

BUILDING THE IMAGE OF RUSSIAN POLITICAL CONSPIRATORS IN EARLY SOVIET CINEMATOGRAPHY

Dunja Dogo

Università degli Studi di Siena, Italia

In my paper I aim at comparing the images of two radical 19th century revolutionists such as Sergei Gennadevich Nechaev and Stepan Nikolaevich Khalturin with the ambivalent portraits of these historical characters that appeared in the Russian and Soviet press before and after the 1917 Russian Revolution. According to a number of publications, Nechaev's figure was given a special position by the Soviet intelligentsia of the 1920s. Also Khalturin became, at the time, particularly popular for having been the leader of the Russian workers' movement. Main questions asked in my Paper include, but are not limited, to the following: how Russian Populists were featured through cinema? By what specific visual devices in the two fictional films shown throughout the 1920s – such as “The Palace and the Fortress” and “Stepan Khalturin” (both directed by Aleksandr Viktorovich Ivanovsky) – were the stories of the recent revolutionary past reorganised in relation to the projects predominating in the Soviet post-revolutionary present? I shall specifically focus the paper on how the characters of Nechaev and Khalturin were treated by the well-known historian Pavel Eliseevich Shchyogolev, who made use of new sources (emerged from the former archives of the Tsarist secret police departments) for composing the screenplays of the above-mentioned films.

Keywords: soviet history, film history, building the visual image, Russian populists, Sergei Nechaev, Stepan Khalturin.

РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ ОБРАЗОВ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ КОНСПИРАТОРОВ В РАННЕМ СОВЕТСКОМ КИНО

Д. Дого

Университет Сиены, Италия

В статье анализируется несовпадение образов радикальных революционеров С. Г. Нечаева и С. Н. Халтурина с репрезентацией и описанием этих исторических личностей в ряде изданий, вышедших в свет вслед за русской революцией 1917 г. Судя по сравнительно большому количеству письменных источников, Нечаев занимал особое место среди советской интеллигенции того времени. Также была весьма популярна фигура Халтурина, чьи подвиги преувеличивались, и этот народоволец считался одним из лидеров русского рабочего движения. В тексте ставится ряд вопросов: какие

личностные черты Нечаева и Халтурина представлены в массовом искусстве, а точнее, в кино? Посредством каких специфических визуальных приемов история русского революционного движения была согласована с идеологическими проектами большевистской властной элиты? Данные вопросы анализируются на материале таких художественных фильмов середины 1920-х гг., как «Дворец и крепость» и «Степан Халтурин» (оба в режиссуре А. В. Ивановского). Особое внимание привлекает трактовка революционеров литературоведом П. Е. Щёголевым в сценарных текстах этих картин. В статье используются архивные источники к постановке – в том числе записки Щёголева к материалам, находившимся в архиве Третьего отделения Императорской канцелярии.

Ключевые слова: советская история, история кино, конструирование визуальных образов, народовольцы, Сергей Нечаев, Степан Халтурин.

1. Moulding the memory of the revolutionary past¹

In this paper I examine a topic – the cinematic image of two memorable Russian revolutionists such as Stepan Khalturin and Nechaev – that can be viewed in the wider context of shaping a “social memory” [Namer 1987] of the 19th century Russian revolutionary past in early Soviet Russia.

In the 1920s, the many stories of the Russian revolutionists were not solely shaped by means of such a popular form of entertainment that was cinema; written memories as well as complete biographies and other manifold testimonies of former political prisoners appeared, over the years, in the press and upon them commercial historically-based novels were grounded [Brintingler 2000]. Bolsheviks would attempt to retain, preserve and celebrate the collective memories of revolt – contained in the documents of the “Section of the Historical Archives of the Revolution”² – as part of a political memory under construction in many cultural spheres.

All the archival heritage thereof was *used* by the Soviet Marxist historiography in its ascent to tell a multi-voice story of 19th century Russian socialism. Halfway through the 1920s texts began to be pub-

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, translations from Russian into English are mine.

² This section is the seventh of the eight sections into which the newly founded Soviet State archives (Gosarchivy RSFSR) were organised: designated as «Section of the Historical Archives of the Revolution», it contained documents of various types (including illegal literature, personal dossiers with biographies, and memoirs of the political prisoners, together with the Acts of the judicial inquiries), which had been either produced by or seized from the dissenters arrested by the Tsarist Secret Police.

lished of what would become, by the end of the following decade, the first, enormous Soviet bibliography dedicated to the Russian Populists, and in particular to those of the extremist section of the “mature Populism” of “The People’s Will” (“Народная Воля”).

As many publications in the home press of the period attest, a few Soviet scholars, alongside thinkers and artists as well, undertook to reconstruct the stories of the Populists condemned to life imprisonment for political crime³. After the 1917 Revolution, scholarship inquiring the lives of Russian Populists flourished and shortly afterward this trend would lead to transmitting a whole knowledge devoted to the Populist subject. Furthermore, at the time a few but still noteworthy Populists (Vera Figner, Nikolai Morozov, Mikhail Frolenko) were still alive and, after having been released and therefore returned full civil liberties, they granted manifold testimonies – and henceforth they became public personalities.

2. Shaping history through films

Apart from Marxist scholars, also a number of Soviet directors would rely upon or at least were inspired by the sources thereof, just emerged from the secret archives of the Tsar; the revolts and uprisings these directors (i.e. Dmitry Bassaligo, Aleksandr Ivanovsky, Sergei Eisenstein, Esfir’ Shub – just to mention those whose works were remarkably consistent) reconstructed served as important moments for the Bolsheviks in their giant project of shaping a public history that would have proved the October Revolution something unavoidable. In preparation for the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution almost one third of the feature-films produced by the Russian national film studios dealt with subjects taken from the Russian and European revolutionary history. These works as a whole encompassed historical events occurred in the period between the French 1789 and forward till the October 1917 in Moscow – in many of them ample space was given to the Decembrist uprising [Штрайх 1919] as well as the 1905 Russian Revolution⁴.

³ In Russia, throughout the 1920s, the first collections of authors like Bakunin, Tkachyov, Lavrov, who were among the most influential spirits in the Populist groups, were legally published. There was ongoing research into Populism, and scholarly journals such as “Каторга и ссылка”, “Красный архив” and “Красная летопись” regularly published essays and memoirs either written by the populists or concerning them.

⁴ The two State film-companies Goskino and Sovkino promoted, at least, six films committed to narrating the 1905 Revolution (TsGAIPD/Archive of Historico-political documents. 198. 1. 13. 4 verso, 5). In the film “9-е января 1905 г.”, whose screenplay was written by Pavel Shchigolev, history was reconstructed strictly on the basis of the text-materials provided by the ISTPART Commission (notably the annotated compilation) [Покровский 1927].

Representing the Populist past through cinematic storytelling was not the achievement of the Soviet cinematography. Early films centred on the deeds of particular Russian regicides were promptly produced and screened soon after the 1917 February Revolution. In the period between February and October 1917 Russian private film-studios released seven long-feature films. The heroes and heroines of these dramas were specially conceived upon the example of those Populists who probably were the most lasting – the regicides – inasmuch as fictional characters could be associated with the real historical personalities⁵. Stories that would have been almost unimaginable telling in the Tsarist epoch were, eventually, disclosed, in the new conditions of freedom of speech that had granted the First Provisional Government by abolishing Court censorship⁶. Thereafter, other characters either inspired by or squarely connected with Russian Populism's history appeared in action-driven Soviet films [Гинзбург 2007, 433–450].

In post-revolutionary Russia dozen of films were projected and made exploiting such narratives – built on the machinations of the would-be assassins. Some well-known figures who, in the years leading up to the fall of the Tsarist system, had attempted by means of individual terror to defeat the autocracy (e.g. Dmitry Karakozov, Stepan Khalturin, Sergei Nechaev, Sof'ia Perovskaia, Vera Figner, and other Populists their fellows) appeared in a few long-feature films as well as incomplete scripts (such as “Aleksandr Uljanov – Lenin's brother” (“Александр Ульянов – брат Ленина”) and “The Year 81st” (“81 год”), this latter left unfinished by Vera Figner), which were made between 1918 and 1932 [Троицкий 2009, 92].

In the mid-1920s, there was a portion of Soviet long-feature films specially designed for being the hit of the period and, principally, produced by the “Sevzapkino” – the most industrious State film-studio in Petrograd/Leningrad as well as one of the hugest integrated companies nationwide. Among these works, there are two specific films “The Palace and the Fortress” (“Дворец и крепость”, 1924) and “Stepan

⁵ After having compared most complete published catalogues of Soviet films of the time I could appraise that, in 1917, ten films were released in which the life and death of given Russian Populists was featured. After having compared most complete published catalogues of Soviet films of the time I could appraise that, in 1917, ten films were released in which the life and death of given Russian Populists was featured [Иванова и др. 2002, 364–412; Мачерет 1961; Lebedev 1962, 487–564; Вишнеvский 1945, 123–137].

⁶ Court censorship, i.e. censorship under the Tsarist rule, suppressed above all political publications holding a political character [See: Зеленов 2000, 3; Orlovsky 1989, 39–56]. Before 1917, fictional films as well as documentary footage showing representatives of the Tsarist establishment and/or treating political issues offending the Establishment could be subject to preventive censorship; nevertheless, there was not an organic apparatus that controlled directly the whole cinema industry [See: Григорьев 2007, 220–223].

Khalturin" ("Степан Халтурин", 1927) – both directed by Ivanovsky and whose screenplays were written by Pavel Shchiogolev, a very important literate and historian for the Socialist cultural heritage⁷. Shchiogolev employed for artistic purposes archival items to which had exclusive and direct access, being both the person in charge of directing the reordering of the fonds of the Tsarist secret police departments (documents of the trials, written testimonies such as missives and confessions) to be archived at the "Petrograd Museum of the Revolution", and an executive fellow of the ISTPART (Committee for the History of the October Revolution and of the Russian Communist Party). Scholarly monographs that would start to be published toward the end of the 1920s were the first major undertaking by historians to use the new primary and archival sources, sources that had got to be available since the break-up of the Russian autocracy in 1917 [Троицкий 2002, 14, 34–39].

"The Palace and the fortress" and "Stepan Khalturin" presented two stories centred on noteworthy figures of terrorists in the Populist movement: the ones who were either condemned or executed for committing political crimes. The aim was to find in these stories traces of a bloody fight against despotism, demonstrating that the Revolution had been the final stage of a long-term process that had its roots in the 19th century.

"The Palace and the fortress" dramatises the vicissitudes of Michail Beideman, a young democrat who forsakes his own class and professional background as a military officer (he is a *junker*, a member of the higher ranks of the Imperial Guard) to become a courier for the intellectual Aleksandr Herzen. "Stepan Khalturin" deals with the deeds of the peasant revolutionary Stepan Khalturin, who, in 1880, joined the "People's Will" and, soon afterwards, led its worker's groups in Moscow for many months – in 1882 he was hanged by the Tsar for his part in the terror act that led to the assassination of the Procuror-General of the circuit law-court in Kiev, Vasily Stepanovich Strel'nikov. The latter had condemned to death several members of "The People's Will" party in a number of consecutive political trials, and notably those that were instructed in the Southern regions of the Russian Empire as well as the "Trial of the 193" (1877–1879) [Троицкий 1983, 83–84] – also known as one of the most giant trials brought against Russian Populists and their followers.

⁷ As scholars have noted, Shchiogolev was one of the few professional historians to be engaged by the Narkompros for carrying out the archival reform that the Soviet administration had endorsed in line with the project for making the history of the Communist event. Since the outset of the Second Russian Revolution, in March 1917, P. E. Shchiogolev had the means of consulting, steadily and extensively, a vast quantity of evidence written about the vicissitudes of the many Populists who ended up in the Tsarist prisons [Хорхордина 1994, 70–71].

“Stepan Khalturin” was released in 1925 for being screened throughout the following five-year period till the public ceremonies praising the 50th anniversary since the birth of the “People’s Will”. Such celebrations took place in the period between 1929 and 1931, in a time when, as commonly maintained by historians, both men of letters and the scholarly community of the country were devoting plenty of literature to “The People’s Will” organisation, and most important memorials on Russian Populism overall had been already published⁸. As late as 1929, both films continued to enjoy widespread distribution as well as outstanding popularity despite negative publicity by the Party critics⁹.

3. Building the portrait of Nechaev and Khalturin

In the historical context hitherto outlined staging the Russian revolutionary past lead to building images of heroes that complied with propaganda’s aims.

“The Palace and the Fortress” was produced by the State company “Sevzapkino”, which had undertook the idea to produce a grandiose Soviet film to be widely distributed not only at home but also abroad, Europe in particular. It was stated in a promotional article published in the newspaper “Pravda”, the main Bolshevik press-organ of the ruling elite, that since the film *blurred* the facts between fiction and fact [Гусман 1924], it perfectly fulfilled the task for which it was generously sponsored by the State. “The Palace and the Fortress” quickly scored a great success with the public and was sold at a profit whereby the “Sevzapkino” could invest money in developing its own production’s plans.

In the “The Palace and the Fortress” there is a subplot with Nechaev treated sympathetically: “around him the revolutionary youth regrouped”¹⁰ and he was arrested by Tsarist authorities because he had

⁸ Three books were published that were devoted to narodovolets; they were mainly made of unpublished material such as memoirs and historical accounts of a different type: the “Всесоюзное общество политических каторжан и ссыльно-поселенцев” together with some Russian populists issued the collection of writings. See: «Народная воля» в документах и воспоминаниях. Москва, 1930; «Народная воля» перед царским судом. Москва, 1930.

⁹ “The Palace and the Fortress” obtained such a success with the audience that it sold out many times at the box office; the film was programmed sixty-five times obtaining on the whole two hundreds and fifty screenings within the theatrical circuit in Leningrad – this comprising the cinemas: “Ампир”, “Астартэ”, “Паризиана”, “Пробуждение”). On the one hand the film enjoyed great success, on the other hand a substantial part of Party’s reviewers harshly criticized. See: Всеукраинская рабочая газета «Пролетарий». 9 февраля 1924. № 33; Вечерние Известия. Москва, 18 февраля 1924. № 7.

¹⁰ This synopsis corresponds to the subject of the film “The Palace and the Fortress” as it is presented in the new edition of the film released in 1936–1937 and whose 35-mm print is available for screening at the Gosfil’mofond.

incited loyal subjects (students) to rebellion against the Tsar, and nor because he had machinate the murder of the student Ivan Ivanov – fact that is neither mentioned in the filmic captions nor suggested visually in the intrigue.

In one of the episodes set in prison, Nechaev not only writes with his own blood an appeal of grace asking for Beideman's sake, but also requests that the executive Committee of "The People's Will" liberate his fellow [Пиотровский 1936, 70–71, 74]. The man who for more than forty years had been regarded as a murderer and schemer if not even as an impostor, was now praised as a positive revolutionary figure of the highest importance, the one who already in the opening stages of the movement had pointed the way which the revolution had to take. Both Beideman and Nechaev represent the regicide *par excellence*, who is glorified in the "The Palace and the Fortress".

In the 1920s, this reversal of opinion concerning Nechaev was consequent upon the researching in the archives: as biographers have asserted over the years, there was scarcely a Bolshevik periodical of importance which did not print some detail about him, his fate, his teachings or at least reminiscences of him by his contemporaries and followers, some of whom were still alive.

However, Shchiogolev moulded Nechaev's fictional character on grounds other than those afforded by the memoirs that saw the light at the turn of the 19th century and, shortly afterwards, in the scientific journal "Былое" [Земляк 1912, 70–73]. The historian departed from the distinctly negative portrait of this revolutionary that had been produced by the press, notably by the ISTEPART's journal "Красный архив" [Максаков 1922, 280–281; Козьмин 1926 а; Козьмин 1926 б], as a result of the public trial which found Nechaev guilty of having caused the death of the student I. I. Ivanov in 1869.

The image of Nechaev promoted in "The Palace and the Fortress" is totally different from the one outlined many years before by Aleksandr Herzen in his letters: apparently the great Russian literary figure must have been unfavourably impressed by his close encounter with Nechaev in May 1869, and thus went so far as to demonize the latter as a "moody individual" ("человек обречённый") – using a well known quotation from the principal manifesto of Nihilism "Chatechism of a Revolutionist" ("Катехиз революционера", Sergei Nechaev and Mikhail Bakunin, 1869–1871) – ready to commit a benchmark murder in order to consolidate in blood his political organization – "The People's Retribution" ("Народная расправа", 1869–1870). Shchiogolev was perfectly aware of the picture of Nechaev that was given by Bakunin in his unpublished

letters and by the *народоволец* in their own publication “Herald of People’s Will” (“Вестник Народной Воли”. 1881. № 1): criminal characteristics that Nechaev was known to have were due to his exceptional capacity for action and persuasion¹¹.

This picture of Nechaev was eventually incorporated in the collective memory of the last Russian Populists; these latter had described Nechaev as a charismatic revolutionist undergoing and surviving his painful detention in Tsarist prisons, but those of them who wrote during their exile abroad, following the regicide, tended to dissociate themselves from Nechaev’s methods of coercion and conspiracy [Сватиков 1907, 165–249].

There was now proposed a different public memorial to Nechaev, designed to erase the image of the impostor and murderer calcified in the memories of certain historians and revolutionaries who were his contemporaries. Nechaev was, in the end, lauded as a thinker of the highest level, who from the first stage of the movement for freedom from autocracy had anticipated the proper strategy to pursue so as to arrive at the establishment of a government of professional revolutionaries. Nechaev became one of the forerunners of Bolshevism, not without the essential contribution of Lenin, who encouraged the study of him, and Shchiogolev, who wrote a substantiated biography of him and dedicated to him the fifth and last long chapter of “Alexei-Ravelin” (“Алексеевский равелин”)¹².

Before the film was distributed, a few articles on Nechaev appeared in the Party press; however, they did not reveal anything new concerning his biography that the pre-Revolutionary press would not have published [Козьмин 1923, 60; Оксман 1923]. Shchiogolev turned the bad reputation surrounding Nechaev as a murderer into an honourable one thanks to such notable deeds as succeeding in persuading the sentries of the Fortress of the rightness of the revolutionary cause. Rather, he relegated to the background Nechaev’s murky past prior to his arrest by enhancing what he presented as true historical proofs officially presented to the Tsar by the Adjutant General, the Commandant and the Warden of the Fortress – biased witnesses, who would have had every reason to discredit Nechaev but did not do so – indeed, they praised his conduct.

¹¹ See: Пушкинский Дом (ИРЛИ РАН). Ф. 627: П. Е. Щёголев. О. З. Д. 2: С. Г. Нечаев. Копии материалов и заметки. Рукописи и машинопись. 21–36; Пушкинский Дом (ИРЛИ РАН). Ф. 627: П. Е. Щёголев. О. З. Д. 52: Материалы о книге об Алексеевском равелине. Глава о Бейдеммане «Таинственный узник». 1–2.

¹² In the Introduction to this work, Schiogolev emphasizes Nechaev’s heroism: the revolutionist is praised for having been “пламенным революционером” and “победителем равелина” [Щёголев 1929, 188–376].

Not only could he study the archival dossiers containing secret papers produced on Prisoner № 5, as Nechaev was labelled in the Fortress throughout his detention (27 January 1873 – 21 December 1882 O.S.), but he also was inspired by the poem “Student” (“Студент” 1868) in which Nikolai Ogarev eulogises his friend Nechaev by recalling his humble peasant origins¹³.

As concerns Stepan Khalturin there is an episode in the eponymous film telling the deepest meaning of the glorification he was to achieve by means of cinema. According to the original screenplay, Stepan Khalturin had a vision showing how he would enter the pantheon of national heroes: he was to see his own memorial set in a not distant time ahead following the accomplishment of the 1917 Revolution. This thematic connection between the past and the present was conveyed through the particular narrative device of the flash-forward in such a way that, whilst Strel’nikov was previewing his own death, Khalturin visualized his own after-life under the single flag of the Bolshevik Party. Archival documents whereby we can know the film “Stepan Khalturin” at complete (i.e. as it was originally proposed to the Soviet audience) provide a full picture of such an intersection between the two timelines (the present and the future). On 21st March 1882 (O.S.) at dawn, immediately before the execution, Khalturin seats aside in his cell and predicts his own apotheosis, an apotheosis that, *post-mortem*, a crowd of workers in the post-revolutionary setting would grant him:

«235. Тюрьма. Луна уходит. Рассвет. На дворе воздвигают эшафот.

236. Камера Желвакова. Желваков тянется к решётке окна и спешит насладиться уходящей луной, уходящей жизнью.

237. Камера Халтурина. Сидит на койке, закрывает глаза, грезит. Волны рабочих одна за другой передвигаются, с красными знамёнами. Стоит он и Желваков. Толпа ближе, ближе. Поднимает его и Желвакова на руки, склоняют над ними знамёна.

238. Постройка эшафота заканчивается.

239. Конец видения Халтурина. Толпа несёт их. Видение исчезает. Дверь открывается. Показывается священник. Халтурин отрицательно машет рукой»¹⁴.

¹³ See: Пушкинский Дом (ИРЛИ РАН). Ф. 627: П. Е. Щёголев. О. 3. Д. 2: С. Г. Нечаев. Копии материалов и заметки. Рукописи и машинопись. 73.

¹⁴ See: Пушкинский Дом (ИРЛИ РАН). Ф. 627: П. Е. Щёголев. О. 3. Д. 63: Степан Халтурин. Киносценарий. Машинопись, режиссёрский экз. 25.

In the film Khalturin pronounces the very famous motto “Alexander II must be killed by a worker” (“Александр II должен быть убит рабочим”) that had been published abroad by “The People’s Will” in the last two decades of the 19th century and otherwise it would not be disseminated albeit in underground press¹⁵. Khalturin pronounces these words in a dialogue with Aleksandr Kviatkovsky at the historic Congress of the Executive Committee of “Land and Freedom” (“Земля и Воля”) in Lipetsk (1879): here, he spontaneously proposes himself to kill the Tsar as soon as this organisation agreed with a new tactic – Aleksandr Mikhailov, Lev Tikhomirov, Kviatkovsky had just decided to adopt regicide as a method of struggle to the end of liberation from absolute power [ИВАНОВСКИЙ 1924, 7]. Furthermore, in the full-length there is a thoroughly enough description on how, in 1880, Khalturin prepared the attempt to the Tsar at the Winter Palace: this and other narrative devices made of him a glorious man whereas any other aspect of his political deeds was simply passed over in silence [Блейман 1968, 16–17].

4. Conclusions

Nechaev and Khalturin can be accorded a profile of an archetypal type: both were examples of young idealists coming from the common people (if not even of poor origins) and penetrating the revolutionary *intelligentsia*, bringing a profound desire for action with their world view. In these films they are portrayed as heroes of their days that shared sympathy for radical actions beyond any narrowed political view or commitment to a specified Party.

By 1920 the ISTEPART Commission had been established for the gathering, processing and realising of materials concerning the story of the October Revolution and the Communist Party – through the time this institution increased the network of museums where such archival items were exhibited having at its disposal more than eighty SEDI by the end of the decade [Кытимова 1983, 12; Кротов 1982, 122–132]. While early Soviet film companies independently produced of that commission, they nonetheless contributed to the process of *reinventing*

¹⁵ According to what The People’s Will published in its propagandistic literature abroad: “Эта мысль, – что царь, обманывающий русский народ, должен погибнуть от руки человека из народа, – гвоздём зашла в голову Халтурина. Говорят, что он советовался с рабочими и получил их одобрение. Сам Халтурин говорил даже одному лицу, что он действовал в этом случае по поручению какого-то рабочего кружка. Как бы то ни было, он обратился осенью 1879 г. к Исполнительному Комитету с предложением не только своих услуг, но даже с целым планом, уже наполовину выполненным” [See: Засулич, Лопатин 1883, 40–48].

the past for ideological purposes [Лейкина 1973; Чернобаев 2010, 286–287]. Works such as the “The Palace and the Fortress”, “October” (S. M. Eisenstein, 1928), “Stepan Khalturin” as well as “From the spark to the flame” (“Из искры пламя”), parallel title “Thread after thread” (“Нить за нитью”, D. Bassaligo 1924) consisting a series of 6 parts and many other Soviet fictional films participated in the process of moulding a political memory of the Russian past that had significance to the present.

Given the in-depth inquiry hitherto proposed, a wider discourse based on further archival sources could examine how, in the 1920s and beyond, prominent Russian historians and literates – such as Yulian Oksman, Yury Tynianov and Viktor Shklovsky – contributed to the process of etching a portrait of (fairly unknown) Russian revolutionaries in the collective imagery of early Soviet Russia.

REFERENCES

- Brintingler 2000 – *Brintingler A.* Writing a Usable Past: Russian Literary Culture 1917–1937. Evanston, 2000.
- Lebedev 1962 – *Lebedev N.* Il cinema muto sovietico. Torino, 1962.
- Namer 1987 – *Namer G.* Mémoire et société. Paris, 1987.
- Orlovsky 1989 – *Orlovsky D. T.* The Provisional Government and its Cultural Work. Bolshevik Culture. Experiment and order in the Russian Revolution. Bloomington, 1989.
- Блейман 1968 – *Блейман М.* Начало искусства // Из истории Ленфильма. Статьи, воспоминания, документы. 1920-е годы. Выпуск 1. Ленинград, 1968.
- Вишневский 1945 – *Вишневский Вен.* Художественные фильмы дореволюционной России. Москва, 1945.
- Гинзбург 2007 – *Гинзбург Г.* Кинематография дореволюционной России. Москва, 2007.
- Григорьев 2007 – *Григорьев С. И.* Придворная цензура и образ верховной власти. 1831–1917. Санкт-Петербург, 2007.
- Гусман 1924 – *Гусман Б.* Дворец и крепость // Правда. 16 февраля 1924. № 38.
- Засулич, Лопатин 1883 – *Засулич В. И., Лопатин Н. Н.* Календарь Народной воли на 1883 год. Genève, 1883.
- Зеленов 2000 – *Зеленов М. В.* Политика аппарата ЦК РКП (б) в области цензуры исторической науки в 1919/1929 годах. Автореферат диссертации на соискание учёной степени доктора исторических наук. Нижний Новгород, 2000.

- Земляк 1912 – *Земляк*. Новое о Нечаеве // *Былое*. 1912. № 14.
- Иванова и др. 2002 – Великий кинемо: Каталог сохранившихся игровых фильмов России (1908–1919) / Сост. В. Иванова, В. Мыльникова, С. Сквородникова, Ю. Цивьян, Р. Янгиров. Москва, 2002.
- Ивановский 1924 – Беседа с режиссёром А. В. Ивановским // *Кинонеделя*. 1924. № 13.
- Козьмин 1923 – *Козьмин Б.* Около нечаевского дела // *Каторга и ссылка: Историко-революционный вестник*. 1923. № 6. С. 55–63.
- Козьмин 1926 а – *Козьмин Б.* Неудавшаяся провокация. Новое о Нечаеве // *Красный Архив*. 1926. № 1 (14). С. 148–158.
- Козьмин 1926 б – *Козьмин Б.* Новое о С. Г. Нечаеве. Удавшаяся провокация // *Красный Архив*. 1926. № 2 (15). С. 150–163.
- Кротов 1982 – Музейное дело в СССР: Сборник научных трудов / Отв. ред. Ф. Г. Кротов. Москва, 1982.
- Кытимова 1983 – *Кытимова С. И.* Истпарт и становление историко-революционных музеев 1920–1928 гг. Автореферат диссертации на соискание учёной степени кандидата исторических наук. Москва, 1983.
- Лейкина 1973 – *Лейкина Е. Т.* Создание и деятельность ленинградского Истпарта (1920–1980) // *Проблемы историографии и источниковедения истории КПСС*. Вып. 2. Ленинград, 1973.
- Максаков 1922 – *Максаков В.* Обряд публичной казни над С. Г. Нечаевым // *Красный Архив*. 1922. № 1. С. 280–281.
- Мачерет 1961 – Советские художественные фильмы. Аннотированный каталог. Т. 1: Немые фильмы (1918–1935) / Ред. А. В. Мачерет. Москва, 1961.
- Оксман 1923 – *Оксман Ю. Г.* Судьба одной пародии Достоевского // *Красный Архив*. 1923. № 3. С. 301–303.
- Пиотровский 1936 – *Пиотровский А. П.* Монтажный лист в картине. Дворец и крепость. В 6 частях. Ленинград, 1936.
- Покровский 1927 – 1905. Материалы и документы / Общ. ред. М. Н. Покровского. Москва, Ленинград, 1927.
- Сватиков 1907 – *Сватиков С. Г.* Студенческое движение 1869 года: Бакунин и Нечаев // *Наша страна: Исторический сборник*. № 1. Санкт-Петербург, 1907.
- Троицкий 1983 – *Троицкий Н. А.* «Народная воля» перед царским судом (1880–1894). Саратов, 1983.
- Троицкий 2002 – *Троицкий Н. А.* Крестоносцы социализма. Саратов, 2002.
- Троицкий 2009 – *Троицкий Н. А.* Орлы-богатыри (Российские народники в искусстве). Саратов, 2009.

- Хорхордина 1994 – Хорхордина Т. Н. История отечества и архивы. 1917–1980-е гг. Москва, 1994.
- Чернобаев 2010 – Русская историография XI – начала XXI века / Ред. А. А. Чернобаев. Москва, 2010.
- Штрайх 1919 – Штрайх С. Я. Декабристы на экране // Жизнь искусства. 1919. 2 декабря.
- Щёголев 1929 – Щёголев П. Е. С. Г. Нечаев в равелине (1873–1882) // Алексеевский равелин. Книга о падении и величии человека. Москва, 1929.

Материал поступил в редакцию 27.12.2014