

9. Krymynalystyka: Uchebnyk. Otv. red. N.P. Yablokov. 2-e yzd., pererab. y dop. M.: Yuryst, 2001. 718 p.
10. Krymynalystyka : pidruchnyk. V.V. Piaskovskiy, Yu.M. Chornous, A.V. Ishchenko, O.O. Alieksieiev ta in. K. : «Tsentr uchbovoi literatury», 2015. 544 p.
11. Krymynalystyka: Pidruchnyk / Kol. avt.: V.Yu. Shepitko, V.O. Konovalova, V.A. Zhuravel ta in. 4-e vyd., pererob. i dop. Kh.: Pravo, 2010. 464 p.
12. Kudriavtsev V.N. Ob'ektyvnaia storona prestupleniia. M.: Yurydycheskaia lyteratura. 1960. 352 p.
13. Kuzmin D.L. Oblikovo-pravovi aspekty zbytkiv i shkody. Problemy teorii ta metodolohii bukhhalterskoho obliku, kontroliu i analizu. Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Seriia: Bukhhalterskyi oblik, kontrol i analiz. Vypusk 3(9). Zhytomyr: ZhDTU. 2007. pp. 112–123.
14. Loer V. Krymynalystyka. Proekt «Luchshaia yurydycheskaia lyteratura». 2000. 268 p.
15. Lukianchykov B.Ye., Lukianchykov Ye.D., Petriaiev S.Yu. Krymynalystyka: Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia stud. yuryd. spets. vysshch. navch. zakl. v 2-kh chastynakh. Chastyna I : Vstup do kursu krymynalystyky. Krymynalystychna tekhnika. 2017. 374 p.
16. Makashvyly V.H. Uholovnaia otvetstvennost za neostorozhnost. M.? 1957. 375 p.
17. Maleyn N.S. Vozmeshchenye vreda, prychnynnoho lychnosti. M.: Yur.lyt., 1965. 201 p.
18. Mykolenko O.M. Naslidky zlochynu – kryterii podilu skladiv zlochyniv. Pravova derzhava, 2000. № 2. pp. 61–64.
19. Motovylovker Ya.O. Poniatye poterpevsheho v sovetskom uholovnom protsesse. Pravovedenye. 1969. pp. 48–60.
20. Navrotskyi V.O. Teoretychni problemy krymynalno-pravovoi kvalifikatsii. Kyiv : Atika, 1999. 418 p.
21. Oderii O.V. Naslidky yak element krymynalystychnoi kharakterystyky zlochyniv proty dovkillia. Teoriia ta praktyka sudovoi ekspertyzy i krymynalystyky. 2013. Vyp. 13. pp. 53–62.
22. Ozhehov S.Y. Tolkovy slovar russkoho yazyka. 28-e yzd. pererab. M.: Myr y obrazovanye, 2014. 1376 p.
23. Orlovskiy R.S. Suspilno nebezpechni naslidky zlochynu. Naukovyi visnyk Khersonskoho derzhavnogo universytetu. Seriia: Yurydychni nauky. 2017. Vyp. 6, t. 3. pp. 76–80.
24. Podorozhna T. Zakonodavchi definitsii yak riznovyd tlumachennia: teoretyko-pravovyi aspekt. Pidpriemnytstvo, gospodarstvo i pravo. 2008. № 11. pp. 133–136.
25. Saltevskiy M.V. Krymynalystyka. Pidruchnyk: U 2-kh ch. 4.1. Kh.: Konsum, Osnova, 1999. 416 p.
26. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy: v 11 tomakh. Tom 5, 1974. p. 192.
27. Tishchenko V.V. Teoretychni i praktychni osnovy metodyky rozsliduvannia zlochyniv : monohrafiia. Odesa : Feniks, 2007. 184 p.
28. Trostiuk Z.A. Poniatiinyi aparat Osoblyvoi chastyny Krymynalnoho kodeksu Ukrainy : monohrafiia. K. : Atika, 2003. 144 p.
29. Turovets Yu. M. Pochatkovyi etap rozsliduvannia zlochyniv proty dovkillia : dys. ... kand. yuryd. nauk : 12.00.09. K., 2012. 230 p.
30. Tseretely T.V. Prychnynnaia sviaz v uholovnom prave. M.: Hosiuryzdat, 1963. 382 p.
31. Shchur B. V. Teoretychni osnovy formuvannia ta zastosuvannia krymynalystychnykh metodyk : monohrafiia. Kh. : Kharkiv yuryd., 2010. 179 p.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.4.2.26>

YALTA FILM STUDIO OPERATIONS IN THE 1920S AS PART OF UKRAINIAN CINEMA DEVELOPMENT

Olha Sakhno

Postgraduate Student at the Department of Modern History of Ukraine

Zaporizhzhia National University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1011-5197

Abstract. In the provisions of this article, the author researches the formation and functioning of the film studio in Yalta and its interrelations with the governmental organisation called “All-Ukrainian Photo Cinema Administration” (hereinafter – AUPCA), which oversaw the entire film industry of the Ukrainian SSR between 1922 and 1930. The analysis of public records and printed publications on film industry of the time revealed that in the early 1920s Yalta Film Studio, which represented the Crimean cinema network, was restored and provided with unimpeded functioning by the efforts from the Ukrainian side. The article provides archival statistics on the number of directors who worked in Yalta. It emphasises the deterioration of relations between AUPCA and the Crimean People’s Commissariat of Education (hereinafter – CrimPCE) in the late 1920s, connected to the construction of a new film studio in Kyiv and the earthquake in the Crimea in 1927. It provides facts that the Crimean government tried to renew the lease and expected financial assistance for the reconstruction of Yalta Film Studio from the Ukrainian Republic despite the fact that Crimea was not formally part of the Ukrainian SSR at that time.

Key words: AUPCA, film studio, USSR, CrimPCE.

ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ ЯЛТИНСЬКОЇ КІНОФАБРИКИ У 1920-І РР. ЯК ЕТАП СТАНОВЛЕННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО КІНЕМАТОГРАФУ

Ольга Сахно

аспірантка кафедри новітньої історії України

Запорізького національного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1011-5197

Анотація. У положеннях наукової статті авторкою досліджується становлення та функціонування кінофабрики у Ялті та її взаємини із державною організацією – Всеукраїнським фотокіноуправлінням (далі – ВУФКУ), яка керувала всією кіногалуззю УСРР протягом 1922–1930-х років. Завдяки аналізу архівних документів, а також тогочасної кінопреси з'ясовано, що на початку 1920-х років Ялтинська кінофабрика, яка уособлювала собою кримську кіномережу, була відновлена та забезпечена безперешкодним функціонуванням саме українськими зусиллями. У статті наводяться статистичні архівні дані щодо кількості режисерів, які працювали у Ялті. Акцентується увага на погіршенні відносин між ВУФКУ та Кримським Народним комісаріатом освіти (далі – КримНКО) наприкінці 1920-х років у зв'язку із розпочатим будівництвом нової кінофабрики у Києві та землетрусом, який стався у Криму в 1927 році. Наводяться факти того, що кримський уряд намагався поновити орендний договір та очікував матеріальної допомоги для відбудови Ялтинської кінофабрики саме від Української республіки, незважаючи на те, що формально Крим на той період часу не входив до складу УСРР.

Ключові слова: ВУФКУ, кінофабрика, УСРР, КримНКО.

DZIAŁALNOŚĆ JAŁTAŃSKIEJ WYTWÓRNI FILMOWEJ W LATACH 20. XX WIEKU JAKO ETAP POWSTAWANIA KINEMATOGRAFII UKRAIŃSKIEJ

Olha Sakhno

aspirantka Katedry Historii Najnowszej Ukrainy

Zaporoskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego (Zaporoże, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1011-5197

Adnotacja. W przepisach artykułu naukowego autor bada powstanie i funkcjonowanie wytwórni filmowej w Jałcie oraz jej związek z państwową organizacją Wszekukraiński Zarząd Filmowo-Fotograficzny (dalej – WUFKU), która zarządzała całą branżą filmową Ukraińskiej SRR w latach 1922-1930. Dzięki analizie dokumentów archiwalnych, a także ówczesnej prasy filmowej okazało się, że na początku lat 20. XX wieku Jałtańska wytwórnia filmowa, która uosabiała krymską sieć filmową, została przywrócona i zapewniona do sprawnego funkcjonowania dzięki wysiłkom ukraińskim. W artykule przedstawiono statystyczne dane archiwalne dotyczące liczby reżyserów pracujących w Jałcie. Nacisk kładziony jest na pogorszenie stosunków między WUFKU a Krymskim Ludowym Komisariatem Edukacji (dalej – KrymLKE) pod koniec lat 20. XX wieku w związku z rozpoczętą budową nowej wytwórni filmowej w Kijowie i trzęsieniem ziemi, które miało miejsce na Krymie w 1927 roku. Przytaczane są fakty, że rząd krymski próbował odnowić umowę najmu i oczekiwał pomocy materialnej w celu przywrócenia Jałtańskiej wytwórni filmowej właśnie z Republiki Ukraińskiej, pomimo faktu, że formalnie Krym w tym okresie nie był częścią Ukraińskiej SRR.

Słowa kluczowe: WUFKU, wytwórnia filmowa, Ukraińska SSR, KrymLKE.

Introduction. Film studios were production centres for Soviet films. There were three of them in the Soviet Ukraine in the 1920s and 1930s, located in Yalta, Odessa, and Kyiv. Until 1926, Odessa and Yalta held the leading position in film production. Later, with the construction of a new film studio in Kyiv, the film production centre was moved there. Yalta Film Studio deserves particular attention, given that for some time in the 1920s it was run by AUPCA, which oversaw the entire film industry, including film studios, film distribution, film production, film education and film media of the Ukrainian SSR, and hence the Crimea.

The establishment and functioning of Yalta Film Studio, its place in the Ukrainian Soviet cinema and other related issues remain poorly understood today owing to the lack of sufficient information sources. L. Hosenko, a French researcher of Ukrainian origin, wrote about it sporadically (Hosenko, 2005: 28). Works that briefly mention Yalta Film Studio during the 1920s began to appear only fairly recently. In particular, Kharkiv researcher V. Myslavskiy's work is worth mentioning, where he is researching the genesis of the Ukrainian film industry in the 1920s, sometimes mentions Yalta Film Studio as an integral part of it (Myslavskiy, 2016: 165). A. Pasichnyk also researched issues related to the functioning of Yalta Film Studio, namely the production of films in cooperation with Odessa Film Studio (Pasichnyk, 2016: 84).

It should be noted that the majority of researchers dealing with this topic are art critics; a comprehensive historical study has not been conducted yet. The purpose of this article is to analyze the operations of Yalta Film Studio in the 1920s in the context of its relations with the government of the Soviet Ukraine.

Main body. The objectives of the study are as follows: to investigate the role of AUPCA in the functioning of Yalta Film Studio; to outline the main actions of AUPCA, which contributed to the reconstruction of the Crimean cinema network; to show the transformation of interrelations in the late 1920s; to explain the reasons behind

the termination of cooperation between AUPCA and Yalta Film Studio. In order to fulfil these tasks, we processed the relevant archival funds of the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine and the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Materials from film media of the 1920s were also used in this study.

Film production in Yalta was started back in the imperial past. Thanks to the efforts of I. Yermolev and O. Khanzhonkov, two pavilions for film production were opened on the Crimean peninsula in 1917. This film base provided a foundation for Yalta Film Studio. In the early 1920s, the cinema network was not in its best shape. Yalta Studio pavilions were half-destroyed, but with the establishment of AUPCA in 1922, the situation changed drastically. Gradually, film studios in Kharkiv, Kyiv, and Odessa, together with the Yalta Studio pavilions were placed under the subordination of AUPCA. The latter were handed over on the terms of a five-year lease after agreements with private entrepreneurs who had received the pavilions from the Crimean Government shortly before. An interesting detail is that provisions of the lease did not include the monetary format as such. The situation with equipment in Yalta was very difficult, so AUPCA had to settle this issue and build new structures needed for filming, which amounted to 25 thousand rubles annually. After the lease expiry date, all this was to become the property of the film studio (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. List 20. File 2492: 133). Thus, facilities and resources were restored, and equipment was purchased through the efforts of AUPCA. Soon, the Yalta pavilions were merged into a full-fledged film studio for film production named the AUPCA Second State Film Studio. Its official opening took place on September 13, 1922 (Myslavskiy, 2016: 165). In a relatively short period of time, the almost destroyed pavilion complex became a self-sufficient centre for film production. The Odessa pavilion was in a worse condition than the Yalta pavilion and needed more major repairs, which is why the first AUPCA films were shot in Yalta. A “Kino” magazine issue from 1926 reported that Yalta Film Studio had filming and lighting equipment, new renovated laboratories equipped with novel devices (Platonov, 1926: 19). Researcher V. Myslavskiy claims that Yalta Film Studio was an auxiliary studio for AUPCA, it was given a supporting role for production of outdoor scenes for movies (Myslavskii, 2016: 150).

There were not enough funds to carry out reconstruction both in Yalta and Odessa. In 1923, an audit commission from the People’s Commissariat of Education (hereinafter – PCE) became interested in the state of affairs at AUPCA. In their reports, they draw attention to tense relationships between CrimPCE and AUPCA (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. List 20. File. 1779: 57). At that time, the lease between them was terminated, but renewed again in 1924.

The former Pavilion of I. Yermolev was rented by AUPCA for the second time, and S. Orelovych, former head of the Kharkiv Political Control Unit of the Joint State Political Directorate, was appointed as the director of the film studio (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1488: 48). He was quite an interesting figure. From the biographical information that was published for readers of “Kino” magazine, it is known that in 1919 he worked in the Komsomol underground in Grodno, which at that time was part of Poland. Later, from 1920 to 1924, the future film studio director worked in special agencies of the Cheka–State Political Directorate (Serzh, 1927: 4). His collaboration with special agencies began in 1921. He worked in the State Political Directorate of the Ukrainian SSR until 1924, when he was sent to Yalta because of his tuberculosis and appointed on the position of film studio director (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 263. Case 37132. File: 79). After the earthquake in 1927, he left Yalta and began working in AUPCA administration, later he was appointed as the director of the Odessa Film Studio and worked on this position until 1930. From 1930 to 1931 S. Orelovych was the director of Kyiv Film Studio, after that he went to Moscow, where he became the director of Moscow United Film Studio. Since 1933, S. Orelovych started to collaborate with the Chekists again, where he gave a good account of himself as evidenced by the fact that he was awarded with a Mauser by the collegium of State Political Directorate of the Ukrainian SSR in 1927 (the Central State Archives of Ukraine. Fund 263. Case 37132. File: 75). During 1933–1936, S. Orelovych worked at first as a deputy head of the NKVD Reserve Forces Department in the Ukrainian SSR, later as a deputy head of NKVD in the Ukrainian SSR. After that, in 1936, the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine re-appointed S. Orelovych as a director of the Kyiv Film Studio (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 263. Case 37132. File: 75).

It is also worth mentioning the content of the minutes of the AUPCA Board meeting which took place in early June 1930 and addressed issues of mostly financial nature. One of the topics heard at that meeting was the request of S. Orelovych to undergo treatment during his stay abroad at the expense of AUPCA. This demand was granted (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1488: 60). PCE, reviewing the decisions made by the AUPCA Board, stressed that a general increase in salaries for accounting staff was unacceptable and it was illegal to allow S. Orelovych to be treated abroad at the expense of AUPCA. The AUPCA Board was asked to review these issues and inform about their decision in this regard (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1488: 55). It is possible that this request from S. Orelovych could be connected with tuberculosis, contracted in the 1920s.

The number of directing staff in Yalta was small compared to Odessa. According to the research of V. Myslavskiy, at Yalta Film Studio there were three directors, V. Turin, O. Anoshchenko and G. Tasin. They all came there from RSFSR. By 1926, the number of director crews at Odessa Film Studio had grown from 6 to 7, and at Yalta Film Studio from 1 to 3; as of 1928, there were 7–8 director crews in Yalta and 12 in Odessa (Myslavskiy, 2016: 153).

One unpublished document states that the number of directors at Yalta Film Studio in 1926–1927 amounted to 5 (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 1238. List 1. File 42: 68). This is confirmed by a report on production activities of AUPCA for that certain period: “there worked the following directors:

Turin, Anoshchenko, Tasin, Hlaholin and Balyuzek. These directors should be considered as directors of formation of the revolutionary period. In June 1927, we reported the following changes in the directors group of Yalta Film Studio. Directors Turin, Anoshchenko and Hlaholin had left, instead the group was joined by Solovyov, a nominee, director Bolshyntsov and Tomsky. The total number of directors working at Yalta Film Studio was 5; 3 directors with experience of the revolutionary period, transferred from theatres, and 2 nominees. Three of them were Party members” (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 1238. List 1. File 41: 5).

Approximately the same data is found in another document from 1927. Namely, in the materials prepared for the All-Ukrainian Party Cinema Meeting. “From 1923 to 1924, 4 director groups worked in Yalta and Odessa, from 1924 to 1925 – 5 groups, from 1926 to 1927 – 11 groups. Nowadays, 23 director groups work at the Odessa and Yalta studios” (the Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1489: 70). The specified number of director groups is the same as the number provided by the researcher V. Myslavskiy (Myslavskiy, 2018: 176). This number is quite justified, because the film studio in Yalta did not have capacity to become a centre of film production.

As it has already been mentioned, in 1924 AUPCA and the Crimean Board renewed the lease for another 3 years. Therefore, when the time came to negotiate its extension, as the agreement was due to expire on October 1, 1927, some difficulties arose in cooperation between them. The Crimean side offered to extend the lease for AUPCA for the next 12 years and a preliminary agreement on these terms was signed by the parties, as the Crimeans stated in a letter to L. Kaganovich (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2492: 136).

At that time, AUPCA had high hopes for a film studio that was under construction in Kyiv. As for Yalta, it no longer had its former significance. In addition, on the night of 11–12 September, 1927, an earthquake struck the Crimea, and the film studio was badly damaged as a result. The AUPCA Board suspended all negotiations on the lease, citing its insufficient financial resources. This, in turn, led to a wave of letters from the Crimean Central Executive Committee (hereinafter – the Crimean CEC) addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (hereinafter – the Central Committee of the CPSU), the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee (hereinafter – the All-Ukrainian CEC), L. Kaganovich and others with numerous requests to sway the decision of AUPCA, because Crimea could not ensure the viability of Yalta Film Studio on its own, and lease holding by AUPCA saved it from gradual decline. Beautiful scenery, plenty of sunny days for filming almost all year round, mild climate – all this, according to the Crimean officials, distinguished Yalta Film Studio from others and therefore it should continue its operations.

AUPCA explained that the operation shutdown in Yalta was due to the fact that the film studio there was profitable neither from the commercial end nor from the point of view for high-quality film production. Among the main reasons for this decision were: weak technical equipment that needed improvement; isolation of Yalta from cultural centres, for which reason many invited actors simply did not want to leave Kyiv, Kharkiv or Moscow; extremely expensive and irregular supply of electricity to the studio (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2691: 11).

According to the AUPCA Board, these negative points obliterated the long sunny season for filming, the clear air, suitable for good shots, and the sea with mountains, that is, all the features that Yalta Film Studio should have been valued for. After all, lack of people and shoddy equipment led to significant disruptions. Financial issues also played a significant role in the decision of AUPCA on the feasibility of further lease, especially after the devastating earthquake in the Crimea. According to AUPCA, the recovery sum of 32.500 rubles provided by CrimPCE was incomprehensible to them and they did not know where it came from, because a special commission for investigation of losses had mentioned other figures in their act, even without taking into account all types of restorative works – 126 thousand rubles (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2691: 14). At the end of the letter with the aforementioned explanations, addressed to the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, AUPCA mentioned the construction of a film studio in Kyiv and stressed that the studio would be able to fill the film network niche with films of domestic make. In our opinion, this was AUPCA’s main reason. The board did not see any reason to invest in the restoration of Yalta Film Studio, which, compared to the newly built Kyiv one, would not justify the efforts spent on it. In addition, the construction process of the film studio in Kyiv was delayed due to financial problems at AUPCA.

P. Neches, director of Odessa Film Studio and former deputy director of Yalta Film Studio, later described this situation in his memoirs: “CrimPCE, being interested in rebuilding the Yalta studio, complained to the Ukrainian Soviet government that AUPCA did not want to rebuild and operate the studio. They even accused film studio workers of deliberately destroying the building. Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR appointed a commission to investigate the complaint. This commission worked for more than a month and came to a conclusion that it was impossible to continue working at the Yalta studio without repairs, which cost approximately 1,360,000 rubles. This is where our relations with CrimPCE ended. It could not be different. If the construction of a new Kyiv Film Studio costs approximately 1.700.000 rubles, and the reconstruction of the Yalta studio costs 1.360.000, does it really make sense to rebuild the old dilapidated Yermolev pavilions, when it is possible to build a new modern film company that will make our opportunities unlimited” (Hoholiev, 1970: 201). It is also worth mentioning that in the letter to L. Kaganovich, CrimPCE operated with a much smaller amount needed to rebuild the film studio, namely 32.500 rubles (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2492: 135).

In the letter dated September 17, 1927 to the director of Yalta Film Studio S. Orelovych, CrimPCE put the question bluntly: they said, either you agree to all our conditions (the conditions are not mentioned in the source, unfortunately), or there will be no prolongation of the lease for AUPCA (the Central State Archives of Public

Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2492: 139). At the same time, they called in letters to L. Kaganovich for “fraternal assistance” to help Yalta Film Studio remain fully functional. “Dear Comrade Kaganovich, you know better than anyone else that the earthquake inflicted such a heavy destruction to Crimea that we are unable to cope with it without help of the fraternal republics” (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2492: 137). The same theses appeared in the appeals to All-Ukrainian CEC: “Taking into account the significance of the disaster that befell Crimea due to the recent earthquake, and the panic among the population, which is intensified by the liquidation of the film studio, the Crimean CEC is bound to ask the All-Ukrainian CEC to provide fraternal assistance, which, first of all, consists in giving instructions to AUPCA on the necessity of keeping the film studio (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2492: 135).

We have no reason to claim that AUPCA refused completely to cooperate with Yalta Film Studio. M. Skrypnyk, People’s Commissar for Education said in a secret letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine that, in his opinion, it was possible and even expedient to run a film studio in Yalta, but under certain conditions. First, either the government of the Ukrainian SSR or the USSR should provide AUPCA with financial aid of 1.200.000 rubles for equipment and renovation of the studio after the earthquake, which, accordingly, required an anti-seismic design. Secondly, in case of giving out such sum, it would be absolutely necessary, according to the People’s Commissar, not to reduce the financial and credit aid to AUPCA with regards to completion of the film studio in Kyiv (the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. Case 20. File: 2691: 21). Such conditions were imposed by financial standings that were not sufficient for the restoration of Yalta Film Studio only at AUPCA’s expense.

Regardless, in 1928, the “Chuvashkino” and “Nimkino” film companies were merged into the “Vostokkino” Company to eliminate low-quality films produced by the aforementioned film companies. Over time, Yalta Film Studio was also added to the “Vostokkino”. Yalta Film Studio could not have avoided this fate due to the fact that the “Vostokkino” did not have its own film studio and was oriented for outdoor shootings, while for pavilion shootings it depended on Belgoskino Studio located in Leningrad (Arnoldov, 1930: 8).

Conclusions. To summarize, the role of AUPCA in the functioning of Yalta Film Studio is undeniable. Despite the fact that film production in Yalta had started back in imperial times by the efforts of I. Yermolev and O. Khanzhonkov, the revolution and events of the Civil War actually led to the destruction of pavilions and film production in general. The potential of Yalta Film Studio was revived by Ukrainian efforts, driven by AUPCA, which took lease of Yalta Film Studio and gradually put its financial matters under control, ensuring proper film studio operations by purchasing equipment and conducting active filming. Back in the late 1920s, the peninsula was named the cradle of Ukrainian cinema (Keselman, 192: 6) and it was true, because the first film produced by AUPCA was released in Yalta Film Studio.

In the late 1920s, the relationship between AUPCA and the Crimean government changed with regards to Yalta Film Studio. Among the reasons for this change we can distinguish the following: gradual development of Odessa Film Studio, which was almost identical to Yalta in terms of climate conditions for filming; beginning of the construction of a film studio in Kyiv, with an ambitious and promising project; the earthquake of 1927 in the Crimea, which significantly damaged the film studio itself that needed significant investment for its reconstruction. It is noteworthy that in such difficult situation for the Crimean government, they expected help only from Ukraine, among all the republics of the USSR. It was the Ukrainian film organization that put effort in the development of the Crimean film network long before 1954. Logically, this can be explained by geographical proximity, infrastructural efficiency and, ultimately, the economic potential of AUPCA, which were very powerful in the 1920s, given the introduction of a new economic policy and the interest of the Ukrainian republic in establishing cooperation with Crimea. Due to AUPCA’s economic situation, which deteriorated partially due to rental barriers arranged by Russian film organizations, and the inability to invest in the reconstruction of the half-destroyed by the earthquake Yalta Film Studio, AUPCA lost the potential capacity of the Ukrainian-born Second Film Studio. Its further submission to “Vostokkino” only confirms it. However, this in no way diminishes the role of the Crimea in the birth of Ukrainian cinema in the 1920s, the autonomy of which was destroyed in the 1930s by the central Soviet government.

Bibliography:

1. Арнольдов А. Як працює Востоккіно. *Кіно*. 1930. № 21/22. С. 8–9.
2. Госейко Л. Історія українського кінематографу. 1896–1995. Київ : КІНО-КОЛО, 2005. 461 с.
3. Кесельман О. Кіносвітанок. *Кіно*. 1929. № 17 (63). С. 6.
4. Кризь кінооб’єктив часу. Спогади ветеранів українського кіно. / Ред. Гоголев Л.Д. Київ : Мистецтво, 1970. 317 с.
5. Миславський В.Н. Становлення кіногалузі в Україні 1922–1930 років: протиріччя часу і розмаїтість тенденцій. Харків : «Друкарня Мадрид», 2016. 344 с.
6. Миславський В.Н. Українське кіномистецтво 20-х рр. XX ст.: організаційно-творчі трансформації : дис. ... д-ра мистецтвознавства : 17.00.04. Харків, 2018. 469 с.
7. Пасічник А.Ю. Особливості становлення Одеської кінофабрики ВУФКУ. *Науковий вісник Київського національного університету театру, кіно і телебачення імені І.К. Карпенка-Карого*. 2016. Вип. 19. С. 84–89.
8. Платонов М. На Ялтинській кінофабриці. *Кіно*. 1926. № 6/7. С. 19.
9. Серж В. Наші директори. *Кіно*. 1927. № 9 (21). С. 4.
10. Центральний Державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. Ф. 166. Оп. 6. Спр. 1488. Протоколи засідань Всеукраїнського фото-кіноуправління. Копії. (1926–1930). 62 арк.
11. Центральний Державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. Ф. 166. Оп. 6. Спр. 1489. Матеріали про стан та діяльність Всеукраїнського фото-кіноуправління за 1926/27 рік (резольюції, виписки з протоколів, доповіді, листування, відомості). 83 арк.

12. Центральний Державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. Ф. 1238. Оп. 1. Спр. 41. Доповідь про діяльність виробничого відділу ВУФКУ і стан кіномережі на Україні (1 жовтня 1926–1927 рр.). 7 арк.
13. Центральний Державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. Ф. 1238. Оп. 1. Спр. 42. Листування з Наркомосом УСРР, Ялтинською кінофабрикою, крайовими відділами ВУФКУ про зйомки науково-популярних фільмів, постачання кінофабрик матеріалами та кваліфікованими робітниками. 234 арк.
14. Центральний Державний архів громадських об'єднань України. Ф. 1. Оп. 20. Спр. 1779. Отчеты Главполитпросвета УССР о политико-просветительной работе, деятельности Государственного издательства Украины, Всеукраинского управления Селянскими Будинками, Всеукраинского фото-киноуправления, совета национальных меньшинств и др. вопросам. Заключение ревизионной комиссии Народного комиссариата просвещения УССР по обследованию Всеукраинского фото-киноуправления. 93 арк.
15. Центральний Державний архів громадських об'єднань України. Ф. 1. Оп. 20. Спр. 2492. Докладные записки, справки, материалы к докладам, выписки из протоколов заседаний Секретариата, Оргбюро ЦК КП(б)У, переписка с ЦК ВКП(б), советскими органами, Наркоматом просвещения, ВУСПС по вопросам агитационно-массовой работы, культурного строительства на Украине, развитии сети клубов, театров, кино. Протоколы заседаний комиссии и другие документы о праздновании 10-летия установления Советской власти на Украине. 145 арк.
16. Центральний Державний архів громадських об'єднань України. Ф. 1. Оп. 20. Спр. 2691. Докладные записки, справки, переписка с партийными органами, Наркоматом просвещения УССР, советскими учреждениями о состоянии и перспективах развития культурно-просветительной работы в республике, деятельности клубов, театров, музеев, красных уголков, развития кинофикации, радиовещания. 76 арк.
17. Центральний Державний архів громадських об'єднань України. Ф. 263. Спр. 37132 ФП. Дело № 763 на Ореловича Соломона Лазаревича. Том № 1. 137 арк.

References:

1. Arnoldov, A. (1930). Yak pratsiuie Vostokkino [How Vostokkino Works]. *Kino*, Issue 21/22, P. 8–9 [in Ukrainian].
2. Hosiako, L. (2005). Istoriia ukrainskoho kinematohrafu. 1896–1995 [The History of Ukrainian Cinema. 1896–1995]. Kyiv: KINO-KOLO, 461 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Keselman, O. (1929). Kinovitanok [The Dawn of the Cinema]. *Kino*, Issue 17 (63), P. 6 [in Ukrainian].
4. Hoholiev, L.D. (1970). Kriz kinoobiektyv chasu. Spohady veteraniv ukrainskoho kino [Through the Lens of Time. Memories of Ukrainian Cinema Veterans]. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 317 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Myslavskiy, V.N. (2016). Stanovlennia kinohaluzi v Ukraini 1922–1930 rokiv: protyrichchia chasu i rozmaist tendentsii [Cinema Sector Formation in Ukraine in 1922–1930: Time Conflicts and Diversity of Trends]. Kharkiv: “Drukarnia Madrid”, 344 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Myslavskiy, V.N. (2018). Ukrainske kinomystetstvo 20-kh rr. XX st.: orhanizatsiino-tvorchi transformatsii [Ukrainian Cinematic Art in the 1920s: Network and Artistic Transformations]: doctoral dissertation on Art History: 17.00.04. Kharkiv, 469 p. [in Ukrainian].
7. Pasichnyk, A.Y. (2016). Osoblyvosti stanovlennia Odeskoi kinofabryky VUFKU [Formation Specifics of AUPCA Odessa Film Studio]. *Naukovyi visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu teatru, kino i telebachennia imeni I.K. Karpenka-Karoho*, Issue 19, pp. 84–89 [in Ukrainian].
8. Platonov, M. (1926). Na Yaltynskii kinofabrytsi [At Yalta Film Studio]. *Kino*, Issue 6/7, P. 19 [in Ukrainian].
9. Serzh, V. (1927). Nashi dyrektory [Our Directors]. *Kino*, Issue 9 (21). P. 4 [in Ukrainian].
10. Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1488. Protokoly zasidan Vseukrainskoho foto-kinoupravlinnia. Kopii (1926–1930) [Minutes of the Meeting of All-Ukrainian Photo Cinema Administration. Copies (1926–1930)], 62 pages [in Ukrainian].
11. Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 166. List 6. File 1489. Materialy pro stan ta diialnist Vseukrainskoho foto-kinoupravlinnia za 1926/27 rik (rezoliutsii, vypysky z protokoliv, dopovidi, lystuvannia, vidomosti) [Analysis of Status and Activities of All-Ukrainian Photo Cinema Administration in 1926/27 (Resolutions, Extracts from Minutes, Reports, Mail, Journals)], 83 pages [in Ukrainian].
12. Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 1238. List 1. File 41. Dopovid pro diialnist vyrobnychoho viddilu VUFKU i stan kinomerezhi na Ukraini (1 zhovtnia 1926–1927 rr.) [Report on AUPCA Production Department Operation and Cinema Network Status in Ukraine (1 October, 1926–1927)], 7 pages [in Ukrainian].
13. Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Ukraine. Fund 1238. List 1. File 42. Lystuvannia z Narkomosom USRR, Yaltynskoiu kinofabrykoiu, kraiovymy viddilamy VUFKU pro ziomky naukovo-populiarnykh filmiv, postachannia kinofabryk materialamy ta kvalifikovanymy robotnykamy [Correspondence Between People's Commissar in the Ukrainian SSR, Yalta Film Studio, AUPCA Regional Offices on Shooting of Popular Science Films, Supply of Materials and Qualified Workers], 234 pages [in Ukrainian].
14. Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. List 20. File 1779. Otchety Glavpolitprosveda UССР o politiko-prosvetitelnoi rabote, deiatelnosti Gosudarstvennogo izdatelstva Ukrainy, Vseukrainskogo upravleniia Selianskimi Budynkami, Vseukrainskogo foto-kinoupravleniia, soveta natsionalnykh menshinstv i dr. voprosam. Zakliuchenie revizionnoi komissii Narodnogo komissariata prosveshcheniia UССР po obsledovaniiu Vseukrainskogo foto-kinoupravleniia [Reports of Glavpolitprosvet of the Ukrainian SSR Political and Educational Work, Operations of Ukrainian State Publishing House, All-Ukrainian Department for Peasant Buildings, All-Ukrainian Photo Cinema Administration, Council of National Minorities and Other Topics. Conclusion of the Audit Committee of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR on Audit of All-Ukrainian Photo Cinema Administration], 93 pages [in Russian].
15. Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. List 20. File 2492. Dokladnye zapiski, spravki, materialy k dokladam, vypyski iz protokolov zasedanii Sekretariata, Orgbiuro TcK KP/b/U, perepiska s TcK VKP(b), sovetскими

organami, Narkomatom prosveshcheniia, VUSPS po voprosam agitacii i massovoi raboty, kulturnogo stroitelstva na Ukraine, razvitiu seti klubov, teatrov, kino. Protokoly zasedanii komissii i drugie dokumenty o prazdnovanii 10-letii ustanovleniia Sovetskoi vlasti na Ukraine [Memorandum Reports, References, Briefing Sheets, Extract from Minutes of Meetings of the Secretariat, the Orgburo of Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Correspondence between Orgburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Soviet Authorities, People's Commissariat for Education, the All-Ukrainian Trade Union in Matters of Propaganda, Cultural Development in Ukraine, Development of Clubs, Theatres and Cinema Network. Minutes of the Commission Meetings and Other Documents on the Celebration of the 10th Anniversary of the Establishment of Soviet Power in Ukraine], 145 pages [in Russian].

16. Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 1. List 20. File 2691. Dokladnye zapiski, spravki, perepiska s partiinymi organami, Narkomatom prosveshcheniia USSR, sovetскими uchrezhdeniiami o sostoianii i perspektivakh razvitiia kulturno-prosvetitelnoi raboty v respublike, deiatelnosti klubov, teatrov, muzeev, krasnykh ugolkov, razvitiu kinofikatcii, radioveshchaniia [Memorandum Reports, References, Correspondence between Party Bodies, People's Commissariat for Education in the Ukrainian SSR, Soviet Institutions on Current State and Development Trends for Cultural and Educational Work in the Republic, Organisation of Clubs, Theatres, Museums, "Red Corners", Development of Cinemas and Radio], 76 pages [in Russian].
17. Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine. Fund 263. File 37132 FP. Delo No. 763 na Orelovicha Solomona Lazarevicha. Tom No. 1. [Case No. 763 on Orelovych Solomon Lazarevich. Volume No. 1], 137 pages [in Russian].

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.4.2.27>

ГРАЖДАНСКОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО КАК СУБЪЕКТ КИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЯ ПРАВООХРАНИТЕЛЬНОЙ СФЕРЫ

Вадим Селюков

кандидат юридических наук, доцент,

*доцент кафедры полицейской деятельности и публичного администрирования
Харьковского национального университета внутренних дел (Харьков, Украина)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6690-6484

Аннотация. Правоохранительная сфера является очень обширной по своей структуре сфера общественных отношений, которая, несомненно, охватывает и общественные институты. Именно они могут считаться главными и ключевыми субъектами кинологического обеспечения, а именно потому, что большинство из негосударственных кинологических организаций тем либо иным способом взаимодействуют с государственными и тем либо иным способом участвуют в правоохранительной деятельности. Стоит отметить, что само гражданское общество не может являться субъектом исследуемой деятельности, поэтому в статье сделан акцент именно на ключевых его институтах – общественных организациях. В контексте исследуемых отношений особое внимание уделено значению такого понятия, как гражданское общество. Проанализированы точки зрения ученых с целью определения оптимального содержания понятия «гражданское общество» именно в контексте кинологического обеспечения правоохранительной деятельности. Отмечено, что, исходя из того, что кинологическое обеспечение является достаточно широким по своему содержанию понятием, стоит отметить, что существует несколько групп институтов, имеющих отношение к кинологическому обеспечению правоохранительной деятельности в Украине в контексте создания возможностей для реализации прав граждан в сфере кинологической деятельности и содержания домашних животных, а также защита их интересов. Кинологическая деятельность не может существовать без таких реальных влиятельных институтов гражданского общества – ветеринарные учреждения, общественные организации, медицинские учреждения, – все эти органы тем или иным образом раскрывают потенциал собак, который в дальнейшем общество, в том числе государственные субъекты правоохранительной деятельности, использует в пользу человечества для обеспечения его безопасности и поддержания правопорядка.

Ключевые слова: общественные кинологические институты, К9, служебная кинология, правоохранительная деятельность, канистерапия, кинологические организации.

CIVIL SOCIETY AS A SUBJECT OF CYNOLOGICAL SUPPORT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT SPHERE

Vadim Seliukov

Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor,

*Associate Professor at the Department of Police Activity and Public Administration
Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs (Kharkiv, Ukraine)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6690-6484

Abstract. The law enforcement sphere is very broad in its structure, the sphere of public relations, which undoubtedly encompasses public institutions. They can be considered the main and key subjects of cynological support, namely because