DEDICATED TO THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF SERGEI MIKHAILOVITCH EISENSTEIN (1898-1949)

Caricature of Eisenstein by the famous Russian Jewish Artist Isaac Schmidt who, in the thirties, was once a pupil together with Marshall in Eisenstein's research group at the Higher State Institute of Cinematography.
A Festival in honor of the seventy-fifth birthday of Sergei

The Center for Soviet and East European Studies will be
mounting a festival in honor of Sergei Mikhailovitch Eisen-
stein's seventy-fifth birthday, which technically falls on Jan-
uary 10th, but which we will celebrate some three months
later.

Firstly, one of the major reasons for the festival is the fact that Professor Herbert Marshall was a student of the
great film director at the Moscow Higher Institute of
Cinematography and the only English-speaking Western stu-
dent to graduate from this institution in the pre-war years.

In his archives at the Center for Soviet and East European
Studies, is probably the best collection of material on Eisen-
stein outside Moscow. Some of it is quite unique including
personal papers, original drawings of Eisenstein that were
presented to Professor Marshall by Eisenstein himself and
his widow, film scripts, letters, programs, lectures, photo-
graphs, slides, articles and world press reviews of his films,
still of all his films and reproductions of all his drawings, in
color and black and white.

The Center remains the key source of research on Eisen-
stein and his associates for anyone in the English-speaking
world.

The major project of the Center is the research, trans-
lation and publication of the Collected Works of Eisenstein
for which the Center is funded both by the University and
this year, by the National Foundation of the Humanities and
Mr. and Mrs. Clement and Jessie Stone. The festival in-
cludes the publication of Volume I of the Collected Works,
Eisenstein's autobiography, translated by Herbert Marshall
and Tony Wray and with an introduction by Marshall, pub-
lished this year by the M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, and Dennis
Dobson, London.

Parallel with this, Marshall is working with his graduate
assistant Tania Trifonow and his colleague Professor Steven
Hill of the University of Illinois, on the preparation of an
anthology called “The Best Film Ever Made—Battleship
Potemkin.” This will, for the first time, give a complete pic-
ture of the origin, the production, the editing, the scripting,
acting, first reception in the Soviet Union, then the reception
throughout the world, then the astounding reaction to its suc-
cess abroad by Eisenstein's own country, then essays and
articles by theoreticians of the world on this extraordinary
work of art, which in 1958 was acclaimed the best film ever
made by a national jury of cineastes. This will be published
by Prentice-Hall, under the general editorship of Professors
R. Gottesman and H. M. Geduld.

Then in conjunction with the President's Scholars Pro-
gram, under Dr. Allan Lange, Marshall is giving a seminar on
The Theory and Practice of Eisenstein, together with a
weekly showing of all the films that Eisenstein ever made in-
cluding the short films Beshin Meadow and Que Vivo Mexico.
This complete showing, which is quite unprecedented, has
been done with the help of the President's Scholars Program
and the European and Soviet Studies Committee of the Uni-
versity.

These films will be shown each week starting with March
28th, every Wednesday night, at 7:00 p.m. at Lawson Hall,
171. Not only will it be class 351c with credits but it will
also be open to the public. Each film will be introduced by
Professor Marshall who will explain about its production, its
significance, etc. Then following the showing of the film, the
class will be open to questions, answers and discussion.

Following is the list of the films and dates:
1. March 23, Strike, (1924) plus Studying with Eisenstein,
   by Marshall, a kinescope of BBC TV “Monitor” Pro-
   gram.
2. April 4, Potemkin, (1925)
3. April 11, Ten Days That Shook the World or October,
   (1928)
4. April 18, The Old and The New or The General Line,
   (1929)
5. April 25, Thunder Over Mexico and Time in the Sun,
   (1930/31)
6. May 2, Beshin Meadow, (1934/35)
7. May 9, Alexander Nevsky, (1938)
8. May 16, Ivan the Terrible, Part I, (1942)
9. May 23, Ivan the Terrible, Part II, (1944)

Parallel with this, in association with the Department
of Cinema and Photography, Chairman Dr. Davis, and Pro-
fessor Blumenberg, there will be an exhibition of photographs
and stills of Eisenstein's films in the department in the Col-
lege of Communications and Fine Arts.

Then with the cooperation of the Rare Books Room, Dr.
Koch, there will be an exhibition of Eisenstein's drawings in
the three showcases of the foyer to Morris Library.

Included also will be a sculpture by Frieda Brilliant of
the hero of Eisenstein's film Beshin Meadow (Pavlik Moro-
zov), which was made at the same time that Eisenstein was
making the film, for whose leading actor posed.

There will also be an exhibition of the books of Eisenstein,
 pamphlets, brochures, and some original items from the Marshall
archives at the Center.

At the same time, due out in March, is Volume Two,
Number Three of The Film Journal which will publish an
Eisenstein cinema montage breakdown of Leonardo da Vinci's
The Last Supper which was part of an exercise Eisenstein
gave in his class. This is the only exercise that has survived
the war by a fellow student Pepinashvili; and is an interesting
exercise in the cinematic montage of a classic painting. The
Daily Egyptian has kindly agreed to dedicate some of its
pages on April 2nd to the festival with illustrations and the
Southern Illinoisan also intends to include some in its weekly
magazine.
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SERGEI MIKHAILOVITCH EISENSTEIN
by Herbert Marshall

The name of Eisenstein still stalks the world of Cinema
like a colossus. Of course to the younger generation he is
now but a whitened black shadow very much like the flick-
ering faintness of old films projected on television screens.
Nevertheless at a recent gathering in Brussels of all the film
experts of the world, who had come together to decide on the ten best films ever made, there was one unanimous conclusion, the top of them all was POTEMKIN made by Sergei Eisenstein. This is still considered to be the greatest film ever made. I am now completing an anthology on The Best Film Ever Made—Battleship Potemkin for publication by Prentice Hall, with the help of my graduate assistant Tania Trifonow. And only recently, his last film IVAN THE TERRIBLE, was projected on television and so everybody's astonishment came over as a most powerful work of art on that little screen. But the greatness of Eisenstein was not only in the unique films he made, or his contribution towards the technique and art of the Cinema, as a practicing Director. Perhaps more important are his contributions as a theoretician and philosopher of the Art of the Cinema. During his teaching at the Higher State Institute of Cinema in Moscow, where he was a Professor, he stated that his aim in life was not just to make films or give lectures, but to try and create a work that would be what Darwin's "Origin of Species" was to Biology and Marx's "Capital" was to Political Economy. He wanted to expound the nature of artistic creation. In his autobiographical essays can be seen something of his searching in that profound problem. Because of these ideas he was attacked by the Stalinists as a "formalist" under "decadent bourgeois influence." They were published only after his death in his own country and now will appear in English this year.

Starting with his earliest essays and his earliest theories, and finishing up with his analyses of montage and composition, (the bulk of which are yet to be translated) are brilliant expositions of the art of the Cinema such as no other practicing film maker has ever made. Eisenstein's range was like that of a Da Vinci. From the highest flights of imagination to the minutest detail of scientific research. His raw material was gathered from every corner of the world and from every aspect of man's culture and history. His was an encyclopedic brain and a profound philosophical mind. These essays are not easy always to read but in them is a fund of thought and of conception and of conjecture. To every student of art, to every practising artist and particularly to every cinema, theatre and television director and producer and scriptwriter, these essays will be an invaluable spring-board for their imagination and technique. In his theory, Eisenstein is still leagues ahead of any other theoretician in the world of Cinema. His postulate of the Intellectual Cinema has not yet found its actualisation in any film to date. He himself only had flashes and sequences in a few of his films. The world still awaits the Intellectual Cinema that Eisenstein dreamed of.

Let me tell you something of how Eisenstein worked.

How Eisenstein Worked With His Students

For three years I was a student-director in Eisenstein's Research Group at the Higher State Institute of Cinema in Moscow. There were four Faculties in all: Directing, Acting, Scriptwriting, Cinematography. Eisenstein was Dean of the Directors' Faculty.

The Institute was equipped with its own studio and had a superb library of international films. The course at the time lasted four and a half years. Three years were devoted to theoretical and practical work inside the institute and a year and a half to practical work in the studios and on location. The Directors' curriculum covered nearly thirty subjects, including philosophy, political economy, sociology, the fine arts, the history of the world cinema and theatre, scenario writing and editing, acting and psychology, theatre, radio and film production, as well as the technical subjects directly concerned with cinema production; photography, lighting, make-up, set-designing, studio organization, etc.

A student's greatest pride was to work in Eisenstein's research group. This group was an instrument in the fulfilment of Eisenstein's dream: "To lay bare the origins of the nature of artistic creation."

During our work two stenographers were always present, taking everything down verbatim: Eisenstein's lectures, our questions and discussion, his replies and summing up.

Here is a practical example of his teaching method. We were asked to prepare a theatrical production of the assassination scene from Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar," Act III, Scene I.

The class was divided into four groups. Each group had to stage collectively its own production, planning it on paper in writing and designs, and then acting it before the others. It did not have to be a finished production but presented schematically from the Director's point-of-view.

"If a Director can't produce on one stage, how can he produce on fifty?" Eisenstein would ask.

We had to work to a general method. First the General Analysis: Social, historical, political. The collecting of iconographic material, etc. Then Special Analysis: Theme, plot, style, form, characters, dialogue, images, mood, etc. We established the basic climaxes of high-spots, then divided the scene into sequences, and sequences into episodes.
Next, the organization of the sequence in space: planning of the setting. How, for example, did Shakespeare's theatre deal with the special problem inherent in Act III, Scene 1: "Before the Capitol" and "Inside the Capitol"? How did we propose to deal with it? We planned the composition of the static setting in relation to the composition of the dynamic movement on it.

Then we proceeded to the organization of the sequence in space and time: the composition of the dynamic environment, i.e., light, skies, sound, things, people. The composition of the movement of the individual characters and the masses: the mise-en-scene. The formless movement of masses in conflict with the purposeful movement of the conspirators.

Finally the artistic image of the whole production: the image as the unity of form and content. The development from the seed of the theme to its final external expression.

We saw the compositional relationship between the encircling of Caesar and the semi-circle of the Senate, the conspirators completing the rest of the circle. The disappearance of Caesar half-way through the play, the semi-circle uncompleted, and the appearance of Caesar's spirit towards the end, the completing of the circle. Personal assassination cannot kill a social force. Caesar is dead, Caesarism lives!

I am recalling at random some thoughts that arose in our work on that particular play.

Why did Shakespeare suddenly go into Latin? 'Et tu, Brutus!' Another example, Eisenstein said, of the law relating to the changing of quantity into quality. At the highest tension-point of the sequence (he was always very particular about the tension-points, 'That's your closest-up point'; there is a leap into another dimension. How to express in words the anguish and tragedy of a man receiving his death-blow from his greatest friend? Ordinary language no longer suffices, the leap into the next dimension could be silence or music—or (brilliant stroke of Shakespeare's genius) another tongue! Caesar's mother tongue!

After this preliminary analysis, each group had to present its mise-en-scene plotted on paper and then show how it would be acted, using whatever classroom furniture there was to suggest the setting, plus illustrations on the blackboard. The class and Eisenstein criticized the result. And believe me there was no pulling of punches!

This was our first phase. Then came the leap into another dimension, silent film; from 'putting on the stage' to 'putting in the shot.' Mise-en-scene to mise-en-cadre. And here we come to Eisenstein's major contribution to the theory of cinema art: his conception of montage, or editing. To Eisenstein editing was something more than usually conceived. It was the basic method of artistic composition applied to all words of art; the creation of a higher dimension from the conflict of opposing forces within a lower dimension. The creation of an abstract idea from the collision of concrete ideas. His favorite example was from Chinese hieroglyphs, where:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door plus ear = to eavesdrop.</td>
<td>Mouth plus birds = to sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife plus heart = sorrow.</td>
<td>That is montage in a nutshell!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now each student had to take his group's theatre production and transform it into his own cinema production. Movements on the stage had to be transformed to movements on the screen—but in terms of the screen art. One had to be developed from the other. What mise-en-scene is to the actor's expressive movement, so is the editing to the shot.

The first historical step had been from theatre to silent film. So we proceeded from stage sequence to silent film sequence, with minimum sub-titles. Each student, whatever his draughtsmanship, had to sketch every shot in his editing sequence. Eisenstein insisted that every director must be able to explain visual ideas visually to his art director and cameraman.

The next stage was to work out the same sequence in sound and then in colour. From this example it will be seen that Eisenstein took students step by step through the evolution of cinema art.

The results were fascinating. From four different theatrical treatments of the scene came nearly thirty different film treatments all clearly designed and ready to be executed. And that was but one facet of Eisenstein's method of teaching film direction.

When we graduated, his final words were: "When you come to make your first film, forget all about montage and about me! Here you have learned, there you must do. And the doing will reveal the learning."

These are some of the methods I shall try and introduce in my teaching and research at Southern Illinois University.

HERBERT MARSHALL

EXTRACTS FROM THE WORKS OF EISENSTEIN:

From the forthcoming book The Best Film Ever Made: Battleship Potemkin.

Sergei Eisenstein—"The Author and his Theme"

Twenty Year After (1925–1945): from "The Battleship" to "The Terrible"

Twenty years have passed...
Twice times ten.
That is twice the period of the statute of limitations, removing from the guilty the legal responsibility for his action, and the acquisition of this right removes the basis for any future claim. . . .

It seems to me that this period gives us the right to write about the "Battleship" and its author as about a third person and about an outside subject; as if the subject and person were objectively existing outside us and that only thanks to a lucky (?) chance are we more or less acquainted with it and know more about it than a number of other researchers.

We will write about the author and his picture from the side, not feeling embarrassed by the sympathy we feel for both, and utilizing the access to material unknown to anyone else which is not available, in general.

And once we undertook to write about the author of "Battleship Potemkin" as a strange outsider, we will try to do this in accordance with the canon which was once demanded in relation to this question by . . . Belinsky.

"... It is required of contemporary critics that they reveal and demonstrate the soul of the poet in his works, that they trace the predominant idea in them, the prevailing thought of the author's whole life, all his experience, and reveal and make clear his inner contemplation, his pathos . . . "

Among the problems about which it is terribly easy to evolve unlimited literary verbosity, the following is very popular:

The author and his theme.

* The Russian use of the word Pathos means extase, ecstasy, inspiration, rather than the limited English sense. H.M.
Do authors have a "permeating" theme or not; did that theme always exist; how do a varying series of works relate to it? etc., etc.—all this is about what is not very well-known and consequently is unbelievably rich soil for interminable interpretations and conjectures.

However, that there is some degree of truth in it is evident. (…) But I will not try to answer this particular question. And I wish to confine myself to but one example of the stem presence of a similar "permeating" theme, though it is very fascinating and tempting to reveal a similar position with our author, who is equally responsible for opuses with, it would seem, similar incompatibilities in theme, as "Battleship Potemkin" and "Ivan the Terrible."

What could be more strikingly dissimilar than the themes and development of two such works, separated one from the other in time by some twenty years?

The collective and the mass are there.
The autocrat—individual is here.
The similarity of choruses, merging into a collective figuration and artistic image is there. A sharply defined character is here. A desperate struggle against Tsar is there. The initial establishment of Tsarist power is here. If here, in these two extremes, the themes seem to have been dispersing themselves into mutually exclusive opposites—then that, which is between them, at a first glance would seem to be simply formless chaos of completely accidentally disconnected themes.

To talk about the "author's theme," even more so, "single" or "permeating," would seem ridiculous to think about, naive to speak about. Actually!

Counting that which has been accomplished on an equal footing with that which is still being conceived; here is a short tale of a certain single strike ("Strike"); here a garland of exotic stories against the background of the Mexican panorama ("Que Viva Mexico"); here an epic account of the October Revolution of 1917 ("October") and suddenly alongside it—"An American Tragedy" (from Theodore Dreiser's novel); the history of the black King of Haiti Henri Christophe, who from the liberator of his island became the tyrant; the heroic struggle of Alexander Nevsky against the Teutonic interventionists of the thirteenth century—"hunter-knights," and the introduction of the collective economy into the setting of the backward village ("The Old and the New"); the history of Captain Sutter, on whose land in California gold was first discovered in 1848; and the history of the insurrection on the mutinous Battleship; the scenario of the building of the Fergana Canal (in 1939)—an original historical triptych (first part) included episodes from Tamerlane's war; and in files detailed elaborate scenarios about Pushkin, colorful and intimately personal, from the poet's life, according to the theme, so brilliantly first touched upon by V. Tynyanov in the article "Anonymous Love": ("Literaturnaya Kritika," No. 5, 1939, Moscow.) and then considerably less interestingly developed in part III of "Pushkin"…And, finally, the film of a titan of the past—Ivan theTerrible and of the establishment of autocratic power in the Moscow State of the sixteenth century.

That this is a conglomerate of the obviously incompatible and incommensurate is evident, even to the most unequipped mind.

And one needs to be sufficiently manically obsessed to try to seek thematic unity in this thematic diversity, to seek a unified theme underlying all this variety and diversity.

To sense that the author has one "permeating predominant thought throughout his whole life"—no, perhaps, not of the whole but of a twenty-five year section in any case (1920-1945).

Bear in mind this tendency—to seek unity in the diversity of multiplicity, and the seemingly maniacal obsession we shall uncover shortly with profit.

Now let us arm ourselves with a little bit of patience and consider in more detail what each of these compositions is concerned with. At the same time we must distinctly remember that the issue here is not about different costumes and vestments, historical situations or the subjects of this or that painting, the ethnographical accident of an image, but in each individual instance of those elements within the theme, which emotionally attracted the author to undertake this or that subject, the majority of which was the free choice of the author, in any case there is always a "personal turning-point" within the theme and in all cases the independent composition of the very material of the film itself.

November 21, 1944

Unity

…If I were a detached researcher, I should say of myself: it seems as if this author is obsessed once and for all with a single idea, a single theme, a single subject.

And everything that he has conceived and done, not only within particular films but throughout all his projects and films, is always and everywhere one and the same.

The author uses different epochs (the thirteenth, sixteenth or twentieth centuries), different countries and peoples (Russia, Mexico, Uzbekistan, America), different social movements and processes within the upheavals of particular social forms, almost unfailingly as the changing masks of one and the same face.

This face is the embodiment of the ultimate idea of the achievement of unity.

In Russian revolutionary and socialist material this problem of unity is national-patriotic ("Alexander Nevsky"), state ("Ivan the Terrible"), mass-collective ("Battleship Potemkin"), socialist-economic (the collective farm theme of "The Old and the New"), communistic ("Fergana Canal").

On foreign soil it is either this same theme, modified in corresponding national aspects, or the shady and without exception tragically-hued reverse side of this same theme, setting off the positive theme of the whole "opus" just as, for example, the basic "bright" patriotic theme of "Nevsky" is set off by the gloomy episodes of the Germans' reprisals at Pskov, which stood for the unity of Russia.

Such are the tragedies of individualism planned during our western tour, "An American Tragedy," "Sutter's Gold" (the paradise of primitive patriarchal California destroyed by the curse of gold—exactly in the moral and ethical system of General Sutter himself, the opponent of gold), "Black Majesty" (about the Haitian hero of the revolutionary liberation struggles of the Haitian slaves against the French colonists, about the fellow-fighter of Toussaint-Louverture, who became the Haitian emperor Henri Christophe and who fell because of his individualistic alienation from his people). "Fergana Canal" is again a hymn to collectivist unification in socialist work, which alone is able to constrain the forces of nature, water and sand (which were given free rein by the
human carnage of Tamerlane's Central Asian warriors, and with the fall of whose state the desert's triumph began), and to overthrow nature's enslaving yoke, under which the peoples of Asia languished, in addition to enslavement by Tsarist Russia.

Finally, "Que Viva Mexico!" this history of the change of cultures, presented not vertically (in years and centuries), but horizontally (as the geographical coexistence of the most diverse stages of culture). For Mexico is amazing, in that it has a province (Tehuanteppec), which has a matriarchal society, next to provinces which almost achieved Communism in the revolution of the first decade of this century (Yucatan, Zapata's programme, etc.). And, as a central episode, it had ideas of national unification—historically, in the joint entry into Mexico's capital of the united forces of Pancho Villa the northerner and Emiliano Zapata the southerner; and in terms of subject, the figure of the Mexican woman, the soldadera, moving, with the same care for her man, from group to group of Mexican troops, all fighting each other, torn with the contradictions of the civil war. She seems physically to personify the image of a single, nationally united Mexico, opposing foreign intrigues that try to dismember the nation and set its separate parts against each other...

Here there will be even sharper objections: this proves all the more that all observations here expounded are related only to you, the author, who is absolutely toque—(crazy, dotty [S.M.E.'s own word.]]) battered by one—maybe even very estimable, but nevertheless single idea.

And so even more ferociously I will be forced to answer, not in the least, for again 'in the given instance' we have merely another example, maybe with heavily stressed characteristics, yet profoundly absolutely general...

(From "Battleship Potemkin" op. cit. pages 18–20. Translated by Herbert Marshall and Barbara Juknialis.)

CONFERENCES & LECTURES

Professor Marshall has been invited to the following conferences to participate or contribute papers.

1. March 10–26: During the spring break, Professor Marshall will be visiting the University of Alabama and the Marshall Space Center at the invitation of Professor Fred Ordway III, Professor of Space Science and Technology, for lectures and consultation; and also to contact Florida State University, Tallahassee and Stetson University, DeLand, Florida.

2. March 29–31: The Society for Cinema Studies Conference, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland; to deliver a paper on: "The Origin of Cinema and Sergei Eisenstein."

3. April 15: Professor Marshall is a co-sponsor of the

Salute to Paul Robeson on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, Carnegie Hall, New York. Some of the other co-sponsors are: Paul Robeson, Jr., Hope Stevens, Alice Childress, Harry Belafonte, Judge George W. Crotchet, Jr., Leon J. Davis, Dizzy Gillespie, Lillian Heilman, Bishop J. Clinton Hoggard, Cleveland Robinson and Pete Seeger.

Paul Robeson Jr. invited Professor Marshall to co-operate in preparing the program for this event and material from his archives will be utilized. The Center has also exchanged information and material with the Paul Robeson Committee of the Deutsche Akademie der Kunst zu Berlin.


5. April 28–30: B'Nai B'Rith Soviet Jewish Art Exhibit, Herbert Marshall and Fredda Brilliant Collection; opening—Congregation Shaary Hall, Southfield, Michigan, where Mr. Marshall will give a lecture on "Soviet Jews I Have Known."

6. September 3–8: Seventh International Congress on Theatre Research, Prague, Czechoslovakia. An invitation has been received by the Director from the Center for Czech Theatre Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and Charles University in Prague, to participate in the Seventh International Congress on Theatre Research.

7. December: The American Association of Teachers of Slavic & East European Languages (AATSEEL) is holding a Conference on Slavic Civilization & Culture in Chicago next December and has invited Herbert Marshall to give a paper on "Aesthetic Trends in Early Twentieth Century Cinema."

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH ASSISTANT AT OUR CENTER

Inge Rader—Research assistant working on the educational theories and influence of Lenin's wife, N. K. Krupskaya on Soviet Education. She received her master's degree from the University of Colorado and is presently a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Higher Education specializing in International and Comparative Education.

GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANT REQUIRED

A new Graduate Research Assistant is required for the new educational year commencing September 20th, 1973. Must be highly proficient in modern Russian language and Soviet culture to work on translations of future volumes of Collected Works of S. M. Eisenstein and other Soviet works; and research in the areas of Soviet Cinema and Theatre. Can be a candidate for MA, MFA, or Ph.D. in Theater Department or interdisciplinary.