

Mimeographed Series No. 71

Newspapers in the U.S.S.R.
Recollections and Observations
of a Soviet Journalist

by

A. Kotlyar

Research Program on the U.S.S.R.

New York City

1955

This memorandum is made available for the information of interested persons. It was produced with the financial help of the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. (East European Fund, Inc.). The author is responsible for its contents. The material is distributed in preliminary form without critical editing by the Research Program. Any inquiries about this memorandum or its author should be directed to the Research Program.

NEWSPAPERS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Recollections and Observations

of a Soviet Journalist

by

A. Kotlyar

Translated by

Fred Holling

*Can all this be
done 10.5.74*

RESEARCH PROGRAM ON THE U.S.S.R.

401 West 118th Street, New York 27, N. Y.

1955

Pages: 73
Price: \$0.95

This memorandum is made available for the information of interested scholars. It was produced with the financial help of the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. (East European Fund, Inc.). The author is responsible for its contents. The material is distributed in preliminary form without critical editing by the Research Program. Any inquiries about this manuscript or its author should be directed to the Research Program.

Copyright 1955

by

Research Program on the U.S.S.R.
(East European Fund, Inc.)
401 West 118th Street
New York, N. Y.

No part of this manuscript may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. (East European Fund, Inc.), except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for a magazine, newspaper, or radio broadcast.

No. 71.

Newspapers in the U.S.S.R.

by

A. Kotlyar

Mr. Kotlyar was a journalist in the Ukraine from the Revolution until 1936. In the early thirties he taught at the All-Ukrainian Communist Institute of Journalism. In the present paper he describes the development of the Soviet press into a militant arm of the Party and government, in terms of his own experience.

It is Mr. Kotlyar's thesis that the press of the U.S.S.R., which has always been treated as a tool of the regime, reflected at any given time the degree of pressure being exerted on the population for the realization of Party and government ends. During periods when control of the press was loosely exercised, as was true in the 1920's, the press enjoyed a certain degree of latitude to discuss problems, offer suggestions and, at times, simply entertain the reader. At that time Party supervision over most newspapers was limited to the appointment of an editor who was a good journalist and a Party member. The editor was considered successful if his newspaper achieved satisfactory circulation and profits, and the Party line was assumed to be adequately safeguarded by his Party membership. But with the onset of industrialization and collectivization a more emphatic control was asserted over the press, and thenceforth the choice of editor was determined primarily by Party considerations; the editor's journalistic abilities, if any, were of secondary importance. Furthermore, editors were increasingly subjected to interference and criticism from numerous official agencies.

The author believes that it is in the light of existing Party and government aims, expressed through direct and indirect controls, that Soviet newspapers should be read and interpreted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.	1
I. THE CIVIL WAR PERIOD.	2
II. THE NEP	8
General Conditions.	8
Effects of Party Control.	9
Effects of Government Control	11
Reporting	14
Worker and Peasant Correspondents	18
The Evening Newspaper	20
Structure and Professional Orientation of Newspapers.	22
"De-Russification" of the Newspapers.	26
III. STALINIZATION OF THE PRESS.	33
End of the NEP.	33
Changes in Function and Content	34
Growth of the Lower-Echelon Press	40
IV. THE INSTITUTE OF JOURNALISM	50
V. STALINISM IN THE PRESS.	62
GLOSSARY.	70
INDEX OF PUBLICATIONS CITED	71
INDEX OF PERSONS.	73

Note: Explanatory footnotes have been supplied. Author's footnotes are identified by his initials.

INTRODUCTION

The Soviet press has passed through several fairly distinct periods which correspond roughly to the main phases of development experienced by the country as a whole. The first period may be called the period of Civil War and War Communism. It began with the October Revolution and extended to the adoption of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921. The period was characterized by the almost complete collapse of organized economic activity. The NEP, which lasted until the late 1920's, was marked by a return to dependence on market relationships in an attempt to regain production levels of the prewar era. In 1928 the First Five-Year Plan was adopted, calling for centralized direction and control of all major spheres of economic activity, the development of heavy industry and the collectivization of agriculture. The problems which were created by this program have continued to the present time, although one may perhaps speak of a new period in Soviet history following the death of Stalin in 1953. The characteristic features of each period were of primary importance in determining the tasks of the press and the limits within which it was required to operate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION
2	I. THE CIVIL WAR PERIOD
4	II. THE NEP
8	General Conditions
10	Effects of Party Control
11	Effects of Government Control
14	Reporting
16	Worker and Peasant Correspondents
20	The Evening Newspaper
22	Structure and Professional Orientation of Newspapers
26	"De-Russification" of the Newspapers
33	III. STALINISM IN THE PRESS
33	End of the NEP
34	Changes in Function and Content
40	Growth of the Lower-School Press
50	IV. THE INSTITUTE OF JOURNALISM
62	V. STALINISM IN THE PRESS
70	GLOSSARY
71	INDEX OF PUBLICATIONS CITED
73	INDEX OF PERSONS

Note: Explanatory footnotes have been supplied. Footnotes are identified by the initials.

I. THE CIVIL WAR PERIOD

If one were to use a single word to describe the Soviet press--especially the provincial press--during the Civil War, that word would be agitation. In the West the word used to designate this concept is propaganda. In the U.S.S.R., however, "propaganda" means the scientific elucidation of certain ideas and theories for popular comprehension. In the Soviet concept agitation is based more upon emotional effect, while propaganda is based upon logic; propaganda, therefore, is considered to be a phenomenon of a higher order, so to speak, than agitation.

Newspapers of the Civil War period were devoted predominantly to agitation, and attention was directed toward such problems as the defeat of the White armies and of Petlyura's troops;¹ the struggle against "banditry," i.e., against the many political (and sometimes criminal) armed peasant detachments which supported Petlyura or Makhno;² the fight against desertions from the Red Army; the campaign for fulfillment of the food levies (delivery by the peasants of grain and other farm products to the state); and the effort to reopen the idle factories and mines in the cities in the Donets Basin.

I lived in a small town in the Ukraine at that time in which two daily newspapers were published, one Bolshevik and the other Borot'bist.³ The guberniya revolutionary committee (the interim government in the region) was composed of three Bolsheviks, one Communist-Borot'bist and one left-wing Socialist Revolutionary Bor'bist,⁴ and was supposedly a coalition

1. Semen Petlyura was a Ukrainian Social Democrat who during the Civil War headed an army in conflict with the Soviet Red Army.

2. Nestor Makhno was an Anarchist partisan leader who operated in the province of Yekaterinoslav, first supporting the Bolsheviks and then turning against them.

3. The Borot'bisty evolved from the left-wing of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries. They were joined in August 1919 by a left-wing group which split off from the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party merging with the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Ukraine in March 1920.

4. The Bor'bisty were the Ukrainian branch of the Russian Party of Left Socialist Revolutionaries.

of these groups. Nevertheless, the Bolshevik paper, the organ of the local committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party was regarded as the official publication of the coalition government.

In addition to these newspapers the Bor'bisty had a publication which came out irregularly and the Maximalists⁵ issued leaflets in conjunction with the Anarchists. Furthermore, there were newspapers and publications throughout the Ukraine of such groups as the Ukapisty,⁶ the left-wing Bund, and the Jewish Communist Party.

Although these publications had different political orientation they all agreed in combating the foes of the new regime. Indeed, the very existence of non-Bolshevik newspapers was predicated on their loyalty to the Soviet regime. If a political group came into armed conflict with the government forces the press of that group went underground. This happened several times to the Anarchists.

In this situation the Bolshevik press was assured of a dominant position, but it had no monopoly and could not publish obviously false reports--as was done later. Newspapers with different orientations could engage in ideological and political discussions with the Bolshevik press and could correct false reports.

In addition to the press of the guberniya centers, newspapers were also published in every povit.⁷ Thus a certain outlying town in the guberniya had a newspaper which was the organ of both the district revolutionary committee (later the executive committee) and the local committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Like its counterpart in the guberniya center it was published partly in Russian and partly in Ukrainian, depending on the people who worked on it. The Russian part was edited either by a Russian who had come into the area or by local Jews. The latter were for the most part good journalists, a fact which kept even this district newspaper on a relatively high journalistic plane. The

5. Extremist Socialist Revolutionaries.

6. The Ukapisty (Ukrainian Communist Party) evolved from the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party.

7. For this and other special terms, see the Glossary, p. 70.

Ukrainian section was edited by members of the local intelligentsia. For a short time the Borot'bisty in the town were able to publish their own newspaper. Later, when the Borot'bisty were merged in the Ukrainian Communist Party, the joint organ became the only official publication of the town. It was published in Ukrainian and edited by a former Borot'bist, a country schoolteacher who had been an officer in the war. He replaced the Russian editor, a Jew who had been graduated from the local gymnasium.

Thus at the central or guberniya level in this area there were now only two newspapers: that of the central Party and government authorities published daily, and a semiweekly intended for the villages. In addition there was usually a newspaper published in each povit center. The pattern of two newspapers for the guberniya and one for each povit was typical of the other guberniyas in the Ukraine.

In 1920 I joined the staff of the Ukrainian-language newspaper Selyans'ka bidnota [The Village Poor], the organ of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee in Kharkov. The newspaper was published several times a week. There were three persons on the editorial staff. Mykhaylo Yalovyi was the editor, a former Borot'bist, a former student of medicine and a writer. He was intelligent and gifted, a good newspaperman and a brilliant agitator for the rural reader. Second was Mykhaylo Semenko, leader of the Ukrainian school of futurist poets. Among other things he wrote futurist poems for the village newspaper about the need for defeating Wrangel, the last leader of the White forces. Although quite young and inexperienced I was listed as the managing editor, and my chief duty was delivering copy to the printshop on time. I also helped the editor in his general duties, but the whole job took very little time, for the newspaper was composed of only two small pages.

In general Soviet newspapers of the Civil War were produced either by persons who had been professional journalists in tsarist days or by people like myself who became journalists by working for newspapers during and immediately following the Revolution. The newspapers published material written by their regular office staff almost exclusively, and there were no reports from outlying areas. Some prominent political figure might write articles, however, and occasionally articles from other newspapers were reprinted.

The Party and the Soviet regime influenced ideological supervision of the newspapers primarily through the selection and appointments of editors who were already trained and

tested Party propagandists. Every editor was either a member of the Party or of a government administrative agency, or was close to those organizations and attended their meetings. The editors received copies of the minutes of meetings at which important political resolutions were adopted, especially those which assigned special tasks to the press, such as the publicizing of ordinances on taxing the peasants in grain and other commodities or resolutions on the struggle against desertion.

The principal workers in the editorial offices during the Civil War period were people with prerevolutionary literary training. The way in which they worked differed little from prerevolutionary methods. Sensational and eye-catching items were frequently sought after with resulting irresponsibility and unreliability in reporting. For example, a story circulated at that time about the newspaper Odesskiye izvestiya [Odessa News], which had a large number of journalists from the old school. Khristian Rakovski, a high official of the Ukrainian Republic government, was supposed to arrive in Odessa in 1920 and speak at a meeting of the city soviet on the international situation. Relations between the Soviet government and Rumania were strained at that time, and Rakovski's speech in Odessa, near the Rumanian border, had been specially arranged. The meeting of the Odessa Soviet was scheduled to begin at 6 p.m., but Rakovski had not arrived by that time. Without waiting for Rakovski to appear, a reporter filed a story stating that Rakovski had delivered a major speech on the international situation in which he stressed the mutual relations of the Soviet republics and Rumania. These relations were characterized by the writer in the spirit of previous statements by the Soviet government with regard to Rumania. The story was printed in the newspaper the following day, even though Rakovski had not reached Odessa and had not given the speech.

Delivery of newspapers was difficult, for railroad service was badly disrupted during this period--a train trip that normally took twelve hours, for example, took two to three days. Moreover, there was no bulk mail service. Our newspaper went to various agitation centers, which in turn sent out copies by special persons to outlying areas. One such center was the agitation train of Grigori Petrovski, chairman of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee.

It was a period of widespread economic destruction, and Kharkov was without fuel, food or streetcars. The people cut down the woods around the city, rooted out stumps and tried to keep warm with small stoves. Our editorial offices, together with those of the government paper Visti VUTsVK [News

of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee], were on Sumy Street, the main street, which had been renamed Karl Liebknecht Street. We occupied the building of the former newspaper Yuzhnyi krai [Southern Land]. The printshop was also situated there. The elegant building, which had once had a central heating system, was now cluttered up with a mass of makeshift stoves fed with wood or coal. In the printshop the resourceful linotype operators had adapted coal stoves instead of electric ones for heating the lead.

The paper used in newspapers at that time was extremely varied. Some issues came out on ordinary newsprint, others on brown or blue wrapping paper, and some on the coarse paper used for book covers. Paper stocks went primarily to the printshops, which used them first of all for newspapers and propaganda material. Because paper supplies were limited they were used sparingly, and a newspaper was used by the people not only for reading matter but for many other things as well.

We received our pay every Saturday (a carry-over from the Yuzhnyi krai era). Probably I received no less than the editor because I wrote extensively. My pay was several million rubles in paper money, which I immediately spent for a few dozen cigarettes. I received some supplementary wages which also totaled millions of rubles, but there was no trade in the city and no place to spend the money, with the possible exception of the Blagbaz (Blagoveshchensk Bazaar), where a month's pay would buy a pound of Crimean tobacco or some food. The bazaar was illegal and was always being broken up by the militia, which confiscated the wares of both sellers and purchasers and sometimes even rounded people up to do various types of forced labor. Nevertheless, an hour or so after such a dispersal people would always gather again.

I lived on Pushkin Street in an apartment abandoned by the "bourgeoisie" when they fled with the White armies. There were three others like myself in the room. At first we had no beds or bedding and for a long time slept on the floor. We dressed in whatever we happened to own. Cold weather would have been a particular hardship on me had it not been for the fact that when our editorial offices obtained two new half-length coats the editor gave one of them to me. It was a quilted jacket made of some kind of cheap cotton cloth the color of an army coat, but for me it was a great treasure.

At the same time that I worked in the editorial offices I studied at the Academy of Theoretical Knowledge, as the university was called in those days. Lectures there were

given under the same conditions--with makeshift stoves in the auditoriums, and with hungry professors and students.

These were the conditions under which the press existed during the period of War Communism. But all of us who created it were young, full of the joy of living and full of faith in the wonderful future which we felt would certainly follow the Revolution.

II. THE NEP

General Conditions

At the end of 1920 I left Kharkov and moved to the Donets Basin where I engaged in periodical publication work. I did not go back to newspaper work until the end of 1921, when I returned to Kharkov and resumed my studies. Then I went to work in the same building on Karl Liebknecht Street, but no longer for a village newspaper. This time I was hired as night editor for the government daily Visti VUTsVK. Actually there was little work for me to do; the position had been created for me by Vasyl' Ellans'kyi (Blakytnyi), the editor-in-chief, in order to provide some kind of salary. I was soon transferred to day work, again to a job specially created for me--I was supposed to proofread the latest issues of the paper. In addition I was listed as a reporter and was issued credentials for interviewing important state figures. For some reason, however, the newspaper was no longer interested in such interviews.

Working day and night in the editorial offices I had a good opportunity to view a newspaper under NEP conditions. These conditions were entirely different from those of the preceding period. The war was over and the Party had announced a "bond" between the cities and villages, the proletariat and the peasantry. Instead of dispersing the bazaars, free trade was allowed, and in place of the slogan "death to speculators" Lenin launched the slogan "learn to trade!" Trade flourished, and social and economic contrasts developed as a result. The country as a whole was still in ruins, hungry and weak, and because of the fantastic volumes of paper money being printed and the extreme shortage of goods, the value of the currency continued its precipitous decline. We no longer received our pay from the editorial offices in millions but in billions of rubles--my first pay envelope contained 3,230,730,000 rubles. But in spite of the fact that my three billion rubles would scarcely buy anything, the working people now appeared to be more prosperous than during the period of War Communism.

The editorial offices also operated under better conditions. True, their quarters were still heated by makeshift stoves and people sat in coats, but the newspaper now came out on white paper and was distributed by mail over the railroads.

While the newspapers of the NEP period were similar to those of the old regime in outward appearance, there was a vital change in their content. Although the newspapers remained primarily agitational in nature their emphasis shifted from "fronts" and "struggles" to a simpler support of the new ways of life that followed War Communism. Instead of fiery articles calling people to arms or visions of the distant future, the newspaper turned to concerns of the present. Articles on topics of the day, sketches, local reports, feuilletons, court and criminal reports appeared. Beginning in 1922 Ostap Vyshnya, one of the most popular Soviet writers of feuilletons dealing with the darker sides of Soviet life, developed his style under the newspaper Visti VUTsVK.

In time this and other newspapers began to publish sketches of new developments in the Soviet countryside, contrasting the new with vestiges of the old, noting, for example, the presence of an orphanage, sanatorium or commune on what had once been a wealthy landowner's estate, or noting how several families were building a new way of life in an agricultural commune.

Naturally the newspapers abounded in recollections of the Civil War, but the all-too-unattractive reality of War Communism was now idealized: there had been neither Nepmen nor homeless waifs during the Civil War period, and all roads had led to a wonderful future, to the "commune just over the horizon." Romanticism became the fashion and flight from every-day life became universal. Even writers hostile to the Soviet regime wrote extensively of the past, especially the Civil War period. It should be noted, however, that each writer described this past in his own way. Complete freedom for the writers reigned in belles-lettres at that time as long as the writer did not overstep the boundary between literature and politics.

Effects of Party Control

The content of most Soviet newspapers, even during their best period, the NEP, was entirely different from that of the competitive press of the west. A number of influences

1. This term was applied to those who resumed commercial trading operations in the early 1920's. Although they were instrumental in reviving economic activity, many people regarded them as profiteers.

caused the press to be weak by western standards. One was Party control which, although relatively mild compared to that of a later period, nevertheless left its mark. It was reflected first of all in the fact that the Soviet newspaper never took the stand of impartial observer but rather continued to be primarily interested in agitation for the success of the various goals of the Party and government. This tendency was evident not only in simple sketches of life but even in articles describing daily events. Furthermore, the agitation was based not on facts but on exhortation and threats of coercion, notwithstanding the fact that Zhurnalists [Journalists], the Moscow-published organ for Soviet newspapermen, maintained that the best agitation was that which is based on facts. Zhurnalists cited interesting examples from the Western press, in which by mere reporting of the facts the newspaper agitated more effectively than if it had resorted to noisy threats in editorials.

There was another aspect of Party control which weakened the press during this period. While the Communists were united among themselves with regard to the non-Party element on the newspaper staffs, differences within the Party were reflected in the editorial offices. The discussion on state and Party policy begun by Trotsky in 1923 won a large segment of the Party to his side, and although members did not wish the details of this discussion disclosed outside the Party, the Party press could not, of course, remain aloof from the discussion. In 1924 Trotsky's Lessons of October and his criticism of the Party apparatus were published, following which his opponents published statements of their views in the Party newspapers. In particular, Pravda printed a succession of anti-Trotsky articles and statements by Zinoviev, Bukharin, Kamenev, Stalin and others. The discussion dealt primarily with ideas and concepts, and a "conspiracy of silence" on the part of all Communists continued to exist in regard to facts. For example, the press never printed anything about the conference held in Moscow by commissars of Red Army divisions who demanded of Trotsky that he seize power and who promised to support him.² Trotsky was defeated in this dispute largely because Stalin was able to line up the entire Party apparatus against him. Stalin presented the case as if the struggle against Trotsky involved not only his ideological opponents but the entire Party as well--especially its machinery and press. People who worked on the Party committees and newspapers, regardless of their personal convictions,

2. See Reswick, William, I Dreamt Revolution, Chicago, Henry Regnery Co., 1952, pp. 59-60, 69, 165.

faced dismissal unless they combated "Trotskyism." And if an editor took a clear stand in support of the "opposition" he was often dismissed. Such, for example, was the fate of Kurs, the editor of the newspaper Sovetskaya Sibir [Soviet Siberia].

There were also cases in which individual newspapermen cooperated with the opposition in a manner difficult for the editor to detect. For example, a member of the staff of Kommunist, the organ of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, helped an unemployed Trotskyite by placing in the newspapers his articles stressing the low earnings of Soviet workers (a feature of Trotsky's argument). Similar cases occurred in Odessa.

There was no opportunity for ideological and political deviation on the part of Soviet newspapers from the general Party line other than that just described. Hence the Party did not need to direct the press beyond selecting editors. The Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee handled this selection for the Ukraine. Later, at the end of the 1920's, the sub-department for the press under the Propaganda and Agitation Department was reorganized as an independent department. Editors which it selected had to be approved by the Organizational Bureau of the Central Committee. The formation of a separate press department under the Central Committee signified increased supervision of the press by the Party apparatus. Such a move was completely understandable because the struggle between the intra-Party factions became intensified towards the end of the 1920's, and those in control of the Party apparatus were consolidating their position.

Effects of Government Control

Government control was carried out through the Central Press Administration of the Ukrainian Republic People's Commissariat of Education. Later this body was called the Main Administration for Literary Affairs and Publishing or the Ukrainian Administration for Literary Affairs and Publishing. In the outlying areas its branches were designated administrations. Without the signatures of these censors nothing could be printed. Every newspaper had to carry a line at the bottom of the page giving its authorization number. Editors were more directly responsible and influential in the publishing of the papers than the censors, however, so that control by the administration was only formal. The editorial office simply inserted a routine censorship number at the bottom of the page. Sometimes, it is true, the heads of the

administration tried to exert their authority, but in general they were content to exercise only formal control, feeling that any serious errors would be charged to the editors rather than to them.

By the end of the 1920's the press began to receive directives concerning the type of information which could be printed. In 1929, for example, the newspaper *Kommunist*, which received economic reports from RATAU (Ukrainian Radio Telegraphic Agency), began to receive instructions on handling the releases--for example, prohibiting any mention of Soviet grain exports. These instructions were usually concerned with economic matters, and were sometimes given in the body of the text of a release. They were unsigned, so that it was impossible to know who had originated them. It was certain, at any rate, that they were issued not by the Party but by the government--probably by the People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade through the Main Administration for Literary Affairs and Publishing. These were the first portents of bureaucratic control of the press. Later this control spread, though not necessarily through written instructions. It was carried out by various methods, especially through the so-called "Review of the Press" departments in the newspapers, in which a higher-echelon newspaper (such as an oblast newspaper) would publish a critical review of a lower (raion) newspaper. This was called "Bolshevik guidance of the press" in the language of the Party officials.

An interesting manifestation of growing control of the press was the disappearance in the early 1930's of newspaper advertising. During the NEP period both advertisements and private notices appeared regularly. Newspaper advertisements were solicited from the trade organizations by special agents of the publishing houses on a commission basis. The agents were often resourceful individuals who managed to cheat both the publishing houses and the trade organizations. The new emphasis on the development of heavy industry under the First Five-Year Plan and the concomitant scarcity of consumer goods meant the end of the need for advertising by the trade organizations. Private announcements in the press continued for some time, however. People announced lost articles, changes of name, inquiries, the death of relatives, etc. Editorial offices were not responsible for the content of such announcements. Naturally, the editors were not completely indifferent to advertisements and announcements printed in their paper, and as a rule they did not allow material to be printed which detracted from the rather severe tone of the Communist press in general. For example, such things as wedding announcements were considered banal in official Soviet opinion, and as such were not printed.

In the early 1930's, however, private announcements attracted the attention of the GPU and eventually they disappeared from the Soviet press entirely. The GPU, it seems, feared that opposition groups might make use of innocuous-looking "private" announcements to communicate encoded directives to their members.

Another aspect of government control was the monopoly of foreign and domestic news. The provincial press received news of the rest of the country and the outside world through TASS (Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union) and RATAU. At the beginning of the NEP period both TASS and the Soviet newspapers' own foreign correspondents abroad supplied international news. In the 1920's the Moscow newspapers were not the only ones allowed to have their own foreign correspondents. For example, the Ukrainian newspapers had correspondents in European capitals. In 1929, however, the newspapers of Kharkov, the capital, no longer had their own foreign correspondents. The reason was not so much political as financial: the People's Commissariat of Finance stopped issuing the newspapers foreign currency for maintaining foreign correspondents. At that time the yearly foreign currency deficit in the U.S.S.R. was very large. The state needed large sums for industrial imports and currency allocations for the press were cut. *Vecherniye izvestiya* [Evening News] in Odessa continued for a time to have its own correspondent in Berlin. This was made possible by an arrangement whereby his fees were paid in Soviet currency to his parents who still resided in Odessa. Later political reasons undoubtedly were the prime cause of the elimination of all foreign correspondents except those of *Pravda* and *Izvestiya*.

Even the correspondents who remained abroad stopped supplying original reports; thus TASS became a monopoly for foreign news. The foreign correspondents could only enlarge upon TASS reports and later could supply political sketches from the areas where they were stationed. But they could not file original reports which might contradict those supplied by TASS; they merely supplemented them. This is no accident. Even at the end of the 1920's Soviet journalists were aware that foreign news was carefully censored by TASS in Moscow and everyone knew of persons who had lost their jobs as TASS reporters because they had filed certain reports improperly.

Thus foreign reports were strictly censored even in the late 1920's. It was just at this period that sales of foreign newspapers were stopped in the U.S.S.R. The theory apparently was that foreign correspondents would report on all newsworthy subjects to Moscow, where the censors would edit the material for domestic distribution. But in the 1930's,

especially during the period when Yezhov was head of the NKVD (1937-1938), correspondents were extremely hesitant to report on everything, for fear some information would be regarded as "counterrevolutionary." Authentic information could only come through the channels of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. TASS had to engage in propaganda even in handling foreign reports.

Kharkov newspapers obtained all their foreign and domestic news through RATAU. In the capital RATAU had a special machine which received all foreign and domestic (Soviet) news from TASS in Moscow. RATAU retyped this material, added its own news for the Ukraine and sent it out to all Kharkov newspapers. The situation was different with regard to news services for the more outlying newspapers. Odessa, for example, received TASS material by radio. Special radio technicians worked in the editorial offices and both TASS and RATAU had special hours for radio broadcasts. Later there were special broadcasts for district papers. This system exists even now, although the broadcasts are now differentiated and controlled even more carefully.

In addition to current news RATAU supplied the provincial press with sketches and literary articles. It issued regular installments of various types of material from which the provincial newspapers could reprint reports, stories and novelettes, poems and other material. The material was written especially for such publications and could not be printed elsewhere first. It could, however, be reprinted from the RATAU collections by several newspapers at the same time. It was for this reason that only the district newspapers in remote rural regions used such collections. Newspapers of such provincial centers as Poltava, Zhitomir or Kremenchug preferred to print original material rather than material carried in other newspapers.

Reporting

Another cause of weakness of the Soviet press during the NEP period was the lack of competent reporting. There were three basic reasons for this situation. First, it was imprudent for a reporter to search for news, since its possession might prove dangerous. Guarded facts were often political facts, the handling of which required great care if one were not to be suspected of anti-Party or anti-government bias. Furthermore, there was a separate department of Party news on each newspaper staffed by Party members which had exclusive rights in determining what should be known about the

Party. As a rule practically all events of importance within the Party were kept from the public eye.

A second cause of weak reporting was that the influential Party department on each newspaper considered its task to be serving not the reader but the Party apparatus from which it received its orders. The members of this department often looked with scorn on their colleagues in other departments even though the latter were usually far better journalists. News as such was of little interest to the Party departments unless it could serve their current agitation-line. They reported not the true situation, but rather what they wished the situation to be, citing facts only to illustrate their didactic commentaries.

A third reason for the weak state of reporting was that most of the practicing journalists lacked special training. Such training did not exist in tsarist Russia, while the Soviet schools had not yet reached the point where they could train their own journalists. The education of journalists during the NEP was extremely varied, but for the most part none of them had completed their higher education. They were people who had gone into journalism from other fields with a gymnasium education or, at most, some courses at a university. Some combined the practice of journalism with studies in a higher school. There was a case in Kharkov in which an experienced reporter who was simultaneously studying law left journalism upon graduation from law school and began to work as a lawyer at a lower salary. At another time he might have stayed in journalism, but during the period under discussion newspaper reporting offered little intellectual interest, while editorial work paid badly and was reserved primarily for members of the Party.

As a young newspaperman working under these conditions I was particularly impressed by a story told by a prerevolutionary journalist Velichko (a pseudonym, I believe), who used to write on foreign affairs for Visti VUTsVK. He told a group of us young journalists that in 1915, when he was diplomatic correspondent for the St. Petersburg newspaper Birzheviye vedomosti [Stock Exchange News], he chanced to meet a secretary of the American Embassy in a restaurant. While having a drink with the secretary he learned that a peace proposal was apparently going to be put forth by the United States. When he returned home at three in the morning he went to bed but could not get to sleep, wondering what was really happening. Finally he had an idea and telephoned the embassy secretary: "Listen, I'm going to file a story about President Wilson's note for tomorrow's paper." The secretary

answered, "My God, don't rush things like that. Minister Izvolsky hasn't received the note yet." The next day Birzheviye vedomosti carried the banner headline "U.S. President Wilson Proposes Peace to Warring Powers." The newspaper sold an extra hundred thousand copies that day.

We Soviet journalists had never experienced anything like that. Such an episode was something from the exotic past for us.

In contrast to such news coverage, the non-Party journalists of the NEP period, especially the reporters, simply tried to write what their Communist superiors demanded of them. They rapidly lost interest in competing for news and even agreed not to compete. They were encouraged in this attitude by the view of the Communist editors that competition was evil in itself, a vestige of bourgeois journalism. To the non-Party reporters the Communist directors of the newspapers left the very modest and uninteresting role of providing government and local news. In this atmosphere a feeling of solidarity and a need for agreement soon arose. In Kharkov, for example, a "reporters' trust" was formed. The trust was conceived when reporters from various Kharkov newspapers ceased to look on themselves as competitors for news. It soon adopted specialization of labor. The reporters allotted "spheres of influence" among themselves: one would get information from the People's Commissariat of Education, another from the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection or the cooperatives, a third from the Procurator's office, and so on. When all the information was shared at the end of the day each reporter had competently gathered material from all aspects of public life.

When published the material supplied by members of the "trust" varied only in the manner in which it was presented in the various newspapers. The editors cared little whether Kommunist carried the same reports as Kharkivs'kyi proletar [Kharkov Proletarian], for the expenses of the newspaper or the profits of the publishing house did not depend on originality of treatment. The editors were held responsible only for the political line of their papers. Ordinarily they were also interested in seeing that the newspapers were readable and interesting, but improvements in the newspapers' contents were not regarded as part of the task of reporting the news. Newspapers could be improved by the inclusion of feuilletons, articles, sketches, cartoons, and theater reviews. Even court reports sometimes had value as psychological sketches. News as such, however, continued to decrease in importance and with it the job of the reporter. Toward the end of the NEP period

the task of supplying information from state and public life passed from the reporters to RATAU, which had previously supplied information only from the provinces.

The agitational orientation of Soviet newspapers and their loss of interest in strictly informative material resulted in the situation that many extremely interesting events and phenomena in Soviet life were not covered in the newspapers. Thus, for example, the newspapers completely overlooked such an interesting development as the re-emergence of the private sector of the economy, especially the markets. Young reporters for the most part avoided the subject of "Nepmen" and restricted themselves to mentioning it only in exposures and in charges made in feuilletons. In 1924, for example, a trust³ in Kharkov disposed of valuable stocks and a private broker who negotiated the transfer with another trust received thousands of rubles' worth of provisions in payment. The operation was entirely unnecessary: to bring two trusts together did not require any such payment. The broker was tried and condemned to be shot, but the press only carried warnings to the "Nepmen" should similar situations arise in the future. There was no dispassionate analysis of the situation, no objective description of the persons involved, and no real economic conclusions. Such conclusions were, of course, drawn by economic agencies but not in the press and not with the help of the public. Press coverage of this type may be attributed not only to the antagonism felt by the Party for the "petty bourgeois" element, but perhaps also to the fact that it was a period when the new Soviet government was dealing with critical situations daily. Perhaps all of us were too concerned with the immediate problems to have the necessary perspective to determine what was significant in the way of news and what was not.

So-called market committees or associations of private merchants in the bazaars existed in the large cities during the NEP period. They were formed to help the financial inspectors collect taxes from the merchants, but they also functioned as a kind of protective society for the "Nepmen," whose civil rights were limited. Some people considered these associations dangerous to the government; if so, they should have been carefully described and analyzed in the press. Actually, however, the press ignored them. The editors turned away because they did not realize the need for

3. State industrial enterprises were grouped in trusts which, unlike the individual factories, were considered juridical persons.

studying the phenomenon, and the reporters overlooked it because they were afraid of becoming involved even by simply reporting the situation.

Worker and Peasant Correspondents

A prominent feature of the Soviet press during the early 1920's was the worker and peasant correspondent movement which played an unusually important role in Soviet political, economic and cultural life. Essentially the movement was an attempt to bring the press into intimate contact with the masses so as to enable it, as an instrument of Party and government policy, to influence and reflect public opinion more effectively.

In every country, probably, the press receives complaints from its readers about the irregularities, injustices and oppression they suffer at the hands of the administration or of influential individuals, together with requests for help or advice. Such correspondence was common during the NEP. During this period, the Party instructed the press to seek out and expose shortcomings in the state administrative apparatus, and the Soviet press began almost instinctively to use complaints from readers for this purpose. At the same time the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection received instructions to investigate complaints in the newspapers, and the Procurator's office was also drawn into the matter. Departments called "Follow-ups on Correspondents' Reports" appeared in the newspapers in which such matters were reported as the reprimand, dismissal or trial of negligent bureaucrats to whom attention had been called by readers' letters. Readers saw that their reports were playing an important role, and a flood of letters streamed into the newspapers. Among the letter writers were special "complainers" about public affairs, people who began to write regularly to the newspapers and who thus became fairly regular correspondents. They were called rabkor (abbreviation for "worker correspondent") or sel'kor (abbreviation for "peasant correspondent"). Every newspaper during the NEP period had a network of such local correspondents who increased in number as the newspaper paid more attention to their reports. (Another reason for the popularity of the movement, it should be noted, was the fact that the volunteers were paid for their contributions.) In fact, local reports were so important at times that the work of the newspaper correspondent became unsafe. The exposers of wrongs and abuses became very unpopular with those exposed. Some correspondents were harassed, others were attacked, and some were even murdered. Such murders became so frequent that there was a satirical verse sung

on the Soviet stage about the subject:

"What is written with a pen
Cannot be hacked away with an ax.
[Nevertheless] a sel'kor wrote with a pen
And was hacked to death with an ax."

One such murder was that of Hryhori Malynovs'kyi, a peasant correspondent for the newspaper Chervonyi Mykolayiv [Red Nikolayev]. Malynovs'kyi, who had written several articles exposing administrative abuses in the village of Dymovka, was killed by a group headed by the secretary of the Party cell, Popandopulo, and including the head of the village soviet and two militiamen. During the trial the defendant Popandopulo maintained that Malynovs'kyi had been a kulak and a member of a "Petlyura band," while the state made a similar charge about the defendant.

On the surface it would seem that in sending in "exposés" of the secretary of a Communist cell, the head of the village soviet, and other locally prominent officials, Malynovs'kyi was attacking the Party and government leadership in the village. But this obviously was not the case, for he was in fact seeking correction of abuses through an accepted medium. Popandopulo and his adherents, however, took an entirely different view of the matter. They considered themselves the victors in the Civil War and viewed their actions in the village as the continuation of what they had done at the front. They regarded Malynovs'kyi as a defender of kulaks and the printing of his reports in a Soviet newspaper as a gross error, the use of a Communist medium of expression against Communism by a "class enemy." The public prosecutor at the trial, Sosnovski, wrote a pamphlet after the trial in which he pictured Popandopulo as a crude and fanatical adherent of Bolshevik Party loyalty, as that word was interpreted in the period of War Communism. Trotsky wrote an effective article on the case in the press in which he spoke out against "criminal plotters" who had "lost contact with the people" and had as a result actually oppressed the people of the villages.

The Malynovs'kyi trial showed that the worker and peasant correspondents, particularly the latter (because there were more administrative abuses in the villages) were by the very course of events pitted against the Bolshevik administration and placed on the side of those who suffered, a group which was composed primarily of the strata of the population which were most prosperous and in general most hostile to the Soviet regime. A curious result of this

situation was the penetration of members of these strata into the peasant correspondent movement. Hence it was claimed that the "kulaks" were infiltrating the peasant correspondent movement in order to compromise Party and Soviet officials through the medium of the press. Perhaps it was for this reason that most of the peasant correspondents used pseudonyms which the editorial offices were not allowed to reveal. Letters from village correspondents would evoke a response from the administration, which would often write that such an article was not true, that it was kulak slander. The editorial offices would check on the article through the workers' and peasants' inspection system and sometimes through the Procurator's office. If it were found that the report was false the newspaper would no longer publish articles by that particular peasant correspondent, and if his article was malicious slander he might even be brought to trial.

In general it is true that many of the peasant correspondents were persons from strata of the population which were hostile to the Soviet regime. The participation of these persons in the peasant correspondent movement, however, probably had positive value for the Party and government. Hostile correspondents were diligent complainers about administrative abuses and therefore served best to correct abuses which would weaken the regime.

The Evening Newspaper

There was one type of Soviet newspaper in which news as such continued to have a dominant place--the evening newspaper. Such newspapers existed in Moscow and Leningrad, and perhaps in Tbilisi and Rostov. They were also to be found in the three largest cities of the Ukraine: in Kharkov it was Vechirnye radio [Evening Radio], in Kiev Vechirni Kiyiv [Evening Kiev] and in Odessa Vecherniye izvestiya [Evening News]. Such papers existed in those places where newspaper standards had been relatively high even before the Revolution. They were, and perhaps still are, the only newspapers in the U.S.S.R. affected to a minimum degree by Party action, i.e., subordination to the aims of Party propaganda. And precisely because they encouraged the hunt for news, the evening newspapers were the most readable. They were the only ones which did not require a subsidy (although they often received one) and which even made profits for their publishers; they paid the best wages to their staffs, which were primarily made up of reporters.

The evening newspaper was not a creation of the Party but a concession by the Party to the people. In general,

although no one regarded these papers as a serious contribution to culture, because of the considerable amount of light material they printed, and although Party leaders officially scorned them, their disappearance from the social scene would have been considered by all as an irreparable loss. Despite numerous attacks by Party ascetics on the evening newspapers, which were never met with logical counter-arguments, they were never abolished. "Opportunism" obviously gained the upper hand over Party principles in this matter, and Odessans, including Party members, held firm for their evening newspaper.

Odessa's Vecherniye izvestiya had unique features of its own, just as has Odessa itself. The city had once been the liveliest port in Russia, with strong international ties. Many Odessans, mainly Jews, had gone out to all parts of the globe--to New York, Palestine, Argentina, Europe, Africa, Australia, Asia. Yet Odessans, no matter where they are, remain Odessans all their lives. This patriotic feeling found expression first of all in the fact that the world over they were regular subscribers to Odesskiye izvestiya. When in the late 1920's the language in which Odesskiye izvestiya was published was changed from Russian to Ukrainian and emphasis shifted from reporting of social to political news, practically all Odessans abroad switched to Vecherniye izvestiya. They were not so much interested in political news as in the minute details of Odessa life: well-known streets, shops, and the names in announcements and ordinary news items. Subscriptions were received in all the currencies of the world. It was the only newspaper in the U.S.S.R. which brought the state more foreign currency than Moscow's Pravda and Izvestiya. And the Odessa citizens in charge of Vecherniye izvestiya felt their duty to their countrymen throughout the world and deliberately wrote to appeal to their feelings for Odessa. For example, one could often find in Vecherniye izvestiya (and also, in the Ukrainian-language Chornomors'ka komuna [Black Sea Commune] death notices such as the following: "Housing Cooperative 1712 sadly announces the death of Ibram Isakovych Shapiro, the oldest resident in our building."

Because it was so well received by its readers, Vecherniye izvestiya was very strong financially. It had its own printshop with 350 employees, 60 of whom worked in the newspaper shop; the rest of the printshop carried out private printing orders (blank forms, questionnaires, ledgers, etc.). Such work was very profitable for the newspaper. In addition, it received subsidies issued under the regulations set forth by the Odessa Executive Committee and the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars. The editorial office

diligently collected these subsidies although it literally did not know what to do with the money. The master of the entire enterprise was not the publisher, as was the case before the Revolution and as is true today in the West, but the editor-in-chief. In general, the "publisher" (the publishing house) in the Soviet press is entirely subordinated to the editor of the newspaper, who himself controls and appoints the directors of the publishing houses. Only in the book publishing houses is the editor subordinate to the director of the publishing house. Even there, however, the editors are not selected by the director but by the Party Central Committee.

The head of the Izvestiya Publishing House asked the editor a number of times what he should do with the money. The amount of the surplus was the secret of the editorial offices, and here the Party and non-Party personnel of the editorial office were in complete agreement: nowhere did they announce that the editorial offices had large surplus funds running into the tens of thousands of rubles. From the present-day point of view this seems incredible: the state was in acute need of resources for rebuilding the economy while a Party agency had tens of thousands of idle rubles, a fact which was known even by the superior Party committee. But it was a time when enterprises still enjoyed autonomy and had not yet been placed under strict financial control. An enterprise with plenty of money was still considered a good enterprise. By 1931, however, I heard more than once the complaint of the non-Party director of the publishing house of an Odessa newspaper that it was no longer possible to draw editorial office funds freely from the bank account, that the bank now had control over the use of the money, etc. Thus the idle funds of the Odessa publishing house probably remained in the state's hands.

The publishing house planned to purchase several automobiles, a villa outside the city for staff members' vacations, and other things of this kind. These plans were never carried out, however. The only thing on which the editorial offices could use money sensibly was the payment of advances to writers and artists. For literary works (poems, stories, excerpts from novels, sketches, etc.), they would advance as much as 20,000 rubles.

Structure and Professional Orientation of Newspapers

The typical structure of most large daily Soviet newspapers in the 1920's was as follows. In charge was an editor-in-chief or responsible editor. He was often simply

called the editor, because Soviet newspapers do not have editors for special departments as do Western newspapers. Below the editor came the assistant editor and the managing editor. Outlying newspapers did not have a special assistant editor, the job being handled by the managing editor. The editor wrote most of the editorials and other articles, approved and sometimes copyread articles sent into the editorial offices, read the galleys of proofs, issued assignments to the departments, and represented the newspaper in dealing with Party and government institutions. Usually the editor was a member of the institution of which the paper was the organ. Thus, Vasyl' Ellans'kyi, the editor of Visti VUTsVK, was a member of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee, while Kommunist was edited by one of the members of the Politburo of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Lifshits, the editor of Robitnycha hazeta proletar [Proletarian Workers' Gazette], was a member of the All-Ukrainian Council of Trade Unions, the organization for which this newspaper was the official organ.

It was the assistant editor of the newspaper who actually managed the newspaper. He wrote editorials and other articles, read copy on articles sent to the editorial office, managed the departments, and set the fees paid for material. The managing editor helped the assistant editor, took care of distribution and dealt with the printshop, delivering copy and obtaining the galleys in return. For the latter task he had a fulltime messenger. The managing editor was the main administrator of the editorial offices--he handled personnel problems, supervised the women linotype operators in the printshop, and was in charge of stylistic editing. He was always the most overworked person on the staff; in large editorial offices he had an assistant who was called either the technical manager or the office manager. This assistant relieved the managing editor of administrative and technical duties so that he could devote more time to strictly editorial work.

Next came the heads of the departments. The international news department during the NEP period and even during collectivization was usually headed by a non-Party journalist, because a knowledge of foreign languages was required and Party journalists who knew foreign languages went into more responsible diplomatic work. Later, when TASS began to monopolize and retain exclusive rights to all foreign news, and when articles on foreign news were supplied by professional writers in such agencies as the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, the Comintern, the foreign departments of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Central Council of

Trade Unions, or the NKVD, knowledge of foreign languages ceased to be necessary even on Pravda's staff. The Party department of the newspaper played an important role only in Party newspapers during the NEP period, and even then occupied second place in terms of the amount of material it actually published. The economics department provided news and articles on economics. Later, after the NEP period, a separate agricultural department was formed, and the economics department became the department of industry and transportation. The department of culture and the arts prepared reviews of theater productions and motion pictures, etc.

Considerable space was set aside for the local affairs department which published material on local life and life in the province. This department was the most apolitical of all, and was usually headed by a non-Party person who was an experienced journalist. Lastly, there was the correspondence department or, as it was later called, the worker and peasant correspondent department.

In the trade newspapers the division into departments and their importance differed according to the nature of the newspaper. Thus, for example, the largest department of the trade union organ was the working conditions department, while the economics newspaper Ukrains'kyi ekonomist [Ukrainian Economist], organ of the Ukrainian Supreme Council of National Economy, had separate departments for various branches of the economy such as industry, transportation and cooperatives.

Most Soviet newspapers during the NEP period were subsidized by the government. The editors' wages and bonuses were controlled, so that no one had any incentive to sell his services to the highest bidder. The editor and his assistant received the so-called Party maximum, i.e., the highest pay they were allowed to receive as Communists, regardless of the work they did. The maximum was originally 180 rubles a month; at the beginning of the 1930's it was 210 rubles. (One must not forget the gradual devaluation of the ruble.) Other staff members received from 140 to 210 rubles a month. In addition, the staff received fees for writing articles and reports. Selyans'ka pravda [Village Truth] paid not more than nine rubles for an editorial, while Visti VUTsVK and Kommunist paid fifteen. A reporter on a Kharkov newspaper might earn 400 rubles or more monthly during the 1920's, while the editor of a newspaper earned less. Furthermore, a special fee was levied by the Party on all Communists who received fees that exceeded the Party maximum.

In spite of the fact that the newspapers of the U.S.S.R. from the first years of the Soviet regime had a common political orientation, they began to assume specific characteristics in accord with their individual professional interests. The first such differentiation arose between the government and Party newspapers. Pravda was the organ of the Bolshevik Party after 1912, while Izvestiya from 1917 on was the organ of the Soviet government. This difference existed primarily in Moscow, however, for in outlying areas, especially the Ukraine, the main newspapers were the organs of both the soviets and the guberniya Party committees. This was true of Kiev's Proletars'ka pravda [Proletarian Truth], the Odeskiye izvestiya, the Kharkivs'kyi proletar, Dnepropetrovsk' Zorya [Star], and others.

Further differentiation of the press occurred when such trade union and workers' newspapers appeared as Trud [Labor] in Moscow and Robitnycha hazeta proletar in Kharkov. Peasant newspapers were established such as Bednota [The Poor] and Krest'yanskaya gazeta [Peasant Gazette] in Moscow and Selyans'ka pravda and Radyans'ke selo [Soviet Village] in Kharkov. Newspapers also appeared for young people. In Moscow there was Komsomol'skaya pravda [Young Communist League Truth] and in Kharkov Komsomolets' Ukraïny [Young Communist of the Ukraine]. For the Young Pioneers and Octoberists and for women workers there was Komunarka Ukraïny [Ukrainian Woman Communist] and for women peasants there was Selyanka Ukraïny [Woman Peasant of the Ukraine].

Newspapers of the various professions began to appear during the NEP period such as Uchytel'ska hazeta [Teacher's Newspaper], Pivdennyi hudok [Southern Whistle], the newspaper of the railwaymen, and the daily Ukrains'kyi ekonomist, local organ of the Supreme Soviet of National Economy (Moscow correspondingly had Ekonomicheskaya zhizn' [Economic Life]). There were even more trade magazines, for almost every trade union in the entire Ukraine had one in Kharkov, even though corresponding Moscow trade periodicals were also distributed in the Ukraine.

By the end of the NEP period each guberniya had at least three main newspapers. The organ of the soviet and the Party committee, which was actually the Party organ, was a daily. The newspaper published for the villages and the Komsomol newspaper were published semiweekly. In addition, the three largest cities of the Ukraine had evening newspapers; Kharkov, the capital of the Ukraine, had more newspapers than any other Ukrainian city.

"De-Russification" of the Newspapers

During the NEP period the Soviet government was confronted with the nationality problem. It was a time when the order of the day was retrenchment, the consolidation of positions won, and perhaps it is within this framework that one should consider various "freedoms" given to the minority nationality groups in the U.S.S.R. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that in the early 1920's the national groups were given "independence," as that word was understood in the rhetoric of the Party. Independence took various forms--political, economic and military--but one of its most evident manifestations was the cultural autonomy granted the minorities. For the press autonomy meant the publication of newspapers in the national language. The process which took place in the Ukraine (where it was called "Ukrainization" of the press), illustrates in a general way what was occurring in national areas throughout the Soviet Union.

The arrival of the Bolsheviks in any non-Russian area immediately after the Revolution inevitably bore the stamp of an occupation, for the local administration which had developed during the period of War Communism was replaced either by people sent direct from Moscow or by local people whose first loyalty was to Moscow. In the Ukraine the Bolshevik administration was usually hostile to any emphatic demonstration of local culture. Even those in power, who were products of the local culture usually dared not show any interest in its development for fear of being accused of "bourgeois nationalism." In the villages, newly created state institutions such as theaters or schools were inevitably basically Ukrainian institutions, simply because it would have been an impossible task at the time to have them otherwise. Not long after the Revolution, however, the Ukrainian population of the hitherto primarily Russian cities began to increase. At the same time the central government decided on a policy of encouraging the development of local cultures, provided they had a "proletarian content." The results of this policy had interesting implications for the Ukrainian press.

Even before the NEP all povit (raion) newspapers in the Ukraine, with the exception of those in the Donets Basin and other industrial centers, were published in Ukrainian. In the larger cities the press was in both languages. For example, in Kharkov in the early 1920's there was a Russian-language daily called Kommunist and a Ukrainian-language daily called Visti VUTsVK. In the guberniyas, the daily papers were published in Russian, while the newspapers for the

villages (published two or three times weekly) were in Ukrainian. Because of the shortage of Russian newspaper personnel in the Ukraine, however, some guberniya dailies, especially west of the Dnepr, shifted to Ukrainian before the NEP period. While the press of some cities became entirely Ukrainian in the late 1920's, Russian language papers such as Pravda and Izvestiya were always available.

In 1926 Kommunist changed to the Ukrainian language, as did the Kharkov newspapers Kharkovs'kii proletarii and Vechirnye radio. From 1926 to 1937, I believe, Kharkov did not have a single Russian-language newspaper. About the same time the Kiev newspapers Proletars'ka pravda and Vechirni Kiyiv became Ukrainized, leaving Kiev without Russian newspaper of its own. The Dnepropetrovsk newspaper Zvezda [Star, in Russian] became Zorya [Star, in Ukrainian]. In 1929 Odesskiye izvestiya began publication in Ukrainian, being renamed Chornomors'ka komuna.

These changes marked the completion of the process of Ukrainizing the press. The principle papers left in the Russian language were Priazovskii proletarii [Azov Proletarian] in Mariopol, Diktatura truda [Dictatorship of Labor] in Stalino, and Vecherniye izvestiya in Odessa. A few raion newspapers may also have been published in Russian in the Donets Basin.

Ukrainization of a newspaper involved the replacement of a considerable part of its editorial personnel. First, special announcements and original articles appeared which the authors themselves wrote in Ukrainian explaining to the readers the changes about to occur. Then translation bureaus were instituted in the editorial offices, called either language or literary editing offices (such offices, incidentally, exist in the Soviet press today). The main task of the language editor was to see that the material to be printed was grammatically correct. Usually these editors were good theoretical linguists who had been graduated from philological faculties and were either lecturers on language in the higher schools or were occupied in some phase of language study. Their work on the newspapers was usually mechanical and monotonous. Nevertheless, the editorial offices paid them amounts which they could never have received for research or teaching, for workers in these occupations were paid fixed wages, while the editorial offices paid many of its employees, including linguists, on a contract basis. For example, the head of the language editing offices of an Odessa newspaper from 1929 to 1931 received 250 rubles a month plus bonuses of about 150 rubles for articles, at a time when the managing editor of the newspaper received 210

rubles (the Party maximum).

While there was nothing to prevent the language editors from writing for publication, few of them did so. Sometimes in the interests of orthographic accuracy a language editor damaged the style of an article. The editorial offices had a rule that the last person to see copy before it was sent to the printshop was the language editor. Even if someone in the editorial offices protested, the language editors could overrule them, and in this they were supported by the Commissariat of Education. This arrangement was correct in the sense that no one in the editorial offices really knew the language (especially the orthography).

In Odessa in July, 1929, four newspapers were published: the daily Odesskiye izvestiya, changed in the autumn of that year to Chornomors'ka komuna; the village newspaper Chervone selo [Red Village], which was published three times a week in Ukrainian; the Komsomol newspaper Lenins'ka zmina [Leninist Generation], also published three times a week, in Ukrainian; and Vecherniye izvestiya, a Russian-language daily. All these periodicals were housed in the plant of the prerevolutionary newspaper Odesskiy listok [Odessa Leaflet] on Pushkin Street and had hired all personnel still left in Odessa from the prerevolutionary newspapers--the Listok, the Odesskiye novosti [Odessa News], the Yuzhnaya kopeika [Southern Kopeck], and others.

In addition, there was an illustrated supplement to Chornomors'ka komuna, the weekly and later tri-monthly Shkval [Squall] first published in Russian, then in Ukrainian. Following the example of the Moscow illustrated weekly Ogonyok [Little Flame], most of the large cities formed their own weeklies. Kiev had one called Globus [Globe, in Ukrainian], and Kharkov had its Vsesvit [Universe, in Ukrainian]. The illustrated weeklies contained photographs from international and domestic political, public and cultural life. Press mats were provided by the Pressfoto agency in Moscow. Most of them were used by the newspapers; the remainder went to Shkval. There were so many of them that the Odessa press was unable to use them all. Photographs from Odessa life were supplied by highly qualified Odessa news photographers who served not only the local Odessa press but Pressfoto as well. In addition to photographs, Shkval carried pictures and photomontages, often combined with the pictures, the work of the many local artists located in Odessa at that time. The illustrated weeklies also provided stories, novelettes, poems, art reports, and theater reviews with illustrations. The editors of Shkval tried to give the magazine as much of the Odessa flavor as possible. The unique feature

of Odessa was the sea, and hence the marine theme--in photographs, illustrations, stories, reports and poems--was never absent from the pages of Shkval. Even the very name of the newspaper was nautical. It reached a large number of Odessans abroad.

In late 1929 a discussion took place as to whether Ukrainian newspapers should be published by the same staff which published the Russian-language press or whether the staffs should also be Ukrainized. Ukrainization of the staffs would have had the practical effect of replacing not only non-Ukrainians with Ukrainians but native Odessans with people who came for the most part from the villages. This would have meant cutting off the newspaper from the urban population not only in language but socially as well. Only Odessans could write satisfactorily about city life in terms familiar to the readers. Nevertheless, even Vainov, the secretary of the Odessa Party committee, himself Jewish, advocated Ukrainization of the staffs. The most ardent advocates of this change, however, were the Ukrainian language editors. Perhaps they were struck by the mistakes made by hastily Ukrainized Odessans, and perhaps national feelings were also a factor. The Party people in charge of Ukrainization in Odessa--Samutin, Samulevych and others--also supported this view, and it prevailed in practice because there were few Ukrainian journalists in Odessa.

The newspaper Odesskiye izvestiya was already largely Ukrainized by late 1929. The editor had learned Ukrainian only the year before but was already writing editorials more or less freely in Ukrainian. Other local editorial personnel, for the most part older Odessa journalists whose training went back to the prerevolutionary period, also learned the language quickly.

One such old Odessa journalist was Diki, a poet then about forty years of age and a doctor by profession. He had been shell-shocked at the front during World War I and was considered an eccentric by the staff. His specialty was the satirical political poem, usually concerned with international events. When it came time to Ukrainize Odesskiye izvestiya completely and when Diki's political poems could no longer be printed in Russian, he left the staff. Because he was popular and had his own circle of readers in Odessa, however, the editorial offices did not want to lose him. Consequently the editor provided him with a little assistance and a great deal of encouragement, asking him to learn the Ukrainian language, even slowly, but at least to begin to write in that tongue. Several months passed and Diki

submitted a satirical poem on Austen Chamberlain, at that time a popular topic of discussion in the U.S.S.R. At the top of the poem were the words, "To the tune of 'Two Tramps Died of Odessa Booze.'" It was a brilliant piece of satirical writing, and only professionals could spot its linguistic imperfections. The tune to which the words were set was a song popular in Odessa at the time, and the poem was sung the next day from one end of Odessa to the other--in Ukrainian. After that Diki began to submit satires in verse regularly, and his Ukrainian steadily improved.

Many other examples could be cited of good correspondents of Russian newspapers staying on to work for the Ukrainian newspapers after Ukrainization. Velichko, the correspondent for Birzheviye vedomosti, for example, worked for Visti VUTsVK although I believe that he wrote his articles on international topics in Russian and that they were translated into Ukrainian. Yu. Zoloteryov, the popular feuilleton writer for Komunist, in Kharkov, also switched to Ukrainian, as did the well-known writer on economics in Kharkov, P. Zhyvotinski, who headed the economics department of Komunist. Many lesser-known reporters and editorial workers in Kharkov, Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk and the Donets Basin also switched to Ukrainian.

There were those, however, who fled from Ukrainization. For example, Rafayilov, the managing editor of Odesskiye izvestiya, a mediocre journalist but a Party member, left Odessa. His departure was followed by that of Fokin, another managing editor of the same newspaper who was not a journalist at all but an outright Party administrator who had been given the job on the newspaper because he was physically disabled. Pavel Shubin, the assistant editor of the newspaper Komunist who had been a brilliant publicist in prerevolutionary St. Petersburg left Kharkov because of Ukrainization. He went to Moscow and worked for the Comintern, on the editorial staff of the magazine Kommunisticheskiy international [Communist International]. Agranovs'kyi, a young and promising feuilleton writer (a Party member) who later worked for Izvestiya, also left Kharkov for Moscow. Incidentally, Odessa journalists enjoyed a good reputation in Moscow and for this reason few of them had any trouble securing positions in their field. On the whole, few Russian journalists went to the R.S.F.S.R. to avoid Ukrainization--most of them stayed on to work on the Ukrainian press.

The process of Ukrainization was important also in its impact on the reader. In the 1920's the residents of the large Ukrainian cities generally preferred Russian

newspapers. In cities where Russian newspapers were no longer published subscriptions to Moscow's Pravda and Izvestiya increased. People were interested in local affairs, however, and could not find anything about them in the Moscow press so that they had to subscribe to the local Ukrainian newspapers. This action was the beginning of the Ukrainization of the readers. I witnessed the Ukrainization of one such reader, in Kharkov. I lived with the family of a local government official in which Russian was spoken, although everyone understood Ukrainian. The family was musical and sang mostly Ukrainian songs, and the head of the household liked to visit the Ukrainian theater. The newspaper which my landlord read regularly was the Khar'kovskii proletarii, which was Ukrainized after 1926 under the name Kharkivs'kyi proletar. When he read it he would look uncomfortable and make ironic comments about unintelligible Ukrainian expressions. Several times he showed outright disgust at the style employed, but nevertheless he became a regular reader of the paper after a few months.

Kharkivs'kyi proletar, and most other Ukrainian newspapers as well, were Ukrainian only in language. In everything else the newspapers were Communist with a Russian cultural slant. A reader could find considerably less of the national Ukrainian theme in them than he could of the Russian theme in Russian Communist newspapers. The Ukrainized newspapers of the Soviet period were very different from those published during the period of the Provisional Government when, in spite of the unaccustomed Ukrainian language, the Ukrainian reader found an emotional contact with the newspaper. Thus the readers of Ukrainian newspapers from 1917 to 1919 were vitally interested in what was said on the printed page, not the way it was said. During the period of Ukrainization of the press, on the other hand, readers adjusted to the new language without this emotional stimulus.

In view of these circumstances the fact that one Odessa newspaper increased its circulation from 80,000 to 120,000 in a year after Ukrainization (it served not only the city of Odessa but the entire southern Ukraine and Black Sea coast) must be attributed to an improvement in its quality, even in comparison with its Russian predecessor. This improvement took various forms. The number of photographs, cartoons and illustrations was increased. Odessa had many first-class artists and cartoonists; P. Vasil'yev, for example, the great artist for Pravda in Moscow, worked for an Odessa newspaper for thirty years. Half a dozen illustrations or cartoons appeared on every page. Then too, the editorial offices presented material in a lively and sometimes sensational manner,

under intriguing headings, so that readers looked for the unusual. Moreover, the newspaper carried regular sketches, feature articles, short stories, poems, etc. It also carried articles dealing with problems of the day (this was still possible at that time) as well as reviews and articles on subjects of special interest.

III. STALINIZATION OF THE SOVIET PRESS

End of the NEP

The end of the NEP and the start of industrialization and collectivization was a major turning point in Soviet history. It was also a turning point for the press, which was slowly transformed and isolated from its readers until it eventually reached the present state in which many Soviet citizens read only the last (fourth) page of a newspaper, the one containing the foreign news.

By the end of 1929 we Odessa journalists learned that seventy-four per cent of the peasant holdings around Odessa and in the entire southern Ukraine had already been collectivized. The most surprising thing, however, was that no one knew how this change had happened. Not a word had been said or written about it anywhere. The editor of *Chornomors'ka komuna* chanced to say to me that all kulaks had been deported from the entire Ukrainian steppe to the far north. He described the methods of this operation, which were supposed to illustrate the humane manner in which the Soviet regime dealt with its enemies. While there had been rumors of collectivization for several years, no one imagined that such a percentage of the households in the southern steppe would be parts of collective farms by the holiday on November 7.¹

Our unbelievable ignorance on this score can be explained to some extent by the administrative reorganization in the Ukraine in which okrugs were abolished and Kharkov, the capital, was brought into direct contact with the raions. As a city, Odessa was directly subordinate to Kharkov; hence Odessa at this time did not have its own hinterland and was thus divorced from village life and problems.

As for deportation of the kulaks to the north, official circles in Odessa were well informed because the head of the Odessa GPU, a member of the Odessa Party Committee, was also head of the GPU for the entire southern Ukraine and had jurisdiction over the defense of the Black Sea coast and the Rumanian border, as well as over all GPU heads in the rural districts of the steppe. It was the head of the GPU who carried out the deportation of the kulaks and informed the Odessa Party Committee about it. Nevertheless, the fact that the Odessa Party organization and its newspapers were cut off

1. In commemoration of the October Revolution of 1917.

from such important events as collectivization shows how quietly the action was carried out. This situation was soon reversed, however, when problems of collectivization became so great that lower Party organs and the press were called upon for aid.

Changes in Function and Content

The Odessa newspaper, as a city paper, did not immediately feel the radical about-face on the problems of collectivization experienced by the central Party and government newspapers. Collectivization, however, aggravated problems of industrialization, and the press was soon dragged headlong into production problems. From this time on the press became progressively less interesting to its readers; it became ever more cut off from the general life of society, ever more at the service of the state. It was just at this time that the press began to carry such clumsy slogans as "Mobilize the masses for fulfillment of industry finance plans." But Pravda's call to "mobilize the masses" was echoed by the lower-echelon press, including even newspapers which had no bureaucratic intermediaries between themselves and the "masses," for example, by field editions of Chornomors'ka komuna during the sowing campaign in the spring of 1930, which were published in the fields during sowing and were aimed directly at the collective farmers.

The year 1930 brought radical changes in both the content and the internal structure of Soviet newspapers. Until 1930 the format of a Soviet newspaper differed but little from that of the usual European newspaper or, for that matter, newspapers in prerevolutionary, tsarist times. Just as before the Revolution, the first page of a Soviet newspaper was devoted to international news; there always was an editorial on the left side of the first page, devoted to international or domestic topics. Sometimes, but not often, the first page contained some unusually important item of domestic news. The second and third pages contained feature articles on international and domestic topics. The newspaper always included a feuilleton, as well as a reportorial sketch and professional news reports from local areas. The last page contained local news, which was considered of secondary importance. Since 1930, however, international news in Soviet newspapers has been shifted from the first to the last page, with the evident intention of stressing the Bolsheviks' scorn for the "bourgeois world." But readers, including Party members, read the Soviet newspaper beginning with the last page. International events are still a deciding factor for the U.S.S.R. a situation that even Stalin was unable

to change.

Before 1930 the first page of the Soviet newspaper usually included a cartoon in the upper right corner, often on some international subject. Good Soviet newspapers carried court reports, written by expert journalists, some of whom became well-known writers (Leonid Andreyev is an example). Every good Soviet newspaper also had regular theater and motion picture reviews, sports chronicle and a chess and amusement department.

The economics department, staffed by professional writers on economics, was given a small space on the next-to-last or last page. No one would have thought of burdening the newspaper with dull reports on the manner in which a plant, mine or village was performing its normal production functions. The most that could interest the readers in the economic field was a report on important changes in the economy such as the construction of the Dnepr hydro-electric project. But even here the readers were not at all interested in the number of cubic meters of concrete poured on the project one day or the next. The most patriotic Soviet reader would be interested only in the general plans for the project, the changes it would bring about in the life of the area, its architecture, and the major achievements scored in carrying out the project. Finally, readers would have been interested in unusual events in the course of construction, such as accidents or casualties. The Soviet press, however, avoids any mention of such incidents.

Such a complete absence of genuine reporting leaves the readers open to imagination and rumor. For example, during the building of the Moscow subway there was a persistent rumor that as many as 140 workers a day were buried by cave-ins or drowned. One could not prove or disprove this rumor by reference to any newspaper.

Until the 1930's the Soviet newspapers published only material written by professional journalists; reports by worker and peasant correspondents were edited by the professional journalists. Other articles and reports were also carried, of course, but only when written by outstanding people in the fields concerned. For the most part it seemed that such people could not write well, and it was difficult and sometimes impossible to get articles from them. In such cases the editorial offices had to be content with interviews. In 1928, for example, the Kharkov newspaper Komunist arranged an interview with the agronomist Markevich, director of the Shervenko Machine and Tractor Station, the first MTS

in the U.S.S.R. (Markevich later became the head of the Tractor Center in Moscow; subsequently, however, he was shot as a "wrecker.")

Few outside contributors indicated their title at that time. Such by-lines as "Ukrainian Republic People's Commissar of Trade. . ." or the Pravda favorite "Secretary of the Province Party Committee. . .," or "Minister So-and-so," never appeared. The most that a newspaper would permit itself at that time was to carry such a by-line as "Prof. Orlov." Academic titles had been respected in the press even before the Revolution, and this was, so to speak, a tradition. Perhaps because the articles by the various ministers and province committee secretaries were now so completely uninteresting the editorial offices felt compelled to dress them up with the authors' titles.

In comparison with the press of the period of Stalinism perhaps the most typical feature of Soviet newspapers before 1930 was their relative independence of Party bodies. The editor, of course, was always appointed by the Party, and there was even a procedure whereby every appointment and dismissal of an editor in the Ukraine had to be approved by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The editors were actually suggested for their positions by the journalists' cell of the newspaper in the 1920's, so that even though the editor had to be a Party member, the Party still looked for him among the journalists. Most of the Party leaders were, if not professional journalists, at least constant contributors to the Party press. While they all agreed with Lenin that the Party press was "not only a collective agitator and propagandist but also a collective organizer of the masses," many of this group still held a firm respect for good newspaper standards. Perhaps this is why before the 1930's the Party limited its supervision to the appointment of the editor. The editor himself assumed responsibility for the political line in the newspaper. Usually the very selection of an editor gave the Party a guarantee that the person in question would follow the proper political line. A Party member had to have amassed considerable experience in the Soviet press to be appointed editor, and he was already well-known both from his written articles, his membership in a Party cell, and his public behavior.

Until the period of Stalinism, therefore, the merits of an editor were judged not by the political line of the newspaper but by its professional qualities. It was said, for example, that the newspaper Sovetskaya Sibir' [Soviet Siberia] was well organized in the sense that it was interesting and

that it was read eagerly not only in its own area but in others as well. Kurs, the editor, was consequently considered one of the best Soviet editors. Under Stalinism the exact opposite came about: the most professional, original and intelligent Communist journalists were the last persons to be appointed editors. All such editors were dismissed at the beginning of the 1930's for various "deviations" and were replaced by candidates from the Party apparatus. Kurs, for example, was dismissed as editor of Sovetskaya Sibir'.

Olexander Ol'shavets' had been the editor of Odesskiye izvestiya for many years. He was a professional journalist and something of a Bohemian. Such conduct on the part of an editor would have been utterly inconceivable in the 1930's. There is no denying the merits of raising the requirements set for editors in the 1930's, but at the same time the framework within which the editor was required to operate had the effect of converting him into a cold and calculating bureaucrat who did not think about pleasing his readers (as the "drunkard" Ol'shavets' had done) but about pleasing his superiors.

Editorials became standardized. Following the example of the central newspapers they had to end with the expression of opposition to "counterrevolutionary Trotskyism, right-wing deviationism and appeasement." Later, when some sort of "plot" between Lominadze and Syrtsov was discovered in Moscow,² the words "against the left-and right-wing bloc" had to be added to the above formula. Even more additions to the formula appeared later, for example, "against bourgeois nationalism," and the formula grew into a very cumbersome and heavy dead-weight on the end of the editorial. Prompted by fear, however, the editor now paid attention not to the stylistic and literary content of articles but to seeing that they had as many stereotyped additions as possible, both in the middle and, above all, at the end.

The heads of departments of Odesskiye izvestiya sometimes wrote editorials; one of them, who was considered sympathetic to the Trotskyites, would always say ironically and reassuringly as he brought his editorials to the editor, "You can turn it over to the printshop. Don't worry: I've already put in all the plugs."

A similar change was the introduction of the standardized and uncritical use of the word "proletariat" in the

2. See Deutscher, 2, Stalin: A Political Biography, New York, Oxford University Press, 1949, p. 333.

early 1930's. Meanwhile articles dealing with civic problems began to disappear, a change which indicated that the function of the newspaper had somehow changed. The press was being called upon to "attack," as the word was used at that time. And so the Odessa newspaper, following the central press, also began to "attack," with all the passion of the Odessa temperament. If, for example, the financial department of the soviet did not collect taxes, especially from "private operators," the newspaper would publish a detailed report under the sensational heading "Who in the Financial Department is Shielding Nepmen?" Such a charge was a serious one, yet similar ones appeared every day. Matters went so far that the newspaper became a nuisance to the local administration. Its conduct was discussed a number of times at sessions of the Party committee and the editor was reminded that the charges in the newspaper were unfounded. Nevertheless, following the example of the central press, which was "unmasking" sensational cases with unabated zeal, Chornomors'ka komuna continued to do the same thing. For a time every such article was accompanied by the standardized addition of the word "attack," for example, "Attack Those Who Are Disrupting the Supplying of the Villages!"

In order to give greater weight and influence to sensational reports the newspaper organized special worker correspondent brigades. For this purpose a member of the newspaper staff would take with him several worker correspondents from local enterprises to make a study of some factory, state institution or sanatorium (Odessa, it will be recalled, is a resort city). Their findings would be published in the newspaper under the by-line "Worker Correspondent Brigade," followed by the names of five or six persons. Sometimes these brigades, rather than discussing some special event at an enterprise, would trace its achievements and shortcomings from the beginning to the end of the production process. In such a case the worker correspondent brigade would sign itself "Entire-Process Worker Correspondent Brigade," followed by signatures. Often the newspaper would use groups of specially selected Komsomol members, who would make a surprise visit to investigate a state institution or enterprise. In such cases the findings of the group would be followed by the by-line "Komsomol Cavalry."

That was the time when "collective work" was increasingly in vogue, a phenomenon which the Party subsequently criticized as giving rise to evasion of individual responsibility. There was even a form of collective reporting to be found in Pravda or Komunist, where, for example, a by-line might read "Pravda's Collective Correspondent, The Newspaper Kochegarka [Stokehole]."

There were many forms of worker correspondent brigade work but the material provided was somehow not the same as if individuals had written it, for practically every article "written" by such a brigade was an indictment which had to be investigated, either by the workers' and peasants' inspection system or by the procurator's office. Such reports also differed from the individual worker and peasant correspondent letters of the 1920's because, while the latter usually reported local news, the material supplied by the worker correspondent brigades was more like control and inspection reports. Such investigations filled the press and left scant room for individual creative work by journalists. Indeed, such work was now considered unnecessary, just as ordinary street fighting becomes unnecessary in wartime. There were only two areas left in the newspaper in which a journalist might find use for his talents: international news and commentaries on it, and reviews of the theater, music and motion pictures. Of course, there was reporting on local news, but it soon began to disappear also and to give way to militant reports by the worker correspondent newspapers.

The growth of worker correspondent brigades around the newspaper did not mean an increase in the worker and peasant correspondent movement. On the contrary, that movement steadily declined thereafter, and today it no longer exists in the same form as previously. The peasant correspondents first disappeared in 1930, in areas of complete collectivization, of which the Odessa area was one of the first. Only a small number of people continued to be worker correspondents in the cities. The peasant correspondents' basic assignment in the 1920's had been to defend the public against the high-handed actions of village officials. Now, however, when the state had destroyed the kulaks and had driven the rest of the peasants onto collective farms, its only support in the villages was the administration itself and the Party and Komsomol members, who were close to it (not all of them, however!). Now every criticism of the village administration, no matter how just, might weaken the state's position in the village. Such criticism was viewed as aid to the kulaks. The moment had come when free reign was given to the Popandopulos,³ who had been meek under the blows of the peasant correspondents. Now it was their turn. They relegated the peasant correspondents, whom they hated, to the category of kulaks or sub-kulaks and either deported them to the far north or got rid of them otherwise. Only those who did not oppose the administration, who helped it crush the kulaks,

3. See p. 19.

attack "slackers" on the collective farms, etc., could now be peasant correspondents. This function was the complete opposite of that performed by the peasant correspondents in the 1920's. At that time the peasant correspondents had served society against abuses by the state; now they served the state against society.

The worker correspondent movement in the cities evolved in the same direction, with the emphasis shifting from criticism of administrative abuse to individual attacks on "slackers," "fly-by-nights," and "wreckers."⁴ Later Stalin advanced the slogan "Criticize without regard for personalities," but the slogan had no meaning. As long as the higher-echelon ruling bodies could act upon the criticism, the lower administrative levels were encouraged to deflect criticism from the administration itself and direct it to personalities.

The so-called "criticism from below" called for by the Nineteenth Party Congress in 1952 is similarly without real meaning. Because criticism must be made in the interests not of the people but of the state, criticism of the administration is dangerous for a reporter. Today the worker and peasant correspondents are in the unenviable position of being asked to criticize administrative abuses, knowing full well that such reporting may lead to reprisal by the agency accused of abuse.

Growth of the Lower-Echelon Press

The function of newspapers as organs of information and ideological struggle and education began to die out in the U.S.S.R. beginning around 1930. Thenceforward Soviet newspapers developed into organs of misinformation and coercion. Every Soviet newspaper article criticizing an institution, every negative book review, every feuilleton criticizing someone, leads automatically to repressive measures against the institution's management, against the author of the book under review, or against the person criticized in the feuilleton. The "Follow-ups on Correspondents' Reports" department of the newspaper now decides the fate of the persons criticized, and without any appeal. In the 1920's a

4. "Fly-by-nights" [letuny] was the name given by the Soviet press to people who changed jobs frequently. "Wreckers" included production workers who through inexperience, carelessness or wilful intent caused damage to machinery.

newspaper might admit it was wrong, and in any event the person criticized in a newspaper could find rehabilitation in other institutions, for at that time the newspapers did not have such terrible authority. Now no one in an okrug dares to say that a Pravda article is mistaken and no one in a raion can say that an article in an okrug newspaper is inaccurate. The fact that accusations made in the Soviet press are not subject to appeal has made the press an instrument of terrorism, for such accusations are always precursors of some type of "corrective action" against the accused person or institution.

Because newspapers now exert such great influence in the interest of the administration and Party, colossal sums are spent on the press, while the circulation of newspapers increases year by year. On Soviet Press Day, May 5, 1953, Moscow newspapers published data on the growth in circulation of Soviet publications. Throughout the U.S.S.R. there are now 8,300 newspapers with a total circulation of 41,700,000 copies. Possibly one of the principal reasons for the effort to increase circulation is that the struggle between the bureaucracy and the people has transformed the state press into an instrument of coercion and intimidation which requires intimate contact with those to be influenced. It is no longer enough to intimidate "in general terms," abstractly; it has become necessary, as much as possible, to name every citizen by name. Hence the rapid growth of city newspaper circulation and of the lower-echelon press--district, factory, shop and collective farm newspapers. Here one really can name every citizen by name, which is something an okrug or even a raion newspaper cannot do.

Factory house organs first appeared in Soviet enterprises around 1930. They grew out of the "wall newspapers" which had originated during the early years of the NEP as amateur organs in plants and institutions. The wall newspaper which gave birth to the printed house organ was an interesting and positive development. Because the power of the Soviet administration was limited by the trade unions in dismissing people from work and in other disciplinary disputes after the Civil War, the need arose for replacing the earlier fear of superiors with something which would still encourage industrial discipline. The wall paper was designed to meet this need. On the other hand the wall newspaper was also a means for combating highhandedness and abuse on the part of the administration. To some extent it was the result of the worker and peasant correspondent movement. Everywhere that active correspondents of the central newspapers appeared, independent wall newspapers appeared also--in factories and

local committees (the lower-echelon trade union cells at enterprises and Soviet institutions).

The newspapers ridiculed administrators who gave jobs to friends rather than going to the hiring halls, those who spent too much money on their own requirements, those who got drunk, those who went on sprees or were morally dissolute. Rank and file workers and employees were also ridiculed for similar behavior.

In the villages the wall newspapers ridiculed ignorance, popular superstitions and the misdeeds of officials. Obviously the more highly placed and authoritative the official the more dangerous it was to criticize him. But balanced against this authority was the prestige of the wall newspaper and the authority of the trade union or political education agency in the village, which published it.

On the whole the influence and educational role of the wall newspapers was an important one. They were perhaps the most important implement in the cultural revolution in the U.S.S.R., for they were instrumental in shattering many old customs and prejudices.

For example, one summer a wall newspaper in a small village stated that a gambling club had been discovered in a wooded area in a remote, outlying part of the village, complete with home-brew alcohol and things to eat. Card games had been played in this woods on Sundays and holidays since time immemorial; no one paid attention to them and they had, in fact, become socially acceptable. If one of the more prominent villagers or the priest scolded people for playing cards and drinking he was simply ignored. When the wall newspaper carried an article on this "gamblers' club" many of its members went to the village building to read it with their own eyes. Card playing did not stop immediately but it came to the attention of the entire village. Then somebody removed the thick growth of hazel bushes from around the card players so that everyone could see what went on as they passed by. First the drinking ceased (home-brew liquor was illegal), and with most of the active participants now hesitant to attend these functions the "club" began to decline.

Examples of the educating influence of the wall newspaper could be cited ad infinitum. With the wall newspapers a new factor was introduced into public life, the influence of the citizenry itself on the conduct of individuals. And unlike the press we have been discussing, there was no compulsion or fear involved--the main emphasis was on ridicule. Of

course ridicule had existed wherever a gathering listened to some wit make fun of an individual or institution. But something different was involved when such matters went from the taverns and streets to the pages of a written newspaper which, even though in only one copy, was nailed on a wall for everyone to read. Here laughter was put into literary form. Uncensored expressions, personal remarks and questionable topics were excluded and the public life at the local level was made the subject of discussion in an entirely new, civilized form. The wall newspapers played a positive role, however, only as long as they were a manifestation of public initiative, as long as they did not fall under the complete supervision of the Party apparatus. Unfortunately, however, this is just what occurred in the early 1930's.

In the wall newspapers one can see the beginning of a process of extending the press network down to the local level, thus placing the Party and government in more direct contact with the reader. In large newspapers of territorial importance (oblast and city) such direct contact was effected by crowding out material written by individuals and filling the newspaper with material by worker correspondent brigades. The broad masses of readers, those in the enterprises, would not be affected by generalized intimidation. For them it was necessary to write concretely, calling people by name and describing misdeeds. A newspaper intended for a large audience could not carry out this task. How, for example, could an Odessa newspaper, serving a city of 400,000 inhabitants, publish complete details on irregularities in specific factories or failures to fulfill plans, how could it identify by name violators of labor discipline and "fly-by-nights"? Yet the Party apparatus demanded just such concrete information. Hence arose the need for a mass printed newspaper at every enterprise of any importance.

The number of printed house organs at enterprises increased rapidly in 1930. Odessa then had fifty-two state

5. Mention should also be made of the "living newspaper." Such a newspaper was not written but was performed on a stage. Good speakers read articles, feuilletons were presented in play form, and even complete plays were written especially for the living newspaper; such newspapers, however, were not the mass phenomenon that the wall newspapers were. Leningrad had a living newspaper called "The Blue Blouse" which toured the entire U.S.S.R. -- A.K.

factories and mills and twenty-eight printed house organs, published weekly and printed in the printshop of Chornomors'ka komuna. A special worker and peasant correspondent department was set up to guide these newspapers and provide them with technical assistance. The department published a weekly newspaper called Trybuna Robsel'kora [Worker and Peasant Correspondents' Tribune], in which the editors of factory house organs and the worker correspondents compared their experiences and discussed matters concerning the factory press.

The editors of Chornomors'ka komuna, however, concentrated their main attention on improving the writing and technical standards of the factory newspapers. All the factory newspapers were published in Ukrainian in Odessa and there were not many people in Odessa at that time with good literary training and a Ukrainian education. The factory newspapers surmounted this difficulty by hiring qualified managing editors, usually student members of the Komsomol who were just beginning to write. The editor was usually a worker from the factory in question and a member of the Party. The factory management relieved him of some or all of his duties paying him either his regular salary or a special salary as editor of the factory newspaper.

Later, all editors of factory house organs, especially at large enterprises, were paid special salaries and began to attend meetings of the factory Party committee bureau as active members,⁶ thus following the example of the large newspapers, the editors of which had had to be members of the bureaus of the corresponding Party committees. For example, the editor of Odessa's Chornomors'ka komuna was a member of the Odessa City Party Committee, which included the secretary of the Party Committee, the directors of the Organizational Department, the Culture and Propaganda Department, and the Mass Agitation Department, the head of the Executive Committee, the head of the GPU, the editor of the newspaper, the director of the political department of the nearest army unit, and the two secretaries of the largest borough Party committees in the city of Odessa.⁷

6. A bureau is elected by a primary Party organization numbering not less than fifteen members. A city or district Party committee elects a bureau of from seven to nine members and three secretaries. See Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya [Large Soviet Encyclopedia], 2nd ed., Vol. XII, p. 223.

7. The organization described is typical for cities and okrugs. -- A.K.

Thus a given enterprise supported at least one worker for the factory newspaper and paid all expenses for printing the newspaper. However, this was never a serious burden for the factory management, for under the five-year plans expenses of the paper are included in planned enterprise expenses and funds are earmarked to cover them. In addition, the factory newspapers soon became indispensable instruments for putting pressure on the workers to fulfill individual work norms and the planned output goals of the enterprise.

The printed house organ did not supply any outside information but carried news about the work life of its own enterprise or the life of the workers. Because these factory newspapers were so obviously tools of the Party and government and were filled mainly with discussions of production problems, they were received by the workers with hostility or indifference.

The attitude of the workers toward the factory newspapers (and also to the wall newspapers since their content had changed) can be illustrated by an incident which occurred at the Dneprodzerzhinsk Steel Mill in the early 1930's. During the early years of industrialization the state placed particularly high demands on the steel mills because the shortage of metal was holding up the development of the entire economy. That is why, for example, Pravda carried a table on its first page every day showing figures for the day's steel and coal output. The factories, however, consistently failed to fulfill their assigned quotas. In such cases the Party committees would send representatives to the enterprises in order to put pressure on the workers and management.

The well-known Moscow poet and Communist A. Bezmyanski was sent to the Dneprodzerzhinsk Mill. As a worker with the pen he was assigned to the wall newspaper of the smelting shop and wrote poems in which he called on the workers to forget difficulties and strive to fulfill the plans, because more steel would mean, he said, more butter. The next day it was found that across Bezmyanski's poem in the wall newspaper someone had written in a worker's uneven hand:

"Comrade, Comrade!
For you I pity feel,
When there's butter
There'll also be steel!"

In order to raise the writing standards of the workers on the factory newspapers and to interest them in subjects other than socialist competition, industry finance plans, norms, etc., Trybuna robsel'kora began to devote one page

(out of four) to the literary activities of worker correspondents and young Odessa writers in general. Because the factory newspaper editors wrote little in Trybuna robsel'kora about their experiences in publishing the factory organs, the entire newspaper was soon converted into a literary organ for beginning writers. None of the higher officials paid any attention to this change, or they may even have sympathized with it, for the creative writing movement which dominated Chornomors'ka komuna not only made it more interesting and readable but also had a corresponding effect on the twenty-eight subordinate factory newspapers, which also endeavored to publish feuilletons, sketches and poems, provide good layouts and in general enliven their content.

The beginning of the 1930's was a period of preoccupation with various types of mass newspapers intended for use in the actual location of production. Thus, for example, Chornomors'ka komuna sent out its own traveling editorial offices to areas where spring sowing was in progress and to spring fisheries. During a spring sowing campaign, for example, the railroads supplied the editorial office with three cars which were fitted with a printshop, kitchen and sleeping quarters for the traveling editors. A locomotive hauled the cars to the destination and left them there, either on a siding or on a small sidetrack near the villages and fields the newspaper was to serve. The editors got in touch with the collective farms they were to serve, and found out what brigades and individuals were lagging and which were in the lead. After they had established contact the editors began publishing a small daily paper, a two-page leaflet called Chornomors'ka komuna na vesnyaniy sivbi [Black Sea Commune in Spring Sowing]. The masthead was taken from that of the larger Chornomors'ka komuna so that people would recognize that it was the same as the newspaper in Odessa except that it was being published especially for a collective farm in the field. The newspaper carried material of the following general nature: "Why Does Petro Maximets' Brigade Lag the Most on the May Day Collective Farm?" "Follow Ivan Matyushek's Example: Yesterday He Plowed N Hectares"; "If You Walk Slowly You'll Never Make It: This Is How Andrei Makarenko, Head of the Lenin Collective Farm, Works."

Similar field editions of Chornomors'ka komuna were published at factories which lagged in fulfilling planned goals. They invariably accomplished their purpose of bringing pressure to bear on both workers and management. Obviously, however, a newspaper of this sort was not an organ of information and cultural interest--it was a means of pressure in the hands of the regime. Everybody realized this and was afraid of being mentioned in the newspaper.

It was in this atmosphere of an expanding press acting as a tool of Party and government pressure that the unique literary liberalism of Chornomors'ka komuna came to an end. This is how it happened. A conflict arose in Odessa between Vainov, the young, talented and ambitious secretary of the Party Committee, and the head of the Black Sea Merchant Marine, who had jurisdiction over the ports of the entire Black Sea coast of the U.S.S.R. and over the Black Sea merchant fleet.

The head of the Black Sea Merchant Marine was usually appointed by the People's Commissariat of Maritime and Inland Shipping. In the administrative sense he was subordinate only to Moscow, but as a member of the Party he was subordinate to the Odessa Party Committee. As long as the Party committees were strictly organs of political guidance (as was the case until the 1930's), relations between the Black Sea navigation authorities and the Odessa Party Committee were normal, but once the Party committees were brought into operational guidance of economic life as members of the controlling management staffs, the question arose of the extent to which the Black Sea navigation authorities had to report to the Odessa Party Committee on economic matters. It was obvious that the navigation authorities could not be entirely subordinate to the Committee because they had large installations not only in Odessa but in Kherson, Nikolayev and even outside the Ukrainian Republic.

Vainov evidently wanted the head of the fleet to be subordinate to him in both the political and economic sense so as to enlarge his own sphere of influence beyond the limits of Odessa and thus to increase the prestige of the Odessa Party organization. The head of the fleet, however, did not subordinate himself and at the same time tried to avoid any conflict with the Party. Vainov called in the editor of Chornomors'ka komuna and, after praising the newspaper for its high literary standards, said that now the press must also help the Party organizations in their daily work. Vainov then remarked that the Black Sea fleet administration was ignoring the Odessa Party Committee.

The editor did not completely understand the secretary, who intended that the newspaper should criticize the Black Sea fleet administration in the same way it had been striking at the administrative shortcomings in the Odessa government. In the case of the Odessa administration, however, it had criticized actual errors and abuses while it had not found shortcomings in the Fleet Administration which would merit either serious or sensational exposure. The editor did

not realize that he was being asked simply to falsify reports and make false accusations against the head of the Black Sea navigation administration. He considered such accusations a crime and a violation of Party ethics, and therefore, when a worker correspondent brigade had been sent to the Fleet Administration and failed to find any particular shortcomings, the editor took sides with the head of the Black Sea fleet.

Cases in which the editor was asked to cooperate against his will with the secretary of the Party committee because falsification or exaggeration of someone's guilt was involved were common; moreover, the editor was indebted to the secretary for some previous favors. But the editor was an idealist who thought that revolutions could not be carried through with soiled hands and that lies and falsehood in the Party would mean the end of both the Party and the Revolution. Consequently, he resolved not to change his stand. His independent conduct so annoyed Vainov that the latter went to Kharkov and asked the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee to provide another editor for Odessa. The secretary stated that the present editor was an honest and capable person but that he was not suited for effective work on a newspaper because a newspaper now had to help the Party organization in its day-to-day work. The Central Committee secretary concurred, which meant the end of the independent policy of the newspaper.

This incident not only illustrates the demands made by the Stalinist apparatus on the newspapers but also shows the moral degradation of Bolshevism and the ideological decline of the Soviet press.

Kaptsan, the new editor of Chornomors'ka komuna, was honest and devoted to the Party cause but he was by no means a journalist, although he had been graduated from the Communist University and had done Party work. He was a personal friend of Vainov, the secretary of the Odessa Party Committee, and for this reason he had been asked to come to Odessa to work. Although reasonable, tactful and industrious, he simply had too little experience and education to be an editor. As a professional Party man, on the other hand, he knew what was expected of a newspaper at that time. He placed this knowledge unreservedly at the service of his friend Vainov.

Like Vainov and many other Party officials, however, Kaptsan was by no means ready to go through fire and water for his patron. At that time oblasts were formed in the Ukraine and Odessa became an oblast center. Vainov was not

important enough to be the secretary of an oblast, and a man named Maiorov, a candidate for membership in the Politburo of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, was sent to take his place. Meanwhile, the custom had already become instituted whereby every secretary took his own staff with him when he went to a new job, not trusting the staff of his predecessor. Kaptsan, however, wanted to stay on as editor of the oblast newspaper in Odessa and therefore decided to win the confidence of the new secretary. On the very day that Maiorov arrived in Odessa Chornomors'ka komuna carried a full-page sensational report of major irregularities in the Odessa Procurator's office. The report was a slap in the face for Vainov: the editor was attacking him publicly before the new secretary. Vainov, however, was not indignant, for he probably would have done the same thing himself. (Incidentally, the terror of the Yezhov period reconciled them all: Maiorov, Vainov and Kaptsan were all shot in 1937 as "enemies of the people.")

Upon his arrival in Odessa Kaptsan made changes in the newspaper which brought it to the standard common to the entire U.S.S.R. First, all poets, writers and artists were removed from the staff as "parasites." They did, it is true, provide little material for the newspaper but their pay was small. Feuilletons, poems, stories and feature articles disappeared from the newspaper, and the number of cartoons and pictures was reduced, while the number of reports on the achievements of enterprises, the modernization of Odessa industry, socialist competition, etc., increased. Technical drawings of new machines were even introduced, for the editor, although he had had only political training, had a weakness for technical subjects.

The editor also reorganized the illustrated magazine Shkval, changing it from an illustrated literary periodical to a magazine concerned with technical methods, one which contained articles on changes in the equipment of Odessa enterprises, machine parts with drawings, etc. The Stalin slogan "In the period of reconstruction technique decides everything" hypnotized all Party personnel at that time, including the new editor of Chornomors'ka komuna.

IV. THE INSTITUTE OF JOURNALISM

Higher schools of journalism were opened in the Soviet Union in the second half of the 1920's; prior to that time no such courses had been offered in Russia. By 1930 there were three higher schools teaching journalism: the State Institute of Journalism in Moscow, the Communist Institute of Journalism in Leningrad, and the journalism department of the Artem Communist University in Kharkov. The latter became, after 1930, the All-Ukrainian Communist Institute of Journalism.

While the guberniyas were still in existence each had had its own Party school; later, when guberniyas were supplanted by okrugs, each okrug had its own school.¹ These schools accepted Party members who had distinguished themselves in lower-echelon Party work but who needed to improve their general qualifications. Completion of the equivalent of public school was sufficient for admission to a regional Party school, which had a two-year course. The curriculum there was approximately as follows: the history of the Party, from which Leninism was later separated as a separate course; elementary political economy; the history of the Ukraine (and of the U.S.S.R.); the Ukrainian language and literature; and the elements of world history. Possibly elementary mathematics and a few other subjects were also taught. Graduation from such a school did not bestow any professional rights, and graduates went back into Party work, often propaganda.

Another type of education was that provided by the universities, both for Communists and others. The Artem Communist University, opened in Kharkov in 1923, was a typical example of a Party school, corresponding to the Sverdlov Communist University in Moscow. A Communist university trained middle-echelon Party cadres, i.e., cadres for approximately the okrug level. While such students entered a Communist university with better training than was required for entry into the regional Party school, matriculation certificates were not required of them.

The subject matter was taught entirely by Communist professors and concerned primarily Party instruction and orientation. The students lived on the campus, isolated from

¹ The okrugs were approximately three-fourths the size of the former guberniyas.

outside influences. As a result of the sketchy background of the students and the narrow scope of the education, the Communist university graduated people who were well-trained in the "applied" but not in the theoretical sense.

It was interesting to compare the Communists graduated from the Communist university with graduates of an ordinary non-Party higher school such as the Institute of National Economy. The programs of both schools were fairly similar (that of the non-Party Institute included professional courses such as law, accounting, etc.), but for the most part the theoretical social and economic subjects were the same. Outstanding Communists graduated from the Communist University, however, simply could not stand comparison with graduates from the Institute of National Economy. Communists graduated from the Institute of National Economy soon developed into brilliant theoreticians, some of whom were advanced to responsible work for the state and published interesting works on economics. At the same time the Communist University did not, to my knowledge, produce a single theoretician, a single instructor for a non-Party higher school, or a single state figure in the field of theoretical economics. Of course, the number of Party figures and administrative personnel produced was considerable.

Another type of education was that provided by the All-Ukrainian Association of Marxism-Leninism Institutes in Kharkov, a Party educational institution which selected as students people who had already been graduated from the higher schools (largely from the Communist universities) and which trained higher school instructors in socio-economic subjects over a three-year period. The only good instructors graduated from this institution were those who came to them not from a Communist university but from a non-Party higher school. The Association, however, did not produce as well-trained economists as the Institute of National Economy.

Generally speaking, the system of isolated Party education did not justify itself and it was, I believe, abolished in the late 1930's. As far as I know there is at present only one higher Party school, that under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The institutes of journalism have been joined to ordinary universities as departments. When I joined the staff of the All-Ukrainian Communist Institute of Journalism in 1931 it had just been made independent of the Communist university and given the status of an institute.

The students at the Institute were similar to those of the Communist University--Party and Komsomol members who had

been graduated from okrug Party schools or seven-year schools, or who possessed even less education. Later, in selecting students particular attention was devoted not to prior educational training but to the importance of the prospective student as a Party member. When an applicant was a prominent Party figure from an outlying area he would be accepted at the Institute even if he were entirely illiterate.

Generally speaking, the first two decades of the Soviet regime were a period of many experiments in education. For example, at one time professorships in the higher schools were abolished, on the theory that students could teach themselves, with professors serving only as tutors to be consulted like books. At the same time individual student examinations were supplanted by brigade examinations. Five or six students were grouped in a brigade. Homework was done by the brigade, which would go to the professor in a body to take examinations. It often happened that a brigade would be passed in a course on the basis of examination questions answered by one or two of its members. Such procedures led to a rapid decline of teaching standards, a decline which was arrested only at the end of the 1930's.

In recruiting for the Institute of Journalism during the first half of the 1930's little attention was given to the general educational and cultural background of the prospective student. For example, after two years of instruction one girl student in answer to a question stated that Gogol was a writer of the NEP period. Such an example, which could be matched by many others, shows not only the low requirements for admission to the Institute but also the poor training provided in consequence of the brigade system, the virtual abolition of professorships and other academic innovations. Poorly trained students were also common in the one-year Komsomol courses given in the Institute which trained journalists for the Komsomol press.

Not all students at the Institute, however, had the same cultural background. There were, for example, some students who had an excellent general educational background, others who were simply more intelligent and capable than the average, and finally there were those who entered the Institute to become real journalists and not merely to get an education or receive a stipend. Actually, the selection of prospective students on the basis of professional qualifications was the weakest feature of the entire institution. Because attention in selecting students for the Institute was focused not on journalistic inclinations or on educational background but on importance in Party and public activity, students who were merely good prospective journalists received a low

priority when seeking entrance.

Generally speaking, people often entered the higher Party schools at that time to take a rest or to enjoy more advantageous conditions than in their previous jobs. One student, for example, had been the head of a mineworkers' committee in the Donets Basin and had received 400 rubles a month. At the Institute, however, he received a stipend of only 350 rubles a month for himself and his family. He could not accept the fact that he was receiving fifty rubles less than before and left the Institute after a year or two. There were many similar cases.

There were also many cases in which students did not do poorly in their studies but nevertheless lacked either ability or inclination for journalism. As the Institute hardly inculcated any professional knowledge of journalism, the careers of the graduates were most varied. Sometimes the most capable student graduated would return to the post of district Party committee secretary or propagandist, or would perhaps even become an instructor for a poultry producers' cooperative society or something of that nature. He would usually not become a newspaperman or journalist, for only a small proportion of the graduates (perhaps twenty to twenty-five per cent) became editors of district newspapers, and hardly anyone became a prominent journalist for a major newspaper. This was not only because the students often lacked the inclination but also because they were unable to get a place on the big papers: a student from the Institute would not be accepted by a big newspaper because he usually lacked both an adequate cultural background and professional training.

What, then, did the Institute do? Essentially it was a Party institute which offered a wide range of political training but scarcely any journalism instruction. This had not always been the case, however. In 1929 two persons who had been in the first graduating class of the journalism department of the Artem Communist University arrived in Odessa. They were not yet well-trained journalists, but they had at least received training applicable to newspaper work, and wanted to do such work. Although not all the graduates during the 1920's went to work for newspapers the great majority did. Why then was this not the case in the 1930's? One reason was that in the 1920's there were few schools and students were selected more carefully, while later it was not the students who asked for admission to the Institute but the Institute which sent its instructors throughout the Ukraine in order to recruit students.

The main reason, however, for the poor quality of journalism instruction in the 1930's lay in a change in the method of teaching journalism. It has been fashionable at times to speak of the "science" of journalism. But it seems more accurate to call journalism a craft, one which, like every craft, can be mastered only through practical work. In the 1920's the feuilleton writer Ostap Vyshnya was asked to come to the journalism faculty of the Artem Communist University to deliver a number of lectures on the subject of feuilleton writing. He began by saying, "Well, what can I say about the way feuilletons are written? Personally, I do it this way: I take a pen, dip it in ink, think awhile and begin to write." This was not so much a lecture as a feuilleton in itself. Yet it is true that the feuilletons of Ostap Vyshnya, which were based on puns and paradoxes, could not be fitted into any general theory. Here surely was a literary craftsman speaking.

In the 1920's instruction in the journalism department consisted of analyzing and classifying various methods of plying the craft of journalism. Such instruction, however, had one great failing: it assumed a good general educational and cultural background on the part of the student. Unfortunately, such a background was seldom present. Nevertheless, because the training was explicit and concerned with applied aspects of writing the graduates had at least the beginning of a good working knowledge of journalism.

During the 1930's this approach to journalism was considered a formalist heresy, a deviation into bourgeois technicalities. First of all, the theory went, a journalist had to know what to write about, not how to write, for if he knew the former the latter would take care of itself. A press department was formed at the Institute in 1931. It became the leading department of the school and was headed by a Party member with a secondary education.

The department divided all journalism instruction into two parts: (1) the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist "science of the press" and (2) the technique of newspaper reporting. The emphasis on the two parts was not equal, for the former claimed ninety-five per cent of the department's attention and efforts. It dealt with theory, and although it was supposed to include a study of newspaper articles (feuilletons, editorials, etc.), they were ignored as constituting "formalism"--"content" was the important thing. The second part was concerned with technical aspects of publishing, such as printing and layout.

The department considered that its main task was to study and apply the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist "science of the press." And yet there was no such science.

For the most part the department seized upon and expanded Lenin's statement that "a newspaper must be not only a collective agitator and propagandist but also a collective organizer of the masses." Lenin had made this statement in the period of Bolshevism when Iskra [The Spark]² was the Party's only means of contact with the masses. Obviously it engaged in both agitation and propaganda among the masses and even organized the masses sympathetic to the Party. But every newspaper performs certain organizational functions. Nevertheless the press department made the organizational function basic, and unsuccessful attempts were made to develop this thesis into a special scientific theory.

It was at about this time (the early 1930's) that the press attacked two persons who had allegedly distorted the "Marxist-Leninist science of the press": the editor of Sovetskaya Sibir', Kurs, and another journalist named Hus. Both had been dismissed from newspaper work for alleged ties with the opposition and had been transferred to work as instructors at the State Institute of Journalism in Moscow. They were even removed from that school, however, on accusations of "deviations from the science of the press," and "formalism." The director of the Institute press department wrote a "scientific" work on the subject and traveled to Moscow and Leningrad with it to read to the press department there. The "ideologically sound" work of the director about the "Kurs-Hus deviation" evoked only ironic smiles in Moscow. People there knew the secret of "Kurs-Husism" better than we did and therefore did not take the Kharkov study seriously.

Elucidation at the Institute of the problems of journalism was reduced to restating Lenin's pronouncements on the press. Stalin too began at that time to be regarded as an authority on the science of Journalism. His uninspired notion that "the press is an implement with the help of which the Party maintains constant contact with the masses" was proclaimed as a profound discovery and was discussed ad

2. Iskra, which first appeared in 1900, was the organ of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. Lenin was instrumental in its organization and contributed extensively. In 1903 it passed from Lenin's control to that of the Mensheviks, and in 1905 it ceased publication.

infinitum in lectures. The study of types of newspaper articles and of journalism training was hardly mentioned. Of course, attempts were made to pose the problem of training journalists more broadly. Something was said about introducing a course on stenography and typing as well as on other strictly journalistic subjects, but nothing came of it.

For this reason I took advantage of summer vacation and the winter of 1931 to attend seminars in literature in Kharkov and to train myself for lecturing on literature. In 1932 I was permitted to give a short course on Western European literatures in the Komsomol faculty of the All-Ukrainian Communist Institute of Journalism, and the following year I gave a course on these literatures at the Institute in addition to lectures on literature in various seminars and courses at the Institute.

The picture of the Institute which I have sketched is lacking in one important respect--it fails to convey the spirit of those tragic years in the U.S.S.R., a spirit which pervaded every institution and activity. Perhaps the best way in which I can correct this shortcoming is to relate some of my own experiences on the faculty of the Institute in the 1930's. Not only do they bear directly on journalism, for I was supposedly teaching that subject, but they illuminate in a general sense the exercise of state and Party power which was, after all, the most important influence in every phase of society, including the press.

It was a period of great changes and terrible happenings in the U.S.S.R. Collectivization had met with powerful resistance on the part of the peasantry, and the state, in enforcing its will, called upon the press for support. In 1932 we read at the top of the front page of the newspaper Komunist, central organ of the Party in the Ukraine (I cite from memory): "The village of Bashtanka in Kherson oblast is declared under boycott for failure to meet grain procurement quotas. All shipments of manufactured goods to the village have been stopped." In effect, a collective responsibility had been established which fell on men, women and children regardless of what role they played in the production process. It was outright war against the village. Komunist carried this announcement for several weeks. It was an example which the entire Ukrainian press soon followed.

It was only the beginning, however. At the very time that people were dying of hunger in the villages, editorials in Pravda and, following it, in the entire provincial press, began to print statements such as "We have built a happy, sunny, joyous life." A rapid change in administrative

cadres took place in all sectors of state and Party work at that time.

All honest Communists with any ties at all with the people fled from responsible work or else were the victims of repression. One Deputy People's Commissar told me when he returned from a village where he had been sent to collect grain from the peasants that "It's actually a matter of whether I take grain from the peasant and his family dies of starvation, or else get sent to Siberia myself." He went to Siberia, but more tractable persons came in his stead to take the grain from the peasants.

The rapid replacement of honest journalists with unprincipled hacks was apparent in the press. I shall never forget the impression a Pravda feuilleton by Mikhail Kol'tsov made on the Institute students. In a well written piece Kol'tsov told how, while in Paris, he had read "slandereous" articles in the "White Guard" newspaper Vozrozhdeniye [Rebirth] about famine in the Ukraine, allegedly written by the newspaper's correspondent from Dnepropetrovsk. Kol'tsov wrote:

Then I decided to test the newspaper Vozrozhdeniye. I wrote a long article [evidently under a pseudonym] in which I described famine in the Ukraine. I put it in an envelope and mailed it right in Paris, even though I pretended to have written it from the U.S.S.R. Several days later this article was actually published in Vozrozhdeniye. However, I had written my article so that every tenth word began with a certain letter, so that if these letters were read in sequence the result would be . . .

At this point there was a photograph of the article in his Pravda feuilleton with the beginning of every tenth word marked. These letters formed the following message: "You White Guard slanderers lie when you say there is famine in the U.S.S.R."

The reaction of students to Kol'tsov's feuilleton is interesting. Some of those who came from the villages or had been workers protested in private (not only could the famine not be discussed, it could not even be mentioned as existing!) They said, "Vozrozhdeniye published a report not from the U.S.S.R. but from Paris, and yet it contained the awful truth. And what kind of people sit in the offices of Pravda that they can be intoxicated by verbal gymnastics concerning

such unspeakable suffering and death of millions of workers?" Others, however, said, "That Kol'tsov is some fellow. Just see how he trapped those White Guardists!" These students were carried away by the outward, strictly formal side of the matter, and their hearts were like stone. They were the ones who were then crawling to power. And while I sat in prison in 1937 and 1938 and saw how they were then processed as responsible bureaucrats by Yezhov's "meat grinder"³ I began to believe that there was indeed some sort of retribution.

The most significant reaction to Kol'tsov's article was that there was not a single Party voice raised to say: "But Kol'tsov is compromising the regime by his feuilleton. The whole country is walking on the bodies of people who have died of starvation, and how can this be denied? How can this sort of thing be so cynically handled in a feuilleton?" No one said this. Everyone was intoxicated -- some from hatred of the regime, others from the joy of power. Those who were drunk from joy called the Seventeenth Party Congress, which convened in the spring of 1934 after the famine, the "congress of victors" (victory over the millions who had died of starvation!) The feuilleton writer Kol'tsov also belonged to the "victors" drunk with happiness . . . and he too was shot in 1938.

I consider it my unmitigated good fortune that at that time fate removed me from newspaper work and from lecturing about newspapers. To lecture on newspapers meant to compromise learning, to maintain that there was some special Marxist-Leninist (and Stalinist besides!) science of the press. Generally speaking, the fate of lecturers whose topics touched to some extent on Soviet reality was not an enviable one at that time. This was true of instructors in the humanities and in other fields as well, except, perhaps, pure sciences. All courses had to begin with Marx, Engels and Stalin. One would have expected the most orthodox Marxists to come to the fore here. Actually, however, opportunists came forward, and their flowery phrases covered an absolute ideological void. Fortunately I lectured on a subject about which Party control agents usually understood nothing--Western European literature. It was difficult for the Party control agents to accuse me of anything because I did not ignore the

3. The name given to the field session of the Military Collegium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Court, headed by Orlov, which came to Kharkov, convened at night and had most of its victims shot. -- A.K.

obligatory sociological-class approach to literary phenomena. On the contrary, I stressed it in order to turn it against Stalinism.

I spoke in such a way as to portray a situation as similar as possible to life under Stalinism. In painting a psychological picture of Shakespeare's Iago, for example, I always kept the image of Stalin in mind, for it lent a sharpness to my analysis. My students, future journalists, stood by me and several times saw to it that I received bonuses for my lectures. Did they understand what I was saying? I was afraid that the real conclusions behind my lectures might crystallize in their minds from the veiled parallels I had drawn. On the other hand, I did not wish my lectures to be merely academic. I wanted the students to realize not only that there was a terrible similarity between Shakespeare's character and Stalinist reality but also to draw the corresponding political conclusions: that Stalinism contained the same egoistic individualism that it allegedly was fighting to destroy, and that it was not collectivism at all but rather a new form of man's rule over man. However, for my own safety, such suspicions would have to arise dimly in the minds of the students themselves, through no ostensible fault of mine. Thus a Party investigator might hesitate to report me for fear that he himself had drawn the parallel between a Shakespearean character and Stalin, a parallel which had not actually been drawn by the instructor. Evidently my teaching device was successful, for when I was finally arrested no charge was levelled against me for the things I had said in the classroom.

During my lectures at the Institute the Stalinist control agents looked for "sabotage" in outward appearances such as disparaging remarks about Stalin. Later they began to complain if I failed in my lectures to mention what they thought were important facts. Someone lecturing about Shevchenko,⁴ for example, could be accused of failing to mention the fate of women in feudal society, children in Shevchenko's works, the military in the time of Nicholas I, etc. But actually it was the task of the Party control agents in the higher schools not to find guilt but to intimidate, to instill fear in lecturers.

There were various means of doing this. For example, a stenographer sent unannounced to attend a lecture would transcribe everything the professor said for the benefit of the

4. Taras Shevchenko (1812-1861), Ukrainian poet.

oblast Party committee. The trouble was not that she transcribed the lecture but that the lecturer was not allowed to correct mistakes or misrepresentations. For this reason, when I saw a stenographer sitting near the lecture platform at one of my lectures I abandoned my regular lecture procedure (in free literary style), took out my outline and began to dictate to the stenographer, slowly and with due consideration to every sentence. The students suppressed their smiles.

Even in such transcriptions, however, the control agents would try to find mistakes and would interpret what I said to suit their purpose. When I saw a district Party committee instructor who had long been "interested" in me at one of my lectures, I pulled out the Soviet textbook and began to lecture from it. Even this dodge did not help, however, because the instructor looked through the textbook and maintained that I had omitted a passage on the Party orientation of literature. Of course, what he wanted was my removal from the faculty, which he finally won in 1936.

There were other methods of persecuting intellectuals. For example, "anti-Marxist" errors would be revealed in a publication at meetings of the department concerned. A work published eight to ten years earlier would inevitably contain passages which did not correspond to the new spirit of the 1930's. The accused author of the work in question would be forced to recant publicly. He had to appear before the entire Institute (students and instructors) and condemn his errors, and write an article for the press in order to render his previous work harmless. If the name of the editor of the publishing house also appeared on the work condemned, he also was blamed and had to recant.

When the errors of a professor were discussed in the department all members of the department had to join actively in condemning him. Persons who said nothing were accused of "glossing over in silence." On one occasion our literature department discussed a "faulty" textbook on Ukrainian grammar, written by one of the members of the department. Everyone severely criticized the author, with whom they had joined just the day before in complaining about such procedures. Now they looked him in the eye and severely condemned his "bourgeois nationalist contraband." All this was so repulsive to me that in making a semblance of condemning the author I actually came to his defense. Curiously enough, I later learned that the author was an NKVD informer.

The "contraband" theme was all-pervasive and it seemed at the time that not positive, constructive work but

exposures of "enemy contraband" were most valued in the press, lectures and every ideological activity. The best journalist seemed to be the one whose articles sent the most "enemies of the people" to the NKVD. Similarly, the best literary critic was the one whose reviews revealed the greatest number of works guilty of Trotskyite or Ukrainian nationalist deviation. The best publishing house editor was not the one who prepared the most books for publication but the one who held back the most after discovering that they contained counterrevolutionary contraband."

Another form of intimidation was linking the name of the accused with the "crime" of another. Thus, for example, a favorable article on Ostap Vyshnya would become evidence of criminal complicity if Vyshnya were arrested and the author of the article would be eligible for arrest.

The same thing was true of lectures. If a professor delivered a lecture favorable to the work of a writer who had just been arrested, a fact not yet known to the professor, the professor was eligible for arrest for having championed "counterrevolutionary propaganda." When I had occasion to give a series of lectures on Soviet Ukrainian literature in 1933, I would go outside the Institute before every lecture and ask any friends I met what the latest news was and whether any of the authors I was about to discuss had been arrested. If such were not the case I delivered my lecture as planned, but if someone had been arrested, then I had to criticize both that person and any textbook which took a favorable view of him.

V. STALINISM IN THE PRESS

Soviet press style in its present form crystallized in the 1930's and can be called Stalinism in the press. The style arose as a response and a contribution to the political circumstances of the time. Certainly the most important reason for the type of press which emerged was the relationship between the Party and government on the one hand and the general population on the other. Whether one attributes this particular relationship to any traits of Stalin's own personality or to the ideological imperatives of the Party workers, the fact remains that great changes were forced upon the people through the Party and government apparatus. One has the impression that the leaders felt that anything was possible if only the many Party and state agencies could study, organize and master the problems of the times, and that if there existed some "aberrant" behavior in society it could be charged to an imperfection of the apparatus. Leon Trotsky, in his last rebuke to Stalin's faction from the speaker's stand in the Central Committee of the Party in 1927, had said that "this system is characterized by a belief in the omnipotence of the apparatus."

The belief that the important goals of the Party and government could be realized if only the masses were properly organized had a direct effect on the activities of all official agencies. It left its imprint on the Soviet press in the sense that it turned the press toward officialdom and away from the people.

For the reader a newspaper under Stalinism is, quite naturally, rather dull. That newspaper is considered good which, in the interests of Party and government, attacks slackers, fly-by-nights and embezzlers of state property, and does a good job of organizing socialist competition (meaning that it knows how to intimidate passive persons and compel them to make higher production pledges).

A typical manifestation of the orientation of the Soviet newspaper toward the apparatus rather than the reader is the title of the editorial previously cited -- "Let us Organize the Masses for Fulfillment of Industry Finance Plans." And in operational terms, for the people who publish the newspapers the Party and state orientation of the press meant that a secretary of the Party at any level could compel a newspaper to be an instrument of his private (though ostensibly Party and government) designs.

A basic operating rule of the Soviet press is that it must report only the achievements of the Soviet regime. This demand first arose in connection with the problems of collectivization in the early 1930's. Soviet life in the countryside was so joyless that if one were to have written the truth about it, even in modified tones, a hopelessly grim picture would have resulted. The newspapers were instructed during those terrible times to seek something positive in Soviet reality. As a result, not only was there no indication in the press of the human tragedy involved in collectivization, but the press actually reported that a wonderful new way of life had been created.

The practice of writing only in positive terms became entrenched in the Soviet press and today, just as earlier, leads to horrible unreality at times. The policy has been carried to the point where, because of the low standard of living in the U.S.S.R., the Soviet press is required to picture life in the capitalist countries in the darkest of colors. Originally this was done cautiously, with a sense of proportion, but by now it has become simply nothing more than stereotyped agitation.

Recently, in rereading Little Golden America by the Soviet writers Ilf and Petrov, published in the early thirties, I was amazed at the freedom of expression which existed even then in the U.S.S.R. in comparison with the present. Today this book would be called "kowtowing to the West," and its authors would be so roundly condemned that they would never write again. But it mocked the negative aspects of capitalism in the most effective way, by juxtaposing them with the positive aspects. The reader sympathetic to the Soviet regime who saw the backwardness of his homeland in this book wanted the U.S.S.R. to "catch up with and overtake" America in technology but was repelled by her capitalist way of life.

Ilf's and Petrov's book, which was printed in installments in Pravda, is a good illustration of the Soviet press of a better day. The press of the 1920's was written in the same spirit, and hence it carried great influence with its readers, fostered critical thinking, and had the reader's trust. Ordinarily, persons both friendly and unfriendly to the regime could find something of interest in the newspapers of that time; in the mendacious Soviet press of today, however, enemies of the Soviet regime can find nothing to support their position, and critically minded, intelligent proponents simply do not regard the newspapers as truthful. During the war a Soviet officer captured by the Germans told me that all the officers and men in his unit at the front simply did not believe the Soviet radio and newspapers when they

described the terrible atrocities committed by the Nazis in dealing with prisoners. The web of lies had so mightily engulfed the Soviet press that even truth was no longer convincing.

Lies were followed in the Soviet press by a false grandeur which today makes Soviet reports unbearably saccharine and improbable, and newspaper articles unconvincing and tedious. Where the reader cannot be convinced by logic and facts an elevated and formal style come to the rescue. A typical example is a story in *Izvestiya* of October 17, 1952 entitled "Inspired by the Speech of the Great Stalin." The article concerns workers at the Lenin Neva Plant who are overfulfilling plans in accordance with Stalin's speech at the Nineteenth Party Congress. The story is only seventy lines long but it is full of grandiose phrases: "toward new labor exploits . . . inspired struggle to create first-class machines . . . in a triumphant atmosphere . . . such an indescribable joyous excitement was in all our faces [on listening to Stalin's speech] . . . the machine builders are working with creative inspiration." And so on day after day in 8,300 press publications in the U.S.S.R. The phrases are repeated so often, and people have become so accustomed to them that it is only when a person who has lived under these conditions enters a more normal environment that he becomes fully aware of their incessant use.

What is the reason for the use of such a stock phrase as "go into operation," which is used to describe the opening of every new factory or power plant? Why should *Pravda* have printed for over a year the "flood of greetings to Comrade Stalin" on his seventieth birthday, each greeting filled with flowery phrases of "profound admiration and affection"? The answer to both questions lies in the fact that such phrases and greetings are inserted to protect the writer or the group he represents. They are printed for the Party apparatus which checks on the "Party discipline" of the press, and are employed in such a way that they may be referred to as evidence of the writer's loyalty. For the same reason every kindergarten or collective farm brigade had to spend money on congratulatory birthday telegrams in drives diligently organized by the Party committees in order not to lag behind other groups and thereby appear less loyal.

Another method to attain "respectability" in the press which became widely used in the 1930's was the use of a ghostwriter. For example, the January 4, 1953, issue of *Radians'ka Ukraina*, the most influential newspaper of the Ukrainian Republic, contains an article by O. Lepeshinskaya,

an active member of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Medical Sciences, entitled "The Fight Against Old Age."

Knowing that Lepeshinskaya received a Stalin Prize for her discoveries in this field, I read her article with interest. It begins with the words, "In our country, where everything is intended for the welfare of the working people, where the basic economic law of socialism, discovered and scientifically established by Comrade Stalin, applies. . . ." I look again at the title of the article and at the by-line to see if my eyes have not deceived me, but no, it is "The Fight Against Old Age," by O. Lepeshinskaya. I read the following paragraph patiently: "Many phenomena which cause premature old age had been forever done away with in the Soviet Union. . . . Citizens of the land of socialism are surrounded by the solituous concern of the state from the day they are born. It is natural that under conditions of the socialist system, under conditions of our fatherland's movement from socialism toward communism, problems of struggling to prolong human life, problems of longevity, assume particular importance." One-sixth of Lepeshinskaya's article is full of such verbal chaff. Only then does the scientific part begin.

Even if she did feel concerned about "the basic economic law of socialism, discovered and scientifically established by Comrade Stalin," any professor as far removed from the political sphere as Lepeshinskaya could not have formulated it in an article in such standard newspaper style. She most certainly received "help" here. Secondly, the agitational introduction to the article is in a different style from the scientific part. Examination of the article leads me to conclude that the author wrote only the first paragraph of the introduction: "The problem of longevity and the fight against old age is an extremely complex and at the same time extremely important one. It requires a wide range of work by specialists in different branches of biology and medicine and comprehensive study by involved and complex methods." This is followed by an insert on the basic economic law of socialism discovered by Stalin and a quotation from Engels, and only then does Lepeshinskaya resume: "Metabolism consists of the incorporation of nutritive substances (assimilation) and the disposal of the products of disintegration (dissimilation)," etc.

Thus we have before us a literary montage in which journalists have rather skillfully added to an article by a professional biologist political "plugs," to use the term employed by my Odessa colleague. Such "co-authorship" between Soviet journalists and the writers of articles is now

widespread in the U.S.S.R. It originated during the 1930's; thus Stalinization of the press means among other things the de-personalizing of writing. When articles began to be signed by entire worker correspondent brigades consisting of several persons literary authorship lost its meaning.

In the 1930's it became standard practice to publish articles supposedly written by prominent Soviet citizens but actually entirely written for them by journalists. It was said, for example, that How the Steel Was Tempered,⁵ the novel by Nikolai Ostrovski, was actually written by Anna Karavayeva, his literary editor. Writing for other people has now become so common in the Soviet newspapers that no one is surprised by it.

Another standard device used in the Soviet press is that of ignoring the time sequence of events. Thus, for example, the "Party Life" department of Pravda for May 11, 1953, carries an article defending the collegium principle in Party leadership. There the author writes that "it is well known that Party leadership is collective leadership." The author does not say when this became "well known," and yet it seems clear that the type of collective leadership which arose after Stalin's death is the antithesis of the leadership provided by Stalin. However, in defending the collegium principle the press pretends to support a system long in existence and championed allegedly by Stalin himself.

Such hypocrisy did not exist in the Soviet press in the 1920's. When it was necessary to introduce the NEP Lenin wrote straightforwardly in Pravda that the country had moved too far ahead and had to retreat a bit. But under Stalin the Soviet press was filled with half-truths, outright falsehood and scarcely concealed coercion and intimidation.

Another characteristic feature of the Soviet press which crystallized in the 1930's is the system of including in a newspaper a department entitled "Review of the Press" in which instructions and orders are given to newspapers of an administrative level subordinate to that of the paper in which the review is published. It is inconceivable that a raion or oblast newspaper should print a review of Pravda, for it alone is entitled to carry reviews of all other newspapers and is beyond criticism. The entire remaining press can only praise Pravda or reprint its articles, for to criticize Pravda would mean an editor's dismissal (and perhaps his

5. The novel appeared in English as The Making of a Hero.

arrest as well) and widespread reprisals against the staff. The lower-echelon newspapers--oblast, city and raion--follow Pravda's example in upholding their own prestige. Oblast newspapers have a "Review of the Press" which carries reviews of administratively lower newspapers in the cities and raions and of the factory and collective farm wall newspapers. The city and raion newspapers carry reviews of factory and collective farm newspapers. The newspaper of one city cannot review the press of another city on the same administrative level, nor can the newspaper of one raion review the press of another. Thus the Soviet press is based upon a strict hierarchy of authority.

The kind of instruction carried in the reviews of the press varies. In late 1952 the Sumy (Ukraine) oblast newspaper Bil'shovyts'ka zbroya [Bolshevik Weapon] devoted four columns in its "Literary Life" department to a photograph of a pensive young girl. For this action the newspaper received a severe reprimand in the "Review of the Press" department of the republic newspaper Radyans'ka Ukraïna on October 28, 1952. "The staff of the Sumy newspaper Bil'shovyts'ka zbroya forgets," wrote Radyanska Ukraïna, "that the most important task of the Party press at the present time is to propagandize the proceedings and decisions of the Nineteenth Party Congress."

In an article entitled "Comprehensively Support and Develop Criticism From Below" in its issue of January 6, 1953, Radyans'ka Ukraïna told two district newspapers that implementation of the decisions of the Nineteenth Party Congress and the development of "criticism from below" necessitated "regular publication in these newspapers of reports and letters from the working people." The editors cited as a good example the Krasny Liman newspaper Za tempy [For Speed] in Stalino Province, which headed whole pages "Letters to the Editor." As a negative example the review offered the newspaper Vpered do Komunizmu [Forward to Communism] in Novo-Arkhangelsk District of Kirovograd Province, which contained only articles written by members of the newspaper staff and no articles at all by readers.

The "Review of the Press" department of Radyans'ka Ukraïna for January 8, 1953, compares two house organs in Kharkov: Shakhtarka [Woman Miner] and Molotarka [Thresher], to the disadvantage of the latter. The "Review of the Press" department of Radyans'ka Ukraïna for January 13, 1953, praises the province newspaper Radyans'ka Volyn' [Soviet Volhynia] for exemplary reports on the reconstruction of war-torn Volhynia. If, however, a staff member of Radyans'ka Ukraïna had wanted to select negative material from some

other part of the newspaper, Radyans'ka Volyn' could have been made to appear as an inferior newspaper. Usually some restraint is shown, and it is not possible to disparage a good newspaper openly. Of course, the reviews of the press, like the rest of the newspaper, are often used for intrigue. If it is necessary to discredit a province or district committee secretary shortcomings will often be sought in his newspaper, thus creating grounds for his dismissal.

During the remaining days of January, 1953, the "Review of the Press" department of Radyans'ka Ukraina carried several commentaries on other papers. On January 15 the Kharkov Province newspaper was criticized for not doing enough to fight "for strengthening the bonds between science and practical work," and for "forgetting about the rationalizers and inventors." On January 17 the department carried the heading "Raise the Level of Propaganda of the Ideas of J.V. Stalin's Classic New Work." Here the province newspaper L'vivs'ka pravda [Lvov Truth] is criticized for not sufficiently popularizing Stalin's article, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." On January 20 the department cites the province newspaper Zakarpats'ka pravda [Transcarpathian Truth] to illustrate the proper ties between a newspaper and the primary Party organizations. The January 23 review deals with a daily wall newspaper on a collective farm. On January 31 the section deals with local life as reflected in a district newspaper.

From what has been said it is clear that in the late 1920's and throughout the 1930's policies were established and enforced which have molded the Soviet press into a powerful instrument for propaganda, coercion and terror in the hands of the Party and government. The increasing effectiveness of the press in this role can be traced in the changes which have taken place in the content of the newspapers.

Perhaps this point can be most clearly illustrated by comparing the November 7 anniversary editions of Pravda for 1952 and 1922. The edition marking the thirty-fifth anniversary of the October Revolution was typical of the Stalinist press we have been describing. The first page contains a portrait of Stalin covering one-fourth of the page. There are also pictures of two ministers--those of the Army and Navy--followed by their orders of the day and an editorial and a slogan at the top of the page. The second, third and part

of the fourth pages carry the traditional report on the formal meeting of the Moscow Soviet on the occasion of the anniversary. One-third of page three is devoted to a picture of the presidium of the formal meeting. The fourth page contains a chronicle of the formal meeting and another brief account of the report of the anniversary, together with greetings from the Communist Party of China and a special feature article. The entire fifth page is given over to special greetings from abroad, two-thirds to Stalin and one third to N.M. Shvernik as head of the Supreme Soviet. Half of the sixth page is devoted to reports on observance of the anniversary abroad and half to international news and news about Moscow. This was the entire content of the newspaper.

Compare Pravda of November 7, 1922, the fifth anniversary of the October Revolution. There are original and thought-provoking articles by Lenin ("On the Significance of Gold"), Trotsky, Bukharin, Kamenev and many others. A brilliant sketch by L. Sosnovski entitled "Russia" describes how the Revolution changed the face of the country and there are poems by Vladimir Mayakovski and others. Thus we see the transformation which has occurred over the last thirty years. On the most important Soviet holidays--the anniversary of the October Revolution and May Day--even Pravda usually comes out in only four or at most six pages. But during the years of War Communism, when newspapers were printed on wrapping paper, special editions of Pravda and other periodicals appeared on better paper and with extra pages--eight or more in all. However, Pravda then dealt with vital problems and every page breathed inspiration. Now the entire Soviet press concentrates on a few topics and simply does not dare to print more than four pages. There is enough paper now, and Soviet publishing technique has approached that of Europe, but the soul of Bolshevism is dead.

Glossary

guberniya (province): the largest administrative unit subordinate to a republic, excluding national areas; abolished by 1930 when the oblast became such a unit.

Komsomol: The Young Communist League, composed of young people from fifteen to twenty-six years old.

oblast (province): the administrative subdivision below the National Republics.

okrug: an administrative unit between the raion and the oblast which had almost disappeared by 1930.

povit (district): the term applied in the Ukraine in the early 1920's to the administrative unit elsewhere known as a uyezd.

raion (district): the basic administrative unit into which all administrative units in the U.S.S.R. are divided, with the exception of those in the Baltic republics.

uyezd (district): an administrative subdivision subordinate to a guberniya; replaced by the raion starting in 1922.

INDEX OF PUBLICATIONS CITED

Asterisk indicates publication in Russian; all others are in Ukrainian.

*Bednota [The Poor], 25

Bil'shovyts'ka zbroya [Bolshevik Weapon], 67

*Birzheviye vedomosti [Stock Exchange News], 15, 16, 30

Chervone selo [Red Village], 28

Chervonyi Mykolayiv [Red Nikolayev], 19

Chornomors'ka komuna [Black Sea Commune], in 1929 this title replaced Odesskiye izvestiya* [Odessa News], 21, 27, 28, 33, 34, 38, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49

Chornomors'ka komuna na vesnyaniy svibi [Black Sea Commune in Spring Sowing], 46

*Diktatura truda [Dictatorship of Labor], 27

*Ekonomicheskaya zhizn' [Economic Life], 25

Globus [Globe], 28

*Iskra [Spark], 55

*Izvestiya [News], 13, 21, 25, 27, 30, 31, 64

Kharkivs'kyi proletar [Kharkov Proletarian], in 1926 this title replaced Kharkhivs'kii proletarii* [Kharkov Proletarian], 16, 25, 27, 31

Kochegarka [Stokehole], 38

*Kommunisticheskiy internatsional [Communist International], 30

Komunist [Communist], in 1926 this title replaced Kommunist* [Communist], 11, 12, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 35, 38, 56

Komsomolets' Ukrainy [Young Communist of the Ukraine], 25

*Komsomol'skaya pravda [Young Communist Truth], 25

Komunarka Ukrainy [Ukrainian Woman Communist], 25

*Krest'yanskaya gazeta [Peasant Gazette], 25

Lenins'ka zmina [Leninist Generation], 28

L'vivs'ka pravda [Lvov Truth], 68

Molotarka [Thresher], 67

*Odesskiya novosti [Odessa News], 28

*Odesskiye izvestiya, see Chornomors'ka komuna, 5, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 37

*Odesskyi listok [Odessa Leaflet], 28

*Ogonyok [Little Flame], 28

- Pivdennyi hudok [Southern Whistle], 25
 *Pravda [Truth], 10, 13, 21, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 36, 38, 41, 45, 56, 57, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69
 *Priazovskii proletarii [Azov Proletarian], 27
Proletars'ka pravda [Proletarian Truth], in Ukrainian since the late 1920's, 25, 27
Radyans'ka Ukraïna [Soviet Ukraine], 64, 67, 68
Radyans'ka Volyn' [Soviet Volhynia], 67
Radyans'ke selo [Soviet Village], 25
Robitnycha hazeta proletar [Proletarian Workers' Gazette], 23, 25
Selyanka Ukraïny [Woman Peasant of the Ukraine], 25
Selyans'ka bidnota [The Village Poor], 4
Selyans'ka pravda [Village Truth], 24, 25
Shakhtarka [Woman Miner], 67
Shkval [Squall], 28, 29, 49
 *Sovetskaya Sibir' [Soviet Siberia], 11, 36, 55
Trud [Labor], 25
Trybuna robsel'kora [Worker and Peasant Correspondents' Tribune], 44, 45, 46
Uchytel'ska hazeta [Teacher's Newspaper], 25
Ukraïns'kyi ekonomist [Ukrainian Economist], 24, 25
 *Vecherniye izvestiya [Evening News], 13, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28
Vechirni Kiyiv [Evening Kiev], in Ukrainian since the late 1920's, 20, 27
Vechirnye radio [Evening Radio], in 1926 this title replaced Vecherneye radio* [Evening Radio], 20, 27
Visti Vseukraïns'kovo Tsentral'noho Vykonavchovo Komitetu [News of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee, abbreviated Visti VUTsVK], 5, 8, 9, 15, 23, 24, 26, 30
Vpered do komunizmu [Forward to Communism], 67
 *Vozrozhdeniye [Rebirth], 57
Vsesvit [Universe], 28
 *Yuzhnaya kopeika [Southern Kopeck], 28
 *Yuzhnyi krai [Southern Land], 6
Za tempy [For Speed], 67
Zakarpats'ka pravda [Transcarpathian Truth], 68
 *Zhurnalist [Journalist], 10
Zorya [Star], in the late 1920's this title replaced Zvezda* [Star], 25
 *Zvezda, see Zorya, 27

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Agranovs'kyi, 30
 Andreyev, Leonid, 35
 Bezymyanski, A., 45
 Blakytnyi, see Ellans'kyi, Vasyl'
 Bucharin, 10, 69
 Chamberlain, Austin, 29
 Diki, 29, 30
 Ellans'kyi, Vasyl', 8, 23
 Fokin, 30
 Hus, 55
 Ilf, 63
 Izvolsky, 16
 Kamenev, 10, 69
 Kaptan, 48-49
 Karavayeva, Anna, 66
 Kol'tsov, Mikhail, 57
 Kurs, 11, 37, 55
 Lenin, V. I., 55, 66, 69
 Lepeshinskaya, O., 64-65
 Lifshits, 23
 Maiorov, 49
 Makhno, Nestor, 2
 Malynovs'kyi, Hryhori, 19
 Markevich, 35, 36
 Mayakovski, Vladimir, 69
 Ol'shavets', Olexander, 37
 Orlov, 58
 Ostrovski, Nikolai, 66
 Petlyura, Semen, 2, 19
 Petrov, 63
 Petrovski, Grigori, 5
 Popandopulo, 19, 39
 Rafayilov, 30
 Rakovski, Khristian, 5
 Samulevych, 29
 Samutin, 29
 Semenko, Mykhalo, 4
 Shevchenko, Taras, 59
 Shubin, Pavel, 30
 Shvernik, N. M., 69
 Sosnovski, 19
 Sosnovski, L., 69
 Stalin, I. V., 10, 55, 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69
 Trotsky, L. D., 10, 11, 19, 62, 69
 Vainov, 29, 47-49
 Velichko, 15
 Vasil'yev, P., 31
 Vyshnya, Ostap, 9, 54, 61
 Yalovyi, Mykhalo, 4
 Yezhov, 14, 49, 58
 Zhyvotinski, P., 30
 Zinoviev, 10
 Zoloteryov, Yu., 30

TITLES PUBLISHED IN THE MIMEOGRAPHED SERIES, JUNE 1952 - JULY 1954

(Numbers 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 29, 32, 41, 48, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 66, 68 and 69 in English; others in Russian)

- No. 1: "Army Requisitions in Soviet Russia," 12 pp., \$0.25
- * No. 2: "Soviet Requisitions in Occupied Germany," 17 pp., \$0.25, out of print
- ✓ No. 3: "Administration of Azerbaijani Industry," by Andrew Naidenov, 19 pp., \$0.25
- No. 4: "Kamchatka: Survey and Recollections," 93 pp., \$1.00, out of print
- No. 5: "Conditions of Research in Soviet Biology," 123 pp., \$1.00, out of print
- * No. 6: "Soviet Economic Administration in Postwar Germany," 37 pp., \$0.50, out of print
- No. 7: "The Moscow Literary Museum and Archives," 21 pp., \$0.25
- No. 8: "Political Work in the Soviet Army," 74 pp., \$0.75, out of print
- No. 9: "Electrification Plans and the Deficiency of Electric Power for Industry in the Soviet Union," 48 pp., \$0.50
- No. 10: "Party and Administration in the Leningrad Agricultural Institute," 33 pp., \$0.30
- * No. 11: "Soviet Operation of Uranium Mines in Eastern Germany," 14 pp., \$0.25, in English, out of print
- No. 12: "Lenin School for Training of Political Officers of the Soviet Army," 15 pp., \$0.25
- No. 13: "The Shelter-Belt Project: Postwar Forestation in the U.S.S.R.," 47 pp., \$0.50
- No. 14: "Soviet Military Intelligence: Two Sketches," 24 pp., \$0.35, in English
- No. 15: "Notes of a Political Prisoner," 52 pp., \$0.50
- No. 16: "The Operation of a State Farm," 28 pp., \$0.30
- No. 17: "Soviet Security Agencies in Postwar Poland," 12 pp., \$0.25, in English
- No. 18: "Soviet Generals: Personalities, Attitudes and Conflicts," 46 pp., \$0.50
- No. 19: "The Cost of Construction of Metallurgical Plants in the U.S.S.R.," by Sergei Koptewski, 76 pp. with tables, \$1.20, in English
- No. 20: "Construction Materials of the Northern Caucasus," 73 pp., \$1.00
- No. 21: "Herbs Used in Ukrainian Folk Medicine," by Natalia Ossadcha-Janata, 114 pp., \$1.25, in English, out of print
- No. 22: "An NKVD Sovkhoz in the Altai Region," by S. Belosor, 28 pp., \$0.35
- ✓ No. 23: "Prospects for Oil Output in the U.S.S.R. by 1960," 22 pp., \$0.30
- No. 24: "Some Aspects of Soviet Price Policy," by Peter Uranov, 80 pp., \$1.00
- No. 25: "Soviet Forestation: Agricultural and Social Significance," by Vladimir Lindemann, 57 pp., \$0.70
- No. 26: "Technical Institutes in the U.S.S.R.," by Jakow Budanow, 30 pp., \$0.40
- No. 27: "Soviet Political Personalities: Seven Profiles," 23 pp., \$0.35
- No. 28: "Some Aspects of Kalmyk History and Society," 30 pp., \$0.40

- No. 29: "The Soviet Urban Housing Problem," 16 pp., \$0.25, in English, out of print
- No. 30: "Political Indoctrination in the Soviet Postwar Army," 29 pp., \$0.35
- No. 31: "The Soviet Movie Industry: Two Studies," by Paul Babitsky and Martin Lutich, 83 pp., \$0.95
- No. 32: "The Law of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Background and Bibliography," by Leo Okinshevich, 53 pp., \$0.75, in English
- No. 33: "Kolkhoz Mechanization," by S. Belosor, 81 pp., \$0.90
- No. 34: "Byelorussian Communism and Nationalism: Personal Recollections," by S. Krushinsky, 81 pp., \$0.90
- No. 35: "Soviet Population Trends, 1926-1939," by Basilius Martschenko, 41 pp., \$0.50
- No. 36: "Party and Political Organs in the Soviet Army," by I. Dmitriev, 59 pp., \$0.65
- * No. 37: "Soviet Dismantling of Equipment in Postwar Germany," by Vladimir Alexandrov, 28 pp., \$0.35
- No. 38: "The Science of Fertilization in Ukrainian Agriculture," by Gregory Makhiv, 97 pp., \$1.05
- * No. 39: "The Administration of the Coal Industry in Soviet-Occupied Germany," by Mikhail Mab, 19 pp., \$0.25
- No. 40: "Pereval: The Withering of Literary Spontaneity in the U.S.S.R.," by Gleb Glinka, 110 pp., \$1.20
- No. 41: "The Introduction of New Plants in Soviet Agriculture: Supervision and Control," by Nestor Korol, 16 pp., \$0.30, in English
- No. 42: "Higher Technical Training in the U.S.S.R.," by Nicolay Ivanov, 38 pp., \$0.50
- No. 43: "The 1952 Plan for the Draining of the Pripet Marshes," by G. Kazakov, 27 pp., \$0.40
- No. 44: "Religious Communes in the U.S.S.R.," by K. Petrus, 73 pp., \$0.85
- No. 45: "The Pushkin Edition of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences," by L. L. Domherr, 110 pp. plus photostats, \$1.50
- No. 46: "The Concise Philosophical Dictionary: A Critical Review," by Alexander Philipov, 58 pp., \$0.70
- No. 47: "Urban Construction in the Soviet Union," 33 pp., \$0.45
- No. 48: "Lespromkhoz as an Administrative and Production Unit," by P. Nikitin, 82 pp., \$0.95, in English
- No. 49: "Cultural Life in the Tatar Autonomous Republic," by T. Dawletschin, 45 pp., \$0.55
- No. 50: "Soviet Military Tribunals," by P. Zorin, 30 pp., \$0.40
- No. 51: "Consumer Cooperatives in the Soviet Union," by Peter Uranov, 180 pp. plus appendixes, \$2.00
- No. 52: "Arbitration in the Soviet Union," by Leo A. Yaresh, 149 pp., \$1.60, in English
- No. 53: "Elements of Disloyalty in Turkmenistan," by Jan Dubicki, 49 pp., \$0.60
- No. 54: "Solonetz and Chestnut Brown Solonetzic Soils in the U.S.S.R.," by Peter Kolymsky, 104 pp., \$1.15
- No. 55: "The Principle of Analogy in Criminal Law: An Aspect of Soviet Legal Thinking," by Juri Starosolskyj, 91 pp., \$1.00, in English

- No. 56: "The German Occupation in Northern Russia During World War II: Political and Administrative Aspects," by Oleg Anisimov, 37 pp., \$0.45, in English
- No. 57: "Soviet National Literature in the New Soviet Encyclopedia," Peter Yershov, 11 pp., \$0.20, in English
- No. 58: "Civilian Life Under the German Occupation, 1942-1944," by Vladimir D. Samarin, 90 pp., \$1.00
- No. 59: "Soviet Shipping in the Spanish Civil War," 22 pp., \$0.30, in English
- No. 60: "Kostomarov's Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People, with a Commentary by B. Yanivs'kyi," 45 pp., \$0.55, in English (Russian text of the Books is included)
- No. 61: "Russian Orthodox Bishops in the Soviet Union, 1941-1953. Materials for the History of the Russian Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R.," by Wassilij Alexeev, 163 pp., \$1.75
- No. 62: "Science Fiction and Utopian Fantasy in Soviet Literature," by Peter Yershov, 66 pp., \$0.75, in English
- No. 63: "Economic Administration and Labor Productivity on a Soviet State Farm," by Alexander Dobrovolsky, 35 pp., \$0.45, in English
- No. 64: "Geographic Studies in Soviet Universities and Teachers' Colleges," by George A. Taskin, 40 pp., \$0.50
- No. 65: "Some Aspects of Ukrainian Music Under the Soviets," by Hryhory Kytasty, 62 pp., \$0.75
- No. 66: "Experiences of a Soviet Journalist," by A. Finn, 27 pp., \$0.40, in English
- No. 67: "Communist Party Officials: A Group of Portraits," by Michael Kitaeff, 170 pp., \$1.80
- No. 68: "Selection and Training of Soviet Personnel for Trade Missions Abroad," and "The Soviet Trade Mission in Iran," by Viacheslav P. Artemiev, 20 pp., \$0.30, in English
- No. 69: "The Fall of Postyshev," by Hryhory Kostinuk, 25 pp., \$0.35, in English

Available in English in Materials on the Soviet Petroleum Industry, Research Studies Institute, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, July 1953.

* These papers have been published by the Research Program in English in its STUDIES ON THE U.S.S.R. No. 3, Soviet Economic Policy in Postwar Germany, 184 pages; \$2.25. Nos. 37 and 39 are still available in Russian in mimeographed form.

Note: Authors' names are listed above only when they appear on the printed manuscripts.

Orders may be placed with the Research Program on the U.S.S.R., 401 West 118th Street, New York 27, N. Y. Standing orders will be accepted for automatic shipment of all publications as they become available. No discount is granted on mimeographed materials.

RESEARCH PROGRAM ON THE U.S.S.R.

TITLES PUBLISHED IN THE MIMEOGRAPHED SERIES July 15, 1955

No. 70: "The Foreign Policy of the Moscow Patriarchate, 1939-1953," by Wassilij Alexeev, 238 pp., in Russian; conclusion in English and Russian, \$2.50

No. 71: "Newspapers in the U.S.S.R.: Recollections and Observations of a Soviet Journalist," by A. Kotlyar, 73 pp., in English, \$0.95

No. 72: "Soviet Use of German Science and Technology, 1945-1946," by V. L. Sokolov, 31 pp., in English, \$0.50

No. 73: "Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Treaty of Pereyaslav in Soviet Historiography," by Andrij Moskalenko, with a bibliography on Soviet publications for the tercentenary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav, 40 pp., in English, \$0.60

No. 74: "The Theater in Soviet Azerbaidzhan," by Kourken Ayvasian, 29 pp., in English, \$0.50

No. 75: "The Local Budget System of the U.S.S.R.: Its Development and Functions," by George Stec, 106 pp., in English, \$1.40

No. 76: "Two Essays in Soviet Historiography: I. The Centralized Russian State of the Seventeenth Century. II. The Age of Catherine II," by Leo Yares, 61 pp., including bibliography, in English, \$0.80

No. 77: "Dissolution and Aftermath of the Comintern: Experiences and Observations, 1937-1947," by Alfred Burmeister, 43 pp., in English, \$0.65

No. 78: "The Organization and Utilization of Forests in the Ukrainian S.S.R.," by P. Nikitin, 85 pp., in English, \$1.20

No. 79: "Bakunin and the Russian Jacobins and Blanquists as Evaluated by Soviet Historiography," by V. Varlamov, 55 pp., with bibliography, in English, \$0.75