

Society for History Education

Sergei Eisenstein: The Artist in Service of the Revolution

Author(s): Ron Briley

Source: *The History Teacher*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Aug., 1996), pp. 525-536

Published by: [Society for History Education](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/494802>

Accessed: 27/02/2014 16:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Society for History Education is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The History Teacher*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Sergei Eisenstein: The Artist in Service of the Revolution

Ron Briley

Sandia Preparatory School, Albuquerque, New Mexico

IN ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1962), the classic account of life in the Soviet labor camps of the gulag, two prisoners argue the artistic merits of Soviet film maker Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948). One, a director who was arrested before he could make his first film, maintains that whether or not one agrees with the political ideology of Eisenstein, it is impossible to deny his genius in such cinematic works as *Battleship Potemkin* (1925). His fellow prisoner begs to differ, observing that the true mark of greatness lies on the moral plane with truth, and Eisenstein, in service of his master Stalin, fails to pass the test. Thus, the most celebrated moralist and novelist of twentieth century Russian letters addressed the problems of artistic life in the Soviet Union. While the choices made by Solzhenitsyn resulted in clashes with the Soviet regime and his eventual exile to the West, Eisenstein celebrated the Bolshevik Revolution as freeing the artist from the restraints of bourgeoisie nationalism. However, the talented film director ended up being at the mercy of Joseph Stalin's system which sabotaged Eisenstein's work and intimidated the artist. Does the political subservience to Stalin deny Eisenstein his position as one of the great artists of the twentieth century as Solzhenitsyn seems to suggest in *Ivan Denisovich*? Perhaps a brief survey of the life and work of Eisenstein will

shed some light on this question and suggest that while the Soviet film maker was an influential force in the development of the twentieth century's most important art form, in the final analysis his contributions were limited by the ideology to which he had attached his star.

Although ethnically of Russian and Jewish heritage, Sergei Eisenstein was born in Riga, Latvia on January 23, 1898. His childhood was not exactly a happy one as his mother abandoned the family and moved to Paris. Eisenstein was raised by his father, a rather stern and austere civil engineer. The young Eisenstein survived his years in Riga by seeking solace in reading adventure and romantic novels focusing on the French Revolution, by going to the circus, by sketching (which would remain a life-long pursuit and provide a framework for many film ideas), and by displaying an adolescent fascination with violence which was later exhibited in many of his artistic works. However, Eisenstein stopped short of rebellion and appeared ready to follow his father's career in engineering when in 1915 he enrolled at the Petrograd Institute of Civil Engineering.

But the coming of the Russian Revolution provided Eisenstein (as with many of his contemporaries) with the opportunity to pursue a radically different career option. Following the pattern of most classmates, he dropped out of the Institute and joined the Bolshevik Red Army, where, rather than see much front line action, Eisenstein used his sketching skills in production design and propaganda for a Red Army theatrical group. With his artistic aptitude encouraged by his military experience, Eisenstein decided to forego an engineering career following demobilization, enrolling in the State School for Stage Direction under the guidance of Vsevolod Meyerhold, who would become somewhat of a father figure to Eisenstein until his disappearance in the Great Terror of the 1930s. Eisenstein also became associated with the avant-garde Proletkult Theater, producing a number of experimental plays. For example, in *The Mexican*, the young director made use of caricature and staged a boxing match for the audience. In *Gas Masks*, Eisenstein placed benches for the audience in an actual gasworks, and at the conclusion of the play, the night shift actually took over the "stage" from the actors. Meanwhile, in *The Wise Man*, he combined elements of traditional theater, circus, and a new means of expression, film.

Like many young artists, Eisenstein found the early years of the Bolshevik Revolution to be an exhilarating experience in which traditional artistic forms of expression were under attack and new experimental art forms were the rage of the day. In this climate of artistic freedom, Eisenstein began to formulate his theory of the "montage of attractions" in which the artist guides the spectator into a "desired mood." Observing the work of American director D.W. Griffith in *Birth of a Nation* and *Intolerance*, the editing of American cinema releases by Soviet film editor Esther Shub in order to make

many of these films more compatible with the revolutionary ideology of the Soviet Union, and the work of Russian director Lev Kuleshov, suggesting that film editing had more impact upon audiences than the expression of actors, Eisenstein concluded that film offered the best medium through which to develop his "montage of attractions." His opportunity to test these theories came in 1924 when Goskino (the state cinema production unit) accepted his proposal for a cycle of films on political events leading to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

Thus, in 1924, although he knew little about the technical aspects of film making and had to depend on the expertise of his camera man (cinematographer would be the term today) Edward Tisse, Eisenstein made his first film, *Strike*. In this film, the director's theory of montage fit well with the desires of Soviet film authorities to depart from traditional narrative and the idealization of individual heroes. Rather than focus upon individual characters, Eisenstein emphasized types such as the organizer, worker, spy, foreman, and manager as he told the story of a strike which was eventually crushed, but through which the consciousness of the proletariat had been enhanced. Eisenstein directed the mood of his audience with metaphors such as the overweight capitalist, the athletic workers, and by cross-cutting between the violent suppression of the strike and the butchering of animals in a slaughter house. While audience reaction to this new mode of cinema was mixed, critics lavished praise on *Strike*. Eisenstein's colleague Grigori Kozintsev told directors "anything we've been doing up till now is mere childish nonsense."¹

Because of the favor in which *Strike* was held by the Soviet film industry, the Jubilee Committee, formed to commemorate the 1905 Revolution, selected Eisenstein to produce a film on the events leading to the Revolution. While the mutiny on the Battleship *Potemkin* was only one brief episode in the original script, Eisenstein, after visiting Odessa (the site of the revolt), decided to focus on the battleship which would provide a metaphor for the larger historical events. Situated at the port of Odessa, the sailors of the *Potemkin* were confronted with untenable living conditions such as maggot-infested meat. When the meat is placed in the soup, many sailors refuse to eat this disgusting dish. Seeking to make an example of these rebellious seaman, the ship's captain orders marines to execute the sailors. However, a Bolshevik seaman Vakulinchuk leads an uprising which prevents a massacre, but in the process he becomes a martyr to the Revolution. In fact, the display of his body on shore produces a show of support for the mutineers by the citizens of Odessa who send supplies to the sailors. This mood of optimism and comradeship is jarred by a subtitle labeled "suddenly" and the appearance of Tsarist troops who march down the Odessa steps, indiscriminately killing

people in what has become one of the most powerful scenes in world cinema. The *Potemkin* responds to the massacre by firing upon the forces of reaction. In the climax of the film, a Tsarist squadron is dispatched to destroy the *Potemkin* and prevent the spread of rebellion. However, in a show of solidarity the sailors of the squadron refuse to fire upon their comrades, and the *Potemkin* is allowed to escape.

While there was some manipulation of the actual historical account, there is little doubt that Eisenstein used his "montage of attractions" to create in *Battleship Potemkin* support for the 1917 Revolution as well as one of the classic works of cinema. The film was well received in Paris, Berlin, and Hollywood, where Charlie Chaplin pronounced it "the best film in the world." In 1958, a jury of over one hundred film historians, representing twenty-six nations, agreed with Chaplin, proclaiming *Battleship Potemkin* the "best film of all time."²

Following the critical acclaim, Eisenstein was the toast of Soviet cinema and was called upon in 1926 to make a film called *The General Line* which was to celebrate the Soviet policy of collectivization of agriculture. However, the filming of this project was temporarily suspended so that Eisenstein could make a film honoring the tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Although not a member of the Communist Party, Eisenstein was very supportive of and comfortable with the Soviet leadership. This relationship began to change during the filming of *October* or *Ten Days That Shook the World* (as it is often called in its Western release). The film had the official support of the Soviet authorities who diverted electricity for the project and blocked off the city streets in Leningrad for the crowd scenes such as the storming of the Winter Palace. Nevertheless, with this cooperation also came interference. With the changing political situation in the Soviet Union, references to the role of Leon Trotsky in the Revolution had to be downplayed (Eisenstein may have had to cut as much as one-third of his film footage). And Stalin, who supposedly screened all of the film before its release, also had Eisenstein edit some of Lenin's speeches. Stalin, now General Secretary of the Party, proclaimed, "Lenin's liberalism is no longer valid."³ Despite these problems, Eisenstein was able to complete his film and experiment with a new technique and theory which he termed "intellectual montage." According to Eisenstein, the intellect of film viewers could be engaged through metaphoric formulae which would rise above the pathos of *Potemkin*. For example, shots of the polished boots of Alexander Kerensky (head of the Provisional Government which replaced the reign of the Tsar), an ornamental peacock, and religious artifacts create the image of a Tsarist figure who must be overthrown by the creative forces of the people led by the Bolsheviks. However, critics as well as audiences, who

found the film difficult to follow, were less than satisfied with the “intellectual montage” of *October*.

Although Eisenstein had visions of using intellectual montage to create a film of *Das Kapital*, his experience with the reception given *October* led him to express some reservations regarding the direction of the Russian Revolution and artistic life within the Soviet Union. In a letter to French film critic Leon Moussinac, Eisenstein confirmed, “We aren’t rebels any more. We’re becoming lazy priests. I have the impression that the enormous breath of 1917 which gave birth to our cinema is blowing itself out.”⁴ The Soviet director lamented that the avant-garde free expression of the early revolutionary period was being replaced by an official doctrine limiting individual creativity.

Regardless of these misgivings, Eisenstein did complete *The General Line*, which would be renamed *Old and New*, justifying in artistic terms the violent, forced collectivization which Stalin was visiting upon the Soviet countryside. In the film, of course, issues of force are downplayed as heroine Marfa Lapkina, a real peasant and not a professional actress, and the district agronomist take a peasant community from backwardness to a flourishing collective farm. Using the central symbols of a tractor, a bull, and a cream-separator, Eisenstein summed up this film as “an attempt to depict in an interesting way the daily round of peasant husbandry.”⁵ *Old and New*, which is the least known of Eisenstein’s films in the West today, was only a moderate success.

Having made four major films between 1924 and 1929, a tired and somewhat disillusioned Eisenstein petitioned the Soviet government for permission to travel abroad. Following a film congress in Switzerland, as well as travel in France and England, Eisenstein was lured to the United States by a film contract with Paramount Studios (the agreement was approved by Soviet film authorities with Sovkino) which placed the film maker on retainer for the sum of nine hundred dollars a week. However, this marriage between capitalistic, commercial Hollywood and the radical author of “intellectual montage” was a mismatch from the start. For example, to show his contempt for Paramount publicity activities, Eisenstein offered to exchange places with a waiter at one formal dinner, refused alcohol since it would be a violation of prohibition law, and showed up for a press conference with a scraggly beard, explaining that Americans pictured all Russians with beards and he did not want to disappoint any one. While finding most Hollywood celebrities “stupid and mediocre,” the Soviet film maker did form friendships with director King Vidor and the irrepressible Charlie Chaplin. Though he failed to succumb to the glitter of Hollywood, Eisenstein did produce well researched and detailed treatments for two film projects: *Sutter’s Gold*,

which provided a critical examination of the impact of greed and gold upon John Sutter and California, and an adaptation of Theodore Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*. Paramount found both of these proposed scripts to be overly critical of American capitalism and decided it would be best to terminate Eisenstein's contract.⁶

A discouraged Eisenstein was not yet prepared to return to the Soviet Union, however, and at the urging of his friend Chaplin sought funding from the prominent American Socialist and novelist Upton Sinclair to make *Que Viva Mexico*, which would provide the Soviet director with an opportunity to pursue his fascination with the creative possibilities of Mexico. With the financial backing of Sinclair and his wife secured, Eisenstein journeyed into Mexico where he became infatuated with this beautiful land in which past and present, civilization and nature, and life and death co-existed in close, intense proximity. Attempting to produce a film which would cover the entire scope of Mexican history and convey his belief that in the primitive environment of Mexico life would emerge triumphant due to the purifying nature of death, Eisenstein ran considerably over budget. This was not all the director's fault because he had to cope with language barriers, illness, weather, amateur performers who were not always reliable, and difficulties with the Mexican government. Nevertheless, in January, 1932, Sinclair discontinued his support of the project; and although he refused to meet with Eisenstein, he did promise to send the director the considerable amount of footage already filmed, all of which was in the possession of Sinclair. Supposedly, Eisenstein would be able to edit the film when he returned home to the Soviet Union, but unfortunately this did not prove to be the case.

It appears that Sinclair's decision to forego the completion of *Que Viva Mexico* was due to more than simply budgeting concerns. Evidence exists that the novelist was pressured into pulling the plug on Eisenstein. In November, 1931, Sinclair received the following telegram from Stalin: "Eisenstein lose his comrades confidence in Soviet Union (stop). He is thought to be director who broke off with his own country (stop). Am afraid the people here would have no interest in him soon (stop). Am very sorry but all assert it is the fact (stop)."⁷ Thus, the man who would receive the 1934 California Democratic nomination for governor with his "End Poverty in California" platform was, in 1931, apparently doing the bidding of Joseph Stalin. Eisenstein's despair over being unable to complete filming was compounded when, in violation of his promise, Sinclair later decided not to send Eisenstein the negatives and raw footage of *Que Viva Mexico* for editing in the Soviet Union. Instead, the muckraking author turned the material over to Sol Lester, a producer of films in the Tarzan series, for editing. Out of Eisenstein's footage, Lester edited two inferior, somewhat incoherent, films, *Thunder Over Mexico* and *Death Day*.

Devastated by Sinclair's withdrawal of support, Eisenstein had returned to the Soviet Union where he suffered a breakdown and was despatched to the Kislovodsk Sanitarium. The artistic scene in the Soviet Union had also shifted during the director's absence. Gone was the avant-garde progressive experimentation of the early Revolution as artistic life in the Soviet Union became increasingly under the control of the State and Party which extolled socialist realism as the prescribed art form for Soviet writers, artists, and film makers. Thus, the cinematic work of Eisenstein was under attack by critics led by Boris Shumyatsky, who in 1930 had been appointed chairman of Soyuzkino, the newly centralized Soviet film organization. Shumyatsky (who would himself be purged and killed in 1938) termed Eisenstein's theories of montage inaccessible to the masses and, thus, elitist, while the director's years outside of the Soviet Union had produced in him a taste for the exotic (*Que Viva Mexico*) and left him out of touch with the Soviet people.⁸

This official evaluation of Eisenstein's cinema made it difficult for the director to work following recovery from his nervous condition. Numerous projects, such as a proposed film on the slave revolt in Haiti featuring African-American singer and actor Paul Robeson, were rejected by Shumyatsky. However, in 1935, Eisenstein was given an opportunity to work again if he could learn to follow the proper ideological dictates. Working for the first time with sound, Eisenstein commenced production on *Berzhin Meadow*, which relates the story of Stepok, a member of the Komsomol who sought to preserve the harvest of a collective farm from saboteurs. In consequence of his efforts, the vigilant Stepok is killed by his Kulak father who sought to destroy the crop and is enraged by his son's behavior. The film, which extolled the virtues of collectivization and dekulakization, appeared to follow the party line on the agrarian question and provided a companion piece to Eisenstein's *Old and New*.⁹ Nevertheless, in March, 1937, when filming on the project was almost complete, Shumyatsky ordered production to cease, and almost all prints of this film have been lost. Eisenstein was accused of being too subjective with his art and not meeting the dictates of socialist realism. The villainous father in the film was portrayed in a too mythological a fashion, while Stepok was filmed with the face of a holy child, and in some of the shots the lighting placed behind this blond child appeared to radiate a halo. Thus, although Eisenstein had placed his art in the service of the Revolution with films such as *Strike*, *Battleship Potemkin*, and *October*, the forces who now controlled the Soviet Union found fault with *Que Viva Mexico* and *Berzhin Meadow* and made it clear that for the director to continue working it would be necessary for him to submit his artistic eye to official orthodoxy. The artistic revolution was over!

But why was Eisenstein not simply consumed by the Stalinist terror and orthodoxy as were so many others, such as Grigori Zinoviev, Lev Kamenev, Nikolay Bukharin, and Trotsky, plus countless lesser known figures, who helped make the Bolshevik Revolution on the political, economic, and cultural fronts? In other words, how to account for the fact that this artist who was officially in disrepute did not end up in the Soviet gulag or with a bullet in the back of his head? For one, Eisenstein remained a committed Marxist and was willing to engage in the Bolshevik practice of self-criticism to save his life as well as to provide the opportunity to work once again as a director. In addition, one should never discount the arbitrary and personalized nature of the Stalin regime. The Soviet ruler's passion for cinema, played out in late evening private screenings for Stalin and his entourage, resulted in film being the only cultural area in which major figures were not liquidated. And although it failed to save many of his close associates, Stalin seems to have maintained a good personal relationship with Eisenstein. Thus, even while his film projects were grounded, Eisenstein was allowed to maintain his position as a teacher and lecturer at the Technical School of Cinematography.¹⁰

It may also have been that the devious Stalin wanted to keep the gifted Eisenstein around because he had plans for the director. Certainly, in 1937 the expanding threat of Nazi Germany provided the scenario for Eisenstein to once again be of service to the Soviet state and practice his art, although not in avant-garde forms of experimentation. To rally support for Stalin's opposition to Hitler and European fascism, culminating in the Popular Front strategy of temporarily forming alliances with bourgeoisie and nationalist elements against a common threat, Eisenstein was commissioned to make a film of the thirteenth century saga of Russian Prince Alexander Nevsky, who unified the armies of Russia and repelled the invasion of the marauding Teutonic knights. The iconography of this film is easy to read. The Teutonic knights were to represent the evil forces of Hitler's Nazi Germany, while the saintly Nevsky was to personify Stalin and the stand he was taking to protect Russia from German barbarism. It was apparent that when the film was made the message would not be lost upon the masses in an abstract intellectual montage, for Eisenstein maintained that Alexander Nevsky would revolve around a single simple idea, "the enemy and the need to defeat him." Thrilled to be at work again, Eisenstein hurried the production of the film, well aware that political events in Europe might alter the necessity for this picture.¹¹

Accordingly, Eisenstein used artificial ice for summer filming of the climatic battle on the ice in which Nevsky and the Russians subdue their Teutonic foes. He also pressured Sergei Prokofiev to produce a musical

score which would be ready for the film's November, 1938 premiere. The film was an immediate success with critics and audiences both abroad and in the Soviet Union, where a pleased Stalin awarded Eisenstein the Order of Lenin. However, the changing political climate, which induced Stalin to enter into the August, 1939 Nazi-Soviet Pact and led to abandonment of the Popular Front strategy, resulted in *Alexander Nevsky* being withdrawn from theaters in 1939. The evil Teutonic empire was now the ally of Stalin.

Once again, Eisenstein's art would succumb to the greater needs of Stalin and the Soviet state. However, the disappointed director was tossed a bone in 1940 when he was appointed artistic head of Mosfilm. After failing to complete proposed films on the Ferghana Canal and the life of Pushkin, Eisenstein was rehabilitated when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union in 1941. *Nevsky* was once again placed in release, and Eisenstein was able to pursue his projected film biography of Ivan the Terrible. Due to the disruption of the war, Eisenstein and his film crew, just as many Soviet industries and ministries, fled Moscow and completed most of the filming in the Central Asian city of Alma Ata. Returning to Moscow, Eisenstein released *Ivan* in January, 1945 as part one of a planned trilogy on the life of the Tsar. Again Eisenstein seemed to have regained his Midas touch because the film earned critical acclaim as well as the praise of Stalin, who bestowed the Stalin Prize on the director.

It is easy to ascertain why this film appealed so much to the Soviet leader. Eisenstein's Ivan is not terrible, only a Russian patriot beset by enemies both foreign and domestic. Resemblance between Eisenstein's Ivan and Stalin were obvious as the film director sought to rehabilitate the much-maligned Tsar whose infamous acts of cruelty were usually portrayed in such lurid terms that they obscured his worthy goal of a great and unified Russia. Ivan's passion and dedication led him to a tragic fate of solitude for the absolute ruler.

At the beginning of Eisenstein's film, however, Ivan announces his plans for a unified Russia, but he is opposed by the treacherous Boyars (nobles) who perceive a greater Russia as a threat to their landed power base. The scheming against Ivan results in the poisoning of his beloved wife Anastasia and betrayal by his best friend Prince Andrei Kurbsky who goes over to the Livonian forces. A tormented Ivan vows to leave Moscow with his dedicated private guard of young men, the Oprichnik, promising only to return when he is called by the people. *Ivan, Part One* ends with a multitudinous procession of the Russian people praying for the return of their beloved Tsar to deliver them from the clutches of the Boyars and foreign invaders. It is not difficult to transcend the basic plot outline of Ivan and see the life of Joseph Stalin beset with the tragic suicide of his wife, foreign threats from Hitler, and the treachery of his

own people such as the alleged betrayal by Trotsky, who in the official Stalinist line became an agent for foreign powers, sabotaging factories and influencing other traitors such as Bukharin. Despite these vicissitudes, the courageous Stalin (Ivan) perseveres against his enemies.

Basking in the affection of Stalin, Eisenstein immediately began production of *Ivan, Part II*. By 1946, the second film was complete, along with some footage for the final segment. On first examination, a viewer might surmise that the second part of the trilogy would also meet the approval of Stalin. In this sequel, which modern viewers might equate with *The Empire Strikes Back* from the *Star Wars* series, Ivan and his loyal Oprichnik return to Moscow, taking vengeance upon the treacherous Boyars. The film may easily be read as a justification for the Stalinist purges, and the Oprichnik may be equated with the NKVD (The People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs).

However, the arbitrary nature of the Stalin regime once again asserted itself as the Soviet strong man discovered a very different interpretation of this work. Eisenstein, recovering from a heart attack following the completion of *Ivan, Part II*, once more found his work under critical official scrutiny and the film was banned. Stalin informed Nikolai Cherkasov, who portrayed Ivan, that the executed Boyars, in Eisenstein's depiction, aroused too much sympathy in the audience, while Ivan expressed too much doubt about his course of action. According to Stalin, the only problem with the historical Ivan was that he had put to death too few Boyars. The line of criticism was made more official in a September, 1946 memorandum of the Party's Central Committee, noting that Eisenstein "betrayed his ignorance of historical fact by showing the progressive bodyguard of Ivan the Terrible as a degenerate band rather like the Ku Klux Klan, and Ivan the Terrible himself, who was a man of strong will and character, as weak and indecisive, somewhat like Hamlet."¹²

Following this rebuke, Eisenstein and Cherkasov were reported to have met with Stalin in early 1947. After expressing their error in presenting Ivan's dealings with the Boyars, permission was granted to commence *Ivan, Part III* as long as Eisenstein's film remained in step with Soviet ideology and the party line under Comrade Stalin. However, the gifted director was unable to complete much work on this project as he continued to be plagued by ill health, suffering a fatal heart attack on February 11, 1948. Although *Ivan, Part II* was finally released in 1958 following Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes during the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, the footage for the final segment of *Ivan* had been ordered destroyed.

With his death at age fifty, Eisenstein had completed only seven major films, a small body of work on which to evaluate an artist. Yet, scholars of

cinema continue to study the film theories of Sergei Eisenstein, and many critics judge his films to be some of the most outstanding contributions to the history of world cinema. Therefore, was Solzhenitsyn's imprisoned film director in *Ivan Denisovich* correct in proclaiming Eisenstein a genius? A survey of Eisenstein's life and work seems to answer this question in the affirmative. However, the prisoner who questioned Eisenstein's moral integrity also has a point. Eisenstein's initial enthusiastic embracing of Marxist ideology and the Bolshevik Revolution freed the young man from following in the footsteps of his father, allowing him to pursue an artistic career in the exhilarating and experimental atmosphere of the early Revolution. But his continued devotion to the party line during the Stalinist rule of the 1930s and 1940s resulted in limitations being placed upon the director's artistic integrity, while episodes such as the official Soviet censorship of *Que Viva Mexico*, *Berzhin Meadow*, and *Ivan the Terrible, Part II* contributed to the decline of Eisenstein's health and his fatal heart attack. While the Revolution may have unleashed Eisenstein as an artist, in the final analysis it also devoured him, leaving the director with poor health and only seven completed films to his credit. While this was a personal tragedy for Eisenstein, lovers of world cinema were deprived of the opportunity to see the full bloom of this great artist. Yet, the legacy of this all too brief work and the lessons of the price paid in his devotion to an ideological system continue to inspire and instruct.

Films of Sergei Eisenstein

- 1924 *Strike*
- 1925 *Battleship Potemkin*
- 1927 *October or Ten Days that Shook the World*
- 1929 *The General Line or Old and New*
- 1931 *Que Viva Mexico* (unfinished)
- 1937 *Berzhin Meadow* (unfinished)
- 1938 *Alexander Nevsky*
- 1945 *Ivan the Terrible, Part One*
- 1946 *Ivan the Terrible, Part Two*

Notes

1. Yon Bama, *Eisenstein* (Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1973), 3.
2. *Ibid.*, 111.
3. *Ibid.*, 122-123.

4. James Goodwin, *Eisenstein, Cinema, and History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 81.
5. Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory* (New York: Harcourt, 1949), 77.
6. Ivor Montagu, *With Eisenstein in Hollywood* (New York: International, 1969).
7. Harry M. Geduld and Ronald Gottesman, eds., *Sergei Eisenstein and Upton Sinclair: The Making and Unmaking of Que Viva Mexico* (Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1970), 212.
8. For discussion of Soviet cinema and cultural life under Stalin see Jay Leyda, *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film* (New York: Collier, 1973); and Shelia Fitzpatrick, ed., *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931* (Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1978).
9. For a more realistic appraisal of Stalin's policy of collectivization see Robert Conquest, *Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
10. For Eisenstein's self-criticism see Marie Seton, *Sergei M. Eisenstein* (New York: Wyn, 1952), 372-377.
11. For a discussion of *Alexander Nevsky* in historical perspective see K. R. M. Short and Richard Taylor, "Soviet Cinema and the International Menace, 1928-1939," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television*, 6 (1986), 131-159.
12. Seton, *Eisenstein*, 458. For Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible* see Goodwin, *Eisenstein, Cinema, and History*, 179-209; and for comparisons between Stalin and the historical Ivan see Robert C. Tucker, *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from Above, 1928-1941* (New York: Norton, 1990), 17-20, 276-282, and 482-486; and Kristin Thompson, "Ivan the Terrible and Stalinist Russia: A Reexamination," *Cinema Journal*, 17 (Fall, 1977), 30-43.