6 Defeats that Were Almost Victories

Jay Leyda's (Soviet) Archives[1]

Masha Salazkina

Abstract
This essay assesses Jay Leyda's contribution to film studies' gradual emergence as a field of knowledge in the twentieth century. It focuses on Leyda's stay in the Soviet Union in the 1930s during a key moment in the development of an ambitious and experimental programme for the production, research and preservation of cinema. Leyda's life-long travel trajectories which began in Russia shaped his understanding of the archive's role as a source, foundation, and vehicle for cinematic knowledge and his keen awareness of its geopolitical positioning, producing a vision of film history that was unique for American culture at the time. The essay argues for the importance of his legacy as speaking to key developments within film and media historiography today.

Keywords: film history, film education, archival practices, Sergei Eisenstein, Jay Leyda

Jay Leyda is best remembered now as one of the first translators of Sergei Eisenstein's writings into English, most notably the two collections, *Film Form* and *Film Sense*, which for many generations (at least until Richard Taylor's translations) were the only source for a systematic analysis of Eisenstein's theoretical oeuvre, in any language.[2] In fact, many of Eisenstein's translations into languages other than English or French were done using Leyda's translation rather than the original, the writings in Russian were

1 My sincere thanks to the editors of this volume and to Tom Gunning, Charles Acland, and Nicolas Avedisian-Cohen for their insightful comments and suggestions.

2 Sergei Eisenstein, *The Film Sense* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942); Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949).

Hagener, M. & Y. Zimmermann (eds), *How Film Histories Were Made: Materials, Methods, Discourses*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2024
DOI: 10.5117/9789463724067_CH06

largely unavailable. After a selection of Eisenstein's writings finally came out as "collected works" in the Soviet Union and when, simultaneously, several other translations began to appear in different languages, Leyda continued until his death in 1988 translating, editing, and publishing other works by Eisenstein, contributing greatly to the preservation and dissemination of his legacy worldwide.

But Leyda was also an important and fascinating figure in his own right. He not only published the first volume on Russian and Soviet cinema in English, but also wrote historical works on Chinese cinema and compilation film (in both cases these were some of the first studies on these two subjects published in English), along with studies of Melville, translations of Musorgsky, and biographies of Rachmaninov and Emily Dickinson.[3] His background was in avant-garde political film-making (as part of the Film and Photo Leagues of the Workers International Relief), which led him to study film under Eisenstein in Moscow between 1933 and 1936. Upon his return, he accepted the position of an assistant curator in the newly founded film department of the Museum of Modern Art and continued political film-making through his affiliation with leftist collectives Nykino and Frontier Films. He later worked as a consultant for Warner Bros., and conducted archival film research in France, China, and the German Democratic Republic, until beginning a university teaching career that culminated in teaching at the graduate programme of New York University from 1974 to 1987, shaping generations of film scholars to come.[4] Leyda belongs to the handful of artists and intellectuals (Joris Ivens and Paul Strand come to mind) whose lives and careers connect some of the pivotal moments in the cultural and political history of cinema of the twentieth century and many of its geographic "hot spots."

As a scholar and an educator, he shaped much of the development of the English-language field of film studies, amongst other disciplines, developing film history in particular. And while the importance of Leyda's experience in the Soviet Union in the 1930s is central to any account of his life and work,

3 Books by Jay Leyda: *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film* (New York: Macmillan, 1960); *Films Beget Films: A Study of the Compilation Film* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1964); *Dianying* (*Electric Shadows*)*: An Account of Films and the Film Audience in China* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1972); *The Melville Log: A Documentary Life of Herman Melville, 1819–1891* (New York: Harcourt, 1951); *The Musorgsky Reader: A Life of Modeste Petrovich Musorgsky in Letters and Documents* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1947); *The Years and Hours of Emily Dickinson* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960); with Sergei Bertensson, and Sophia Satina, *Sergei Rachmaninoff, a Lifetime in Music* (New York: New York University Press, 1956).

4 Ian Aitken, "Jay Leyda," in *The Concise Routledge Encyclopedia of Documentary Film* (London: Routledge, 2013), 545–48.

making sense of that connection in terms of what it can tell us about the history of film studies and film historiography, beyond Leyda's individual biography, still remains a pressing task. This essay charts this historical connection, through the figure of Jay Leyda, in the larger context of film studies emerging as a field of knowledge in the late twentieth century. In particular, I focus on the broader context for Leyda's stay in Moscow during a key moment in the development of an ambitious and experimental—albeit very short lived—programme for the study of the production, research, and preservation of cinema, as well as Eisenstein's role in that process, that took place at the Institute of Cinematography (VGIK), the Moscow film school.

Eisenstein's work at VGIK and his ideas about pedagogy and film training as it pertained to his general approach to film theory and history were obviously central to the trajectory of Leyda's intellectual development: he came to Moscow specifically to learn film-making from the celebrated Soviet film-maker, studying in Eisenstein's "workshop" (which is how the institute was organized) for three years. At first, this was as an officially enrolled student and later as an auditor. He also worked as an assistant on the making of *Bezhin Meadow* (*Bezhin Lug*). Leyda understood the importance of Eisenstein's pedagogical practice and how integral it was to his overall theoretical and artistic oeuvre. These insights were reflected in Leyda's translations and commentaries, several of which deal explicitly with Eisenstein's teaching (this includes the translation of Nizhny's *Lessons with Eisenstein*, as well as *Film Essays and a Lecture*).[5] In fact, until quite recently, when some of VGIK's original documents were finally published (in the four-volume *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], 2000–2013), much of the existing information outside the institutional archive about both the film institute and Eisenstein's role in it could only be gathered from Leyda's work—both his translations and his own writings.

Considering Leyda's work in the context of the pedagogical experiments taking place in VGIK in the 1930s may help us to reconstruct Leyda's place in the development of American film historiography, as a scholar, activist, and teacher. While not fully accounting for Leyda's specific approach to film history to his experiences at VGIK, Leyda's career links the Soviet experiments in film education with the broader development of the discipline of film studies—film historiography, in particular—in the Anglo-American sphere. It connects several pivotal moments in the transnational history of

5 Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Essays, with a Lecture*, ed. and trans. Jay Leyda (London: Dennis Dobson, 1968); Vladimir Nizhny, *Lessons with Eisenstein*, ed. and trans. Jay Leyda and Ivor Montagu (New York: Hill and Wang, 1969).

the institutionalization of the preservation and study of cinema. As a result, it draws attention to some constitutive tensions and struggles underlying these developments, which Leyda's experiences bring to light with particular force.

In sketching out the contours of VGIK's experimental programme in the remainder of the essay, I do not mean to suggest that all of its inner workings and broader social and political contexts were known to Leyda at the time (despite his closeness to Eisenstein). And yet, acknowledging the gaps, disjuncts, and contradictions in our attempts to reconstruct this slice of history—while still asserting the importance of this larger project—seems like a fitting way to historicize a historian whose own work relied so clearly on the power of personal experiences, anecdotes, and broader intellectual conjunctures, and whose own method was in many ways an homage to his illustrious Soviet mentor—Eisenstein himself, of course, posited history as a kind of dialectical montage (this approach is visible in the episodic structure of the writing of *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film*, or in the very premise of *Films Beget Films: A Study of the Compilation Film*, as well as in student accounts of Leyda's own teaching).

And as befits a Marxist historian, such a dialectical history understands its object as the site of struggle: in our case, of simultaneous and inseparable drives towards institutionalization—and therefore, control and organization of knowledge and material through scientific management—and democratization, which often demands the opposite, namely, the dismantlement of the institutional hierarchies and control, which in turn inevitably demonstrate the specific failures of scientific management as a model when these are confronted with the particularities of individual experiences, perceptions, desires, and the unpredictability of historical outcomes.

Early Soviet film education embodies this cluster of contradictions with particular force due to the political urgency placed on these developments by state and political actors. What I argue here is that the way conflicting forces that shaped the emergence of institutionalized film education in the Soviet Union played out over a longer period from Moscow to New York. This institutionalization was reshaped not only by the circumstances of different times and places, but also by different but intrinsically related historical pressures over the course of the twentieth century, which established the norms and aspirations for the study of film history as we know it today. This was embodied most succinctly in Leyda's intellectual and professional trajectory.

A few elements emerge here as part of a broader conceptual framework connecting Leyda's ideas and teaching practices and the Soviet context on which I will be drawing. Central to it is an expansive and ambitious notion

of film pedagogy, in its many forms, including the assertion of cinema as an object of organized scholarly study—which had no equivalent in the US cultural and educational landscape of the 1930s.[6] As part of this broader ambition, Leyda combined, for the duration of his career, three discrete notions of film archives: the first is the archive as the foundation for alternative (non-commercial) exhibition and education circuits and the kind of experimental, artistic, and theoretical knowledge they produce (a notion, which has come to fore within film scholarship only in recent decades)[7]; the second is the archive as a primary scholarly resource (as canon formation but also as a way to refute the existing assumptions about cinema, its history, and its geography), and this is where his work for MoMA and for the French, German Democratic Republic, and China film archives are relevant referents[8]; the third is the archive as a site for potential creative and political practice (an understanding that is foregrounded in *Films Beget Films*). Leyda's work reveals an interplay among these different functions as conceptualized by his contemporaries and comrades Harry Potamkin, Eisenstein, and Nikolai Lebedev. This broader understanding of the social, pedagogical, and historical functions of an archive extends to the personal and affective, but is also dialectically connected to the institutional archive or library models of film education. This encompasses education of the masses (especially through non-commercial cultural circuits and sites of film exhibition), as well as highly specialized forms of pedagogy (such as graduate education in film studies).

A commitment to this model, which combines the seemingly contradictory impulse towards the popularization of film education and its extreme specialization, can be seen in Leyda's involvement, on the one hand, in such projects as MoMA's and, on the other, in the NYU graduate film programme from the 1970s onward—one historical pillar in the development of the highly specialized scholarly discipline of film studies. Establishing film archives turns out to be a crucial precondition for both.

6 See his argument in Jay Leyda, "Training for Film Workers: Russia," *Hollywood Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (April 1946): 279–86.

7 For examples of such recent scholarship, see Malte Hagener, *Moving Forward, Looking Back: The European Avant-garde and the Invention of Film Culture, 1919–1939* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007); Malte Hagener, ed., *The Emergence of Film Culture: Knowledge Production, Institution Building and the Fate of the Avant-garde in Europe, 1919–1945* (London: Berghahn, 2014); Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson, eds., *Inventing Film Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

8 See, for example, Jay Leyda, "Towards a New Film History," *Cinema Journal* 14, no. 2 (1975): 40–41; and especially "Waiting for Jobs," *Film Quarterly* 16, no. 2, with a Special Survey: Our Resources for Film Scholarship (1962–1963): 29–33.

Beyond merely securing the material basis for exhibition and scholarship (which is, of course, the most direct way to think of archives' functions), archive-building historically acquires particular symbolic social value: a form of institutional organization as a form of accumulation of cultural (and material) capital, on the one hand, which legitimizes the institution in the eyes of the public (or the state)[9]; at the same time, the centrality of archives to the institutional development also speaks to the triumph of scientific management and rational organization of knowledge (and labour). Both of these functions of the archive were particularly resonant in the early Soviet Union, where the ideologies and practices of scientific management (part as adoption of Marxist ideology, and part as a response to strategic needs of industrialization and modernization) were inseparable from the dynamics of cultural revolution, in which film played an important role. And the debates on what a film archive should be—and the competing plans for its creation and development in relationship to film education—took place in the Moscow throughout the 1930s, coinciding precisely with Leyda's own experience there.

To begin teasing out Leyda's pioneering vision for the discipline of film history, I will only sketch out the broader context of Leyda's stay in the Soviet Union at a moment of crucial transformation in film education, in particular through Eisenstein's work for VGIK. I propose this here as one of the possible broader contexts within which to frame the trajectory of Leyda's life and work. At the same time, Leyda's experiences serve as an entry point into considering a slightly different version of a translational history of film education and film archives and the problems this may pose.

Jay Leyda's time in Moscow was preceded by experience in New York, where he arrived in 1930 to work as the photographer Ralph Steiner's assistant where he became involved in the photography branch of the Film and Photo Leagues of the Workers International Relief. Using his first experimental short, *A Bronx Morning*, as his admissions portfolio for the application to the Film Institute, specifically in hopes of working under Eisenstein, he arrived in Moscow in 1933. At the time it was not only the oldest (its earliest incarnation was founded in 1919) but by far the most advanced film school in the world, at once contributing to the development of cinema as a craft as well as a field of academic study. It was by that time also the main institution of film education in the Soviet Union, with highly centralized resources. While the institute's main goal was (as it remains

9 Jacques Derrida, "Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression," *Diacritics* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 9–63.

to this day) the training of film-makers, such training from the earliest days of the school was understood as going far beyond the pragmatics of film-making, or even questions of the development of a particular film style. The institute's goals—especially as advanced by the early 1930s—included the integration of film theory, historiography, and methodology with production, resulting in its institutional ability to grant academic degrees (university level by 1930, and advanced post-graduate degrees by 1934) not only in aspects of film production but also research—both theoretical and historical—something that was unique anywhere in the world at that time and essentially the forerunner to university film studies programmes as they exist today.

Unlike any other film educational institution of that period, training within the film institute was understood to combine practice with theory, embracing artistic experimentation as way to produce knowledge about cinema, and vice versa. Central to this project of institutionalization of cinema as a field of study was the goal of creating a major film archive and a museum of cinema.

Notwithstanding the constantly escalating threat of administrative purges, and problems with infrastructure, the years between 1933 and 1937 (the period that coincided exactly with Leyda's stay in the Soviet Union) proved to be the most productive in the institute's history in terms of realizing its ambitious research platform. It was also a time of constant changes and institutional reshufflings. Ultimately, it was the pedagogical and administrative work by two figures—Sergei Eisenstein and Nikolai Lebedev—that would be fundamental to the institute's growth and development, and the unique research status achieved by VGIK during the 1930s. Attending the institute during these crucial years of its experimental practice, and through his personal proximity to Eisenstein, Leyda witnessed the fleeting but powerful moment in which the modern film institute was in the process of being first imagined. The ambition of this pioneering institution was truly ahead of its time as a model of pedagogy and research. For many of those who participated in and witnessed its early construction (and lived to tell the tale), it would serve as an inspiration for many years to come.

Despite his canonical status as a theorist and film-maker, the importance of Eisenstein's institutional and pedagogical work tends be largely unacknowledged. This is despite the fact that not only were the theoretical ideas he is so well known for often explored and refined through his teaching, but also his vision for the institutional development of cinema as an academic discipline was directly linked to his intellectual production. Notably, his monumental *Notes for a General History of Cinema*, was in fact

developed as part of his course planning for the research section of VGIK.[10] Eisenstein's broader goal was, indeed, to fully integrate creative, theoretical, and pedagogical practice, and VGIK in the 1930s provided a space to realize this ambition. In fact, between 1932 and 1935 Eisenstein's activities were entirely centred on the institute: both his pedagogical activities and his administrative and organizational work were uninterrupted by any production work as he was consistently denied the opportunity to make films during that period. But even before assuming a permanent position in the institute, starting from the late 1920s, Eisenstein was already involved in the debates on film education and what it should entail. In his continuous efforts to expand the kind of education offered at VGIK, Eisenstein published polemics, insisting on the need to extend film education beyond a practical curriculum, allowing students time to develop an artistic sensibility as well as master the foundations of dialectical thinking. Complaining about the inadequacy of cram courses in "*diamat*" (the abbreviation of "dialectical materialism") and lack of aesthetic education, he compares rushing students into the film industry like a "shock worker mother" who decides to support the Five-Year Plan by giving birth in seven months rather than nine.[11]

After years of reorganizations, and following intense debates in the press and among cultural bureaucrats, in 1930 the film school finally attained the status of an institution of higher education. While Eisenstein would become central to shaping the direction of the institute, he was not alone. The other key figure in this respect was Nikolai Lebedev. Throughout the 1920s, Lebedev had established himself as a director of educational cinema, having directed five feature-length documentary films at the studio for *kulturfilms*. He had also been actively publishing essays on various aspects of cinema and started working on a dissertation on film theory in the graduate school of the Communist Academy. He initially started teaching in the newly formed faculty of cinematography, leading its newsreel department. Given his keen interest in theoretical questions and pedagogical practices, he quickly became the head of the institute-wide committee on the methodology of cinema. Lebedev started teaching at VGIK in the fall of 1931, just before Eisenstein assumed a permanent position there as well, first creating the department of film history and theory. By 1934, became director of VGIK, which he remained until 1937. Many decades after his

10 See Sergei Eisenstein, *Notes for a General History of Cinema*, ed. Naum Kleiman and Antonio Somaini (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016).

11 Sergei Eisenstein, "Pis'mo v GIK," *Izbrannye* 5, no. 40, quoted in Vance Kepley, "Eisenstein as Pedagogue," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 14, no. 4 (1993): 5.

dismissal, he continued to teach at the institute and was instrumental in the creation and preservation of its internal archive.[12]

Lebedev and Eisenstein shared a common ambition to create a methodological and pedagogical apparatus for the systematic development of leading research in film studies. In the 1920s, prior to the two men taking leading positions, the core course of study at the institute focused on the training of actors, with workshops offered for directors, screenwriters, and editors (including a special animation workshop). By the early 1930s, perhaps the best organized—and largest—faculty was that of cinematography. Its programme understood the work of cameramen as a combination of both technical and aesthetic criteria and skills, elevating it to artistic status. From its very beginning, the faculty was able to boast many of the most famous Soviet cameramen, such as Vladimir Nilsen or Anatolii Golovnia, among their ranks. It was also highly specialized methodologically, differentiating between the training of cinematographers for fiction, newsreel (documentary), and educational (especially scientific) cinema.

As part of the reorganization of the institute in the early 1930s (right before Leyda's arrival in Russia), the programme of study was extended to three years, and subsequently included considerably more political education, including the introduction of such required courses as Leninism, Marxist socialist art (different from art history or art theory) as well as history and theory of literature, sociology of the arts, political economy, economics, and the rational organization of production.[13] It seems unlikely, however, that the international students such as Leyda would be expected to follow this curriculum.

As a response to the accusations of a lack of theoretical, methodological, and ideological cohesion, research and pedagogical methodology of the study of cinema were given new emphasis and institutional priority as a way to solidify its apparatus. Criticism and theory were clearly conceptualized as a way to introduce and enforce greater control over a *uniform* model for film scholarship. On the part of the administration of the institute, this was an attempt to demonstrate that they were moving away from the "formalist tendencies" and multiplicity of positions and points of view that characterized the 1920s cultural debates in the Soviet Union, and towards

12 Nikolai Lebedev, "Ot shkoly k VUZu" ["From a school to an institute of higher learning"], in *K istorii VGIKa* [About the history of VGIK], *1 (1919–1934)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2000), 350–55.

13 Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, eds., *K istorii VGIKa* [About the history of VGIK], *2 (1919–1934)* (Moscow: VGIK, 2000), 214.

a unified "Marxist-Leninist method," which gradually came to be expected of all cultural production. This "artistic method"—the development and articulation of which was supposed to be one of the goals of education within the institute—in this context became an early code word for "socialist realist method," used in direct opposition to "the leftist excesses."[14]

At the same time, while this process was obviously enforced from above, making the development of a unified artistic method a priority also attracted many of the most brilliant theorists and scholars, who shared the ambition of creating an institutional space to further develop a theoretical platform for the scholarly study of cinema. Many of them, such as Eisenstein, were themselves known for their "formalist excesses." With Eisenstein's return as VGIK's head of directing in 1932, he immediately threw himself into the methodological and theoretical challenge of developing a programme of systematic study of film direction. This included everything from designing entrance exams to the evaluation process, and, of course, devising a complex and theoretically rigorous course of study. Right at the start, Eisenstein offers the following list of conditions, as summarized by Kepley:

> (1) He would not spend his classtime showing movies or discussing them, claiming that "it will not be from the corpses of outmoded [film] works that we shall examine the processes of production." His charges would have ample opportunity to see films through other VGIK avenues, including its new cinematheque. (2) He would not work from available scripts since they employ pedestrian, nonexpressive language. Scenes from literature would offer material for staging and editing. (3) The artistic heritage (novels, plays, paintings) would be worked right into the direction workshop, not isolated as background disciplines.[15]

It is easy to see from this description that Eisenstein's approach to the teaching and study of cinema, both in its practical and theoretical aspects, was geared towards integrating cinema within the broader history of the arts, contrary to contemporary assumptions about "medium specificity" as the basis for film studies. The kind of erudite knowledge Eisenstein envisioned for the students of cinema (certainly mirroring his own), however, would prove to be a challenge to implement.

14 L. Zarkhin, "Prevratit' GIK v moshchnyi kino-VTUZ. O putiakh razvitiia so Vsesoiuznogo instituta kinematografii," *Kino* 37 (July 6, 1931), in *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *I (1919–1934)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2000), 149.

15 Kepley, "Eisenstein as Pedagogue," 7.

Looking at who was attending VGIK at the time that Leyda was at the school gives further insight into the social context that informed his experience. As a result of the newly instituted quotas, in 1932 the institute reported that 76 per cent of the newly registered students were from working-class or peasant backgrounds, and 68 per cent were members of Komsomol (the youth league of the Communist Party); 44 per cent represented national and ethnic minorities, including three foreign students. Since the required educational minimum was raised to nine years of formal schooling, the overall number of applicants was significantly lower than it had been previously.[16] The admission process was being conducted under pressure to meet the required quotas of the students of working-class and peasant origin (until 1934 this was supposed to represent 75 per cent of admitted students), and students from the "provinces" (both, outside of the city centres and beyond the Russian Federation)—while simultaneously increasing the educational and artistic standards, which unsurprisingly, would quickly prove to be quite a disastrous combination.

By the early 1930s, the film institute had already attracted some international students: thus, Leyda joined a small but active group of foreigners headed by Herbert Marshall (a British writer and film and theatre director, who spent the last twenty years of his life in the US, as a director of the Center for Soviet and Eastern European Studies in the Performing Arts at the University of Southern Illinois). Eisenstein and Lebedev had plans to open film education to international students on a much greater scale. As Leyda in *Kino* quotes from his own letter to a friend, in 1933:

> "GIK is going under a general supervision of Eisenstein this year—with his plans (at least for the regisseurs courses) and unifying method. Part of this plan is the formation within GIK of a foreign section with lectures and lessons in foreign languages. The first one to set up will be one in the English language. (Getting excited?) It should begin functioning about the first of December under his supervision and the direct leadership of Marshall. The patron of the foreign section is Mezhrabpom, who will take care of entries into the country, tuition at the school, and stipends for each pupil." Though a few more foreign students arrived, nothing further came of this plan.[17]

16 "Itogi priema v GIK," *Kino* 61 (October 30, 1932), in *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *I (1919–1934)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2000), 139.
17 Jay Leyda, *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 304.

The ambitious plans for the internationalization of the institute never materialized, while the gap between the educational level of the students attending the institute and the expectations placed on the curriculum continued to widen. The increasing politicization of education was both motivated and exacerbated by the intense political cleansings sweeping the country. Even academic debates on the topic of education and professionalization were mandated to yield "concrete positive results" instead of "scholastic word-pushing." The relationship between Soyuzkino, the umbrella organization controlling cinema in the USSR, and VGIK was strained: Soyuzkino regularly failed to increase the institute's budget or provide internships and jobs to its graduates. It was announced that the development of a technological infrastructure would be a priority, but no funds were committed. Achieving the actual professionalization of its cadre was where the institute was clearly failing. In this sense, we see the tensions which will mark film schools all over the world for decades to come between the demands of "the industry" and the inherently academic nature of film education—even in its most experimental forms—tensions which would become familiar to Leyda in a very different context several decades later.

In the meantime, Lebedev and Eisenstein's solution to this problem was unequivocally in the direction of greater scholarly emphasis. In response to attacks on the institute for failing in its mission to supply the industry with highly trained professionals (based on the extremely low numbers of graduates actually working in cinema), Lebedev and Eisenstein began to petition for a new academic model. They identified the problem as stemming from the fact that young students lacked knowledge of either the realities of cinematic production or of culture more generally, and could therefore not be trained to be serious film professionals in such a short period of time. They would argue that for a director to get all the necessary training—academic and practical—to prepare for a successful career would require between six and eight years of education. Since the institute did not have the existing infrastructure (material as well as pedagogical) necessary for such a prolonged course of study, and the film industry urgently needed highly qualified specialists, Lebedev in particular proposed admitting only those students with prior professional or academic experience, limiting the number of applicants and raising the acceptance criteria. As a result, the length of this new advanced degree was reduced to two years. In effect, this also meant a radical departure from the existing quota system, which would now be met by having a separate track for "worker students" who were not integrated into the general curriculum. After an intense campaign, a compromise was achieved, and Lebedev succeeded in changing the status of the institute to

that of a specialized academy, which indicated a post-graduate university level of education.

In addition to the inclusion of the graduate school, this change had a particular impact on the training of directors. In order to raise the bar for admittance, the institute accepted applicants for a special advanced (academy-type) degree, who had already had significant artistic or production experience, and identified the main goal of such training to be "to master the knowledge of the treasures of the world culture and the achievements of the new, the highest and most perfect culture of the socialist period."[18] After the initial screening of applications, those admitted to entrance exams had to pass a special directing assignment designed by Eisenstein. In the first year of its existence, ninety people applied to this newly formed department, only twenty-three of whom were allowed to take the entrance exams; fifteen were accepted as a result. The programme of study was also changed considerably: for example, as part of their curriculum, students were required to attend twenty-five plays staged in Moscow in their first year as part of their required course on theatre history. The programme also included a two-week-long trip to Leningrad to visit museums as part of their art history course. Distinguished figures such as Alexander Dovzhenko, Grigorii Roshal', Vsevolod Meyerhold, Alexander Medvedkin, Boris Barnet, and Béla Balázs were brought in to teach and participate in research. The much-contested internship programme was finally established for students to be able to go through practical training at the main film studios in the country; by the late 1930s graduates, unlike in earlier years, were placed at (mostly regional) film studios and given the chance to make their own films.

Somewhat ironically, as a result of this change in admission requirements, Leyda, lacking prior education or formal professional experience, would be forced to stop officially attending the institute. He did, however, continue to audit Eisenstein's workshop for the duration of his stay in Moscow, and although he left VGIK without any formal degree, he was still able to witness the drastic transformation that the institute was undergoing during that period.

Particularly important for the development of film studies (and specifically film historiography) was the establishment of the Sector for Scientific Research (NIS) by Eisenstein and Lebedev as part of VGIK. Its goal was to coordinate all the research and development of instructional materials,

18 "Slushateli rezhisserskogo fakul'teta VGIKa. Otkrytoe pis'mo," *Kino-gazeta* 4 (January 22, 1935), in *K istorii VGIKa* [About the history of VGIK], *II (1935–1945)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2004), 224.

as well as their publication and dissemination. NIS was set up as a semi-autonomous structure within the institute that had its own personnel in addition to those drawn from the existing faculty across different departments, and other artists and scholars brought in on a short-term basis to participate in individual projects.[19] The specific goals of NIS were organized around two clusters. The first was the development of infrastructure for research and preservation, such as the creation of a film archive, film museum, and a research library. The second focused on the organization of research, both individual and collaborative, leading to the publication of instructional and scholarly materials to be used for teaching at the institute and its newly created graduate school. In the years between 1933 and 1938, NIS was responsible for producing the first systematized reference sources, including filmographies and bibliographies of Soviet and foreign films, archives of scripts and other production-related materials, and press clippings and other specialized film-related collections.[20] A series of research publications also took place under their auspices, although due to publishing capacity limitations (the institute did not have its own publishing house), many of the dissertations and edited collections representing their research either came out in fragments through journals and newspapers, or were not published at all. A large-scale project for translations of works on films from other languages was also undertaken at the same time—though that, too, would only ever be partially realized.

The creation of the first systematic film archive also took place during this time. While VGIK began collecting materials towards the creation of the museum of cinema as early as 1923, the regular practice at the time—in the Soviet Union, as well as everywhere else—was to destroy film prints once they were no longer in active circulation. VGIK started collecting prints of mostly foreign films in the late 1920s to use as illustrations for courses on the history of cinema. By the mid-1930s, the collection had grown to include several thousand titles, making it the first and the largest film archive in the Soviet Union at the time, with a particularly strong selection of early cinema.

This focus on the development of film archive was certainly not unique to VGIK: the time Leyda spent in Russia coincides with the very moment of

19 Lebedev, "Ot shkoly v VUZu," 365.

20 For more on this, see Natalie Ryabchikova, "When Was Soviet Cinema Born? The Institutionalization of Soviet Film Studies and the Problems of Periodization," in *The Emergence of Film Culture: Knowledge Production, Institution Building and the Fate of the Avant-garde in Europe, 1919–1945*, ed. Malte Hagener (New York: Berghahn, 2014), 118–42.

the formal institutionalization of film archives in Europe (starting Germany in 1934) and the US, resulting in the formation in 1938 of the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF). It was as part of their efforts to build an international network that John Abbott and Iris Barry, the founders of the MoMA Film Library (soon to become the US member of FIAF and the hosts of the first FIAF conference in 1938[21]) met Leyda in Moscow in 1936 and recruited him as assistant curator of the Film Library. Their original plans to include VGIK in their international network failed due to ideological conflicts between the US and Soviet representatives, as well VGIK's lack of support in the higher echelons of the Soviet cultural apparatus (Souzkino and Tsentrarkhiv), which were in the process of developing a centralized film archive, one that was designed to address the directives of the party and not the particular plans of the (largely ideologically untrustworthy, from the point of view of the party) film school. Thus, it was not the archive of the film institute but the State Film Collection, Gosfil'mofond, established in 1937 that would become the country's main film archive, eventually joining FIAF in 1957 (after having VGIK's holdings transferred there in 1948, the year of Eisenstein's death). This exclusion of the nascent Soviet film archives from the initial formation of FIAF has had the effect of obscuring VGIK's efforts, especially in attempting to integrate archival operations with film education, and concealing the uniqueness of the institution's initial vision.

The close attention that the Soviet state awarded this issue is not surprising. In fact, preservation and archiving was designated as having primary importance for the post-revolutionary state. As early as 1918, Lenin signed the "Decree of the Reorganization and Centralization of Archival Affairs of the Russian Federation," and although film was not explicitly included in the decree, as part of the process of nationalization of film production there were discussions in the press regarding the need for creation of a national film and photo archive, a "film museum of history."[22] However, the concept of a national "kino-photo-archive" was focused on the material which was seen as having national (Soviet) historical significance—nor necessarily related to any assumptions of artistic or cultural value of cinema. The subsequent 1926 decree which specifically ordered the inclusion of negatives (of both photographs and films) in the newly created Central Archive of the Russian Federation concerned only "documents of historical-revolutionary topics"

21 The original members of FIAF included the British Film Institute, the Cinémathèque française, the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and the Reichsfilmarchiv in Berlin.

22 Vasilii Lebedev, "Kinomatograf i istoriia," *Kino-gazeta* 16 (April 1918).

(i.e. newsreels, mostly filmed in Russia and Soviet Union), excluding all fiction and instructional (educational or scientific) films.[23]

However, the attention brought to the status of films (and stills) and the need for their preservation in the 1920s, and the general "archive fever" of the post-revolutionary period certainly allowed for greater urgency behind the idea of creating a film archive as part of the film school. However, because of its status as an educational institution, VGIK was therefore not under control of either the film or archival state governing bodies, allowing it a greater flexibility in defining its own criteria for selection and organization of the material—but also resulting in considerably less support from the party and the state.

What makes VGIK's efforts quite unique as compared to either comparable projects in Europe and the US, or the other archival projects within the Soviet Union at the time, is its expansive conception for accession criteria—encompassing a great variety of cinematic productions, from newsreels (which would be the staple for most historical archives), to educational and other forms of "useful" films (which tended to only be included as part of special collections, such as those planned by the failed archive of the Institute of Educational Cinematography in Rome, or of the educational wing of the British Film Institute), as well as all fiction films, both Soviet and foreign, with particular attention given to films considered for their artistic value (as part of the creation of a cinematic canon—as would be the case for most cinematheques and museum collections) but also films valued as material for the reconstructing the broader contexts for the study of historical development of cinema, such as its technological and industrial foundations. Such an acquisition policy was rooted in the primacy of scholarly objectives for the archive, which exceeded considerations of national patrimony or concerns for creating the documentary basis for the correct ideological interpretation of historical events.

It is worth noting that in general, one of the distinguishing features of early Soviet state's approach to the institutionalization of archives has been its expansiveness: the 1918 decree, among other things awarded the Main Administration of Archival Affairs (soon to be renamed Central Archive, Tsentrarkhiv) unprecedented access to (and, subsequently, control of) all records, as according to the decree state institutions did not have the right to destroy any individual files, institutional records, or any other documents without written permission of the Central Archive. Even if in practice such total preservation proved to be impossible, the decree demonstrates the

23 V. M. Magidov, *Zrimaya pamyat' istorii* (Moskva, 1984), 117.

intense concern with posterity and cultural heritage of the new Soviet state—and ultimately accounts for the kind of all-inclusive approach to archiving, which came to characterize Soviet archives, certainly including film archives.[24] So, the lack of state support of the VGIK library was not due to its particular conception of film preservation but rather to issues of political control.

Gosfil'mofond would, likewise, embrace the same all-encompassing approach as to acquisition and preservation.[25] The main official impetus for its creation of was the need to create the infrastructure which would enable the national film industry to keep copies of all of its productions, in addition to consolidating the existing collections of films as historical documents. VGIK, on the other hand, was explicitly concerned with the creation of a material legacy of film as a cultural, technological, and aesthetic form for the purposes of teaching, research, and artistic creation. The emphasis on cinema as an art form (and not only a form of documentation or didactic material) whose formal aesthetic dimensions constitute their own historical categories makes this conception close to those shared by Henri Langlois, Iris Barry, and Olwen Vaughan, in many ways combining the ambitions of many of FIAF's founding figures.[26]

Inseparable from the questions of criteria were the issues of use and access. Unlike VGIK, Gosfil'mofond (the State Film Archive) was conceived of primarily as a repository (initially identified as *fil'mokhranilische*—literally, film storage), and like all other archives in the Soviet Union had classified and restricted access to many of its collections.[27] The conception of the film archive at VGIK, instead, was inseparable from its use—by researchers and students (if not, admittedly, by the "general public"). What would constitute such "use" would depend on the self-understanding of the scholarly and pedagogical mission of the institution. And in the case of VGIK of the 1930s, as we just saw, this self-understanding was as ambitious as it was expansive.

The rich collection of American and European cinema (which included the full range of now-canonical films and film-makers) enhanced the courses on the history of "foreign cinema." These courses at VGIK were taught by Feofan Shipulinskii, one of the first Russian/Soviet film historians. Shipulinskii started as a journalist and translator during the pre-revolutionary period,

24 Kelly A. Kolar, "Bourgeois Specialists and Red Professionals in 1920s Soviet Archival Development," *Information & Culture: A Journal of History* 53, no. 3 (2018): 243–70.

25 Vladimir Malyshev, *Gosfil'mofond: Zemliaichnaia poliana* (Moscow, 2005), 68.

26 See Christophe Dupin, "First Tango in Paris: The Birth of FIAF, 1936–38," *Journal of Film Preservation* 88 (April 2013): 43–61.

27 Malyshev, 69.

and began teaching at the film school from its first iterations in 1919. His film history courses started with a long prehistory of the technological apparatus of cinema, requiring students to spend considerable time learning about "thaumatropes, intermittent movement, Maltese crosses, Marey's guns, zoetropes, magic lanterns" and memorizing the names and inventions of "Uchatius, Kircher and Anschütz" for the exams. Only after this prolonged history were students exposed to "Griffith, Mack Sennett, Linder, Chaplin, Keaton, Harold Lloyd, Monty Banks and Douglas [Fairbanks] [...] as well as Rene Clair, Fritz Lang and the whole "German" school [i.e. German Expressionism]."[28]

Such a historical detour may have appeared a mere eccentricity (as it did to Iurenev, who came to be a highly influential film scholar and critic in the Soviet Union), but it is also worth noting that Eisenstein's great unfinished project, which comes to us in the form of *Notes for a General History of Cinema*," starts its narrative of film history with cave drawings, and often transcending all medium-specificity in favour of a more all-encompassing and dynamic vision of artistic media.[29] While this approach may seem all too familiar to those of us who have been educated on such promiscuous understanding of "prehistories" of the cinematic apparatus, it is worth noting that this kind of a "deep history" was not part of the educational or scholarly programme at the time of the institutionalization of film studies as an academic discipline in Europe and North America (as well as, to some degree, in the Soviet Union) in the 1960s, as it was largely concerned with textual analysis and film theoretical discourses.[30] This process had the effect of obliterating this historiographic approach from what would be constructed as the (new) foundations of the discipline. It was only when the collection and preservation of early and silent cinema and the (re)conceptualization of a cinema in the *longue durée* as part and consequence of the so-called archival and cultural turn in film historiography took place in the 1970s–1980s, that these insights come back into focus in both scholarship and film curricula worldwide. And, indeed, Leyda played no small part in this process, both as teacher and scholar (it is certainly not accidental that some of the most influential US film historians, in particularly of early and silent cinema—Charles Harpole, Tom Gunning, and Charles Musser—were Leyda's students).

28 Rostislav Iurenev, *Moi milyi VGIK* (Moscow: VGIK, 1994), quoted in *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *II* (*1935–1945*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2004), 302–3.

29 See Eisenstein, *Notes for a General History of Cinema*.

30 For example, Sadoul in his 1946 *Histoire générale du cinéma* begins vol. 1 with optical machines—albeit certainly not all going as far back as Kircher.

Leyda's departure from Moscow coincided with the beginning of a rapid decline within VGIK: despite the overall support from the government, the growth and reorganization of the institute was already accompanied by continuous ideological attacks and political purges, which created constant pressure on all pedagogical practices. Research on Russian and Soviet film history in particular became a very politically charged and potentially dangerous field of study, as Natalie Ryabchikova explores.[31] In 1935, a special committee was set up to review all the materials at the newly formed archive in order to assess their ideological appropriateness and confiscate any counter-revolutionary content.[32] By 1936, another committee was created to review all teaching materials, plans of study, and research produced by the institute for any signs of "formalism and other kinds of excesses in the theory and practice of cinematic arts."[33] This was followed by an evening of "discussion on formalism and naturalism" intended to underscore the danger of such aesthetic phenomena, attended by most of the leading faculty of the institute. Despite his attempts to mediate the political pressures, Lebedev ultimately failed to keep the forces of Stalinist cultural conformity at bay. The final break came in 1937, when Eisenstein, following his "political and ideological artistic errors in the making of *Bezhin Meadow*," was fired (temporarily—he was reinstated in 1938) by direct order of Boris Shumiatskii, then still the head of the State Management of Cinema (Soyuzkino). Shumiatskii would himself be arrested and sentenced to death only a year later. Lebedev was also removed from his position as director as NIS closed down, and with it, the film archive and all the plans for the creation of a film museum. By 1938, VGIK was officially reorganized yet again, reversing all prior changes and getting rid of the "academy-type," two-year higher degrees in directing and cinematography. All the research in the institute was now to be geared toward the development of textbooks. The wide range of scholarly work produced on the earlier period of film history (in particularly the period before the 1917 revolution) would never be published. Several of these historians would end up in Gulags.

In conclusion, I want to briefly suggest two additional contexts for placing Leyda's experience in Soviet Russia directly in relation to his own point of origin in the ongoing efforts to legitimate and institutionalize the study of

31 Ryabchikova, "When Was Soviet Cinema Born?," especially pp. 133–37.

32 "Prikaz 51 po VGIKu" (April 19, 1935), in *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *II (1935–1945)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2004), 18.

33 "Iz prikaza no. 24 po VGIKu" (March 17, 1936), in *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *II (1935–1945)*, ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev (Moscow: VGIK, 2004), 55.

film. Two other examples of contemporary efforts to give cinema a status of a serious cultural medium and an academic discipline, this time in the US, stand out here. One is Harry Potamkin's unrealized plans for the alternative radical film school and film library, and the other is Iris Barry's fully realized institutionalization of film and film study through the Museum of Modern Art; both projects to which Leyda was personally connected.

Potamkin's work and ideas were an important point of reference for Leyda, both before and during his stay in Russia. Just prior to his departure, Potamkin and Leyda took part in the film courses and screenings at the New School for Social Research linked to the Workers Film and Photo League. Potamkin had already travelled to the Soviet Union and established the very connections that Leyda would draw on when arriving in Moscow. Potamkin's own plans for a Marxist film library and school (published posthumously in 1933 by *Hound and Horn*) similarly sought a way of mediating between the Soviet experience and that of the culture of the US socialist movement and its aspirations for the transformation of the working-class culture. And we know from Leyda's notes in *Kino* that he was not only familiar with and inspired by Potamkin's ideas and plans, but that he attempted to recruit his Soviet teachers (Eisenstein and others)[34] in helping realize them.

While Potamkin's project came to an end with his untimely death in 1933, perhaps the most consequential development in the history of archival preservation and institutionalization of cinema in the US ultimately took place in New York in the 1930s through the Museum of Modern Art, particularly through the efforts of Iris Barry.[35] In the summer of 1936, Barry was on a European tour to collect prints for the newly established MoMA film collection and came to Moscow, where she met Leyda and offered him a position as an assistant curator at the Department of Film at MoMA. Leyda left Moscow for New York via Berlin, Paris, and London, acquiring films for the MoMA collection in each city, and for a few subsequent years he would become actively involved in Barry's efforts to build their film library. These efforts included not only expanding the actual film archive, but also creating an educational section, which would be responsible for the production and publication of scholarly books on cinema and circulating them throughout the US and Canada in order to establish a foundation for formal film education.

34 Leyda writes about it, for example, in 1946 in his article "Advanced Training for Film Workers: Russia," *Hollywood Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (1946): 279–86.

35 See Haidee Wasson, *Museum Movies: MoMA and the Birth of Art Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

It may be instructive to note that while it is clear that being exposed to a rare example of a highly organized and developed archival structure at VGIK must have impressed and served as an inspiration to Leyda, whose efforts for many subsequent decades in the US lead in the similar direction, the film library and archive at MoMA differed from VGIK in the most fundamental of ways. While at VGIK, Leyda participated in the efforts towards building a state archive as part of an educational institution of higher learning whose goal was training professionals for the national film industry, while MoMA's film library was a private art museum's efforts to educate the (elite) public, to create a cultivated audience for cinema. Yet both, VGIK and MoMA understood this to be part of cinema's educational missions (as VGIK certainly had a significant presence of educational and newsreel film-making as part of its understanding of the cinematic institution). And the role of the archive in both cases was closely linked to legitimizing cinema as a cultural form and film history as a legitimate field presumed to be of value to professionals (whether in the academy or the film industry) and to the general public alike; this assumption, it should be noted, was not widely shared in the 1930s.

As part of this initiative, MoMA's Film Library also developed an active programme of visiting writers, film-makers, and researchers that included Paul Rotha, Fernand Léger, Luis Buñuel, and Siegfried Kracauer. Leyda's position was likewise financed through the Rockefeller Fund, which supported the preparation of films for the library's circulating programmes, the research of students, writers, and other Film Library staff, the acquisition of material for museum collections, the preparation of an index system for the library's films, and the regular screening of films. Thus Leyda's involvement was instrumental to the development of this project, and he remained a key influence in its trajectory until his politically motivated dismissal in 1940, when the MoMA Film Library came under direct attack for the pro-communist stance of its programming choices. Leyda was the one identified as responsible for the "pro-Soviet Communist Party political propaganda" in this regard.[36]

By 1942, having lost his position at the MoMA, Leyda moved to California to work for Warner Bros. as a technical adviser on Russian subjects and began

36 The main attacks on Leyda were made by Seymour Stern, one of the co-editors of the journal *Experimental Cinema*, on the pages of the socialist paper *The New Leader*, which early on took an anti-Stalinist position. Stern continued campaigning against Leyda and his role in the MoMA Film Library, including writing a letter to Nelson Rockefeller, whose foundation supported much of the MoMA film project. For more, see Wasson, *Museum Movies*, 272–73.

to focus more heavily on his translations of Eisenstein. It would not be until the 1950s that he would resume his film education and archival work (first in France, and then all over both Eastern and Western Europe, and by 1959, in China). However, well before that, his writings would have profound impact. Already by the end of the 1940s, the "Film Notes" he prepared for the MoMA Film Library were being used by university film courses, film societies, and clubs throughout the United States and Canada, and continued to be used for decades, thus shaping film education years before Leyda's professional teaching career was formally established in the early 1970s. For him, the archive could be used to narrate a history of cinema, enabling this story to emerge with its dramatic complexity intact. Such a history has much in common with the story of his own life: one that dwells on discontinuities (geographic and temporal) and improbable conjunctures; the paradoxes and tensions were left unresolved, unexpected futures emerging from past failures.

We can see these complexities and parallels in the way that VGIK's ideas from the 1930s (in the midst of Stalinist repressions) unexpectedly resonate with the 1970s return to the social, cultural, and political history of cinema. We can see them in the way that both Eisenstein's and Potamkin's ideas find a realization in Cuban film education of the 1950s and 1960s through the work of José Manuel Valdés-Rodríguez, who in the 1930s was the Latin American correspondent for the journal *Experimental Cinema* (ironically, the very journal whose co-editor was instrumental to Leyda's removal from the MoMA project), and who also visited the Soviet Union and met Eisenstein in the mid-1930s. Thus the same networks laid the foundation of film education in Cuba of the 1950s (and further, after the 1959 revolution), and so many other historical conjunctures that formed Jay Leyda's life and legacy.

In fact, one of the most striking aspects of Leyda's understanding of the archive's role as a source, foundation, and vehicle for the production and dissemination of cinematic historical knowledge, which emerges as a result of an international travel trajectory that began in Russia, is a fine-tuned appreciation for the particularities of its geographical (and geopolitical) positioning. Leyda's engagement with the archive throughout his career was truly global, thereby producing a different geography of film history than American film culture typically allowed for at the time. From his stay in the Soviet Union in the 1930s, to his work in China in the 1950s–1990s, and his participation in the international film festival scene of the 1960s–1980s (in particular the festivals within the Soviet Bloc and the Global South), his travels and reflections on the cinemas provide us with a distinct—and early—vision of "world cinema" that is clearly linked to forms of both,

Marxist internationalism and modernist cosmopolitanism. By the 1960s, Leyda's regular contacts range from the radical political experimental film-maker and key figure in the Indian New Wave, Mrinal Sen, to Marxist critic Alex Viany, who was crucial for the formation of Brazilian Cinema Novo. This global vision is also reflected in his writings.[37]

And Leyda's words perhaps resonate and inspire more now than they did when they were written in the 1970s, serving as a moving tribute to the difficulty of coming to terms with the turbulent history of the last century—of cinema, of political hopes and dreams, of opportunities lost, and unrealized pasts yet to be (re)discovered—words that to me come to offer more of an authentic historiographic methodology than entire scholarly volumes on *Histoires croisées*. The more I continue to immerse myself in the messy and self-contradictory business of film history I find:

> An open investigation of any part of film history reveals a continuing drama that is more comfortable to conceal than to reveal. It takes courage to probe into this drama of lost opportunities, cutthroat competition, too little money, too much money, moral contradictions, defeats that were almost victories, victories in the face of impossible obstacles, the roles of chance and irrationality, personal brutalities, film failures that found audiences in the future or in other countries—to probe these, and emerge with undiminished enthusiasm for this extraordinary synthesis is the real test.[38]

References

Aitken, Ian. "Jay Leyda." In *The Concise Routledge Encyclopedia of Documentary Film*, 545–48. London: Routledge, 2013.

Derrida, Jacques. "Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression." *Diacritics* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 9–63.

Dupin, Christophe. "First Tango in Paris: The Birth of FIAF, 1936–38." *Journal of Film Preservation* 88 (April 2013): 43–61.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Essays, with a Lecture*. Edited and translated by Jay Leyda. London: Dennis Dobson, 1968.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949.

37 For a strong formulation of a "truly international film history," and what we would now call both transnational and global, see Leyda's "Towards a New Film History," 40.

38 Ibid., 41.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *The Film Sense*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Notes for a General History of Cinema*. Edited by Naum Kleiman and Antonio Somaini. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "Pis'mo v GIK." *Izbrannye* 5, no. 40.

Grieveson, Lee, and Haidee Wasson, eds. *Inventing Film Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Hagener, Malte. *Moving Forward, Looking Back: The European Avant-garde and the Invention of Film Culture, 1919–1939*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.

Hagener, Malte, ed. *The Emergence of Film Culture: Knowledge Production, Institution Building and the Fate of the Avant-garde in Europe, 1919–1945*. New York: Berghahn, 2014.

"Itogi priema v GIK." *Kino* 61 (October 30, 1932). In *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK]*, I* (*1919–1934*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 139. Moscow: VGIK, 2000.

Iurenev, Rostislav. *Moi milyi VGIK*. Moscow: VGIK, 1994.

"Iz prikaza no. 24 po VGIKu." (March 17, 1936). In *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK]*, II* (*1935–1945*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 55. Moscow: VGIK, 2004.

Kepley, Vance. "Eisenstein as Pedagogue." *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 14, no. 4 (1993): 1–16.

Kolar, Kelly A. "Bourgeois Specialists and Red Professionals in 1920s Soviet Archival Development." *Information & Culture: A Journal of History* 53, no. 3 (2018): 243–70.

Lebedev, Nikolai. "Ot shkoly k VUZu" ["From a school to an institute of higher learning"]. In *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK]*, I* (*1919–1934*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 350–55. Moscow: VGIK, 2000.

Lebedev, Vasilii. "Kinomatograf i istoriia." *Kino-gazeta* 16 (April 1918).

Leyda, Jay. "Advanced Training for Film Workers: Russia." *Hollywood Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (1946): 279–86.

Leyda, Jay. *Dianying* (*Electric Shadows*)*: An Account of Films and the Film Audience in China*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1972.

Leyda, Jay. *Films Beget Films: A Study of the Compilation Film*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.

Leyda, Jay. *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film*. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Leyda, Jay. *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Leyda, Jay. *The Melville Log: A Documentary Life of Herman Melville, 1819–1891*. New York: Harcourt, 1951.

Leyda, Jay. *The Musorgsky Reader: A Life of Modeste Petrovich Musorgsky in Letters and Documents*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1947.

Leyda, Jay. "Towards a New Film History." *Cinema Journal* 14, no. 2 (1975): 40–41.
Leyda, Jay. "Training for Film Workers: Russia." *Hollywood Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (April 1946): 279–86.
Leyda, Jay. "Waiting for Jobs." *Film Quarterly* 16, no. 2, with a Special Survey: Our Resources for Film Scholarship (1962–1963): 29–33.
Leyda, Jay. *The Years and Hours of Emily Dickinson*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
Leyda, Jay, Sergei Bertensson, and Sophia Satina. *Sergei Rachmaninoff, a Lifetime in Music*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
Magidov, V. M. *Zrimaya pamyat' istorii*. Moskva, 1984.
Malyshev, Vladimir. *Gosfil'mofond: Zemliaichnaia poliana*. Moscow, 2005.
Nizhny, Vladimir. *Lessons with Eisenstein*. Edited and translated by Jay Leyda and Ivor Montagu. New York: Hill and Wang, 1969.
"Prikaz 51 po VGIKu" (April 19, 1935). In *K istorii VGIKa* [About the history of VGIK], *II* (*1935–1945*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 18. Moscow: VGIK, 2004.
Ryabchikova, Natalie. "When Was Soviet Cinema Born? The Institutionalization of Soviet Film Studies and the Problems of Periodization." In *The Emergence of Film Culture: Knowledge Production, Institution Building and the Fate of the Avant-garde in Europe, 1919–1945*, edited by Malte Hagener, 118–42. New York: Berghahn, 2014.
"Slushateli rezhisserskogo fakul'teta VGIKa. Otkrytoe pis'mo." *Kino-gazeta* 4 (January 22, 1935). In *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *II* (*1935–1945*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 224. Moscow: VGIK, 2004.
Vinogradov, Vladimir, and Konstantin Ognev, eds. *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *I* (*1919–1934*). Moscow: VGIK, 2000.
Vinogradov, Vladimir, and Konstantin Ognev, eds. *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *II* (*1935–1945*). Moscow: VGIK, 2004.
Wasson, Haidee. *Museum Movies: MoMA and the Birth of Art Cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
Zarkhin, L. "Prevratit' GIK v moshchnyi kino-VTUZ. O putiakh razvitiia so Vsesoiuznogo instituta kinematografii." *Kino* 37 (July 6, 1931). In *K istorii VGIKa* [To the history of VGIK], *I* (*1919–1934*), ed. Vladimir Vinogradov and Konstantin Ognev, 149. Moscow: VGIK, 2000.

About the Author

Masha Salazkina is Concordia University Research Chair in Transnational Media Arts and Culture at Concordia University, in Montreal, Canada. She

is the author of *In Excess: Sergei Eisenstein's Mexico* (2009) and co-editor of several edited volumes on film and cultural history. Her new book, *World Socialist Cinema: Alliances, Affinities and Solidarities in the Global Cold War*, is coming out with California University Press in 2023. She is currently working on a new project on the dynamics of reception and appropriations of Latin American popular culture in the Socialist Bloc in the 1950s to the 1980s.