Chapter 8:

Mummified Subversion

Reconstructions of Soviet Rock Underground in Contemporary Russian Cinema

Roman Dubasevych

> We require a visible past, a visible continuum, a visible myth of origin, which reassures us about our end. […] Whence this historic scene of the reception of the mummy at the Orly airport. Why? Because Ramses was a great despotic and military figure? Certainly. But mostly because our culture dreams, behind this defunct power that it tries to annex, of an order that would have had nothing to do with it, and it dreams of it because it exterminated it by exhuming it *as its own past*.
> *(Jean Baudrillard 1993: 10)*

1. Introduction

In contemporary Russian film the Soviet era is mostly appropriated in a nostalgic way. While conservative – often neo-imperial or nationalist – representations prevail, this essay focusses on two musical films, *Hipsters* (*Stiliagi*, 2008) by Valerii Todorovskii and *Summer* (*Leto*, 2018) by Kirill Serebrennikov, which, on the contrary, explicitly celebrate moments of anti-authoritarian subversion and change. Both films express a strong nostalgia for the non-conformist subcultures and countercultural movements – the post-Stalinist hipsters, the so-called *stiliagi* of the 1950s, and the late-Soviet punks, the so-called 'non-formal' youth of the 1980s. However, despite all sympathy one can have towards the depictions of the open, liberal, underground and youth cultures in these two films, the two clearly nostalgic reconstructions of Thaw and perestroika rebels reveal significant contradictions or more precisely: a remarkable tension can be detected between the longing for moments of political emancipation and their simultaneous renunciation and mitigation.

Working on my material, however, I realised that the paradoxical self-induced neutralisation of subversive, countercultural messages had a significant political dimension: the films in question construct a surprising opposition between a rebellious, creative

(and materially mostly unconcerned) minority on the one hand, and an indifferent, degenerate *seraia massa* (grey mass) of ordinary (Soviet) citizens on the other. Remarkably, this sort of elitist dichotomy undermines the democratic appeal of both the rock-n-roll of the 1950–60s (*Hipsters*) or the songs of the legendary rock bands *Kino* and *Zoopark* with their front men Viktor Tsoi and Maik Naumenko (*Summer*). Moreover, the striking division into the proud rebels and servile conformists not only resonates with a deep-rooted Russian fatalism – the long tradition of cultural inferiority complex and political resignation. My main thesis is that such antisocial modelling of countercultural groups, confirms traditional Russian topoi about the impossibility of change due to the 'national character' and apathetic masses, and thus plays into the hands of the current regime, because it disables solidarisation across rapidly growing social divides and, as a result, impedes the consolidation of a future opposition.

A prominent example for such an alienation between the high and low classes of Russian society, despite the overall critical tendency, is provided by Kirill Serebrennikov's dystopian drama *Yuri's Day* (*Iur'ev den'*, 2008) which brings its female protagonist, a cosmopolitan Russian opera star Liuba, to her provincial birth town where she experiences a nightmarish survival tour amid her lower class compatriots. Though expressing valid concerns about the growing distance between the glitzy metropolitan Russian centres and its dilapidated hinterland, *Yuri's Day* is also marked by palpable estrangement and disdain towards the pauperised and 'degenerated' strata of society.

Such a radical social othering significantly contrasts with the film's late-Soviet templates, for instance, Karen Shakhnazarov's remarkable phantasmagorical comedy *Zerograd* (*Gorod Zero*, 1988), where alienation and empathy function not exclusively but rather complementarily, reinforcing the absurd poetics of the plot and the helplessness of the protagonist. The film's crescendo with its celebration of the rock-n-roll pioneer of the dystopian 'City of Zero', a former police officer, provides an important intertext to both post-Soviet musicals: here, in the late-Soviet context, the reception of rock-n-roll articulates an ambivalent aura surrounding the popular Western music in Russian culture – an irresistible impulse to enjoy and rebel as well as the anxiety in this way to succumb to hedonism, amnesia and hegemonic power. In the post-Soviet situation, this ambivalence has turned into open contradiction, and the shock of Serebrennikov's 2008 protagonist Liuba and her barely hidden contempt for the decaying inhabitants of the eponymous provincial town in *Yuri's Day* can only be redeemed through her highly unrealistic and patriarchal transformation from an international opera star to a virtuous nurse, healing the putrid wounds of incarcerated criminals, suffering from venal diseases and tuberculosis.

Although the topos of an unbridgeable gap between liberal-democratic, pro-Western elites in the form of the paradigmatic former 'audience of the Ėcho Moskvy' or the TV channel Dozhd' on the one hand, and those indoctrinated by state television – the infamous *zomboiashchik* (zombie-box) – on the other, had been extant long before the Russian attack on Ukraine, the alienation between the oppositional elites and masses has reached its peak after February 2022 when, in the face of the state-initiated aggression and war-crimes, the expected mass protests arose only in some large cities and in diaspora.

Thus, instead of speculating about the abysses of the 'Russian soul' or a momentum for resistance, a stronger focus on the social alienation and contempt encoded in these

two films, could contribute to a better understanding of the present defeat of liberal-democratic forces and the 'shocking' silence of the Russian majority as well as the absence of active large-scale resistance. For sure, the inactivity of broad strata of the population certainly has complex reasons. Yet, the contempt of the post-Soviet (neo)liberal elite for the 'degenerate' masses undoubtedly played its part in driving them into the hands of an authoritarian and conservative ruler like Vladimir Putin, who could always profile himself as the advocate and protector of the 'ordinary' or 'little Russians,' accepting them without any socio-cultural conditioning.

Current Western research on reconstructions of the past in post-Soviet cinema often deals with the imperialist or nationalist mythologies. It usually discusses how dramatic historical events in Central and Eastern Europe are instrumentalised for political legitimisation and the formation of national or 'imperial' collectives, but also for the repression of the unwelcome past events and voices. In particular, historical traumas from World War II like the battle of Stalingrad, the defence of the Brest fortress (*The Brest Fortress*, also known as *Fortress of War*, *Brestkaia krepost'*, 2010, Aleksandr Kott) or the Volhynian massacre (*Volhynia*, also known as *Hatred*, *Wołyń*, 2016, Wojciech Smarzowski), but also the state-initiated famine of 1932–33 Holodomor (*Mr Jones*, *Obywatel Jones*, 2019, Agnieszka Holland) or the Holocaust (*Ida*, 2013, Paweł Pawlikowski) have been broadly appropriated in the contemporary Russian, Belarusian, Polish and Ukrainian collective imagination.

In contrast, attempts to reconstruct subversive episodes which seem to openly question the hegemonic consensus have received much less consideration. But how to reflect critically on artworks which use cultural-historical turning points and phenomena to challenge the authoritarian narratives and mythmaking? Since both films discussed in this essay depict youth counter- or subcultures of the Soviet era, they stand, at first glance, for an ideological and aesthetic alternative to such highly mythologised Russian renderings of history such as the historical dramas *Admiral* (2008, Andrei Kravchuk), *Stalingrad* (2013, Fëdor Bondarchuk), *Panfilov's 28* (*Dvadtsat' vosem' Panfilovtsev*, also known as *Battle for Moscow* and *Thunder of War,* 2016, Kim Druzhynin/Andrei Shal'opa), but also to contemporary Ukrainian historical dramas *Firecrosser* (*Toi, shcho proishov kriz' vohon'*, 2011, Mykhailo Illienko), *The Guide* (*Povodyr,* 2013, Oles' Sanin), *1918 The Battle of Kruty* (*Kruty 1918*, 2019, Oleksii Shapariev), *Black Raven* (*Chornyi voron*, 2019, Taras Tkachenko) or Tatar films like *Haytarma* (*Qaytarma*, 2013, Akhtem Seitablaiev).

In the following I will discuss how the films *Hipsters* and *Summer* try to reanimate the traditions of nonconformism and the underground. In doing so, I will analyse to what extent these reconstructions of protest subcultures ultimately fail and even lead to their surprising neutralisation, to a trivialisation or even subtle affirmation of repression. Thus, I will argue that the films seem, more unwittingly than not, to inscribe themselves into the hegemonic order complicit with the current regime and its ideological bonds, for instance, through the idealisation of the USSR and commodification of its underground cultures. In referring to Fredric Jameson's critique of conservative aspects of postmodern nostalgia and Jean Baudrillard's observations on the postmodern media, I will also discuss the respective aesthetic characteristics of this tendency – *Hipster's* carnivalisation and 'Americanisation' of the post-Stalinist era as well as *Summer's* monochrome 'documentary' style and "hipsterization" of the Soviet 80s. Particular at-

tention will be paid to the hyperrealism in the depiction of both historical periods which results in a paradoxical relativisation of their subversive cultural semantics. Finally, in the first approach these ambiguous phenomena will be tentatively described with the notion of 'mummification' – a metaphor which surely requires further elaboration.[1]

2. Valerii Todorovskii's *Hipsters* and the Challenge of the Philistines

The film *Hipsters* by Valerii Todorovskii, the son of the renowned Soviet-Jewish filmmaker Pëtr Todorovskii, became one of the most successful productions in the history of post-Soviet Russian cinema. It was due both to its theme – the rediscovery of the nonconformist youth culture of the Soviet era – and to the structural factors – the box office success of *Hipsters* – that, together with the popularity of such films as *Brother I/II* (*Brat I/II*, 1997/2000, Aleksei Balabanov), *Brigada* (2000, Aleksei Sidorov), as well as the international success of *The Barber of Siberia* (*Sibirskii Tsiriul'nik*, 1998, Nikita Mikhalkov) or *Night Watch* (*Nochnoi dozor*, 2004, Timur Bekmambetov) – was seen as a long-awaited recovery of the Russian film after the collapse of the state-subsidised Soviet film industry. The new self-confidence of Russian filmmakers also developed in a complex relationship as apprentice and rival to the West, especially given the global domination of Hollywood cinema. The claim of *Hipsters* was precisely no less than to realise a local historical theme in one of the most traditional and conventionalised Western film genres, the music film.[2]

As the title suggests, the movie tells the story of the Soviet hipsters *stilagi* (the "styled" or "style-conscious") – a youth culture of the late 1950s that, despite the Cold War, took its cue from the rock-n-roll and jazz music seeping through the Iron Curtain. The action takes place in 1955, just on the eve of the Thaw, a brief period of liberalisation introduced by Stalin's successor Nikita Khrushchev, notably by his criticism of the so-called 'cult of personality' at the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU in 1956. The film's protagonist, student Mėls Biriukov, is an average Soviet citizen who initially succumbs entirely to the regime's ideological indoctrination. As a volunteer team member monitoring public order and morality (*druzhinnik*), he actively participates at its lowest level of social control. In the course of a raid on an unofficial rock-n-roll dance party in Moscow's Gor'kii Park, he pursues and falls in love with his victim, a young woman Polina (Pol'za, eng. "utility"), who, along with her friends, mostly children of the Soviet upper class – diplomats, party and industrial nomenclature – indulges in the frowned-upon Western lifestyle.

After several attempts, which demand much energy, creativity and, not least, purchasing power, Mėls finally becomes a member of the adored clique. The admission means not only an erotic but also a social initiation for him. The timid and naive young

1 Speaking about the reference to the practice of 'mummification' also hints at a conspicuous tension between its deep roots in Russian Orthodox and Soviet traditions on the one hand, and the contemporary stage of capitalist media development on the other, a question that due to space restrictions cannot be explored further here. On the impact of the Orthodox tradition on the post-revolutionary cult of Lenin and his mummification see the talk by J. Arch Getty "Dead Man Talking: Lenin's Body and Russian Politics" (Getty 2016).

2 A detailed and systematic analysis of Todorovskii's effort to revive the genre and its Russian remarketing is offered by Rimgaila Salys (2016: 114–135).

man gradually develops into a self-confident consumer and adherent of an alternative, Western lifestyle, learning even to deal with the underground economy that supplies *stiliagi* with the coveted Western items. Mėls' new status is also underpinned by self-taught saxophone lessons, an instrument that the authorities deemed bourgeois and ideologically reprehensible,[3] and which the protagonist acquires at great risk on the *barakholka*, the Moscow black market.

However, his conversion from an obedient *homo sovieticus* to a defiant *stiliaga* is only one aspect of the film's story. Its climax is the protagonist's second and final initiation – the confrontation with the secondary or semi-fictional character of the *stiliagi* lifestyle. When Mėls' mentor Frėd, now a career diplomat, returns from a tour of duty in the US, both men escape from the confines of a claustrophobic family apartment onto the streets of Moscow to talk openly about Frėd's experiences in the country of their dreams, in particular about his impression of American hipsters. Mėls former role model visibly struggles to share his insight with his mentee – the *stiliagi* culture they idolised does not exist there. America, Frėd confesses, is much more conformist than they ever imagined. Accordingly, their entire hipster lifestyle was based on fiction, and is a simulacrum.

Mėls shock is intensified by Frėd's disillusionment and transformation from a flamboyant *stiliaga* and representative of the transgressive Moscow jeunesse dorée to a cynical and conformist Soviet functionary in fine American garments. Frėd's revelations trigger almost a violent backlash from Mėls, who, horrified about the shattering of his ideals, sends his former mentor packing and strides off in the opposite direction. Here, in the public space of a Moscow boulevard, the film completes a time jump that catapults Mėls into the present. Suddenly, the protagonist, who has paid such a high price to preserve his ideals, is no longer a loner – as Mėls steps into the empty middle of the boulevard, the colourful crowd of various youth subcultures grows around him. The song accompanying this triumphant march of diversity calls for the rest of society to treat the noisy and disruptive youths mildly and with understanding. Amid this carnival of youth non-conformism, Mėls' lover Pol'za also finds him, and they together stride towards a free and bright future.

Perhaps the most surprising thing about the reception of *Hipsters* was the enthusiastic reactions from critics in and outside the government camp. The notorious regime's TV presenter and Kremlin chief propagandist Vladimir Solov'ëv, noted at the time:

> I was stunned. There hasn't been a film like this in Russia for a long, long time, both in terms of genre and the quality of the script, the direction, the superb acting, and the camerawork… The film is so ideologically crucial that I would ask everyone to see it. It's about individual freedom, the right to be different, to be unlike others. I don't think the "Nashi" movement would like it very much. (Solov'ëv 2008)[4]

3 The complex dynamics of Soviet jazz and negotiations accompanying its status in Soviet society is highlighted by Gleb Tsipursky (2016: 332–361).

4 Cf. also the responses on the movie website Beliy.ru (Otzyvy): https://www.beliy.ru/work/stilyagifilm/index-48.htm [09 April 2023].

One of his antagonists from the opposition, the renowned music critic Artemii Troitskii even praised the film as "absolutely anti-state" and "freedom-loving": "'Stiliagi' is actually a very valuable appropriate and beautiful excuse to talk about other things, namely, once again, about freedom" (Vorob'eva 2009).

The enthusiastic consensus of both political antagonists Solov'ëv and Troitskii is significant in so far as it indicates the default agreement among post-Soviet Russian elites. The point of their paradoxical convergence is an elitist pathos of individuality opposed to the conformist 'gray mass' of the ordinary people. However, as the film shows, the nostalgic celebration and even carnivalisation of the still highly repressive Soviet power of the first post-Stalin years ultimately results in a trivialisation and surprising normalisation of the Soviet reality and its modern equivalent – the Putin regime of the early 2000s.

Without doubt, Todorovskii successfully communicates the central message of the depicted globalised subcultures – of rock-n-roll and jazz. The individuation process, the pathos of liberation of sexuality and creativity from traditional and collective constraints that characterised the original American model resonate remarkably well with the Soviet context (Bielefeldt 2017: 25–30). Despite all the systemic differences, the McCarthy and Eisenhower eras, with their Cold War paranoia and mass cultural pressures, bore some similarities to the Soviet regime, which sought openly to determine its citizens' leisure activities and consumption: yet while in the Soviet Union this control was exercised by state dictatorship, the laws of the market also had their norming effects. Though the film takes great effort to accurately depict the historical atmosphere, it reduces erotic, social and even political protest and transgression to the triumph of popular music.

Thus, *Hipsters* at first sight expresses a strong criticism of Stalinism, the ideological and social repression of the Soviet regime. Obviously, it can and should be interpreted allegorically and, in a counter-presentist way as a growing unease with authoritarian development under Vladimir Putin's second presidency. Yet, despite its general or manifest liberal tenor, the film's message contains significant contradictions, making the current regime and its historical correlate sometimes appear as almost harmless, even supportive towards its citizens, in a way representing its victims as its potential winners and true 'shareholders'.

Notwithstanding the criticism of uniformity, *Hipsters* strongly essentialises and simplifies the origins and dynamics of Soviet society. Todorovskii's music film establishes a seductive dichotomy: here the flamboyant individuals from the *stiliagi* camp, there a grey, jaded *seraia massa* (gray mass) of Soviet philistines, whom the young hipsters refer to with the pejorative slang term *zhloby* ("greedy persons"). Although the mainstream's hatred for *stiliagi* is shown as almost instinctual, 'zoological' in nature, its sociological or ideological causes are hardly elucidated. As a result, all the rage of the faceless proles is directed against the exterior forms of the protest – clothes, hairstyles, and music. The whole complexity of the Soviet experience, its tensions and paradoxes, adaptations and resistances as well as epoch-specific shifts are reduced to a conflict of lifestyles and consumer cultures, between style and stylessness. This is the more surprising as it was precisely during Khrushchev's Thaw that fundamental cultural and political issues became much more expressible and important than questions solely of looks and habits. The de-Stalinisation manifested itself, inter alia, in the emergence and growing popu-

larity of the so-called 'poetic clubs' or the development of the author song, popularised by such bards as Bulat Okudzhava, Iurii Vizbor, Vladimir Vysotskii, Iulii Kim and others.[5]

The ideological and social struggles of the time are also well documented in the iconic movies like Aleksandr Zarkhi's coming-of-age drama *My Younger Brother* (*Moi mladshii brat*, 1962) which clearly departs from the heroic scripts of the Stalin era. Travelling for vacation from their native Moscow to the 'westernised' Estonia, its protagonists routinely go the pubs, listen to jazz music, work on the black market or even discuss the contemporary 'bourgeois' philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre. The other paradigmatic social movie drama of the time, *Il'ich's Gate* (*Zastava Il'icha*, 1965) by Marlen Khutsiev, includes even a documentary episode with the legendary poetic readings at Moscow Politechnical Institute which hosted such important voices of the generation as Ievgenii Ievtushenko, Bella Akhmadullina or Robert Rozhdestvenskii. In contrast to Todorovskii's post-Soviet film, in Khutsiev's movie precisely ordinary young people like the working-class protagonist Sergei attend such readings, thereby clearly distancing themselves from the social narcissism and consumer-oriented lifestyle of the Soviet nomenclature children.[6] But instead of presenting in a similar way a nuanced picture of the contradictions within the alleged Soviet 'uniformity', the various forms of state control and strategies of resistance in which its 'silent majority' engaged, Todorovskii's *Hipsters*, except for the scene with Bob's Jewish parents and Gulag returnees, trivialises Soviet daily life into a harmless cat and mouse-game of flamboyant teenagers with clumsy authorities and their dumb and literally unstylish personnel.

As a result, the lack of sensitivity towards the historical and intellectual climate of the late 1950s is compensated within the film with an ardent attention to the material environment. The obsession with period fashions, hairstyles, old radios and cars virtually absorbs the viewer, turning the totalitarian Soviet Union into a mirror image of the golden American 1950s, the Perestroika period or even the Moscow night life of the 2000s. This impression is particularly reinforced by the numerous musical soundtracks, all by famous rock bands of the 1980s like *Mashina vremeni*, *Chai F* or *Kino*, which make the still highly repressive post-Stalin years feel even like the much more liberal Gorbachev era, transforming the risky actions of its protagonists into an exciting adventure game. At this point, paradoxically, the film's anti-authoritarian pathos tips over into an affirmative stance; the vibrant *stiliagi* subculture is represented as an archipelago of freedom and intrinsic part of the regime itself. Accordingly, it creates the impression that this epoch of authenticity, a real sense of community, destination and outstanding technical-industrial achievements actually was not so bad, but a time of great and pristine feelings, joyful improvisation, modesty and finally a meaningful way of life.

Thus, behind the untroubled dance life of the Soviet hipsters of the 1950s, one can easily recognise the attitudes of the early 'golden' 2000s which, in the Russian case, for

5 On the intellectual and artistic climate of the time, especially on the role of poetry in the anti-authoritarian resistance, see the memoirs of the author, translator, and literary scholar Vladimir Britanishskii [n.d.]: http://www.ruthenia.ru/60s/kritika/britanish_stud.htm [11 April 2023].

6 According to Vladimir Semerchuk, *Il'ich's Gate* enjoyed the status of a manifesto for the "sixtiers," especially due to its problematisation of a deep crisis of Stalinist identity model and its collectivist orientation (Cit. Kun 2012: 223).

large sections of the population were indeed characterised by increasing prosperity, living standards, and consolidation of state authority. The newly acquired self-confidence (and narcissistic self-referentiality within the film) arose out of the belief in irreversible economic advancement, but also out of the feeling of Russia's comeback as a great geopolitical power that, despite its authoritarian drift, still allows considerable freedom and leeway for art and business. Locating the film within this cultural-political frame, however, does not explain why the non-conformist *Kulturträger* in the film see as their primary opponent not so much the authoritarian regime, but the heavily homogenised mainstream society. Moreover, the ordinary Russians, increasingly excluded from participation in political and economic life, appear as phantasmatic, zombie-like, grey and obedient *homines sovietici*, incessantly stalking and harassing the colourful hipsterian dandies.

Such a limited, reductive portrait of the Soviet hipsters not only itself cuts away their characteristic oscillation between popular and countercultural, nonconformism and conformity, but leads to their depoliticisation and excessive aestheticisation. The important anti-racist as well as social message, accompanying the US-rock-n-roll wave due to its blues origins and numerous Afro-American performers, such as Little Richard and Chuck Berry, also gets lost in Todorovskii's transposition into the Russian context. Though its hybrid roots were hinted at by the female heroine's love affair with an exotic Afro-American visitor of the VI. World Youth and Student Festival in Moscow 1957, one can barely take seriously the smooth acceptance of the extramarital child by Mėls and his family. Supported by his father, a revered and open-hearted veteran, such an inclusivity rather coalesces with the regime's upcoming instrumentalisation of the Great Patriotic War, represented by such historical dramas like the *In August of 1944* (*V avguste 44*, 2004, Mikhail Ptashuk) or *Burnt by the Sun 2 (Utomlënnye solntsem 2*, 2010) by the prominent 'court-filmmaker' Nikita Mikhalkov. At the same time, the film's unwillingness to confront the racial issue more seriously contrasts with the persistent xenophobia towards migrant workers from the former Caucasian or Central Asian republics which is depicted so vividly in Balabanov's iconic *Brother* dilogy. In addition, the final scene, in which Frėd delivers to Mėls the shattering news of the invented nature of their rock-n-roll lifestyle, can also be interpreted as a warning to Russian culture against trusting Western ideas too much.

Moreover, one of the film's pictorial leitmotifs – old x-ray films used for the pirate copies of rock-n-roll vinyl records – can even be interpreted in a self-revealing way. Lighthearted dancing to the sounds from the clinical x-ray pictures in a metaphorical sense discloses the symptomatology of the film itself: its frivolous treatment of a dramatic historical period appears now almost like literal dancing on the bones of the (dead) witnesses and victims of the regime, an impression, intensified, amongst others, by the choice of the music film genre for representing the early post-Stalin era. Though the recycling of the medical celluloid is historically accurate, the presence of the bones and skeletons amidst rock-n-roll-carnival cannot but evoke subtle associations with decadence, death and decay. While the unhomely black-and-white colour scheme of the x-rays also resonates with the film's schematic characterisation and Manichean dichotomies, bereft

of the 'flesh' – human complexity and depth[7] – one is even tempted to see them as a metaphor for a surprising mortification of the film's genuine impulse to revive the spirits of non-conformism and resistance.

3. Reanimating the Protest Traditions during Vladimir Putin's Fourth Term

> Neither Naumenko, nor Tsoi, nor Serebrennikov are fighting the system. They simply live and create as if it does not exist, and the music of T. Rex easily drowns out the thunderous anthem of the USSR. It is precisely this position that makes them alien and hostile to any power, Brezhnev's or Putin's. (Dolin 2018)[8]

While the reception of *Hipsters* undoubtedly benefited from the cinematic legacy of the Todorovskii dynasty, especially the extraordinary success of Petr Todorovskii's perestroika dilogy *Intergirl* (*Interdevochka*, 1986) which broke ground with such explosive issues as illegal valuta, prostitution and emigration, the reception of another famous Russian musical film *Summer* (*Leto*, 2017) is hardly conceivable without the context of the late Putin-regime, particularly the persecution of its producer, the Moscow theatre director Kirill Serebrennikov. The art director of the renowned Moscow Gogol' Centr theatre since 2012, he gained his reputation with bold stage experiments collaborating, however, also in opera productions in famous state-sponsored institutions like the Bolshoi (Moscow) and Mariinskii (St. Petersburg) theatres. Apart from that, the versatile artist made successful films such as *Yuri's Day*, which earned him awards at the prestigious Locarno, Warsaw and Cannes Film Festivals. Yet, despite Serebrennikov's genuine liberal stance, his Gogol' Tsentr also staged authors loyal to the regime such as Zakhar Prilepin, who due to his key role in Kremlin propaganda warfare and the separatist fight for Donbas, was even appointed in 2018 a deputy art director of another renowned venue, the Maxim Gorkii theatre.[9]

---

7 Remarkably, the *Hipster's* ambivalent semantic structure is reproduced by some critical comments. Stating on the one hand that the film avoids the dangers of idealisation, Yana Meerzon surprisingly realises at the same time that it can be instrumentalised by the Kremlin power elite: "In other words, Todorovsky's film Stilyagi not only celebrates the Soviet musical underground as a tool of liberation and an expression of nonviolent resistance but also establishes present-day Russian youth as a target for new ideological narratives. It provides the Russian post-communist ideologists […] with a propaganda tool directed at glorifying the experience of the powerless" (Meerzon 2011: 479–510).

8 As Anton Dolin, one of the most renowned oppositional film critics in Russia continues: "*Summer* needs an adequate viewer who is able to remove the film from its many contexts (historical, human rights, festival, etc.) and enjoy it – like a concert of old, beloved, familiar music that suddenly sounds fresh, as if it were being played for the first time" (Dolin 2018).

9 The most significant controversy, however, was sparked by the rendition of the novel *Okolo nulia* (*At Zero*, 2009), published under the pen name Natan Dubovitskii. This nom de plume concealed Vladislav Surkov – a shrewd Russian apparatchik who, after his successful career as a PR manager in private business, rose to the rank of Russia's deputy prime minister. A 'creative head' behind the political scene of Putin's regime, Surkov is the one who allegedly invented, inter alia, the latter's party United Russia and led the Trilateral Contact Group for the peaceful settlement of the situation in eastern Ukraine.

In view of Serebrennikov's complex interaction with Kremlin elites, his arrest on charges of embezzling state funds from a theatre production came as a great surprise inside of the country – the harsh treatment of the star director stirred up tempers insofar as Serebrennikov, like Todorovskii a decade before him, had been considered the living proof of a certain leeway within the regime – a showcase of paradoxical coexistence of political paternalism, oil and gas based economic stability and some artistic freedoms that characterised the regime until the annexation of Crimea and its involvement in Donbas separatism. Thus, the filmmaker's detainment, despite numerous protests at home and abroad, marked a new stage of political repression.[10] Serebrennikov's persecution was immediately perceived as a warning signal to potential troublemakers among the Russian beau monde, and the sign of the growing dominance in the Kremlin's power hierarchy of the *siloviki* – officials associated with the state security apparatus – over the quasi-neoliberals.[11]

While *Hipsters* reflected in a counter-presentist manner the flaring up of tentative hopes for liberalisation under Vladimir Putin's co-regent Dmitrii Medvedev (2008–2012), culminating in the peaceful and partly festival-like Bolotnaia protests against the fraudulent parliamentary elections to the Russian Duma in December 2011, *Summer* could be attributed to the second, post-carnivalesque protest phase, in which the desire for change, especially after the violent crackdown on the protests, was growing ever more desperate but has been suppressed even more drastically. In this respect, the shift in Serebrennikov's music film from the politically relatively benign rock-n-roll or jazz to the much more explosive punk-rock and the band *Kino* with its charismatic front man Viktor Tsoi fits in well. *Kino's* songs, especially its hit *I Want Change!* (*Khochu peremen!*) reached the general public with Sergei Solov'ëv's cult film *Assa* (1986) and its eponymous refrain, becoming the anthem of the perestroika.

Tsoi's cutting voice and Asian appearance transformed the singer with Korean roots into a multi-layered symbol. Embodying a dual Russian-Soviet and Eurasian subaltern, who, after decades of social and political estrangement, started 'singing back' against the corrupt empire and demanding a say. Respectively, Tsoi's final performance in *Assa* expressed the sensibility of a whole generation, craving changes to the corrupt system, in which no mediation existed between the new, often murky elites and the rebellious avantgarde of rock musicians.[12] Generally, Serebrennikov's *Summer* does not deal with the later fame of Viktor Tsoi as a rock and film star but with the beginning of his career.

---

10 Obviously, it was also an escalation of internal power struggle within the regime hierarchy which satirist Viktor Shenderovich pointedly and frequently dubbed "spider fights in a jar" (Maiers 2023).

11 The insurmountable antagonisms within Soviet society that were exposed through the looming collapse of the Soviet Union was mediated in *Assa* by the biblical Flood allusions and parallel historical narrative of Emperor Paul I's murder. Moreover, the death of the main protagonist of *Assa*, the frontman Bananan, at the hands of an ambitious mafioso Krymov as well as the circumstances of historical fratricide of Paul I by the future emperor Alexander I, appear, retrospectively, as a gloomy prediction of the future failure of systemic change and the subsequent marginalisation of Russian civil society in its desperate struggle with the country's multiple authoritarian pasts.

12 See: Shada 315 (2018); Andrei Burlaka is an independent producer, eco-activist and historian of the Russian rock, still working as an editor of several St. Petersburg-based rock-n-roll websites.

Yet Tsoi's first steps to the all-Soviet stardom are only one aspect of the film which programmatically sets out to illuminate the larger context – the socio-political climate on the eve of perestroika. Its goal was also to draw a collective portrait of the Leningrad rock underground of the early 1980s, which included such pioneers of the genre as Maik Naumenko (*Zoopark*), Boris Grebenshchikov (*Akvarium*), Andrei Panov aka "Svin" (*Avtomaticheskie udovletvoriteli*) or the famous rock critic and promoter Artemii Troitskii.

The film's major narrative line is the artistic friendship between the already established 'master' Naumenko and his talented 'apprentice' Tsoi which unfolds against the backdrop of Leningrad's rock underground. This tale of a creative tandem of once again two great male artists is repeatedly overshadowed by a parallel romantic story – a triangle between Maik, his wife, Natal'ia (Natasha) and the young Viktor. In this respect, *Summer* could also be seen as a film about love and creativity, a cinematic coming-of-age and artist's novel (*Entwicklungs- und Künstlerroman*) in one.

Surprising about Serebrennikov's approach to this period is, however, the absence of the major political, social and cultural currents of the time. Instead, the film plot focuses on private and small places like communal or private apartments where the legendary *kvartiniki*, house concerts took place, or the gloomy backyards of St. Petersburg's old town. The performances in the cradle of the movement – the Leningrad rock club on Anton Rubinshtein Street with its relatively limited public – is also part of the somewhat claustrophobic film chronotopos. Though a few sequences in which the television or radio run in the background evoke a certain *Zeitgeist*, they have a rather decorative, ornamental character and reveal often no specific relationship to the film narrative.

The absence of the ideological atmosphere of the time within a film which raised expectations of a cultural and political manifesto contrasts instead with an overabundance of material details – from the beautiful but dilapidated fabric of St. Petersburg's buildings to old-school music equipment, tape recorders, furniture and Soviet interiors. Like *Hipsters*, *Summer* repeatedly creates the impression that historic artefacts and non-discursive media are much more important than the cultural-political circumstances of the time. The fixation on iconic Soviet commodities feels almost like a metropolitan second-hand store – a biotope of modern hipsters rather than the history-laden time of the looming perestroika.

This incongruity between this highly stylised 'vintage' world on the one hand, and the testimonies and remembrances of witnesses on the other, provoked a heated public debate. As one of the film's protagonists and forefathers of Russian rock Boris Grebenshchikov bitterly remarked on *Summer*:

> His script features hipsters, typical, today's Moscow hipsters, who except to fuck at someone else's expense, do nothing at all. It has nothing to do with Maik, Tsoi, Natasha, or any of us. The man who wrote this script, he wasn't even on this planet. (Roads L. 2018)

However, it would be too easy to attribute Grebenshchikov's scathing comment just to the jealousy of the witness who knows better. Other reviewers like the aforementioned critic Artemii Troitskii, who also appears as a protagonist in the film, saw the accusations of historical inaccuracy as a fundamental misunderstanding, praising it above all as a good

piece of entertainment.[13] Similarly, the renowned St. Petersburg cineaste and producer Sergei Sholokhov highlighted the "amazing" quality of the camera and the "joyful affects" conveyed by the film: "Our joy in cinema has disappeared. In this film, despite the fact that it talks about some terrible years of stagnation, there is no terribleness" (Telekanal Sankt-Peterburg 2018).

This depoliticisation and privatisation of *Summer's* story line lends the film an aura of ahistoricity which is reinforced by some of its formal features, above all, by its colour tone – the nostalgic, 'old-school' aesthetic of black-and-white pictures. However, the intention to create in this way an accurate and 'authentic' sense of the late Soviet Union, to provide its specific "world view" or "structures of feeling" (Raymond Williams) paradoxically tips into its opposite. First, the switch to the monochrome picture itself causes some confusion since by the early 1980s the majority of Soviet films were already released in colour. Serebrennikov's decision was apparently dictated by the desire to create an aura of documentary accuracy, and underground atmosphere. Yet, this technique is contradicted by the fact that the movie is shot in modern monochrome perfection instead of the characteristic Soviet film and photo tonality – for instance the typical irregular, 'amateurish' contrast structure and softness of the Soviet Svema tapes, produced at the Shostka factory in the Soviet-Ukrainian Donbas. This impeccable digital black-and-white aesthetic imparts to the film a surprising coldness and timeless rapture which tellingly correlates with its 'hipsterian' content.[14].

This aesthetically and content-wise historically oblivious approach to the past is not, however, a unique post-Socialist Russian phenomenon, but a general postmodern tendency prominently problematised by Fredric Jameson. In the US-American cinema of the 70s, he observed a remarkable retro wave – a tendency for idealized reconstruction of the 'golden American' post war-era, epitomized in such films as, for instance, in the films *American Graffiti*, 1973 by George Lucas, or *China Town*, 1974 by Roman Polanski (Jameson 1991: 19). The critique relates these nostalgic representations to a fundamental change in the regime of postmodern signification which, respectively, reflects the recent, "purer", post-industrial stage of capitalist development (ibid: 35–36). Accordingly, the main distinction between modernist and postmodernist art lies in different types of representation which Jameson subsumes under the opposition between the depth and surface of

13 Troitskii 2018.

14 A close friend of Tsoi and co-founder of *Kino*, author and filmmaker Aleksei Rybin observes in relation to *Summer*, albeit with a telling slip of the tongue: "A film is made by a director. All questions to the director. […] The screenwriter there is simply diabolical [adov], Idov is his last name, but in my opinion, it's diabolical, a simply diabolical man. This man, he should only write series called '80s'. What I saw in the film *Summer* is absolutely one of these '80s' series, which he did, as a matter of fact. Completely unlike the real 80s, not even close" (RTIVi Novosti 2019). Rybin refers here to popular series launched by Russian television between 2012 and 2016 which generally offered an idealised and nostalgic picture of the late Soviet period. Interestingly, in this interview with Rybin both interlocutors agree that the number of fictional elements depends on the genre. While Troitskii, who briefly advised the *Summer* film team, still tries to justify its playful treatment of historical background by stressing its generic nature as a music film, Rybin is much more critical. The reaction of Andrei Tropillo, the legendary producer and promoter, the "godfather of the Russian rock", turned out to be even more devastating. Cf. Unamusic 2017.

an object. Whereas modernist art like Vincent van Gogh's famous *Peasant Shoes* (1888) reflects not only a specific stage in aesthetic development like the ground-breaking usage of colour, but also the social world of the French peasantry, postmodern art, like in Andy Warhol's *Diamond Shoes* (1980) is characterised by pure self-referentiality, free of any historical relations, and hence remarkably silent. Even more, the "flattening" of Warhol's picture, its two-dimensional quality results into a "waning of affect" (ibid: 10), "a new kind of superficiality" which Jameson diagnoses as "the supreme formal feature of all postmodernisms" (ibid: 9). In contrast to van Gogh's *Shoes*, which renders to the spectator the severity of the peasant's life, Warhol's painting conveys fragmented, fetishised and thus mortified reality. Similarly, through their nostalgic character and fixation on the material surface, the postmodern cinematic reconstructions of the US-post-war years produce idealised, fictitious worlds; signs bereft of the complex historical reality and authentic historical setting – a simulacrum (ibid. 10).

Despite its conservative tinge, the idea of postmodern simulacra can be productively applied to the carnivalesque setting of *Hipsters* as well as of *Summer*. Todorovskii's musical film with its glaring bright colours and consumer goods (fancy clothes, cars etc.) strikingly contradict the harsh everyday conditions of the post-war Soviet Union. In the same way, Serebrennikov's film, despite its opposite aesthetic strategies of reductive and monochrome perfection, ends up with an analogous loss of historicity. A loss that is already suggested by the very title "Summer", which, on the one hand, connects the birth of Russian rock to the high season of vacation, enhancing its de-temporalisation and de-historisation. As a result, the evocations of the eternal, carefree lifestyle of the Leningrad's rock bohemians differ considerably from such groundbreaking cinematic testimonies of the time and milieu as Aleksei Uchitel's film *Rock* (*Rok*, 1988).

It is telling that the escape from history and social reality into a purified, careless and isolated bohemian universe also correlates with the extensive presence of nature – *Summer* begins in a picnic atmosphere of a Baltic beach where the nascent rock scene celebrates its parties. In addition, the beautiful shots of the pristine pine forests and Baltic Sea coast, now stylised as a monochromatic Soviet Woodstock, work as a counterpoint to the claustrophobic spaces of the decaying collective apartments (*kommunalkas*), belle epoque buildings with their deep, shady backyards and dilapidated staircases. The escape from history thus coincides with an escape from the modern city.

4. Conclusion: Showbiz Logic and the Mummification of Subcultures

> There were no admirers [...] In those rock-club days there were no admirers. It's a stupid word, admirer... You know, there were like-minded people or people who shared the same worldview... (Shevchuk/Zhang 2022)

The differences between the present and the past, the consistency of certain historical references are blurred in both *Hipsters* and *Summer* not only on an aesthetic and narrative level, but also in terms of ideology. In Serebrennikov's case, the most problematic ideological inconsistency is certainly the projection of several features of modern showbiz back into the Soviet 1980s. For example, the Leningrad rock scene, which according to

contemporary witnesses had horizontal and rather rhizomatic forms of organisation, is presented in *Summer* as a hierarchical, competitive, and star-centred world, strictly divided between the 'genius' and his enchanted entourage. Respectively, the film abounds in episodes with ecstatic female fans whose reaction is often the only way to indicate artistic quality; by the same token, Maik Naumenko, who in real life was notorious for his shyness of publicity, modesty, and self-irony, appears as a taciturn, lofty enigmatic guru who does not care much about his surroundings. The band leader, who actually was highly sceptical towards the commercialisation of rock and the lures of the emerging Soviet music industry, is presented as an impresario who encourages his younger follower Tsoi by sharing with him his exquisite collection of Western records and supporting him as a co-producer in his first successes. Such a showbiz reinterpretation manifests itself, for example, in the rendering of Tsoi's debut in the rock club which is dramatised as an absolute turning point in his artistic career. Here it is not his performance that first excites the reluctant audience, but only the appearance of the older 'master' Naumenko which breaks the ice bringing the predominantly female fans to a frenzy and thus setting the stage for a happy ending.

At the same time, Serebrennikov is very inventive in the ways he stages and narrates the relations between the 'old master' Naumenko and 'to-be-master' Tsoi; with great intermedial sophistication he shows how certain moods, everyday situations or phrases, casually picked up on the street, may transform into songs. He, for instance, presents facsimiles of the original songs and blends them with quasi-documentary material such as faked amateur recordings to highlight the explosive, bifurcatory dynamics of the song writing. Communicating mostly without words, sometimes via chords, the creative exchange between two rock musicians is thus given an almost mystical aura of silence and non-verbal agreement. Yet all these scenes with the two protagonists are presented in such a speed of sequences, including various multimedia effects, that the viewer is rather overwhelmed, getting no time for imaginary immersion or, in Jamesonian terms, for developing any deeper affect and identification. Even more: the cross-fades, quick cuts, cartoon elements or other defamiliarising devices in a way marginalise the archival material aesthetically, covering its poetic function behind the perfect modern orchestration and montage.

This aesthetic choice of accelerated perfection influences also the depiction of the protagonists, which follows a certain showbiz logic. Generally, Serebrennikov's characters are rather emotionally flat and unconvincing: On the one hand, there is the Leningrad 'John Lennon' Naumenko, who lives in his genius bubble, neglects his family and balances on the verge of creative exhaustion. On the other hand, the younger Tsoi, also withdrawn and solitary, but taking touching care of Naumenko's young son and his wife Natal'ia, a detail that Serebrennikov develops into a magesterial plot line which totally contradicts the biographies of his historical prototypes.[15] Especially the speed

15 Remarkably, it is precisely the love triangle between the two icons of Soviet rock culture that earned Serebrennikov the most criticism. Although Nataliia Naumenko admits in her interviews and memoirs a short-lived, platonic affection for the young and inexperienced Tsoi, the love affair highlighted in the film fails to convince and only distracts the attention from its central message: the testimony of intense aesthetic and ideological innovation. Cf. Kushnir 2018.

with which Natal'ia's love oscillates between Maik and Viktor presents an Eros who like a radar follows the creativity of the (male) rock demiurges. Moreover, the female muse operates as an irrational force that knows no constancy in feelings and attachments but wanders after the (floating) symbolic capital, mirroring and reinforcing the male creative genius. Driven by this relational logic, Natal'ia acts pretty much in line with the 'the winner takes it all' principle of showbiz. Consequently, the rising leader of the Leningrad rock scene (Tsoi) wins not only the hearts of the audience but also the rival's lover (Natal'ia), turning history into a perfect Hollywood style success story.[16]

If we look at this aesthetic strategy in a broader theoretical perspective, it almost literally echoes Jean Baudrillard's critique of the postmodern stage of media development – its "precession of simulacra" (Baudrillard 2006 [1994]: 8). According to the French thinker, instead of a positive "lively, dialectical, full dramatic relation" to reality, postmodern cinema is characterised by "an inverse, negative" one, aiming at a more perfect picture of the world than the original itself and thus leading to an abolishment of the historic referent (ibid: 47). Striving towards such "an absolute correspondence with the real" (ibid.), which Baudrillard calls "a strategy of the real, neo-real and hyperreal," (Baudrillard 1993: 197) this fading of the historical referent results in a characteristic postmodern heightened self-referentiality and the respective nostalgia for a lost reality we discover in Serebrennikov's *Summer*. The described postmodern symptoms manifest themselves particularly in the metareflexive commentaries added in certain critical moments of transgression, when the present threatens to replace the fictionalised past too blatantly. Then the figure of a chronicler appears who repeatedly exclaims: "All this did not exist!" ("Ėtogo vsego ne bylo!"). This demonstrative negation of the film's narrative has seemingly the rhetorical goal to parody the attitude of a sceptical – Soviet or contemporary – and indoctrinated petite bourgeois who stubbornly denies the uncomfortable and subversive past or present reality. By contrast, for a more sophisticated audience it signals ironic distance to this utterance, asking for a sympathetic and winking acceptance of Serebrennikov's version of the events, now validated by negation.

However, this apparently sophisticated self-referential postmodern irony is not only unhistorical and superficial, but also bears an antisocial impulse, very similar to Todorovskii's othering of the Soviet 'grey masses' in *Hipsters*. This tendency culminates in an episode with the suburban regional train, the *elektrichka*. After a short peaceful ride in the eponymous vehicle of Soviet culture, the young rockers start brutally mocking and threatening ordinary Soviet citizens, who are going to their *datchas* or elsewhere. Instead of mild irony and sympathy for their elderly fellow countrymen, known from such pretexts as Venedikt Erofeev's ground-breaking novel *Moscow-Petushki* (1973)[17] or the already mentioned drama *City Zero*, the urge to scandalise and provoke finally prevails and becomes an end in itself.

However, this transgressive behaviour of the rebellious heroes together with the ostentatious character of the meta-commentaries do not automatically elicit unconditioned sympathy with the nonconformist characters: The portrayed quasi-artistic

16 This may be the reason behind Grebenshchikov's harsh critique of the Leto production team which completely misunderstood his circle, namely that it was not all about money (Roads L 2018).

17 *Moskva-Petushki* is also known as *Moscow to the End of the Line* or *Moscow Stations*.

excesses and provocations in the suburban train after a certain moment start to undermine the human dignity, solidarity and the very critical common sense they appeal to. Given the disdain and aggressive behaviour towards their fellow citizens, intensified by the exorbitant use of the multimedia montage, the 'ordinary' viewer rather involuntarily feels empathy with 'declassed' 'common people,' scared and stressed by aggressive punk performances.

Thus, the contradictory ambivalent rhetoric and aesthetic structure of both films – their simultaneous impulse to preserve and replace, to remember and to forget – leads to a paradox self-sabotage of the intended subversion.

Remarkably, the intense mythologisation and reification of the non-conformist youth cultures as well as the idealisation of the Soviet everyday life in Summer and Hipsters, promote rather the forgetting of its burdens and a paradox nostalgia for the very political system – the Soviet regime – they set out to dismantle. With their hyperrealist claim to surpass the historical past, to achieve a 'higher' verisimilitude, particularly on the level of protagonists, material decorations or formal perfection, both films lead to a striking mortification or even 'mummification' of the non-conformist content. Despite all painstaking efforts to recreate and reanimate the historical body of the Soviet rock culture, it – very much like the efforts to preserve Lenin – remains lifeless. In this way, both movies reflect something deeply symptomatic for a specific authoritarian context of Putin's Russia and beyond – a kind of Stockholm syndrome, an identification with the hegemonic power – a tragic turn against oneself.

Filmography

Admiral, dir. Andrei Kravchuk, Russia 2008.
American Graffiti, dir. George Lucas, USA 1973.
Assa, dir. Sergei Solov'ëv, USSR 1986.
Black Raven (*Chornyi voron*), dir. Taras Tkachenko, UA 2019.
Brigada, dir. Aleksei Sidorov, Russia 2000.
Brother I (*Brat I*), dir. Aleksei Balabanov, Russia 1997.
Brother II (*Brat II*), dir. Aleksei Balabanov, Russia 2000.
Burnt by the Sun 2 (*Utomlënnyie solntsem 2*), dir. Nikita Mikhalkov, Russia 2010.
China Town, dir. Roman Polanski, USA 1974.
Firecrosser (*Toi, shcho proishov kriz' vohon'*), dir. Mykhailo Illienko, UA 2011.
Haytarma (*Qaytarma*), dir. Akhtem Seitablaiev, UA 2013.
Hipsters (*Stiliagi*), dir. Valerii Todorovskii, Russia 2008.
Ida, dir. Paweł Pawlikowski, Poland/Denmark/France/United Kingdom 2013.
Il'ich's Gate (*Zastava Il'icha*) dir. Marlen Khutsiev, USSR 1965.
In August of 1944 (*V avguste 44*), dir. Mikhail Ptashuk), Belarus/Russia 2004.
Intergirl (*Interdevochka*), dir. Petr Todorovskii, USSR/Sweden 1986.
Yuri's Day (*Iur'ev den'*), dir. Kirill Serebrennikov, Russia 2008.
Mr Jones (*Obywatel Jones*), dir. Agnieszka Holland, Poland/Ukraine/United Kingdom 2019.
My Younger Brother (*Moi mladshii brat*), dir. Aleksandr Zarkhi, USSR 1962.
Night Watch (*Nochnoi dozor*), dir. Timur Bekmambetov, Russia 2004.

Rock (*Rok*), dir. Aleksei Uchitel, USSR 1988.
Stalingrad, dir. Fëdor Bondarchuk, Russia 2013.
Summer (*Leto*), dir. Kirill Serebrennikov, Russia/France 2018.
The Barber of Siberia (*Sibirskii Tsiriul'nik*), dir. Nikita Mikhalkov, Russia/France/Italy/Czech Republic/USA 1998.
The Brest Fortress [also known as *Fortress of War*] (*Brestkaia krepost'*), dir. Aleksandr Kott, Russia/Belarus 2010.
The Guide (*Povodyr*), dir. Oles' Sanin, UA 2013.
Volhynia [also known as *Hatred*] (*Wołyń*), dir. Wojciech Smarzowski, Poland 2016.
Zerograd (*Gorod Zero*), dir. Karen Shakhnazarov, USSR 1988.
Panfilov's 28 [also known as *Battle for Moscow* and *Thunder of War*] (*Dvadtsat vosem' Panfilovtsev*), dir. Kim Druzhynin/Andrei Shal'opa, Russia 2016.
1918 The Battle of Kruty (*Kruty 1918*), dir. Oleksii Shapariev, UA 2019.

References

Baudrillard, Jean (1993): "The Evil Demon o,f Images and The Precession of Simulacra." In: Docherty, Thomas (eds.): Postmodernism. A Reader. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 194–199.
Baudrillard, Jean (2006): Simulacra and Simulation [1994], Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
Bielefeldt, Christian (2017): "Rock-n-Roll." In: Hecken, Thomas/Kleiner, Marcus S. (eds.): Handbuch Popkultur, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 25–30.
Britanishskii, Vladimir (1996): "Studentskoe poėticheskoe dvizhenie v nachale ottepeli." In: Ruthenia.ru [n.d] (http://www.ruthenia.ru/60s/kritika/britanish_stud.htm) [11 April 2023].
Dolin, Anton (2018): "'Leto' Kirilla Serebrennikova: kollektivnyi son o minuvshei epokhe. V Kannakh pokazali fil'm arestovannoho Kirilla Serebrennikova o Viktore Tsoe i Maike Naumenko." In: Meduza, 10 May 2018 (https://meduza.io/feature/2018/05/10/leto-kirilla-serebrennikova-kollektivnyy-son-o-minuvshey-epohe) [08 April 2023].
Getty, Arch J. (2016): "Dead Man Talking: Lenin's Body and Russian Politics." In: University of California Television (Youtube), 11 February 2016 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NBpm3CnGT30) [21 May 2023].
Grani.Ru (2017): "Viktor Shenderovich o dele Kirilla Serebrennikova." In: Youtube, 23 August 2017 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1h35Ik6HfdU) [11 April 2023].
Jameson, Fredric (1991): Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism, Durham: Duke University Press.
Kun, Mishel' (2012): "Zastava Il'icha (1968)." In: Braginskii, Nikita/Vasil'eva, Ekaterina (eds.): Noev Kovcheg russkogo kino: Ot "Sten'ki Razina" do "Stiliag", Moscow: Globus, pp. 228–533.
Kushnir, Elena/Koėn, Tania (2018): "'Moia zhizn' – ne sovsem moia': Natal'ia Naumenko o filme 'Leto', svoem muzhe Maike, druzhbe s Viktorom Tsoem i nostal'gii." In: Meduza, 19 June 2018 (https://knife.media/naumenko-interview/) [08 April 2023].

Meerzon, Yana (2011): "Dancing on the X-rays: On the Theatre of Memory, Counter-Memory, and Postmemory in the Post-1989 East-European Context." In: Modern Drama 54/4, pp. 479–510.

Maiers, Masha (2023): "Personal'no Vash. Interview with Viktor Shenderovich." In: ĖkhoFM 07 April 2023 (https://echofm.online/programs/personalno-vash/personalno-vash-s-viktorom-shenderovichem-4) [01 May2023].

Roads L (2018): "Boris Grebenshchikov vozmushchen fil'mom Kirilla Serebrennikova o Viktore Tsoe." In: YouTube, 15 February, 2018 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_inVuKLkIVc) [07 April 2023].

RTIVi Novosti (2019): "Aleksei Rybin: 'Tsoi nikogda ne igral russkii rok.'" In: YouTube, 28 May 2019 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VEo03zUOlCQ&t=911s) [11 April 2023].

Salys, Rimgaila (2016): "Hipsters." In: Salys, Rimgaila (ed.): The Contemporary Russian Cinema Reader 2005–2016. Boston: Academic Studies Press, pp. 114–135.

Shada 315 (2018): "Andrei Burlaka o fil'me 'Leto.'" In: YouTube, 07 August 2018 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H9z06SpTFvA) [11 April 2023].

Solov'ëv, Vladimir (2008), "Ideologicheskii fil'm nastol'ko vazhnyi, chto ia by vsekh procil ego posmotret'" In: Beliy.ru (Otzyvy) (https://www.beliy.ru/work/stilyagifilm/-id=204-1.htm) [09 April 2023].

Telekanal Sankt-Peterburg (2018): "Kak kritiki i muzykanty vospriniali fil'm Serebrennikova 'Leto.'" In: YouTube, 25 June 2018 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8gi_khfjMbo) [08 April 2023].

Troitskii, Artemii (2018): "O fil'me 'Leto' i Leningradskom rok-klube (ARU TV)." In: YouTube, 24 June 2018 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nT5vxayAPN8) [08 April 2023].

Tsipursky, Gleb (2016): "Jazz, Power, and Soviet Youth in the Early Cold War, 1948–1953." In: The Journal of Musicology 33/3 (Summer), pp. 332–361.

Unamusic (2017): "Kirill Serebennikov. Fil'm 'Leto.' Viktor Tsoi. Mnenie Andreia Tropillo." In: YouTube, 16 September 2017 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QzO8OMPbpqs&t=2s) [11 April 2023].

Vorob'eva, Irina (2009): "Osoboe mnenie. Interview with Artemii Troitskii." In: Ėcho Moskvy, 6 January 2009 (https://echo.msk.ru/programs/personalno/563726-echo/) [12 August 2020].

Zhang, Petr (2022): "Iurii Shevchuk o Viktore Tsoe. Kakoi konflikt byl mezhdu Shevchukom i Tsoem?" In: YouTube, 29 January 2022 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=az9ZHwJ3SRI) [09 April 2023].