

*Ina PUKELYTĖ**Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Arts, Vytautas Kavolis Transdisciplinary Research Institute, Kaunas, Lithuania*

32

I
N
A
P
U
K
E
L
Y
T
Ė

LITHUANIAN ACTORS' STUDIO IN MOSCOW: A TOOL OF SOVIET INDOCTRINATION

Summary. The article presents the strategies of the soviet regime that were used to colonise Lithuania and to politically indoctrinate Lithuanian post-war artists from 1947 to 1952. The first strategy was related to the establishment of new soviet drama in theatres, but it proved less effective compared to the second one, that is the indoctrination of young artists by sending them to study at the Russian Institute of Theatre Arts in Moscow (also known as GITIS). Based on interviews with actors Birutė Raubaitė and Leonardas Zelčius, as well as the memories of stage director Aurelija Ragauskaitė, the article reveals the specific methods used to indoctrinate future Lithuanian actors. The teaching methods played a crucial role in turning actors into promoters of the regime. As revealed by the study, the Stanislavski method was the most effective in influencing the consciousness of young actors, they became proponents of socialist realism art. Based on the theoretical insights of David Brandenberger and Hannah Arendt, the article reveals how, using political speeches, art, front organisations, propaganda manipulated emotions and solidified the totalitarian regime.

Keywords: Lithuanian soviet theatre, soviet indoctrination, propaganda, soviet ideology, postcolonial, Lithuanian actor studio, Russian Institute of Theatre Arts (GITIS).

INTRODUCTION

The article will explore the mechanisms of soviet indoctrination of a group of Lithuanian actors who studied at GITIS (the Russian Institute of Theatre Arts) in Moscow, from 1947 until 1952. The analysis will be based on the comparison and critical interpretation of interviews conducted by the author with the former students of the studio, Birutė Raubaitė (1926–2018) and Leonardas Zelčius (1928–2015), and the memoirs of the theatre director Aurelija Ragauskaitė (1924–2017), published in 2000. The interviews took place in 2005 and 2006, when the two actors were already in their eighties and had a critical perspective on the events that happened to them when they were young. The analysis also takes into account the content of the acting courses of the first year of the studies. The file with the content of the courses was donated to the author by the actor Leonardas Zelčius. The analysis and the comparison of all the above-mentioned sources allow an objective approach to the topic and reveal how soviet propaganda was used on young, talented people, and what impact it had on their lives.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The mechanisms of soviet indoctrination can be approached from the postcolonial perspective. For many years, the Soviet Union was not regarded as a colonial project because left-wing scholars considered it a Marxist project, dealing with class struggle topics. Only at the end of the 20th century, after the fall of the Soviet Union, did scholars start to recognise colonial patterns in the way the Soviet Union was constructed (David Chioni Moore, Violeta Kelertas). The colonisation was not only economic or political, but also psychological; according to Kelertas, it affected those “who dissented with the ideology, yet were unable to keep ideas and mind-sets from creeping into their brains”.¹

To reveal the tools of soft power used by the soviets, we shall first discuss the concepts of ideology, indoctrination, and propaganda. Ideology, according to David Brandenberger, “serves as both ends and means, not only defining political objectives and worldviews but also acting as a vehicle for realization of these objectives”, in the context of Stalin’s totalitarian regime, it is “both an official

political culture and a 'top-down' tool for popular indoctrination and mobilization".² Coined in the 1950s the term "indoctrination" refers to "a persuasive process by which ideology is inculcated in the popular mind by means of propaganda and a pervasive political culture".³ In her book *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt described the strategies used by totalitarian nazi and soviet regimes to attract and indoctrinate the masses. Among the most important are propaganda and the establishment of front organisations. Although the term "propaganda" was coined first in the field of public relations by Edward Bernays in 1928,⁴ nowadays it is mostly related to political and ideological purposes. Propaganda, according to Brandenberger, is "a term closely associated with ideology, deliberate and concerted attempt to use political sloganeering, imagery, and iconography in order to advance a systematic message designed to influence and shape popular beliefs, attitudes, and behaviour. Propaganda's persuasive appeal can be direct or oblique and typically assumes one of two modes, emphasising either rational argumentation or the rallying of sympathy through a variety of emotional registers".⁵ Propaganda, says Arendt, is mostly based on consistency and irrationality. "Contaminating (the) subjects with the specifically totalitarian virus",⁶ "true selflessness of its adherents",⁷ "beyond the power of reason",⁸ – are several image-based notions that Arendt used to define the mechanisms that testify to the fact that indoctrination is based not on reason but on playing with human emotions. Propaganda is used on those strata of the population who still do not belong to the totalitarian regime and need to be indoctrinated.⁹ The instruments of propaganda are relatively miscellaneous, consisting of political speeches, press, parades and demonstrations, visuals, and different forms of professional and amateur art. Front organisations are entities through which propaganda is transmitted and circulates in society.¹⁰ Among them are trade unions, associations, schools, and art institutions.

DISSEMINATION OF SOVIET IDEOLOGY

Basing our research on the above-described concepts, we shall first define the historical periods when soviet indoctrination took place in Lithuania. Lithuania was occupied by the soviets twice. The first occupation was short; it lasted from June 1940 until June 1941, the year when the German troops entered Lithuanian territory and chased away the soviets. The second occupation started in August 1944, after the German expulsion, and lasted almost fifty years, until 1990. As soon as the soviets re-entered, they began implementing discourses and institutions to disseminate the bolshevik ideology. The theatre was foreseen as a front organisation already in 1940; from the beginning, it had to promote a Russian bolshevik repertoire that would inspire the masses to fight against the class enemy. The so-called red corners for bolshevik propaganda were foreseen in every soviet institution, and portraits of Stalin and Lenin were obligatory in public spaces. However, the attempt to indoctrinate the masses was stopped by the war. Three years later, the soviets returned and continued their agenda.

The Lithuanian communists representing the soviet regime defined the cultural tasks for the country already during the first soviet period. The first secretary of the Lithuanian communist party, Antanas Sniečkus, declared in February 1941 that the main task of the cultural society was to build socialism. The task, according to Sniečkus, was not easy, so one should not be pressed to fulfil it at once. Cultural heritage should be explored first, and only then should it be decided what was reactionary in it and what was not.¹¹ The second task defined by the soviet government was to develop a culture that would be national in its form and socialist in its content. The communists, according to Sniečkus, "do not recognize such a national culture, which is reactionarily bourgeois in terms of its content".¹² The communists support a culture that "educates the masses in the spirit of friendship between nations and serves the interests of the working people".¹³ National politics, according to Sniečkus, was at the heart of the soviet communist party, as all the nationalities that existed in pre-revolutionary Russia were oppressed,

and only now they had an opportunity to revive. Also, the first secretary emphasised that the real Lithuanian national culture could not be developed during the bourgeois regime (the first Lithuanian independence from 1918 until 1940) as this regime oppressed the Lithuanian people.¹⁴ Sniečkus' speech reveals the main notions of the propaganda vocabulary that were introduced in the public discourse of the Lithuanian soviet republic as soon as the soviets were on Lithuanian territory. This vocabulary reflected the ideology of the Russian soviet regime and had to be introduced in all the national republics of the Soviet Union. Soviet culture was concerned with addressing working-class people, and was oriented towards the rapprochement of different soviet nations.

Cultural objectives did not change when the soviets re-entered Lithuania in July 1944. For theatre, several tasks needed to be fulfilled, such as creating a new soviet dramaturgy and educating actors according to the highest soviet standards. To accelerate the creation of the new dramaturgy, a competition was organised in 1946. The regulations of the drama competition reveal the ideological tasks the authors had to deal with. Among them was the need "to portray correctly the life of soviet society, (...) to create plays that will affect the further development of the best traits of the soviet people, which will educate the soviet people, soviet youth in the spirit of communism".¹⁵ The regulations also defined themes, such as the fight of Lithuanian partisans against German plunderers, the glorious path of the Lithuanian Red Flag Division, and the heroic work of the soviet people in carrying out the 4th Five-Year Plan, among others.¹⁶ However, the old Lithuanian writers did not hurry to create new dramaturgy. According to the research of Vilijus Ivanauskas, out of approximately 110 writers, 78 left Lithuania as soon as the soviet army re-entered the country. Many of those who stayed were either sent to Siberia or killed by the soviet organs.¹⁷ Only a few authors of the younger generation tried to obey the instructions, creating plays that would reveal the transformations of society; however, the plays did not meet the requirements of the communist party. Sniečkus reproached the playwrights in

his speech at the 6th Congress of the Lithuanian communist party in 1949, saying that they did not represent the creative work of the soviet people, nor did they reflect the socialist transformations that were taking place in the village.¹⁸ The creation of a soviet dramaturgy remained problematic in Lithuania during the whole period of the soviet regime.

INDOCTRINATION OF CULTURAL WORKERS

Meanwhile, the implementation of the soviet ideology while trying to indoctrinate stage directors and actors, especially those of the younger generation, was a more successful strategy than creating new dramaturgy. The first steps were realised in 1945, when the local soviet authorities asked the Russian ones to help them open the Russian Drama Theatre in Vilnius, as well as to send soviet theatre practitioners to Vilnius and Kaunas, namely two stage directors for drama, one for opera, one ballet master, and one artistic director for the Musical Comedy Theatre.¹⁹ Also, three Lithuanian specialists were to be sent to Moscow theatres to ameliorate their stage directing skills, while three others were to be sent to study stage direction at GITIS, and three were to be sent to Moscow for theoretical theatre studies.²⁰ To indoctrinate local cultural workers, other means were used, such as evening universities of Marxism and Leninism. According to the report of 1947, most of the theatre workers successfully attended these universities and thus spread the new ideology around.²¹ However, the biggest impact on the new generation of cultural workers was to be made while sending groups of acting students for studies in Moscow. National groups of students at the GITIS were organised in 1947, the aim was to bring different soviet nations closer together. The Lithuanian student group was to be the first to get the vision and objectives of the soviet theatre. Later followed Latvians, Estonians, Tatars, and Mordvins.²² Stalin, the head of the soviet regime, loved the performances of Moscow Art Theatre (MAT), and made this theatre serve as a model of the doctrine of socialist realism. The theatre was founded by Konstantin Stanislavski and Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko in 1898, and was known at

the end of the 1920s as a laboratory of research for new acting methods. This laboratory got the name of Stanislavski's method and was acknowledged for its realistic and authentic approach in the creation of stage characters. Although the aims of the method had nothing to do with the doctrine of socialist realism, it fitted the ideology and became the only legitimate acting method used in soviet acting schools during the whole soviet period.

Stanislavski's method was not a novelty to Lithuanian actors. Lithuanian acting students were introduced to Stanislavski's method at the beginning of the thirties, when Stanislavski's students Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, Michail Chekhov, and Vera Soloviova, all of them coming from the First Studio of the MAT, left Russia and worked for some years at the Lithuanian National Theatre. At that time, the method was regarded as innovative and allowed a deeper understanding of the characters represented on stage.²³ When Lithuanian acting students were approached by the soviet representatives in 1947, Stanislavski's method could not be questioned anymore, and was regarded as a tool of soviet indoctrination.

At first, Lithuanian officials responded negatively to the demand to form a student group for Moscow, stating that there were not enough acting students in the country. However, this answer did not persuade the Moscow officials, and they sent their representative, the vice president of the GITIS Veronika Motylevskaja, to do the agitation work and bring the Lithuanian students to the soviet capital. Motylevskaja originated from the Lithuanian Švenčionėliai district; she was Lithuanian Polish and did not speak Lithuanian.²⁴ Her agitation was successful, as the students at the studios of Kaunas and Vilnius drama theatres, as well as some already working young actors, were attracted by the proposal even when older actors discouraged them, saying that they would be russified.²⁵ The studio was formed in two phases; one group of the students came to Moscow in the autumn of 1947, and the rest joined the studio in the spring. Thus, the total number of students in the first year was 19.²⁶

RUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF THEATRE ARTS (GITIS)

The first year of studies was dedicated to learning the basics of the Stanislavski method; students had to make etudes (improvisations) without using any words, first alone and later with a partner. The objective was to learn to express a theatrical truth based on students' motivation, imagination, and authenticity: only then were the students allowed to create stage characters. The process was written down by a teacher's assistant present at each course and taking notes of every exercise. Thirty-two courses were described in total. The written record was to become a tutorial for other teachers. As the students recalled, they were already acquainted with the method during their acting studies in Lithuania. Still, the teachers in Moscow allowed them to understand the principles of the system much better. All of them praised the precise work realised by Vasilii and Marija Orlov, both former students of Stanislavski's Second and Third Studios, and the director of a younger generation, Grigori Koniski. The latter was responsible for staging performances with the students during the following study years.

As Ragauskaitė and Raubaitė recall, the students had no moral scruples about going to the heart of the soviet regime. All they wanted was to see legendary Stanislavski actors and performances in famous Moscow theatres, especially MAT. When the students arrived in Moscow, their first impression was sad. They were taken by truck to Trifonovka district, where two-storey student barracks were situated. All the girls, eight in total, had to live in one big room with a stove and a washbasin in it. The Lithuanian group, in comparison with other students, looked different. They were regarded by other GITIS students and teachers as representatives of the West in the positive sense, more educated and better dressed. Such an attitude, according to Raubaitė, consolidated the Lithuanian group, and each one felt responsible for the Lithuanian image in the soviet institution.²⁷ However, not all the students chose Moscow for their studies voluntarily. According to Ragauskaitė, only much later were they aware that some of the boy students tried to escape soviet persecution in Lithuania, and

hoped that they would not be reached in Moscow. Among them were Kęstutis Genys, who would later become one of the most brilliant actors of the Kaunas State Drama Theatre, Augustinas Pajarskas, who was however approached by the soviet police in Moscow during his first study year and sent to Siberia for several years, and Justas Petraitis, who tried to avoid returning to Lithuania because of his father's past as a colonel in the Lithuanian army. He even changed his name to Petrakis, married a Georgian woman, and left with her for Georgia.²⁸

The curriculum at the GITIS Lithuanian studio comprised not only acting courses but also, among others, courses on Leninism, Marxism, and socialist and capitalist political economy. As Raubaitė recalls, she had to pass an exam in political economy and was preparing for it assiduously. She was tested before the exam by the representatives of the Komsomol committee and was sure that she was ready; however, she did not pass it because of her nervous overstrain. She was again approached by the Komsomol committee and, with its help, succeeded finally in getting the best mark.²⁹

Raubaitė's case illustrates how easy it was for the soviets to manipulate and indoctrinate a young person, even if this person thought she was resistant to the propaganda. Raubaitė was twenty-one when she arrived in Moscow, and she refused to become part of the Komsomol at the beginning. However, she went with other students to the communist demonstrations and praised the name of Stalin even when her father was sent to Siberia as a class enemy. After a while, she followed the other students and joined the Komsomol. Sixty years later, Raubaitė recalled that the most terrible thing was that no one forced her to worship Stalin. She was put into such a situation that she herself decided to believe in what all the others supposedly already believed because "how could it not be true if all those people believed in it so strongly?"³⁰ Faith in Stalin seemed to be more important than her own father's destiny. How was this possible?

As noted earlier, the regime used various direct and indirect tools for indoctrination. Manifestations

worshipping the communist system and its heroes, courses about communist politics, affiliation to a group, be it komsomol or communist party, improvisations of the fight for communism in everyday life during the acting courses – all this worked as direct propaganda on the young actors. However, indirect propaganda was probably even more important, as it was more sustainable and deeply affected young people. It unfolded through the exclusivity of the students, the fact they regarded themselves as exceptional because they were taught by the best of the best, the former students of Stanislavski. Marija and Vasilii Orlov, Grigori Konski, as well as teachers of the older generation, theoreticians Alexei Dzhivilegov and Stefan Mokulski, all had a huge influence on the future actors as they made them dream of an exceptional place in the world of theatre.

As Ragauskaitė summed up, "five years later, we have all become categorical unitarians of the method, worshippers, fanatics. That's how we came back to Lithuania".³¹ Another thing that impacted the young people was the Russian capital itself. Moscow was a big city with a rich cultural life, and students had an opportunity to attend numerous cultural manifestations. "Moscow grabbed me in, all those performances, especially those of MAT, we went to see them again and again", recalls Zelčius. One could say that Stanislavski's method and the entourage of the big city served as a tool that changed students' perceptions of themselves. Having returned to Lithuania, they regarded themselves as being more distinguished than actors who did not study in Moscow. As Zelčius put it, "we were different, our performances were of a very high quality, interesting, pure".³²

How was this mix of direct and indirect propaganda produced? Students' memories of their teachers give a glimpse into the moral and material challenges that the teachers were confronted with. Ragauskaitė describes in her memoirs the tribunal against GITIS teachers organised by the communist party members in 1948. The students were ordered to observe a political crackdown of the teachers of the older generation organised in the

GITIS hall: “There was a long table covered with red cloth on the stage, ‘human monkeys’ were comfortably sitting behind the table, a small tribune was installed at the bottom, our professors and teachers had to come one by one to the tribune from a small side room”.³³ The moral execution of the teachers made a great impression on the students. They witnessed the humiliation of talented people, who had to resign from their research and beliefs. Professor Alexander Anikst had to renounce his monograph about the stage director Vsevolod Meyerhold, and another young researcher his work about stage director’s Alexander Tairov’s wife, actress Alisa Koonen. Both stage directors were accused of formalist tendencies that did not correspond to the line of socialist realism in theatre and therefore had to be deleted from the soviet collective memory. Only one professor in the hall, Dzhivelegov, already in his eighties, refused to give up his views, making excuses for his old age. Although the students wanted to applaud and thus support the brave professor, “all of us were silent”.³⁴ The soviet purification action reached the highest management level as well, leading to the president of the institute Mokulski, and the vice president Motylevskaja having to abandon their positions.

The atmosphere of fear became a satellite of everyday life in the institute. One politely avoided talking about politics, recalls Zelčius and Raubaitė. “We satisfied ourselves with telling jokes about theatre and scouring intrigues and gossip”.³⁵ “The prefix ‘soc’ is probably impossible to explain in any other way than the requirement to react optimistically and uncritically to the reality that surrounded us”,³⁶ resumed Ragauskaitė many years later. Having witnessed the crackdowns of professors and fellow students, Lithuanian students distanced themselves from politics and thus were a useful tool to the regime. Moreover, the communist party took care of them and supported the students materially, delivering scholarships of 200 roubles per month. Lithuania had a party representative in Moscow, a certain Laurinaitis, who provided the students with warm sportswear and cared for them in everyday life. Those who were particularly good at their studies were afforded a Stalin scholarship of

790 roubles. As Zelčius recalls, this scholarship was bigger than the salary in any soviet theatre.³⁷

The extreme poverty of a professorship was one of the reasons why GITIS teachers obeyed the regime and demanded the same from their students. As Zelčius recalls, he attended piano lessons at the apartment of a musician Plotnikova, sister of the famous actor Nikolai Plotnikov. Her small room was poorly furnished, lined with sweet papers, collected by her brother when he worked in a confectionery factory. Most of the teachers of the elderly generation did not get any retirement pension, so working at the institute was vital for them. To survive, the teachers looked for protection from Lithuanian soviet officials, as well as from the students. Zelčius recalls that at the end of his studies, Orlov addressed him, asking to support his wife, so that she could get a national award. Indeed, all three teachers received Lithuanian soviet awards after the graduation of the Lithuanian students. Orlov obtained the highest award, the title of the Lithuanian People’s Artist, and his wife and Koniski received the titles of Lithuanian Recognised Artists. Motylevskaja, the organiser of the studio, managed to convince the Prime Minister of soviet Lithuania, Mečislovas Gedvilas, to make her director of the Kaunas State Drama Theatre, where the former students of GITIS were to settle down. As we see, the existence of a soviet artist or functionary depended on collusive arrangements and intrigues; expressing one’s own opinion undermined professional careers, therefore the soviet theatre community distanced itself from political questions and cherished the illusion that it was above all kinds of politics.

BACK TO LITHUANIA

With such a moral disposition, the students³⁸ returned to Lithuania, Kaunas State Drama Theatre in 1952 and considered themselves different, “anointed”.³⁹ Theatre critic Irena Aleksaitė defined their condition in that post-studies period as “hypertrophied”, the “young heads were intoxicated by their first achievements, and even more

by their famous educators. It seemed to them that they were proclaiming new artistic truths hitherto unheard of in the Lithuanian theatre as if those truths were almost blessed by the great Stanislavski himself".⁴⁰ One can presume that the soviet ideologists succeeded, in Arendt's words, in "a lying world of consistency which is more adequate to the needs of the human mind than reality itself".⁴¹ Theatre allowed the students "through sheer imagination (...) feel at home and spare the never-ending shocks which real life and real experiences deal to human beings and their expectations".⁴²

The performances brought from Moscow took the Kaunas theatre to a higher level, "the audience flooded the theatre".⁴³ Just before the students left Moscow, a group of older Lithuanian actors was sent to Moscow for half a year so that they could work together with the young ones and be integrated into the performances prepared by Konski. Thus, the bridge between the older and the new generation of actors had to be established, on the other hand, the actors of the older generation were forced to get a glimpse into the forge of the soviet theatre of socialist realism and later promote it in Lithuania. Indeed, Pierre Beaumarchais' *The Marriage of Figaro*, Maxim Gorki's *Barbarians*, and Jaroslav Galan's *The Golden Eagle*, rehearsed with Konski during the last two years of studies in Moscow, demonstrated a diligent analysis of the play and the roles that led to a high quality of performance.

Konski and Orlov's mission with the Lithuanian students in Moscow was not over; they came to Kaunas to accompany the newly-born actors and to stage new performances that would show other Lithuanian actors how the theatre of socialist realism would be developed. A Lithuanian play, written by Augustinas Gričius was chosen, *The Eve*. As the plays were performed in Lithuanian, the former teachers had an assistant who translated everything into Russian. Later the three teachers returned to Russia, leaving Motylevskaja to guide the Kaunas theatre until the beginning of the sixties. Being a theatre critic, she was passionate about her profession and looked over the quality of the performances staged in Kaunas theatre. In the middle of

the 1950s, several other young Lithuanians finished their studies at GITIS and returned to Kaunas; among them were stage directors Henrikas Vancevičius and Regina Senkutė. Now the young actors had the artistic leaders of their generation and were ready to devote their lives to theatre.

The above-described Lithuanian studio was the only one that finished its studies in Moscow as a group. In 1952, a theatre faculty at the state conservatory of the Lithuanian socialist republic was created, and from then on actors were prepared locally. Those who wanted to study stage directing or theatre criticism continued to go to Moscow or Leningrad (St Petersburg) until the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. One can presume that the soviet ideologists in Moscow considered their work with young Lithuanian actors done. The content of the totalitarian propaganda became "real and untouchable an element in their lives as the rules of arithmetic".⁴⁴ However, following Stalin's death in 1953 and the collapse of his cult, this content was revised and new propaganda clichés, better adapted to the new generations, were constructed. The actors analysed above lived and continued their professional careers after Lithuania regained its independence in 1990. As the interviews and memoirs demonstrate, they critically evaluated their youthful attitude toward the regime, but did not consider their professional life a failure. They accepted the political changes that accompanied their lives and adapted to them. As Arendt pointed out, the fictitious world indoctrinated to the masses by the totalitarian system, as soon as it is destroyed, stops existing, and "the masses revert to their old status of isolated individuals who either happily accept a new function in a changed world or sink back into their old desperate superfluousness".⁴⁵

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the soviet regime used theatre as a means of soviet indoctrination. Several strategies were tested, including the creation of soviet dramaturgy and the teaching of the students according to the Stanislavski system. The second strategy, that

is, teaching the students, was successful. As the interviews and memoirs of former students reveal, they were fascinated by their Moscow teachers and the vibrant cultural life of the soviet capital, so that when they returned to Lithuania, they felt exceptional, having a mission to propagate soviet culture. This culture consisted not only of ideological Marxist or Leninist clichés but also comprised such artistic trends as socialist realism, which was based on the Stanislavski acting system. Thus, unconsciously for the young artists, the Stanislavski method served to indoctrinate and make them faithful to the regime.

References

- Aleksaitė, Irena. *Režisierius Romualdas Juknevičius*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1998.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland and New York: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1962.
- Banionis, Egidijus, Aleksandras Guobys (ed.). *Teatras. 1940–1960*. Vilnius: LTSR Mokslių akademijos istorijos institutas, 1986.
- Bagušauskas, Romualdas, Arūnas Streikus (sud.). *Lietuvos kultūra sovietinės ideologijos nelaisvėje. 1940–1990*. Dokumentų rinkinys. Vilnius: Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centras, 2005.
- Brandenberger, David. *Propaganda State in Crisis: soviet Ideology, Political Indoctrination, and Stalinist Terror, 1928–1930*. Yale University Press, 2012.
- Ivanauskas, Vilius. *Įrėmintą tapatybę: Lietuvos rašytojai tautų draugystės imperijoje*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2015.
- Kelertas, Violeta. *Baltic postcolonialism*. 1st ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.
- Kirsch, Sharon J. “Democracy and Disclosure: Edward Barneys and the Manipulation of the Masses.” In *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*. 1st ed. Edited by G. L. Henderson, M. J. Braun, L. L. Adams, C. Bazerman, C. Chaput & P. Carbondale Dunmire. Southern Illinois University Press (2016): 29–50.
- Notes of the Courses of the First Year of Studies*. Moscow: GITIS, 1948.
- Pukelytė, Ina. “Between nationalism and ideology: Stanislavsky in Lithuania” In *Stanislavsky in the world: the system and its transformations across continents*, edited by Jonathan Pitches and Stefan Aquilina. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2017, 87–104.
- Ragauskaitė, Aurelija. *Režisierės užrašai*. Vilnius: Scena, 2000.
- Raubaitė, Birutė. *Interview by the author*. Kaunas, 2005.
- Vengris, Antanas. *Lietuvos tarybinis teatras 1940–1956*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1979.
- Zelčius, Leonardas. *Interview by the author*. Kaunas, 2006.

Notes

- ¹ Violeta Kelertas, *Baltic Postcolonialism*, 1st ed. (Amsterdam; Rodopi, 2006), 6.
- ² David Brandenberger, *Propaganda State in Crisis: soviet Ideology, Political Indoctrination, and Stalinist Terror, 1928–1930* (Yale University Press, 2012), 6.
- ³ Ibid., 7.
- ⁴ Sharon J. Kirsch, “Democracy and Disclosure: Edward Barneys and the Manipulation of the Masses”, in *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, 1st ed., ed. by G. L. Henderson, M. J. Braun, L. L. Adams, C. Bazerman, C. Chaput & P. Carbondale Dunmire (Southern Illinois University Press, 2016), 29.
- ⁵ Brandenberger, 6.
- ⁶ Hannah Arendt. *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (Cleveland and New York: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1962), 306.
- ⁷ Ibid., 306.
- ⁸ Ibid., 312.
- ⁹ Ibid., 342.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., 365.
- ¹¹ Egidijus Banionis and Aleksandras Guobys (ed.), *Teatras. 1940–1960* (Vilnius: LTSR Mokslių akademijos istorijos institutas, 1986), 25.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., 34–35.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., 35.
- ¹⁷ Vilius Ivanauskas, *Įrėmintą tapatybę: Lietuvos rašytojai tautų draugystės imperijoje* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2015), 35–36.
- ¹⁸ Banionis and Guobys, 39.
- ¹⁹ Juozapas Romualdas Bagušauskas, Arūnas Streikus (sud), *Lietuvos kultūra sovietinės ideologijos nelaisvėje 1940–1990*, dokumentų rinkinys (Vilnius: LGRTC, 2005), 55.
- ²⁰ Ibid., 57.
- ²¹ Ibid., 93.
- ²² Leonardas Zelčius, *Interview by the author* (Kaunas, 2006), 2.
- ²³ Ina Pukelytė, “Between nationalism and ideology: Stanislavsky in Lithuania,” in *Stanislavsky in the world: the system and its transformations across continents*, edited by Jonathan Pitches and Stefan Aquilina (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2017), 87–104.
- ²⁴ Zelčius, 3.
- ²⁵ Aurelija Ragauskaitė, *Režisierės užrašai* (Vilnius: Scena, 2000), 23–24.
- ²⁶ *Notes of the Courses of the First Year of Studies* (Moscow: GITIS, 1948), 3.
- ²⁷ Birutė Raubaitė, *Interview by the author* (Kaunas, 2005), 3.
- ²⁸ Ragauskaitė, 23.

²⁹ Raubaitė, 4.

³⁰ Ibid., 5.

³¹ Ragauskaitė, 26.

³² Zelčius, 3.

³³ Ragauskaitė, 177.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ragauskaitė, 59.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Zelčius, 2.

³⁸ The list of the students who finished their studies at GITIS and got their diploma in June 1952: Antanina Mackevičiūtė, Aurelija Ragauskaitė, Vytautas Eidukaitis, Danutė Grinkevičiūtė, Antanas

Gabrėnas, Lionginas Dovydenas, Petras Kaminskas, Elena Mackevičiūtė, Laimonas Noreika, Birutė Raubaitė, Romualdas Vitkauskas, Laimutė Parokaitė, Genovaitė Tolkutė Gabrėnienė (Banionis and Guobis, 49).

³⁹ Ragauskaitė, 30.

⁴⁰ Irena Aleksaitė, *Režisierius Romualdas Juknevičius* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1998), 236.

⁴¹ Arendt, 353.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Raubaitė, 5; Zelčius, 3.

⁴⁴ Arendt, 363.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

Ina PUKELYTĖ

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Menų fakultetas, Vytauto Kavolio transdisciplininių tyrimų institutas, Kaunas, Lietuva

LIETUVIŲ AKTORIŲ STUDIJA MASKVOJE: ĮRANKIS SOVIETINEI INDOKTRINACIJAI

Santrauka

Straipsnyje pristatomos sovietinio režimo strategijos, kurios buvo naudojamos siekiant kolonizuoti nepriklausomą valstybę ir indoktrinuoti Lietuvos pokario menininkus 1947–1952 metais, siekiant politinių tikslų. Pirmoji strategija buvo susijusi su naujosios sovietinės dramaturgijos įtvirtinimu teatruose, tačiau ji, lyginant su antrąja, nepasiteisino. Antroji buvo skirta jaunų menininkų indoktrinacijai, išsiunčiant juos mokytis į Rusijos teatro meno institutą Maskvoje, kitaip vadinamą GITIS. Remiantis aktorių Birutės Raubaitės ir Leonardo Zelčiaus interviu bei režisierės Aurelijos Ragauskaitės atsiminimais, straipsnyje atskleidžiama, kokiomis konkrečiais priemonėmis buvo indoktrinuojami būsimieji Lietuvos aktoriai. Svarbiausią vaidmenį, siekiant paversti aktorius režimo propagautojais, vaidino mokymo metodai. Kaip atskleidė tyrimas, Stanislavskio metodas buvo veiksmingiausias, siekiant paveikti jauno žmogaus sąmonę ir paversti jį socialistinio realizmo meno propagautoju. Remiantis Davido Brandenbergerio and Hannah Arendt teorinėmis įžvalgomis, straipsnyje atskleidžiama, kaip naudodama politines kalbas, meną, priešakines kultūros organizacijas propaganda manipuliavo emocijomis ir įtvirtino totalitarinį režimą.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: Lietuvos sovietinis teatras, sovietinė indoktrinacija, propaganda, sovietinė ideologija, postkolonializmas, Lietuvos aktorių studija, Rusijos teatro meno institutas (GITIS).

Gauta 2025-03-14

Parengta spaudai 2025-07-02

Ina PUKELYTĖ

PhD Ina Pukelytė is an Associate Professor at the Theatre Studies Department of the University of Vytautas Magnus (Kaunas, Lithuania). Her research interests are Jewish theatre history in the Baltics, Lithuanian theatre history, theatre and migration. Her publications include monographies: “Karas ir kultūra: Lietuvos teatras nacių okupacijos laikotarpiu / War and Culture: Lithuanian Theatre during the nazi Occupation”

(2024), “Žydų teatras tarpukario Lietuvoje /

Jewish Theatre in Lithuania During the Interwar Period” (2017).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6435-3188>

E-mail: ina.pukelyte@vdu.lt