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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the topic of political control of literature within the Soviet Union. The specific scope of this examination includes an investigation of Nikita S. Khrushchev and his utilization of socialist realism as one of the primary methods of literary control during the period, 1960-1963. A study of literature and its political control will demonstrate the important and dynamic roles which the political control of literature fulfills in the political system.

Since literature is controlled by the political authority of the state, an examination of the scheme of control falls within the purview of the political scientist. Because many aspects of Soviet society are controlled or manipulated by the state, one may conceptualize the Soviet system as a politically closed society. A closed society may take one of two forms: these systems are usually semantically identified as authoritarian or totalitarian. The goal of an authoritarian system is the domination of the political man. In other words, the authoritarian system seeks to control primarily the political behavior of its citizens. Totalitarianism, as its name would indicate, is the complete
control of man by the state, and there is no phase of human behavior which the state does not seek to dominate. Rather than stumble into a semantical pitfall, the Soviet system will merely be semantically identified as a politically closed society. By using that concept, it can be readily seen that literature can be a dynamic force in shaping and directing public opinion within the system. Literature also plays an important role in the process of political socialization.

Public opinion and political socialization are closely akin to one another, but there are some differences. Public opinion is most simply described as the view of the general populace, especially as a force in the determination of social conduct and political action. Political socialization is defined basically as the process by which the individual is adapted or inducted or made to conform to the political standards of a given society. Public opinion can be directed by political socialization. That is, public opinion is generally exercised only after the general populace has been properly socialized by the system; political socialization sets the standards of acceptable social and political behavior.

\(^1\) Almond and Powell's concepts of interest articulation aggregation would easily fit here. That is, literature is a means by which the interests of society may be articulated and aggregated; however, the actual articulation and aggregation functions are performed by the government officials. See Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach (Boston, 1966), p. 11 ff.
By regulating the content and flow of literature, the political leadership both directly and indirectly controls the communication process. Here it is important to note that the communication process is inverted by the state. The communication aspect or function of literature becomes a political tool of the state, and literature, therefore, becomes a means of "reverse communication." Literature is often a method of communication from the dissatisfied section of society to the establishment, or it is a means of communicating public opinion to the political decision makers. In the Soviet Union that process is reversed; public opinion is formed and established by the political leadership.

There are many significant aspects of literary control which need to be perused. The mere fact that the political leadership of the state deems it necessary to control and regulate the dissemination of literature implies a state of conflict within the system. By directing the flow and content of literature, the state is attempting to still the voices of

---

2Generally when one speaks of communication, the usual directional flow is upward, i.e. from the citizens to the political leadership of the state. A good example would be the "muckraker" type of literature which exposes faults within the system and suggests new authoritative allocations. The "reverse communication" function of Soviet literature does not fit this conceptual mold. On the contrary, "reverse communication" becomes thinly veiled ideological directives and commands from the state to the citizen. Thus "reverse communication" is a means by which the political leadership influences public opinion and the communication processes of the citizen.
possible dissent. Artistic quality is important only if the views are directives of the state are represented.\(^3\)

It may be readily seen why the intelligentsia would become disillusioned over the cultural policies of the government since it is the intelligentsia who are generally critical of the state. The words \textit{intelligentsia} and \textit{intellectual} usually imply a person of education and learning. The intelligentsia is usually more aware of political and social problems than the general public; they are likewise usually more critical. Since the Soviet state owns and controls the means of communication and mass media, the only real avenues of communication open to dissident Soviet intellectuals are the creative arts; or they may choose to remain silent.\(^4\)

\(^3\)The first duty of literature then is to represent the beauty of the socialist state; artistic responsibility must follow the commands of the government. That is to say that if a work follows the ideological directives of the regime, i.e. the tenets of socialist realism, the artistic quality of that work is correspondingly high and \textit{vice versa}.

\(^4\)For the purposes of this thesis, the arts as a whole will be treated only tangentially. The major emphases herein will be directed toward literature; however, whenever there have been restrictions in one of the arts, similar restrictions have also appeared in the sister arts. Thus when the leadership of the state make objections about abstract and \textit{avant-garde} art, there is an implicit objection made about abstraction and the \textit{nouveau} in all art forms in general. For research purposes, statements made about literature in particular will be emphasized; however reports of other art forms, because of their direct bearing on literature, will also be utilized.
The state in recognition of this factor accordingly puts clamps on the arts as a means of expression. For if the function of a political system, as Beer and Ulam suggest, is to make legitimate policy decisions, the protests of Soviet writers challenge the very legitimacy of that system. On the other hand, Communist Party and Soviet governmental officials, by utilizing the flexible concept of socialist realism, are seemingly trying to reestablish the legitimacy of an intensely tightened policy of political control over literature.

In the Soviet Union, as in any closed society, political control of literature is neither primarily moral nor paternal in nature; on the contrary, it is a potent political and ideological weapon in the system's political armament magazine. Literature can articulate the interests of society as seen by the authoritative allocators and directly present these interests to the citizens. The political leadership is in essence articulating and aggregating interests for the citizen. By forcing the intelligentsia to bend to its will, the government is attempting to disguise its policy decisions in the form of prosaic or poetic work. "Literature, broadly speaking, still remains the hand maiden of propaganda in the U.S.S.R. . . ."\(^6\)


Literature in the open society can very easily be the gadfly that constantly goads society to take a closer look at its structure and institutions; it can be the veritable alter-ego that society might need. Literature definitively, stylistically, and historically represents and depicts the political culture of a given society, and it is also a means of politically socializing an individual into the system. The environmental and structural features of the political culture may not always be explicitly represented in literature, but there is a definite implication always present pointing to their existence.

Literature, as a means of political socialization, can for the purpose of examination be placed into a schematic diagram depicting the political system. By doing so, one can more easily visualize the effects of literature, or more specifically political socialization, on the political system; even the diverse roles which literature plays in the system might be demonstrated. By utilizing David Easton's systems analysis approach, the political system can be better visualized and placed into a somewhat broader

---

7Here interests are aggregated and articulated to the political authority, not vice versa because the writers make their views known to the government.
The political system consists of various, interrelated, and interdependent component elements yet each can potentially be influenced by, or itself influence, literature and political socialization.

The preceding schematic presentation of the political system is only a heuristic device for the examination of the data.

---

8 David Easton, *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1965), p. 112. Easton's concept of a general theory for a political analyses of political systems is not of importance in the present investigation; however, the use of schematic presentations of the political system has great utility. Easton's idea of a political system is useful herein only as a conceptual framework in which to view the interactions of the system.

9 Ibid.
The component units will be only briefly discussed in the present chapter; however, they will be elaborated upon in Chapter V.

The Soviet political system, it could be effectively argued, does not fit this nice, precise schematic diagram because of its authoritarian nature. The fact that the Soviet Union is not a representative democracy is irrelevant because demands are made and decisions reached in any system. That is, all systems respond to the stimuli of demands; the response may be either positive or negative. By utilizing a framework of this nature, an analysis of the literary conflict is made easier.

By designating the demand inputs as literary practices contrary to "acceptable" Communist principles, one component unit of the system may be depicted. Here, literature is directly injected into the system. In the same manner, support inputs may be indicated as the theoretical bases for the "alien" literature and the literary demands. Next in the schematic blueprint, the demands are placed before the decision maker which in this case may be tentatively designated as Nikita S. Khrushchev. Khrushchev may be designated thusly because of his most influential position in both the Party and the government. Demands are, by definition, articulated statements that an authoritative allocation of values ought to be undertaken.\(^\text{10}\) The authoritative allocator or decision

\(^\text{10}\)Ibid., p. 120.
maker thus must make some type of decision in relation to the inputs; he must either accept or reject the demands.\textsuperscript{11}

The decision now becomes a very important component unit in the analysis of the system. The very nature of the Soviet system makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the scholar to accurately assess the decision making process. There is no method by which the votes may be quantified, for the decision making process is neither recorded nor published for scholarly consumption. The decision making process is, therefore, probably the least observable component element of the entire system. Consequently, the actual decision and the implementation thereof is doubly important and must be scrutinized minutely. Feedback in this instance must be observed very closely in an effort to determine which type of literature becomes acceptable to and recognized by the political leadership of the system. Environment can be useful as an analytical tool in answering the questions: 1. Why were the demands made on the system at a particular time? and 2. What political conditions prevailed at that time which influenced the specific decision of the system? Environment is also important to the political system, as will later be demonstrated, because of its influence on the process of political socialization.

\textsuperscript{11}Even if the decision maker delivers no formal decision or allocation of values, he is recognizing if only tacitly, the demands made of the system.
The systems analysis approach has helped the following pattern of analysis to emerge. A historical overview of the topic of political control of literature is important because it lays the foundation of the ensuing analysis. By observing the historical trends of the political role of literature in the Soviet Union, some general conclusions about the relationship between the government and literary society may be deduced. Next by examining literature as an agent of political socialization, the political role of literature will be made much clearer. Then by observing the political behavior of Nikita S. Khrushchev during a three year period with emphases placed on his literary policy statements, his political position toward the arts can be determined. Finally by analyzing all the available data, some general conclusions will be made about the political control of literature during the Khrushchev era, 1960-1963.
CHAPTER II

METHODS OF POLITICAL CONTROL
OF LITERATURE

Although the primary emphasis of this study is the examination of socialist realism as a means of political control of literature, socialist realism is not the only method of control. On the contrary in the Soviet Union, there is a plethora of formal and informal agencies of control, and a cursory examination of the other methods of literary control would be fruitful. The following presentation is a brief descriptive and historical sketch of the Soviet agencies and institutions that keep the literary society of U.S.S.R. closed.

Political control of literature is not a new concept; it and censorship antedate Christianity. The idea that the state may protect itself and its citizens from demoralizing and debasing literature is evident in the works of Plato.

In formulating the structure of his "perfect" state, Plato in Book II of The Republic carefully analyzed the role of political control of literature in his state. Children, according to Plato, must be taught only the "good" fables; the "bad" must be discarded or censored.

Then first, as it seems, we must set a censorship over the fable-makers, and approve any good fable they make, and disapprove the bad;
those which are approved we will persuade the mothers and nurses to tell the children, and to mould the souls of the children by the fables even more carefully than the bodies by their hands. Most of those they now tell must be thrown away.¹

It was the role of the state to mold the minds of its citizens, thereby creating a paternal, beneficent state.

Plato realized the force and impact that literature could have on the state; therefore, he felt that literature must be approved and condoned by the state. He further realized that literature could have permanent effects on the minds of the readers. The citizen, accordingly, must be taught only the good things about the state:²

... that God, since he is good, would not be the cause of a few things to mankind, and of many no cause; ... and of the good things no other must be described as the cause, but of the evil things we must look for many causes, ... ³

Those things which are good emanate from the state; those which are bad are vestiges of the past and in no way related to the state. Political control of literature is not a communist innovation.

Even today in the twentieth century United States, a Puritanical code of ethics pervades the legal rendition of statutory codes concerning literature. General public

²Ibid., p. 176.
³Ibid., p. 177.
acceptance of literature is also governed by this moral code. Literature which debases the morality of the populace can be legally proscribed and condemned. It would, however, be a tragic mistake to step into the polemical pitfall of comparing, on the same plane, the censorship policies of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The literary policy of the Soviet Union, generally speaking, condemns all literature contrary to the "Soviet way of life." That is, any literary work which is contrary to or contradicts the principles of Marxism-Leninism is wrong and must be expunged. Any writer whose work reveals a "vestige of the past" or an abstract of the future has fallen victim to the decadence of the West. It is the duty of the state to prevent these "bad" works from being published.

Control of literature in the Soviet Union is not primarily paternal in tenor even though the fervent, evangelical zeal sometimes seen in the Soviet Union has often been compared to the Protestant Ethic. Control of literature is essential to the health and well being of the ruling oligarchy, for one "heretical" work could well breed resentment and resistance. The Soviet Union, accordingly, has utilized agencies of censorship and control to enforce and support the rule of the regime.

In conducting any type of examination of the control of literature within the Soviet Union, one must constantly bear
in mind the unique political character of Soviet society. The Soviet polity has been conceptualized as either a totalitarian monolith or authoritarian in nature. Regardless of the description used, Russia has historically been a politically closed society. The "authoritarian character" of the Soviet Union is neither a distinctive communist institution nor invention. The "police" character of the Soviet Union may be traced back to the rule of the tsars, and this feature is an environmental factor affecting the Soviet political system.

Political control of literature and the press, likewise, is not a communist instituted apparatus. Freedom of the press, in the democratic sense of the phrase, has never really existed in Russia; the tsarist autocracies also exercised stringent controls over the press and literature. The committees for the affairs of the press were the institutions of censorship under tsarist regimes. These committees were the predecessors of some of the communist institutions; in other words, the foundations were already there. For a literary work to receive the official sanction of publication, it had to reach the censors within a prescribed length of time. This is not an attempt to trace the development of censorship of the press; it is, however, an attempt to demonstrate that

---


5 Ibid. The specific length of time was seven days.
political control of literature is not a communist instituted innovation.

The intellectual community of the Soviet Union hoped that a new era in Soviet literature would commence after Khrushchev delivered his now famous "Secret Speech" to the Twentieth Party Congress.⁶ After the delivery of the speech poems, novels, and short stories which deviated sharply from the literature of the previous thirty-five years of Soviet rule were written. When Khrushchev decided to tighten literary policy, he had a whole history of precedents on which to base his action.⁷

Censorship, in the Soviet Union, is normally an instrument of prevention (prophylactic justice);⁸ it is designed to prevent material which the government finds detrimental or hostile to its interests from being published. "In the Soviet Union the problem of censorship is one of internal supervision rather than external control."⁹

---

⁶This topic will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapters IV, V, and VI.

⁷For an excellent account of the events surrounding the recent writers' trials, see: Marvin Kalb, "The Soviet Trials, 1968," Saturday Review, LI (February 17, 1968), 19-21.


The secret police, K.G.B., plays a very important role in that internal supervision. The K.G.B. is organized into many subdivisions for the express purpose of internal supervision; the agency which supervises the bureaucracy and intelligentsia is the Main Secret political Administration (Glavnoye sekretopoliticheskoye upravleniya — S.P.U.). The role of the S.P.U. has varied at different times, but at the present, it apparently has the following functions:

Supervision of the Party apparatus including Party organizations up to the highest level, various "philosophical," "research," "historical," and other Party institutions, propaganda organizations, etc. . . .

Supervision of cultural and educational institutions and activities, including scientific institutes, laboratories, research organizations, planning agencies, Academies of Science; publishing houses and offices (censorship); theatres, cinemas, radio and television; higher educational institutions such as universities, engineering and other professional schools; . . .

Supervision of all "public organizations" functioning on a "voluntary" basis and ostensibly independent of the Soviet government, such as labor unions, "voluntary societies," the "Writers' Union," the "Artists' Union," the "Composers' Union," etc. Experience has shown that anti-Soviet feelings, tendencies, or nuclei are easily crystalized in such organizations. 10

The S.P.U. is actively involved in the political control of literature because of its specific supervisory functions in the three above mentioned categories.

It is obvious that the secret police apparatus watches for and hunts down anti-Soviet feelings among the people; each particular subdivision or subunit of the K.G.B. serves the function of controlling a single area from many and diverse angles. Given its specialization the secret police activity falls into distinctly different terroristic spheres.

... terrorism as a means of seizing power, as a means in the revolutionary struggle, is known as "individual terrorism," and terrorism as a means of retaining power, governing the masses is known for that reason as "mass terrorism." 11

Obviously, overt terrorism has diminished as one of prime aspects of controlling the masses, but the threat of terror hangs over the heads of all the people in the Soviet Union. The secret police serves as an instrument by which the regime is able to assume and retain power and control. The secret police as an agent of the state has the function of suppressing literature which challenges the primacy of the regime; the K.G.B., in the final analysis, serves as an agent of political control of literature.

Another method of the political control of literature in the Soviet Union lies within the publication process itself. The Soviet Union has a formal governmental censorship agency known as GLAVIT, a short form for its full title—Chief

Administration for Literary Affairs and Publishing. GLAVIT, in the absence of any government agency directly responsible for propaganda, is attached to the Ministry of Education of the Russian Republic. GLAVIT was established June 6, 1931 by the following decree which stated the primary functions of the agency:

1. For the purpose of putting into all types of political, military, and economic control over items prepared for publication or distribution in the press, over manuscripts, pictures, drawings, etc., and also over radio announcements, lectures, and exhibitions there shall be organized under the People's Commissariat of Education of the R.S.F.S.R. (The Ministries of Culture of the various union republics currently house the censorship agency) a Chief Administration for Matters of Literature and Publishing Houses (GLAVIT).

2. In order to carry out the tasks placed upon it, GLAVIT, shall be permitted to forbid printing, publication, and distribution of productions which:
   a. contain agitation or propaganda against Soviet authority and the dictatorship of proletariat.
   b. reveal state secrets.
   c. stir up ethnic and religious fanaticism.
   d. have a pornographic character; ...  

GLAVIT still exists today though its power is somewhat curtailed; in reality, it holds a position of secondary political importance. "Its prepublication censorship is

---


largely limited to seeing that the material does not reveal any military or economic secrets."\(^{14}\)

The authoritarian character of the Soviet political system must not be forgotten. Because of the authoritarian nature of Soviet politics, the principle of \textit{samokritika} is expounded to the Russian people. Briefly, \textit{samokritika} means self-criticism; however, its ideological implications involve something much deeper. In essence the principle of \textit{samokritika} propounds the ideological concept of the superiority of the socialist system, and the Soviet citizen is expected to criticize himself and his actions so that he might properly fit in the system. The Soviet censor consequently searches for \textit{samokritikal} evidence in the literary works in his administrative jurisdiction.\(^ {15}\)

The All Union Publishing House, the central publishing agency in the Soviet Union, is owned and operated by the state, and the state has thus accrued great power in deciding what will and will not be published. The duties of the All Union Publishing House are stated in a fairly concise manner in its charter.

\(^{14}\)Inkeles, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 186.

6. The All Union Publishing-Polygraphic Combine, "Vneshtorgizdat"
   a. prepares manuscripts of catalogues, prospectuses, instructions and other publications.
   d. finds authors to write the texts for appropriate publications.  

The All Union Publishing House is virtually omnipotent in that it not only decides what will be published but in some cases actually chooses the authors for the appropriate work. Freedom of the press in the Soviet Union is obviously limited, but it does exist as a "freedom" to adhere to the Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the state's policies. Freedom of the press, as are the other civil liberties, is restricted in the Soviet Union; but according to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the restrictions are along class lines.

The civil liberties, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and association are specifically guaranteed by the 1936 Soviet Constitution; however, the interests of socialism limits the use thereof. The interests of the state must come first. In fact on paper, Russian civil law seems to guarantee the writer much latitude in his writing. The following is an example of a recent enactment:


16Hazard, op. cit., p. 86.
The author shall have the right: ... to publication, reproduction and distribution in any method permitted by law of his production under his name, ...\(^{17}\)

It is important to recognize that the author does have freedom, but it is a freedom which the state, at its discretion, allows him to exercise. The freedoms of press and speech in the Soviet Union are obviously not analogous to the First Amendment Freedoms of the United States.

In reality, freedom of the press is one of those semantical catchwords used by the communist system; for it is not really a freedom *per se* but a privilege with the sovereign prerogative resting with the state. The Central Committee's Department of Propaganda and Agitation has several subdivisions in the hands of which general supervisory responsibility for all phases of newspaper publishing is concentrated.

State administration in the Soviet Union is basically a system of checks and additional checks. At, and for, each level of administration there is an internal system of *proverka* or *kontrol* (Check-up) which functions along administrative lines of subordination. There are two formal agencies with administrative control-like functions, the procuracy and party state control commission, which operate the lines of subordination.\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\)Ibid. [Emphasis added.]

It is important to remember that the press (newspapers) in the Soviet Union is not primarily a news gathering instrument, but it is primarily a channel for the propagation of policies which have already been decided by the regime. The press is operated for and by the state.

Finally, the last instrument of control to be examined is the Union of Soviet Writers, and it exercises a power which is both formal and informal in nature. Its formal control lies in the fact that it is the agency which forwards "rewarding" material to the All Union Publishing House. The informal aspect of its dominion is a post-publication reward and punishment system. The stated aim of the Writers' Union is to bring the artists together "to participate through their creative work in the class struggle of the proletariat..." and "the creation of artistic works worthy of the great epoch of socialism." The Union of Soviet Writers was set up on the theoretical basis of interplay and exchange between the Party and the writers; and through this interaction, the Party hoped it could guide and direct the writers along the correct ideological path.


20 Swayze, op. cit., p. 225.
The Writers' Union, a Stalinist institution, was founded in 1932. The All Union Congress is at the apex of the pyramidal structure of the Union. The Congress, however, met only twice between the years 1934 and 1954; the control of the Writers' Union ultimately rested in the hands of Stalin, himself.21 In 1954 after the death of Stalin, the laws governing the Union were amended to require the Congress to meet at least once every four years. Other important organs of the Union are the presidium and secretariat. In the formative years, the presidium was the dominant organ; however, it later became dormant. After World War II, the secretariat gradually eclipsed the presidium as the more powerful entity. In 1959, because it performed its tasks "inadequately," the presidium was abolished. The secretariat was then increased in size from eleven to twenty-eight members; power, though, was wielded by an "inner secretariat" of thirteen men.22

The secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers has many responsibilities; it has great authority especially in the areas of making policy and financial arrangements.

The responsibilities of the secretariat are great: its sessions may be concerned with anything from broad questions of literary policy through organizational problems on the union, republic, district, or local level. In practice,

21 Ibid., p. 226.

22 Ibid., p. 227. In recent years the secretariat has been criticized by many outstanding Russian writers for its use and/or misuse of power.
the central literary journals and nation's publishing house "Sovetsky pisatel" [sic] are accountable to the secretariat, which exercises the right to appoint and remove members of their editorial board.23

Thus, it is readily seen that the secretariat is practically omnipotent within its defined scope of operation. It not only supervises the publication of belles-lettres but is also the governmental agency which dispenses information and content guidelines to the literary journals and quarterlies.

Also of major concern in the Union of Soviet Writers is the Party organization therein. The Party concerns itself with every aspect of literary life and attempts to inculcate the doctrine of socialist realism into all literary works. The Party has tremendous influence over what the Soviet literary consumer receives. The Party organization in the Writers' Union, as in Soviet society as a whole, is characterized by centralized control and authority.

As a noted authority has observed, the process of controlling literature begins not at the Writers' Union nor with the snip of censor's scissors but in the mind of the writer. Political socialization has taken root; there is an "internal censor" present which is the result of Soviet ideological indoctrination and the fear of possible sanctions. The educational system affects the writer in that he automatically rejects some plans, either consciously or

---

23Ibid., p. 228.
subconsciously, because the rejected plans contravene the doctrine which he has been taught to respect and obey.24

Within the institutional framework of the Union of Soviet Writers, there is a Literary Institute of the Writers' Union which is an institution of higher learning that trains young writers, critics, and scholars. The primary purpose of the Institute is to equip its students with a sound knowledge of Marxism-Leninism; the stated aim of the Institute is specifically to acquaint the student with "questions of content and the ideological intent of the works."25 It is apparent that ideological inculcation plays an important role in the finished product.

In addition to the formal institute, there are many informal literary circles, clubs, seminars, and conferences. Implicit in the organization of these subunits is the socialization of the writers as to the purpose and fulfillment of socialist realism in the Soviet system.

A financial reward and assistance program is another method whereby literature is effectively controlled. An aspect of lucrative exploitation by the state is Litfund. It is an all union organization with branches at all levels. Litfund engages in extensive fiscal operations, and it builds and controls writers' clubs, retreats, sanatoria, nurseries, and kindergartens. Litfund makes loans and grants available to the writers; but in order to receive these remunerations,

24 Ibid., p. 237.  
25 Ibid., p. 238.
the writers are expected to espouse those ideas that the Party wants to hear.

Other remunerative rewards are literary prizes with stipends, such as the Lenin Prize which has replaced the Stalin Prize as the most prestigious literary award in the Soviet Union. The prizes serve as strong incentives; however, the impact has not been totally satisfactory. Some Soviet literary critics have claimed that many of the works are turned out mechanically for monies proffered. These critics, in effect, claim that many authors prostitute themselves because they write primarily for the money involved and forget literary craftsmanship and inventiveness. The prizes thus serve as methods of indirect control, for the Party will not reward those who refuse homage to Caesar.

Finally, there is a complex royalty system in the Soviet Union, and this system provides materialistic incentives to those writers who please and placate the state.

Government decrees have established three categories of payment: the first category is for outstanding works, the second for good works and the third for satisfactory works and works of beginning writers. Prose writers receive four thousand, three thousand, or fifteen hundred rubles per "printers' sheet" of forty thousand typographical units, and poets, twenty, fourteen or seven rubles per line. The rewards are based on literary craftsmanship and ideological purposefulness of the works; there is also a sliding

\[\text{26} \text{Ibid., p. 239.} \quad \text{27} \text{Ibid., pp. 242-243.} \quad \text{28} \text{Ibid., p. 243.}\]
scale for successive editions of the work. An author, consequently, if his work passes the tests, stands a very good chance of making an excellent profit. Obviously, the state is virtually omnipotent in determining what will be published for public consumption.

It is evident in the Soviet Union that there are many formal, informal, institutional, and extramamnstitutional methods of political control of literature. An author may be refused the privilege of publication, or he may be rewarded for publishing the correct type of work. The rhetoric extolling the new, liberal Russia notwithstanding, there is evidence that points to the contrary. Many stringent controls on literature are still evident in the Soviet Union.

The preceding historical survey of the institutions and apparatus of literary control will hopefully place the concept of socialist realism in proper perspective. Socialist realism is a catchy slogan which the Party has utilized in censoring literature and the arts in general; it is, therefore, a method of political control of literature in the Soviet Union.
CHAPTER III

SOCIALIST REALISM: AN APPRAISAL

Another method of the political control of literature in the Soviet Union is socialist realism, the analysis and evaluation of which is necessary to the understanding of the full scope of literary control. What is socialist realism? This question defies a specific, erudite answer because socialist realism is a most elusive and flexible doctrine. Both as a political doctrine and aesthetic dogma, it is almost impossible to explicate and evaluate with a large degree of accuracy because the meaning of socialist realism has varied greatly from regime to regime. Socialist realism is but one of the many techniques of political socialization and indoctrination utilized in the Soviet Union;\(^1\) moreover, the creative arts, especially literature, have been utilized by the Party, under the guidance of principles of socialist realism, as a method of subtle, and in some cases not so subtle, propaganda. Socialist realism has been described as a pseudo-literary formula to disguise political criteria for

the arts. If one were to try to formulate an all-inclusive specific definition, he might say that socialist realism denotes the political style and content of literature.

Even though the veracity of such a definition cannot be challenged, it is a bit too broad to be analytically utilitarian. It is true that socialist realism is used as a means of political control of literature, but it is a rather sophisticated method of control. Its censorship methods lie in its doctrine of antiabstractionism and its emphasis on the positive aspects of Soviet life. Therefore at this point in the thesis, a functional definition of the term socialist realism needs to be formulated. For the purposes of this chapter, the following definition will be employed as a foundation from which to build: socialist realism is governmental regulation of the specific content of literature by the use of artistic guidelines. Obviously, literature can be used to manipulate public opinion, for as Stalin was reputed to have remarked to Gorky, "Writers are the engineers of human souls."3

The Soviet government from the time of Lenin to the present has realized the value of literature as a force in socialization process. The doctrine of socialist realism was


\[\text{Swayze, op. cit., p. 16.}\]
adopted to collectivize, as it were, literature. Literature must be positive in relating stories and plots about the Soviet government and society. Literature has the duty of following the lead of the state; therefore, socialist realism was set up as a literary guideline for Soviet writers to follow.

Although socialist realism is imprecise and vague artistically, it can be very precise politically. The imprecision found in the artistic guidelines forces the literary works to square with the political creed established in socialist realism. The lack of precision gives the authorities much leeway in enforcing the political requisites required for publication. Works written in accord with all the rules and principles of socialist realism serve as utilitarian purpose, the Party's purpose; therefore, literature must actively serve political values.\(^4\) The writer may, of course, express his views of society, the good and the bad; however, if he is true to the credo of socialist realism, his views must coincide with the Party's analyses of society, its wants and needs.\(^5\) Trotsky, himself, purposely remarked that the Party must guide the arts.\(^6\) Literature


\(^5\)Literature, here, fits into Easton's scheme of the political system; it plays an important role in the authoritative allocation of values.

must, accordingly, serve society, but it serves only under the
guidance and direction of the Party. As Trotsky noted, "Art
is always a social servant and historically utilitarian."7

The Communist Party, as the vanguard of the proletariat,
can, according to the Marxist-Leninist theory, demand the
support and subservience of the arts. As far as the arts are
concerned, the Party is the veritable invisible guiding hand,
and adherence to the rule of socialist realism represents
Party loyalty, partiinost.8 Deviation from the political
principles set down in the doctrine of socialist realism is
tantamount to the denunciation of the Party; therefore,
literature performs the function reinforcing Party policy.
The theoretical bases for socialist realism are found in the
tenets of Marxist-Leninist ideology, and this ideology has
been transformed and nurtured on the concept of infallibility.
This is to say that the Party and its leaders can do no wrong,
and literature, consequently, is urged to perpetuate the myth.

Under Stalin, the intelligentsia under the guidance of
socialist realism presented Stalin as a demigod whose capacity
for doing wrong was nil. Stalin manipulated the creative arts
in such a manner that he was presented as being incapable of

7Ibid., p. 168.

8Michael P. Gehlen, "The Soviet Union: Literary
Conflict and the Sinyavski-Daniel Affair," Politics and Civil
Liberties in Europe: Four Case Studies, Ronald F. Bunn and
p. 184.
error. Khrushchev severely criticized the intelligentsia for their part in the creation of the "cult of the individual;" but given the principles and techniques of socialist realism, they had no other choice. Khrushchev, as all other Soviet leaders, was not beyond using the creative arts as a means of political socialization. The present regime in the Soviet Union headed by Kosygin and Brezhnev is not guiltless in the application of socialist realism as a method of governmental control of literature.

Hence, the crux of socialist realism lies in its political utilization and application; artists and writers must describe and explicate the attractiveness of the communist system while at the same time making no derogatory statements about the system. Stylistically, the writers and artists must represent the system in a manner comprehensible to the "laboring people." Herein lies the flexibility of this nebulous doctrine; it must constantly shift with the ever changing Party views. Socialist realism must, of necessity, consistently square with the contemporary Party line. As the Party leadership has changed from Stalin to Khrushchev to Kosygin and Brezhnev, the exact role, meaning, and use of

---

9 Khrushchev and his use of socialist realism will be examined at length in Chapter IV.

10 See Kalb, op. cit., passim and Gehlen, op. cit., passim.

11 Swayze, op. cit., p. 69.
socialist realism has also changed. Each of the different leaders have had different ideological perspectives about the communist system, the role of terror, and the use of socialist realism. Stalin used literature to present himself as the steel-willed leader of men whose judgement in all political and social things was not to be questioned. There have been speculations that Stalin used literature to enhance and develop a charisma because he was not as charismatic as Lenin was. Under the present regime in the Soviet Union, self adulation is not the reason for control of literature. Literature is used to promote the primacy of the regime. As a result of the changing intraParty views, the precise meaning of socialist realism is in a constant state of flux.

The content of all artistic works must equate with the current Party world view, and the style must be familiar to the great mass of people. Art must have a political foundation, and "[it] should be devoted to the struggle of the people for a communist society."\(^1\) Literature must portray in an almost prosaic manner the ideals, goals, and advantages of the "communist way of life" \textit{vis-a-vis} the decadence of the West. Literature must be down-to-earth, not abstract because, even according to Trotsky's concept of the creative arts,

there are no abstract truths. Literature, on the contrary, must be fraught with the self-evident truths of communism.

Literature must, of consequence, devote its energies to the portrayal of the real world—that is reality as the Party visualizes it. The creative arts must graphically depict the victories and glory of the Communist Party, but they must do so in a manner which does not diminish their art form. "For even if the works of art are regarded only as instruments of indoctrination, they must possess a modicum of artistic merit if they are to be effective..." The Party sees in the arts a regimen whereby the populace can be effectively socialized and inducted into the system. Literature is, therefore, a weapon which not only can be used by the Party, but it may also be turned against the Party. As a consequence the control of literature is a requisite in the politically closed society.

It would be unwarranted to assume that literature is not a part of the political education (or indoctrination) system; the Party is cautiously aware of the political implications found in the arts. Because of this awareness, Party ideals and goals become aesthetic qualities in and of themselves.

---

\(^{13}\)Trotsky, op. cit., p. 225. The emphasis on concrete is justified here because Khrushchev was later to echo Trotsky's remarks. Socialist realism hence is antiabstractionist. See Chapter IV.

\(^{14}\)Swayze, op. cit., p. 13.
Hence, the emphasis on the positive hero doing his utmost to predicate the innate greatness of the communist system is not only ideologically sound, but it also becomes an aesthetic quality worth propagating. When L. I. Timofeev, in Kratki slovar literaturovedicheskiki terminov, said that socialist realism was determined by "the lofty emotion of Soviet patriotism, love for one's Soviet homeland, by his identification with the Party, and by the Communist attitude toward life instilled in the Soviet people by the Party of Lenin and Stalin," he was, in effect, assigning quasi-aesthetic attributes to the content of communist ideology.

Because of the intertwining of aesthetic and political qualities in the doctrine of socialist realism, the position of literature in the political arena becomes exceedingly important. Likewise, the role of the positive hero had become correspondingly important because the positive hero is the symbol of the victory of communism over all obstacles. The positive hero also helps literature to fulfill the Marxist-Leninist function of serving along class lines, or in other words, it becomes a "class literature." The positive hero becomes a protagonist which the working people should emulate. The positive hero of Soviet tragedy, for example, knowingly sacrifices his life on behalf of the Party, and Soviet literature calls for a continuing struggle against the

15Cited in appendix, Mathewson, op. cit., p. 331.
events which caused the death of the positive hero. The positive hero is hence a personification of the perfect proletarian who must constantly do battle with the evils which confront communism.

Works which portray the positive hero in complete accord with the principles of socialist realism are unabashedly open in their admiration of the communist system.

Soviet literature, . . . , portraying life truthfully, not only does not conceal its communist tendency, but seeks in every way possible to have the work of art set an example of how an individual should behave to inspire the people to fight for their happiness, and to help build a communist society.

Works of art, consequently, must not be ashamed but proud to have an explicit communistic scope, and this kind of communist tendency must necessarily stifle creativity in the arts.

Accordingly, the communist frame of reference recognizes no such thing as a freedom of creativity; it simply does not exist. The regime, in placing socialist realism on the pedestal of obedience, admiration, and adulation, claims that even in the West the "myth" of freedom of creativity is divided along class lines.

---

16Ibid., pp. 333-334.  
17Ibid., p. 331.  
18Swayze, op. cit., p. 68.  
19Johnson, op. cit., pp. 221-223.
Literature, not unlike the economy, must be planned in order to nurture the communist system. The guidelines of socialist realism are set to produce a political yield, and the results are beneficial in the socialization process. Khrushchev said that it would be absurd to think of a freedom of expression within the arts; according to his frame of reference, there are no absolutes of human freedom or of expression even under an absolute communist system. The writer's duty then is to follow the direction of the Party, for the Party knows the peoples' wants and needs. The arts must not be amoral; they must express the political wisdom of the ages as envisioned by the Communist Party. In the final analysis, socialist realism constitutes a method whereby the creative arts are utilized in building the communist system and are used in politically perpetuating the regime.

20 Ibid., p. 177.  
21 Ibid., p. 190.
CHAPTER IV

KHRUSHCHEV AND SOCIALIST REALISM, 1960-1963:
A CASE STUDY

In February, 1956, Nikita Sergeyvich Khrushchev delivered his now famous "Secret Speech" to the Twentieth Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It was this speech which exposed the excess of the Stalinist regime and the cult of the individual primarily; whereupon the Soviet intelligentsia thought they had reason to expect latitude and freedom in the artistic fields. Khrushchev had criticized the intelligentsia of the Stalinist era for illuminating the cult of the individual and presenting Stalin as infallible.\(^1\) This gave the intellectuals expectations of a decreased role of socialist realism in the arts. He also criticized the Stalin Prizes\(^2\) and their administration.\(^3\) The literary


\(^2\) The Stalin Prizes were remunerative awards for excellence in the fields of art, literature, science, etc. The prizes were supposedly based on merit, and stipends were given to the best in each of the fields. The Stalin Prizes have since been replaced by the Lenin Prizes, and they are awarded every year. See Swayze op. cit., pp. 238-243.

\(^3\) Khrushchev, op. cit., p. 157.
intelligentsia hoped that a new era of "liberalization" of governmental policies toward literature would commence.

Many intellectuals began almost immediately to write poems, novels, and short stories contrary to the past doctrines of socialist realism. These works evidently appeared on the literary scene because the intellectual community was expecting new "liberal" policies. Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago, Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, and Yevtushenko's "Babi Yar" were published, and the authors were roundly criticized for the publication of those works. The criticisms were seemingly based on the fact that the Soviet state and the Party in particular did not appear in an exceedingly favorable light.

Did the intelligentsia misinterpret the "Secret Speech," or were they merely hoping that a new epoch in literature would appear? The answer could possibly be a little of both, for Khrushchev clearly pronounced a deemphasis of some of the Stalinist practices. He, however, gave no indication of a new policy of "liberalization."

All this [Stalinist Era] has to be thoroughly revised so that history, literature, and the fine arts properly reflect V. I. Lenin's role and the great deeds of our Communist Party and of the Soviet people - the creative people.\(^5\)

\(^4\)Doctor Zhivago by Boris Pasternak was not published in the Soviet Union; it was published outside the U.S.S.R. without his permission.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 159. [Emphasis added.]
Khrushchev then went on to explain that the "correct" ideological line would be followed in the future.\footnote{Ibid., p. 166.}

Whether or not Khrushchev intended to initiate a new policy of "liberalization" became a moot question since many new works did appear, a large number of which were avant garde. The decision makers promptly realized that a Pandora's Box had been opened, for if Stalin could be criticized, they could be criticized also. Whereupon, the government in a plethora of meetings, directives, and newspaper articles "explained" the Party line to the intellectual community. The Party denounced all works which contravened the tenets of socialist realism; however, again no precise policy definition of the elusive creed was given at this time. The government did, however, note that no research had been done on the theoretical role of socialist realism and that fault needed to be corrected.\footnote{Oktyabr, July, 1959, pp. 124-134, translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XI, November 18, 1959, 13.} It was, nevertheless, emphatically pointed out that art for art's sake did not square with socialist realism because art had to be understandable to the masses for it to fall within the scope of socialist realism. Art consequently, had to be a "democratic art."\footnote{Ibid., p. 14.}
Since art was "democratic" and of the people, the Party and the government fiscally supported the arts and artistic endeavors. The Soviet government, at Stalin's instigation, created a Literary Fund (Litfund) for writers; Litfund was used to provide the writers with loans, retreats, and nurseries for their children. In return, the writers were, of course, expected to turn out ideologically acceptable works. Writers utilized the benefits of Litfund, and Izvestia in late 1959 chided the writers for enjoying the good life at the expense of the people and not living up to their obligation of writing "good" works. Izvestia stated that the writers, in order to present a true picture of Soviet life, must live among the people and not on the extravagant retreats sponsored by Litfund. Consequently for a literature of the people to be effective, it could not be lavishly subsidized by the state.

In early 1960, the government began to disseminate information pertaining to the ideological content of literature to the officials of the literary sector. Party leaders met with the leaders of the intelligentsia in April, 1960; and M. A. Suslov, in the name of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., told the gathering of intellectuals:


11Ibid.
It is necessary to give the people a clearer view of the struggle for peace, which is incompatible with the passivity, hopelessness, and fatalism that reactionary bourgeois art is trying to sow. . . . They [the people] need art that reaches all areas of the soul and inculcates communist morality and a high level of feeling. 12

The government made its position relative to the arts extremely clear. Literature needed to ideologically indoctrinate the people; for as Suslov, the Party ideologue, pointed out, the artist must stress the importance of communist morality. Pravda in September, 1960, stated that the development of "socialist art" and the growth of the Soviet people were directly related to one another. 13 The government thus admitted that the development of communist art was dependent upon a communist intelligentsia, but more importantly, an intelligentsia which followed the Party line.

Izvestia also demonstrated the government's view of socialist art when in September, 1960, it condemned all those who wrote "nonsense" poetry as parasites. 14 According to Izvestia, for literature to be worthwhile, it had to be based


on an underlying theme of socialist realism. A symposium sponsored by Literaturnaya gazeta that same month reiterated the idea that the writers should mix with the masses in order to thoroughly know their subject. The journal Neva admonished all writers to utilize the full, rich Russian language and not the lexicon of the street or the slang of the West. Writers were inundated with advice on how to conform to the principles of socialist realism, and the government made its views known by every means possible.

The next year, 1961, the book Horizon Beyond Horizon won the Lenin Prize for literature because it portrayed "the image of the people's irresistible movement to communism." The prize seems to have been awarded primarily on the basis of the book's ideological content. The writers were constantly urged to follow the guidelines of socialist realism and were

---

15 Ibid. Nonsense poetry obviously had little, if any, ideological significance.


17 Neva, Number 9, September, 1960, pp. 200-203, translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XII, December 14, 1960, 20. Herein a clear dichotomy between the content of Western and socialist art is beginning to emerge; the government insisted upon an almost pedantic style of writing.

18 Pravda, April 22, 1961, pp. 1-2, translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, May 17, 1961, 15. A detailed study of the books which have won the Lenin Prize could possibly give some valuable insights into criteria of socialist realism.
personally admonished by Nikita S. Khrushchev, himself, to adhere to that doctrine.\textsuperscript{19}

Khrushchev echoed Suslov's earlier remarks by stressing that literature must instill the "communist moral quality and traits of character" in the reader.\textsuperscript{20} So once again the ideological importance of literature was emphasized. Khrushchev further instructed the intelligentsia to

\begin{quote}
\ldots educate the people in the spirit of communist ideals, stir their wonder at all that is splendid and beautiful in our socialist reality, inspire the people a readiness to devote all their efforts, knowledge and ability to boundless service of their people, the desire to follow the example of the heroes of these works and make them uncompromising toward what is antisocial and negative in life. \ldots \textsuperscript{[D]edicate oneself, one's efforts, one's talents to the struggle for communism, for carrying out the policy of the Communist Party, and consequently the cause of the people.}\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

Literature was to be a part of the political arm of the Party, and it was to be utilized to educate the people and inculcate the socio-political credo of the Party into the masses. Literature was consequently a means of carrying out policy decisions.

\textsuperscript{19}The May issue of Kommunist revealed that Khrushchev had met with the leaders of the Soviet intelligentsia on July 17, 1960, and gave the text of his address.


\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
The intelligentsia were instruments of the Party since it was their duty to transmit Marxist-Leninist doctrines to the people. For as Khruschev noted:

Soviet writers, composers, artists, and workers of cinema and theatre find inexhaustible sources of creative inspiration in the policy of the Party and in its ideology. They accept the Party's ideas as their own ideas. Not on orders but out of their own convictions, they use all their works to champion Marxist-Leninist ideals and fight for their accomplishment. They see this as their genuine calling and as utterly unrestricted manifestations of freedom of creation, producing highly artistic works imbued with the spirit of socialist realism. In the Leninist conception, freedom of creation consists in marching with the people, creating spiritual treasures for the people and in the interest of the people.  

The writer, if he were to follow Khrushchev's policy statements, would be no more than a puppet of the Party. His ideas would, in effect, be formulated by the Party.

Also, Khrushchev, like Trotsky in this respect, refused to visualize any abstract truths in literature; literature's sole purpose was to convey the concrete truth as found by the Party. It was not only within the purview of literature but also an explicit function to demonstrate the beauty of socialist society. Khrushchev thought literature should be a conduit for Party policies. Thus if a writer were to succumb to the decadent formalism of the West, he would and should be criticized mercilessly.

---

22 Ibid. 23 Ibid., p. 6.
Khrushchev, in his report on the Party Program of 1961, gave more of his views on Soviet literature. He said that literature which was inconsistent with the "tasks of communist construction" did not fall within the scope of purview of socialist realism. Khrushchev stated his belief that literature played an important role in the socialization of the new Soviet citizen.

What tasks do we have in mind when we speak of the molding of the new man? They include: consolidation of the communist outlook; deep belief in the ideals of communism, a conscientious attitude to one's duty to society, socialist internationalism and patriotism; devotion to the homeland and readiness to defend it with one's life.

The writer should devote himself to the perpetuation of communist ideals, for "communism is the highest flowering of mankind and the human personality." Khrushchev's approach to the duty of literature in the instillation of the communist morality in the masses was not unlike that of an early Puritan minister; that is, they both had rigid doctrines which they exhorted their followers to obey.

The Party became extremely concerned over developing within the literary community. If the earlier policies had been misunderstood, the present policies could not be. The Party made its position very clear; the Party was to be the

---

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
guiding light for the arts. The flurry of meetings and pro-
nouncements was meant to emphasize that the Party knew the
role literature could play in the development of an ideology;
the Party wanted the intelligentsia to realize that the Party
was not of secondary importance in the literary realm.

The molding of the new man became the main theme of the
government's policy toward literature. Hand in hand with the
new theme was the reemphasis placed on the positive hero.
M. A. Suslov, the Party theoretician, delivered a speech in
which he dwelled on the role of literature in the molding of
the new man and the creation of the positive hero.

In order to vividly and impressively pre-
sent the hero of our times, the man of large
soul and ardent heart, the convinced builder
of communism, the artist must know the depth
of the people's life, always be together with
the people and their vanguard - the Communist
Party.27

Sovetskaya kultura quoted the report on "The Decisions of the
Twenty-second Party Congress and the Tasks of Soviet Artists"
as saying that it was the obligation of literature "... to
create those attractive works that reveal the romanticism of
communist labor and inculcate initiative and persistence in
achieving goals."28 The objective of literature was to
present the positive hero in a palatable form.29

27Pravda, October 23, 1961, pp. 4-5, translated in Current


29Ibid., pp. 10-11.
The chief tasks at the moment is [sic] to form ties between the new and contemporary content and the search for new artistic forms and means of expression that will make it possible to capture the poetry and beauty of our life and to present it powerfully, boldly, sincerely, and with a great and genuine Party passion.30

The literary criticism of the year 1962 was levelled mainly at weaknesses in the portrayal of the positive hero, and the critics generally claimed the hero could be portrayed much more accurately.

In December, 1962, an art exhibition was held in Moscow, and Khrushchev, in the company of other Party leaders, attended the exhibition. A number of abstract works were exhibited; and when Khrushchev caught sight of them, he created quite a scene. He charged the offending artists with copying decadent Western ideas, and he gave his views on abstraction in general. Art, he said, must inspire the people in the building of the communist system; it must reflect socialist realism.31 If the art meant nothing to the people or meant different things to different people, it was not really art, for it did not inspire or build anything within the communist framework. Abstract art violated the concepts of socialist realism and meant nothing to the people.32

30Ibid., p. 11. [Emphasis added.]


32Ibid.
Socialist realism connoted the "creation of works of high artistic significance, saturated with the heroic struggle of the international proletariat, the glory of the victory of the Communist Party." The victory of the Communist Party was concrete and could not be explained in abstract terminology nor figures. The young artists who were reprimanded were branded as liberal, irresponsible, and victims of Western formalism.

After his visit to the exhibition, Khrushchev obviously thought it was time for another meeting between Party officials and the intelligentsia. On March 8, 1963, such a meeting was held. Khrushchev told the assemblage of his experience in December, and he labeled abstract art as Western art and incompatible with socialist art. He again stated his position that the arts must inspire the people in the construction of the communist system. He also pointed out that the good in life should be portrayed rather than the bad. The intelligentsia, in Khrushchev's opinion, possessed valuable tools in the reshaping of the human mind, tools which were to be utilized by the Party in the interest of the people.

33Gehlen, op. cit., p. 169.


36Ibid.

37Ibid., p. 13.
The highest duty of the Soviet writer, artist, or composer, of any creative work as to stand in the ranks of the builders of communism, to serve with his talent the great cause of our Party, to fight for the triumph of the idea of Marxism-Leninism. It must be remembered that a fierce struggle is now going on in the world between two irreconcilable ideologies - the socialist and the bourgeois. Consequently, it was the duty of the writers to utilize their talents for the benefit of the Party.

Khrushchev saw the arts as systems within an ideological galaxy. Western arts and Soviet arts were totally separated and incompatible, and there could be no peaceful coexistence among the arts. Socialist art and socialist realism dealt with true and genuine art, while Western art dealt with abstractions of nothing. Since socialist realism embodied the will of the Party, it represented the interest of the people, for the Party was the vanguard of the people. Khrushchev readily admitted that the arts were important ideological tools of the Party. Literature formed an ideological battleground, and the writers were of consequence warriors of the Party.

---


39 Ibid., p. 7.

40 Ibid., p. 8.

41 Ibid., p. 9.

42 Ibid., p. 10.
Dawson and Prewitt suggest that political socialization or political learning takes one of two forms, direct and indirect. Direct political socialization refers to those processes which are "specifically political" in content. By utilizing Dawson and Prewitt's approach, it may be surmised that socialist realism is a means of direct political socialization. Even a superficial investigation of Khrushchev's use of socialist realism would reveal that the primary, if not the sole, aim of that nebulous literary doctrine is political in nature.

An examination and analysis of the preceding data will reveal that Khrushchev, by any standard of measurement, was an extremely capable politician. It could readily be inferred that the "Secret Speech" was a clever and astute maneuver on the part of Khrushchev to elicit support for his tenuous claim to power. By attacking the infallibility of Stalin, he was, in fact, attacking the infallibility of the Party, itself. Khrushchev must have recognized that the de-Stalinization speech could threaten the stature and primacy of the Party. The "Secret Speech" is, therefore, a study in ambiguities. In the speech, Khrushchev tried to lay all the blame for the

---

44 Ibid., p. 64.
atrocities and purges during the cult of the individual on Stalin, himself, and a few of his trusted henchmen, while at the same time he tried to create an aura of purity around himself and his followers.\textsuperscript{45}

It is rather obvious that Khrushchev created a dilemma from which he found it hard to extricate himself. By portraying himself as an unwilling and misguided follower of Stalin during the "period of excesses," he seemed to be proposing to fashion a new role for the intelligentsia. Khrushchev must have known, however, that if he were to propose a new policy of "liberalization," it would tend to undermine the position of the Party and consequently Khrushchev, himself, as leader of the Party. He astutely left himself a way out of this possibly critical situation. He emphatically reiterated that Stalin had not followed the accurate ideological line, but Khrushchev promised that he would follow the correct ideological prescriptions of the Communist Party.\textsuperscript{46}

The implications of "liberal" policy found in his speech were, in all probability, clever ploy by which he could consolidate personal power. The "Anti-Party Group," as Khrushchev stigmatized his opposition, were all Stalinists. Khrushchev was seemingly trying to garner all the support that


\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 159.
he could against his opposition; he appealed to all levels within the Party in an effort to strengthen his position as leader. 47

Khrushchev, even by his actions, seemed to support a policy of "liberalization" for he stated that he personally had authorized the publication of Solzhenitsyn's work One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. His reasons for permitting the publication of that work remain problematical, but it must be noted that Solzhenitsyn's novel was anti-Stalin in tone. This fact alone may have been reason enough for Khrushchev, but this has yet to be proven. Solzhenitsyn was later severely criticized for deviation from the principles of socialist realism; nevertheless, Khrushchev failed to give any real indication of any specific new policy in literature.

By 1960 Khrushchev's pronouncements about the role of socialist realism, strangely enough, sounded not unlike those of Stalin. He first proclaimed that literature was an instrument of the Party. It seems that by 1960, Khrushchev thought that he had enough power to lay down the law, as it were. The law which he laid down was one which created an almost subservient status for the writers. To be sure, the law was not strictly obeyed by the writers, but this was not the fault of the government.

Khrushchev, by personally appearing before groups of intellectuals, indicated that he thought literature was a prime method of technique of political socialization and that it was an excellent way of instilling the communist morality in the populace. Khrushchev was straightforward in his appraisal of the role of literature in communist society. He was quite open when he said that the primary function of literature was to help build the communist system.

By utilizing Dawson and Prewitt's concept of political learning, one can readily see that the function of literature is encompassed within the scope of direct political socialization. In the case of direct political socialization, the impetus for political learning and/or education usually comes from the socializer. 48  Khrushchev's utilization of socialist realism was an obvious attempt "to communicate the approved political values and habits." 49  Khrushchev's comments, which were earlier noted, definitely demonstrate that, in his opinion, literature was but a technique of communicating and authoritatively allocating those proper political and social values.

The importance of political education is apparent. In the first place, citizens need some minimal information about political duties and rights to operate in the political arena. Obeying laws, . . . , is critical if governments

---

48 Dawson and Prewitt, op. cit., p. 76.
49 Ibid. [Emphasis added]
are to operate effectively. We thus expect that, at a minimum, a society will establish some means of educating new [and old] citizens in this minimal political education, most societies make available to their citizens extended information about their government, . . . , what the accepted goals are, and so forth.

Possibly much more important, the society will have methods of political education which encourage loyalty, patriotism, and support for the political institutions. Most formal schooling includes in the curriculum a full ritual life—pledging allegiance, saluting the flag, commemorating national heroes, singing the national anthem, etc. — which is intended to bind the child [and even the adult] to his nation.50

Khrushchev was self-consciously attempting to instill a national character, the communist character, through literature.

By emphasizing the role of the Party, literature was to help develop a communist personality. The positive heroes found in Soviet literature were personifications of the Party writ small. Literature, in Khrushchev's opinion, had the duty to cultivate an empathy between the people and the Party. Literature could also easily serve as a safety valve for the Party. A person's opinion toward governmental policy tends to change as his view of society changes; therefore, it would be in the best interest of the Party to control or manipulate those changes in a person's viewpoint to meet its needs.

50 Ibid.
In conclusion, analysis of Khrushchev's use of socialist realism tends to support the proposition that he did not visualize a new "liberal" role for literature in Soviet society. He, like his predecessors, supported strict governmental control of the creative arts.
CHAPTER V

A SYSTEMS ANALYSIS
OF THE KHRUSHCHEV PERIOD

The next step in the logical progression in the formulation of an analysis and hypothesis is to place the perception of data in an acceptable conceptual framework. As mentioned earlier, the method of analysis which will be utilized herein is the systems analysis. The systems analysis will be based on David Easton's model; however, the model will be utilized only as a heuristic device and tool.¹

The political system, using the systems approach, consists of five basic component units: environment; inputs; decision making body or device; outputs; and feedback.² For the sake

¹In other words, the model will be used only as a convenient scheme to present, explain, and analyze the data; it will not be used as a means of prediction. A survey of Easton’s works will reveal that the concept of systems analysis, as he envisioned it, does not square with the model utilized in this chapter. Because the concept of systems analysis does not uniformly fit every political system and because the concept is but an analytical tool, not a general theory, some liberties must be taken in order to demonstrate the unique complexities of the Soviet system.

²Cf. David Easton, "An Approach to Analysis of Political Systems," World Politics, IX (October, 1957), 385-387. In schematically presenting the political system, several means of symbolic representation may be easily employed, but the use of one particular form does not imply anything except a value judgment as to the ease in diagramatically depicting it. That is, no one symbolic representation is more valid than any other.
of simplicity, the presentation herein will be in block form similar to the following example:

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 2—Representative Model of a Political System**

The systems diagram, however, is useless without some explicit delineation and description of the component elements. Environment is the first component unit to be discussed; environment consists of the external factors which influence the behavior of the actors within the framework of the system.

---

3 Source: Ibid., p. 384. This model is not an exact duplicate of Easton's model; however, it is essentially the same.

4 This descriptive definition of environment is not meant to preclude any internal factors within the system which could influence the functioning of the system, for it could be readily argued, and very effectively for that matter, that environment is a result of internally stimulated phenomena. Environment, here, is meant to represent all those factors which are not specifically and explicitly enumerated in the system; environment is then the catchall unit of the system. Some environmental elements could take the form of political culture, common historical factors, and ethnic congruities; these are but a few examples.
The input components may take several forms; however, only two will be utilized in the present analysis: demands and supports. Demands are by definition, "articulated statements proposing that some kind of authoritative allocation ought to be undertaken."\(^5\) Supports, the other input, are the bases for the demands.\(^6\) The other two component units are the decision making body and the output.

In order for the system to resolve any crisis or issue, the system requires some kind of decision maker.\(^7\) The result of the decision maker's deliberation is the next component element, the output or the decision.\(^8\) The effects of the

---

\(^5\)Easton, *A Framework for Political Analysis*, p. 112. Any system regardless of its descriptive qualities has some kind of demands made.

\(^6\)The support bases may be theoretical, historical, economic, social, political, legal or ethical in nature. Taken together, the input units comprise an issue or crisis for the system to resolve.

\(^7\)Easton, *The Political System*, p. 276. The decision maker may take one of several forms: democrat, authoritarian, or totalitarian; the decision maker may be a dictator, democrat, collegial body, representative body, appointive body, or any number of combinations thereof. Regardless of the size or the semantic representation of the decision maker, an authoritative allocation must be made, and the method whereby that decision is made becomes an integral part of the system.

\(^8\)The output may also take several forms; the basic of which are rewards and deprivations. A decision is never neutral; it rewards some individuals or groups of individuals and at the same time derives other individuals or groups of individuals. The decision rendered by the authoritative allocator makes the political and social values of the authorities known to the general public. The decision is, obviously, not an isolated phenomenon and there are many factors affecting it.
decision are relayed back to the decision maker by process of feedback. In essence then, this is the diagramatic presentation of the political system in its simplest form. It must be emphatically noted at this point that all of the component elements of the system are interrelated and interdependent and the system cannot continue to function with the absence of any one of the parts. That is, the whole is composed of all its parts; thus given the absence or malfunction of any one of the several units, the system becomes dysfunctional.

Notably lacking from the system at this point is political socialization. Where does socialization fit into the scheme? Is it an input, an output? Is it related to the decision making process, or is it integrated into the feedback function? Is socialization an integral part of the environment? In essence then, how is an individual inducted into the political system? Political socialization poses quite a problem in placing it properly into the systems analysis framework. Conceivably political socialization fits into the scheme at any given point. By observing the political system, one can see that socialization is not separable from any of the component units.

Feedback is often termed the heartline of the system; that is, it relays the state of the system to the system.

It is easy to concede the point that every unit of the political system is influenced by, and itself either directly or indirectly influences, political socialization. It is an altogether different story in attempting to specifically label socialization as a part of the system. Some scholars who have used the systems approach allude to the fact that political socialization is an input of the system, i.e. interest identification. This cannot be disputed; however, the Soviet system is not so easily pinned down. Since socialization is a specific aim of the decisions reached in that system, it is also an output. In the Soviet system, therefore, political socialization is both an input and an output. In fact, this may be true of every political system, for it is axiomatic that every government tries to influence the behavior of its citizens in one way or the other. Political socialization permeates the system.

Environment, of course, plays an important role in the socialization of any individual. The individual's home life is important in regard to his acceptance of any political values. If an individual's home life were characterized by democratic decision making processes, that is, if the individual as a child were accepted as an integral part of family

---

decision making, he is likely to have democratic political values. If the family structure were characterized by mother or father dominance, the individual is more prone to accept authoritarian political values. The individual's schooling also plays an important role in his political outlook; likewise his peer group relationship is a viable factor in his political view of society. The socio-political history of his country is no less significant in the socialization process. It is then possible, given the above factors, to postulate that political socialization is a function of the environment of the system.

Now what of the inputs? Is socialization a function of the input components? In order to make demands of any system, an individual must have some ideas of what his political interests and goals are. He must have been socialized as to his political beliefs. To make a demand, an individual must have a support of some type. That is, he must have some theoretical notion on which to base his demand; for him to have this theoretical basis, he must have been properly socialized. As has already been mentioned, socialization may itself be a direct input of the system. For an individual to operate politically, political socialization is an absolute

---

12 Dawson and Prewitt, op. cit., pp. 74-77.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., pp. 75-76.
necessity. He must know how to act in the accepted political and social manner. Political socialization is obviously an input function, for an individual must be inducted into the political system.  

Is political socialization a part of the decision making process? First, if the decision makers were asked whether or not an individual should conform to the standards of the system, they would in all probability answer in the affirmative, for a negative answer would give rise to a serious challenge to the very legitimacy of that system. The decision makers of any system are aware of the possible consequences of deviant behavior and of the potential consequences this behavior could have on the system as a whole. The decision makers, consequently, make the political values and norms of the system known to all the individuals within the system. They communicate their ideas and manifestations of the system through their authoritative allocation of values. Thus, the decision makers and the decision, itself, perform the function of political socialization. The decisions are then transmitted back to the system by means of the feedback process, and political socialization becomes an output of the system. Socialization then becomes a withinput of the system through feedback, and likewise the political and social mores of the system. Then feedback also performs the function of socialization.

---

It is readily discernible that the system thrives on political socialization. In fact, the system could not exist for long without effective political socialization of the individuals and institutions within the system. Accordingly then, all the component elements of the system must perform the function of political socialization.

Given the important role that socialization plays in the system, how can literature and the control of literature fit
into the system? By utilizing the concepts of systems analysis, literature and the control thereof may be placed into a much broader and better perspective. By removing certain elements from the system and by examining them very carefully but at the same time remembering that these elements must interact with one another to be effective, it is possible to fruitfully postulate some general and specific hypotheses and observations about the role of literature and its control in the Soviet political system.

Choosing the most valuable units for examination is in itself a delicate task. As has already been pointed out, each component unit or element is interrelated and interdependent; therefore, each is equally important in the functioning of the system as a whole. A relevant question at this point is: is each of the component units of the system equally important in the control of literature in the Soviet Union? The removal of certain units from the system for specific examination and analysis presupposes a negative answer. It would also signify that a value judgment has entered into the selection process. Since Khrushchev and his use of socialist realism are the principle topics of investigation, the component units which will receive the greater proportion of analysis are the decision maker and the decision. The other elements of the system will be treated only tangentially and briefly.

In order to examine the topic using the concept of systems analysis, it will be necessary to represent the data
in the systems scheme. It will also be necessary to re-
capitulate some of the data to make it relevant to the
analysis at hand.

ENVIRONMENT
(Authoritarian Society)

DEMANDS
(Writers demanded liberalization of literature)

SUPPORTS
Concepts of
1. Creative Freedom
2. Artistic Responsibility
3. No Political Control

AUTHORITATIVE DECISION MAKER
(Khrushchev, Chairman of CPSU)

DECISION
(Denied Writers Demands: Party to Control Literature)

FEEDBACK
(Socialist Realism as Guideline for Writers)

Fig. 4--The System in Perspective

What were the demands made on the system? First, the writers
wanted and demanded more freedom than they had had under
Stalin. The "Secret Speech" intimated to them that Khrushchev
would initiate a new literary policy. Unaware that the
Khrushchev era was but a temporary change in Soviet politics, the writers following their own predilections, used Khrushchev's de-Stalinization pronouncements as a support for their demands. Other supports on which they based their demand were more abstract and esoteric and included the belief in the freedom of creativity in the arts, artistic responsibility, and the belief that the arts should be free from political control.  

The decision makers are to be designated as Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Politburo, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The decision was that the creative arts must follow policy directives of the Party in regards to the style and content of literature. The feedback consisted of a reinforcement of the doctrine of socialist realism, for socialist realism was definitely relayed back to the system as a withinput. The environmental factor most prevalent was the authoritarian character of Soviet government and society. Other environmental factors affecting the outcome of the issue were the emphases placed on de-Stalinization

---

16 The data examined thus far tends to support this speculation. These factors are supports of the system if the definition of supports as herein rendered is accepted.

17 Only a brief justification for the designated decision makers is needed; Khrushchev as the leader of the Party and government is obviously one of the decision makers. The Politburo and Central Committee as the institutions of the government and Party respectively were obviously involved in the decision making process.
and the past governmental policies toward literature. The decision makers were also not unaware of the importance of literature as a socializing agent. These briefly are the component elements of the model of a political system of the Soviet Union during the years, 1961-1963, given the issue of political control of literature.

Now, before proceeding any further, a justification for the use of the above mentioned descriptions as elements in the system is in order. Clearly the writers did articulate demands that some sort of authoritative allocation be undertaken. The supports described were the theoretical bases for the demands. Together, the demands and supports created an issue or crisis which had to be resolved by the decision making apparatus. These two elements then are definitely inputs of the system.

Since every political system has an authoritative decision making body, the Soviet system must have had an authoritative allocator of political values. Since Khrushchev was a leader of both the government and the Party, it is safe to assume that he was a primary force behind the policy decisions of that period. With the reservation of Party participation and influence taken into consideration, it is now possible to designate Khrushchev as authoritative allocator. The system is now almost complete.
With Khrushchev designated as the authoritative allocator or decision maker, his responses to the input issues would then constitute a major proportion of the decision. Given a specific demand made of the system, the writers demand for new literary policies, the authority's reaction and response to that stimulus can be properly termed the decision. As was noted before, the decision is never neutral; it may be either positive or negative. That is, the authority can respond in a manner either favorable or unfavorable to those making the demands. In the present case the Party can either acquiesce to or deny the writers' demands. Accordingly, Khrushchev's policy pronouncements would either reward or deprive the writers in regards to their demands toward a liberalization of literary policy.

![Diagram]

**Fig. 5--Khrushchev's Response to the Writers' Demands**
Feedback would then consist of policy statements restricting innovations in the literary field under the guise of socialist realism. Future demands made of the system would hence be restricted to the confines of socialist realism.\(^{18}\)

Clearly demands were made of the system, and the system reacted and considered the demands. Even if no formal decision had been reached, the system would still have made an authoritative allocation of values; for, by refusing to act on the demands, the system would have made a negative response by maintaining the status quo. In the case at hand, a formal decision was reached. Khrushchev's decision, developed over a three year period, marked a clear cut decision; for the writers were, in fact, ordered to follow policy directives of the Party. The policy directives were thinly disguised as socialist realism, and the directives re-enter the system as feedback.

The systems analysis concept makes the interactions within the system easier to visualize. Again the systems analysis is used primarily as a descriptive device in order to present the crisis of literature as a political conflict in which the authoritarian character of the Soviet system is readily discernible. Hence, the literary conflict can be seen in a broad perspective.

\(^{18}\text{Cf. Easton, "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems," p. 389. Easton terms feedback demands or internally generated demands "withinputs."} \)
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The advantage of the systems analysis is now evident, for the data have been presented in a visual and traditional method. Thus having examined the data in this twofold manner, one is now able to formulate some general hypotheses, draw some general conclusions, and make some predictions about future state of the Soviet system. The structural arrangement to be utilized in the following chapter will consist of statements of the hypotheses and then an elaboration thereof after which some general conclusions will be made. The following statements constitute the hypotheses:

1. Khrushchev neither advocated nor proposed new policies of "liberalization" for the creative arts.

2. Socialist realism is a means of political socialization.

3. Socialist realism is a method whereby the Communist Party of the Soviet Union politically controls the content and style of literature and the other arts.

4. Khrushchev used socialist realism as a political tool to not only control literature but also the intelligentsia in general.

5. In a closed society political control of literature is a desirability if not a necessity.
By examining these hypotheses, it will be possible to draw some general conclusions about the Soviet system during Khrushchev's administration in the years, 1960-1963.

I

Khrushchev neither advocated nor proposed new policies of "liberalization" for the creative arts. Although Khrushchev clearly denounced Stalinist practices in the "Secret Speech," it cannot be shown that he planned to initiate new "reform" policies for literature. It is true that he soundly rebuked the intelligentsia for their portrayal of Stalin as infallible and invincible. He also noted that in the future literature would "properly present" a true picture of the Party and the country. It is rather obvious that he would not, and could not, allow any of the art forms to threaten the primacy of the regime for to do so would place Khrushchev himself in a hazardous position. Though the intellectuals were reputed to have seen liberal policies in the speech, Khrushchev's actions very clearly belied their alleged observations. It may be supposed that the intellectuals read into the speech their own predilections and wishful thinking.

The fact that the intellectuals began almost immediately to publish works which were contrary to the past doctrines of socialist realism merely shows that the intellectuals
expected new literary policies, nothing else. The de-Stalinization crisis indicates a good point of speculation. Innovations in any country seem easier in periods of crises and tensions, and maybe the intelligentsia thought this was a good time to make their demands known. Khrushchev was in a delicate position for he was attempting to appease every sector in the Party, both left and right. He did try to gain the support of the literary sector but did not commit himself to any drastic changes in literary policies. Consolidation of power in Khrushchev's case did not cause him to repudiate the monolithic character of the Party.

II

Socialist realism is a means of political socialization. If the Party could regulate the content of literature to its whim, it could then be an important tangible factor in structuring the political views of the reader. All readers are influenced by what they read in one way or another to a lesser or greater degree. Literature possesses a valuable political worth which can be instrumental in instilling certain political values and variables in the reader. As the child is influenced by what he reads in his prescribed educational curriculum, so is the adult influenced by what he

\footnote{Or maybe they were taking the initiative and trying to force the government to legitimatize their demands.}
reads. The reading material need not be purely political in tone, but merely needs to reflect the political values of that society. Literature then can be an important factor in whether or not that individual conforms to or deviates from the accepted political and social norms of behavior of the system.

If the system can control the actions and behavior of characters in literary works, it can accent the character of the political and social norms to be followed. The decision makers by issuing policy directives in the form of socialist reality can control what the writers actually put down on paper. Socialist realism, hence, controls the content of literature. Since the state owns the means of publication, the writers must follow the guidelines of socialist realism in order for his work to be published for public consumption. If a writer does not follow the tenets laid down by the Party, he not only does not get his work published but is also subject to the sanctions of the state. Socialist realism is then a means of direct political socialization.

III

Socialist realism is the means by which the Party controls the content and style of literature. The Communist Party, in order to retain the position as the ideological oracle of the

\[2\text{Cf. Dawson and Prewitt, op. cit., p. 73 ff.}\]
system, controls the flow and dissemination of literary works. The Party needs some ideological bases for this control. The bases have been found in socialist realism; the Party could covertly control literature under the guise of ideologically correcting errant works. The primacy of the Party has to be inculcated into the minds of all citizens whether they are Party members or not. The doctrine of socialist realism softens overt, direct censorship, and at the same time, gives the Party a theoretical basis from which to work.

From the democratic perspective, it is rather easy to ascribe the value-laden term "bad" to socialist realism as a method of literary control, but the intrinsic moral quality of socialist realism, be it good or bad, lies in the eye of the beholder. It is not the scope of this thesis to determine the morality of socialist realism; however, viewed from any perspective, socialist realism is a means of government control of literature. In essence, socialist realism does not aim at the artistic improvement of literature, or any of the arts for that matter since its prime objective is wholly political in nature. Even though the doctrine purports to uplift literature to the countenance of the beauties of communism, it, in effect, denies the writer the right to criticize the system or its ideological underpinning meaningfully. Meaningful criticism nurtures the system and keeps it from becoming stagnant. For a system to deny writers the means of criticism, it tends, in all probability, in the long
run to damage the system itself more than the writer. The primary objective of socialist realism then is to structure the Party's political value system into the creative arts.

IV

Khrushchev used socialist realism as a political tool to control both literature and the intelligentsia. Khrushchev inadvertently opened a Pandora's Box with his "Secret Speech" to the Twentieth Party Congress. It is very difficult to determine his exact motivation for the delivery of the de-Stalinization speech, but the fact that he was involved in a power struggle lends support to the idea that the speech was only a political stratagem. As was suggested earlier, Khrushchev in all probability was trying to garner enough strength to ensure his position at the apex of the Party hierarchy. Khrushchev was himself an active Stalinist apparatchik; so in making the speech, he placed himself in a very tenuous position. His position with regards to the intelligentsia was very shaky. Despite the fact that he had not made new policy recommendations toward the arts, the intellectuals felt they had gained a new freedom, a freedom of which they were to take advantage.

They wrote with a new verve and vigor, and these works would not have been published during an earlier period. Khrushchev, by his support of Solzhenitsyn, fed fuel to the flickering fire. The rationale behind Khrushchev's early
policies, or lack of, is not entirely clear; however, as he became more thoroughly entrenched as Chairman of the C.P.S.U., he became less tolerant toward the *nouveau*. He began to make clear cut policy statements toward the arts which were by no standards liberal. His statements concerning the role of literature in contemporary Soviet society were not unlike those of his predecessors. Literature and the intelligentsia must serve the state. Socialist realism once more became the political tool by which literature was measured.

Socialist realism was the style and content manual for the Soviet writers. Literature had to coincide with the Party's views thereof, or the writers would have to pay the consequences. Khrushchev used a pragmatic, conservative rationale in his dialogues with the intellectual community, and all available information indicates that they were, in fact, dialogues. The writer was paid by the state; therefore, he should do the bidding of the state. On the surface, it was that simple. Beneath the surface, however, were more important reasons; Khrushchev could not allow literature to challenge either his or the Party's position in the Soviet system. Socialist realism, in the hands of Khrushchev, was consequently a political tool employed to keep literature and the intelligentsia in line, both figuratively and literally.
V

Political control of literature is desirable, if not a necessity, in a closed society. A closed society by definition presupposes a ruling elite and a lack of freedom for the general populace. If a system operates according to authoritarian or totalitarian principles, it must keep a tight rein on the populace. It cannot allow the system to become involved in any internal turmoil which might topple the regime. By controlling literature, the state is, in a matter of fact, attempting to control the emotional character of its subjects. By controlling literature, the state attempts to have itself constantly placed in a favorable light. On the other hand, if the state were to allow meaningful freedom of the press, it would then be subject to question. A closed society cannot be questioned; for to allow questioning of the state's authority would be tantamount to admitting that the system is in fact fallible. The system must be viewed with awe, fear, and benevolence.

Because the state must constantly be presented as an omnipotent, almost paternal figure, literature as a consequence plays an important role in the closed society. The state gives to the people, and it can also take away. The good things in life come from the good offices of the state. The state must be repaid for its "kindness" with obedience and compliance with its requests and directives; from the viewpoint of the state, the people owe it at least this much.
Thus if literature pays homage to the state, the people are directly influenced by what actually gets into print. It is then to the advantage of the state to determine what is published. The state must preserve the image of the "omnipresent brooding in the sky." The state must jealously guard its image of vengeful paterfamilias.

In the final analysis, it is possible to evaluate Nikita S. Khrushchev as a modern day autocrat whose actions sometimes depended only upon his own personal whim. His sometimes crude style of politics and his stern policy pronouncements belied his grandfatherly appearance. He was a dictator in the true sense of the word. His policies were often ambiguous, not unlike some of the early tsars. Khrushchev's policies seemed, at times, to benefit the writers, yet at the same time, they denied the writers. It is clear, however, that he did not intend to initiate new policies of liberalization. To do so would be in direct contradiction of Marxist-Leninist principles. His image as liberator of the people from the epoch of Stalinism was only a clever ploy on Khrushchev's part to entrench himself in the leadership of the Party. It was also designed to stigmatize his opposition as perpetuators of the cruelties of the Stalinist era.

The political jargon of today presents a paradox of semantics. Given the left-right dichotomy, communism is usually placed on the left hand side of the continuum. The term left usually implies "liberalism;" however, this simple
measure of political typology is far from accurate. In fact, its utility is extremely limited if not altogether useless. Communism resembles some of the "right wing" monarchies and fascist governments of the past. If one were forced to use the modern labels of conservatism vis-a-vis liberalism, communism would appear suspiciously conservative; and yet communism and leftist are today considered synonyms.

Utilizing a democratic frame of reference, it is impossible after an examination of his policy statements over a three year period, to assess Khrushchev as an innovator of liberal literary policies. He is on record as an admirer of the monolithic unity of the Party, and as saying it was the duty of the intelligentsia to help maintain this monolithic character. Under the threat of punishment for failure to perform and comply with the Party's directives, the Soviet writer does what he can to minimize the danger. He knows that as an individual he is expendible and replaceable. So the writer really has no other choice but to comply. Khrushchev utilized the doctrine of socialist realism to maintain the monolithic character of the Party and the state. Possibly more importantly, he used socialist realism to reenforce his position as "first among equals." That is, he seemingly initiated a new species of the cult of the individual.
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