say.

Agitation policy was also applied to children and adolescents. The films - *Camp in the Mountain* (dir. A. Takaishvili), *Mzagho and Bela* (dir. Sh. Khuskivadze), *Stepfather* (dir. G. Lomidze), *Communar's Pipe* (dir. K. Marjanishvili), *Tanya on the Front* (dir. Z. Berishvili) in addition to the motives of humanitarian and patriotic values, also carried the themes of political propaganda. What was important for the regime: "Education of selfless love for the motherland, bravery, heroism in the young generation." Therefore, the theme should be important with the working class, Party struggle and interesting heroic plot line" (Documentation, Kremlin Cinema 1928-1953, 2005, p. 284).

Under the conditions of centralized film production during the Soviet period, all Georgian films, as well as films from the rest of the USSR republics, are kept in Russia and are still in the Russian Federation's film archive. Therefore, the works listed here are only part of the films we know about. In addition, this period, 1930s, is associated with the era of the "Great Terror", when many artists were included in the lists of those

who were repressed. Films with artists undesirable for the State ideology were massively destroyed or "put on the shelf" in film studios. Their cases have not been fully explored to this day.

In a report dedicated to the eleventh anniversary of Soviet Georgia, Lavrenti Beria says about the cinematography: „... we have a number of film directors whose work and artistic productions have attracted the attention of the Government. By overcoming bourgeois formalism and aestheticism, our film industry makes its way to the real reflection of the tasks of socialism construction... <>Cinema is the best tool in the work of agitation and propaganda and it must fulfill this assigned task clearly" (For Proletarian Art, 1932).

Thus, the State gained complete and unconditional power over all actors of the cinema system. At the head of power was its creator, Stalin, who single-handedly led the Soviet film system, determined the directions of its development, was its main advisor and censor. But obviously this alone could not bring success. The usurpation of power in this field of art is not directly proportional to the success with the audience and therefore does not guarantee the achievement of the totalitarian State goal. The strength of the Stalinist cinema system lay in the fact that, along with the practical, there was a vertical of theoretical and ideological power, focused on the demands of the mass audiences, which gave rise to the important phenomenon of Stalinism - the agitator of the mythology and program parameters of the Stalin regime; and it played a decisive role in the implementation of the "cultural revolution".

In the 1930s, the Soviet Government achieved major success. With the help of cinematography, they managed to create such a lever on the public consciousness, which perfectly established the ideology and socio-political myth of the regime in the Soviet audience.

Conclusions.

In the Soviet Union of 1920s, the then form of development in cinematography could not satisfy the authorities in any way. A problem for the Soviet Government was the fact that the film system, based on market mechanisms and relative, but still existing, creative freedom, where directors were allowed to show their potential and talent, was developing rapidly. Films based on the Leninist utilitarian approach often simply could not compete. The audience was less interested in propaganda chronicles and "culture films" and gave clear preference to action and adventure films. There was a search for new ways and forms of film language, which the Soviet Government did not need, especially in the conditions of the establishment of the totalitarian state of Stalinism, where any branch of art served to "brainwash" society.

Joseph Stalin clearly shared the Leninist view that cinema is the best tool for agitation and propaganda of political ideas. But knowing the psychology of the masses very well, unlike his predecessor, he went much further and made important corrections in the Leninist directive. Stalin, unlike Lenin, did not believe that with the help of the "tenth muse" society should be educated, raise knowledge and awareness. He gave this idea another purpose - entertainment function was added to the agitational-propagandistic and educational one. It was this correction that became the main theoretical-ideological basis of the "Kinostalinism" system established in the Soviet Union in the 1930s. This ideological platform makes it clear that considering the psychology of the masses, Stalinist totalitarianism, acted wisely and prudently. In this (not just in the well-known repressions and the creation of Gulags (the main division of labor and correctional camps and colonies), was his power. Therefore, the "people's" films created in the 1930s are not only part of the mass culture formed at that time, but also part of Stalin's State policy, which was the basis of the "cultural revolution" of the powerful ideological regime, for the creation of an obedient, fearful and admiring "new humans".

Thus, in the 1930s, the Bolshevik regime finally managed to establish control over cinematography. Moreover, the system of management and control of "the greatest of the arts" created by Stalin became so totalizing that such a complex and contradictory phenomenon as cinema was "simplified" and lost most of its diversity. This "simple" and primitive declared cinematography, having only the utilitarian, propaganda function, existed for quite a long time, almost until the 60s of the 20th century and managed to maintain the myth in one part of the audience for a long time, about the of the main function of cinema - the necessity for an illusory world.

REFERENCES

1. (1932). *For Proletarian Art*, pp. 1-2.
2. Berdyayev, N. (1960). *The Origin of Russian Communism*. Michigan.
3. Beskin, O. (1928). Some features from the life of Sovkino. *Soviet Cinema* #1, 3.
4. Documentation. (2005). *Kremlin Cinema 1928-1953*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
5. Documentation. (2005). *Kremlin cinema. 1928-1953*. Moscow: Publishing house ROSSPEN.
6. Documentation. (2005). *Kremlin Cinema. Conversation 1934 October 7*. Moscow: Rosspen.
7. Dumbadze, S., & Dzanava, N. (2017). *Kote Mikaberidze*. Tbilisi: Public Publishing House.
8. Eisenstein, S. (1964). *Selected works in 6 volumes*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
9. Fomin, V. (2019). *Cinema and Power*. House Materik.
10. Kalandarishvili, L. (2014). *Spiritual Values - Eternity and Relativism*. Tbilisi: Shota Rustaveli Theatre and Film Georgia State University.
11. Khatishvili, T. (2022). *Soviet Fairy Tale About Good and Evil*. Tbilisi: National Centre of Georgia.
12. Kontridze, E. (2022). *Sakhkinmetsev - Exemplary Punishment*. Tbilisi: National Center of Georgia.
13. Kravchenko, A. (2018, 10). *Arzamas*. Retrieved from Creation of a new man: <https://arzamas.academy/materials/1499>
14. Ochiauri, L. (2022). *In Time And Against Time*. Tbilisi: National Center of Cinematography of Georgia.
15. Our Cinema. (1931, December 14). *Pravda*, p. 2.
16. Party congress on cinema. (1928). *Soviet Cinema* #1, 28.
17. Personal File, Fund-1, Folder-1783, manuscript-168 (Art Palace).
18. Personal files, Art Palace (Fund-1, Folder-1783, manuscript-182).
19. Tikanadze, R. (1978). *Georgian Cinema of the Problem of Searching*. Tbilisi.
20. war, B. r. (n.d.). <https://arzamas.academy/materials>.
21. Yampolsky, M. (1982). Cinema "Total" and "Montage". *Art of Cinema* #7.
22. Zhelev, Z. (1995). *Fascism*. Moscow.