379
N81
NO, 5068

THE HISTORY OF UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATION IN RUSSIA
SINCE THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

William R. Rainbolt, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1975

Rainbolt, William R., The History of Underground Communication in Russia Since the Seventeenth Century.

Master of Arts (Journalism), August, 1975, 100 pp.,

Bibliography, 72 titles.

The purposes of this study were (1) to identify the reasons for and the processes of underground communication in Russia since the seventeenth century and (2) to utilize the information to interpret the clandestine media's significance.

The study concluded: (1) underground media have evolved because Russian governments have oppressed free speech; (2) dissidents have shared similarities in the methods of illicit communications; (3) whereas the earlier clandestine press tended to be either literary or political, today's samizdat is a synthesis of many varieties of dissent; (4) underground media have reflected the unique characteristics of Russian journalism; and (5) the Chronicle of Current Events is unparalleled as a news journal in the history of Russian dissent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTROUDCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose	
Hypothesis	
Definition of Terms	
Review of Literature	
Justification	
Limitations	
Methodology	
Organization	
II. FROM PEASANT REBELS TO RADISHCHEV: DISSENT LITERATURE DEVELOPS	17
III. THE EARLY UNDERGROUND: REVOLUTIONARIES AND LITERATI	30
IV. FROM <u>BELL</u> TO <u>SPARK</u> : THE UNDERGROUND PRESS AS A MOVEMENT	44
V. <u>SAMIZDAT</u> , PART I: THE LEGACY SURVIVES	61
VI. <u>SAMIZDAT</u> , PART II: DISSENTERS AS PUBLISHERS	74
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Suppression symbolizes the history of free speech in Russia from the persecutions of printers in sixteenth-century Muscovy to the Kremlin's war against samizdat (self-publishing) in the Soviet Union today.

Press freedoms appeared for brief periods in tsarist Russia, but none of these instances showed a sovereign's commitment to liberty;¹ since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the media have been subservient to the Communist Party's ideological doctrine. From the seventeenth century until today, however, Russian dissidents have utilized various channels of the printed and spoken word to communicate protest. In doing so, the dissenters have represented a major theme in Russian history: raskol, the chasm between the government and the governed.² More often than not,

¹For examples, see Charles A. Ruud, "Censorship and the Peasant Question: The Contingencies of Reform Under Alexander II (1855-1859)," Vol. V of California Slavic Studies, edited by Nicholas Riasanovsky and Gleb Struve, continuing volumes (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1970), pp. 137-167.

²Thornton Anderson, Russian Political Thought (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), p. vii.

dissenters have resorted to extraordinary measures, legal and illegal, to disseminate messages.

This communication of dissidence is fundamental in the heritage shared by Russian malcontents in the past three centuries. The dissenters, however, have been as unique as their dogmas. The earliest dissent communicators were rebels who used "seditious letters," which were nailed to village posts or read to illiterates, to incite bloody revolts against the tsars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³ These rebels were succeeded by noblemen who satirized the ills of society during Catherine II's affair with Enlightenment in the second half of the 1700s. During this period, Russia's first literary class also began to assert its role as a significant force in the cultural and political history of the country.⁴ It became customary for literati to circulate essays, letters, poems, and even novels by hand, the manuscripts given to trusted friends for copying and careful dissemination. Some of Russia's seminal authors, poets, philosophers, and intellectuals used this underground network,⁵ and some of Russia's most brilliant

³N. G. Georgieva, "Nelegalnaya listkovaya pechat Rossii kontsa XIX - nachala XX veka," Voprosy istoriya, XLVI (June, 1972), 36.

⁴Richard Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime (New York, 1974), pp. 254-255.

⁵Sidney Monas, The Third Section: Police and Society under Nicholas I (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), p. 183.

literature appeared during the stifling reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855).⁶

Social consciousness, an awareness that life possibly could be and should be better for the people of Russia, also began to awaken during Nicholas' reign. A "passion for improving the world"⁷ evolved from this consciousness. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the idealists and anarchists who veered Russia toward 1917 relied on an underground press movement to attack the social system, debate among themselves, and speak for the masses.⁸

Today in the Soviet Union, where information and communication channels are controlled by the government, the dissenters who secretly publish their ideas compose a small but viable element of society. Numerous scholars have dissected the movement. One of the results is that Russia's modern dissidents are seen as "engineers-politicals or martyrs-metaphysicals,"⁹ as scientific and literary

⁶Leon Stilman, "Freedom and Repression in Prerevolutionary Russian Literature," Continuity and Change in Russian Thought and Soviet Society, edited by Ernest J. Simmons (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), p. 425.

⁷D. S. Mirskii, A History of Russian Literature, edited and abridged by Francis J. Whitfield (New York, 1949), p. 167.

⁸Anderson, op. cit., pp. 231-232, 248-249, et passim.

⁹Sidney Monas, "Engineers or Martyrs: Dissent and the Intelligentsia," In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today, edited by Abraham Brumberg (New York, 1970), pp. 33-37.

malcontents,¹⁰ and as "moral absolutists or instrumental pragmatics."¹¹ Labels notwithstanding, today's self-publishers come from diverse walks of life¹² although the tribulations of prominent scientists, artists, and academicians dominate news coverage outside Russia. From Nobel Prize winners to tractor drivers, dissenters have relied on samizdat to communicate on a multitude of themes: nationalism, religion, human rights, and artistic freedoms are among the prevalent subjects.¹³

Peasant rebels, noblemen, literati, social revolutionaries, the famous and the unknown--these have been the Russian dissident communicators in the past three centuries. What have been the effects of their messages? With two notable exceptions, dissent communications have not provoked great upheavals in society. The "seditious letters" movement, the first exception, intensified the belligerence of rebels in the four serious revolts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: as excellent propaganda, the leaflets moved their audiences into committed action. The other

¹⁰Lewis S. Feuer, "The Intelligentsia in Opposition," Problems of Communism, XIX (November-December, 1970), 10.

¹¹Rudolf L. Tokes, "Dissent: The Politics for Change in the USSR," Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970s, edited by Henry W. Morton and Rudolf L. Tokes (New York, 1974), p. 18.

¹²Paul A. Smith Jr., "Protest in Moscow," Foreign Affairs, XLVII (October, 1968), 157.

¹³Tokes, op. cit., pp. 15-17.

exception is the revolutionary, secret press which, beginning in the 1860s, inspired the factions which led tsarist Russia toward its last revolution. Neither the rebels nor the revolutionaries destroyed oppression, however: the peasant revolts eventually failed, and 1917 only replaced tsarism with totalitarianism.

Whether under the tsars or the Communist Party, Russian dissidents repeatedly have challenged what they considered to be arbitrary, repressive authority. They have recognized and stepped into the historical vacuum between rulers and subjects. If a major theme of Russian history is the raskol, one of the strongest constants in that theme is the dissenters' use of protest communication by any means possible.

It is futile, however, to identify the whole history of such informational activities as "journalism" in the limited sense of new gathering, management, and dissemination. Some of the futility comes from shaping "journalism" to fit the purposes and methods of dissenters, and some of it comes from the unique character of Russian journalism itself.

Most dissident publicists have been interested more in promulgating an ideal than in observing accuracy, brevity, and fairness. The communicators have relied more on interpretation than on the reporting of perishable news, and they often have overstepped the thin line between interpretation for the benefit of society and propaganda for

persuading audience thought and behavior. Like the colonials of eighteenth-century America, dissidents in Russia usually have been committed to what they believed was a just cause, and they have dedicated themselves to spreading that belief.¹⁴

The raskolniki, the schismatics, do not fit easily into all of historical or modern journalism, either. Since Mikhail Lomonsov's treatise on journalists in 1754,¹⁵ the field has developed unique characteristics both in tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union. For example, Effie Ambler, contends that the pre-Soviet press was literary and a vital ingredient in culture, that it felt a sense of mission to enlighten and to elevate, that it preferred interpretation to news reporting, and that it watched closely the societies of Western Europe.¹⁶ In the Soviet Union today, journalism is defined by V. I. Lenin's concept of a newspaper: it "is not only a collective propagandist and collective agitator, it is also a collective organizer."¹⁷ Thus, the purpose of

¹⁴Jay Jensen and Richard Bayley, "Highlights of the Development of Russian Journalism, 1553-1917," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Summer, 1964), 403.

¹⁵"Zhurnalists," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Vol. XVI (Moscow, 1950-1957).

¹⁶Effie Ambler, Russian Journalism and Politics: The Career of A. S. Suvorin, 1861-1881 (Detroit, 1972), pp. 13-14.

¹⁷V. I. Lenin, Vol. V of Collected Works, 39 vols. (Moscow, 1961), p. 502.

the Soviet press is "to propagandize rather than inform, to indoctrinate rather than enlighten."¹⁸ The operations, goals, and results of dissent communication in Russia have drawn certain elements from such characteristics without being included completely in Russian journalism: dissident communications often have been literary; dissenters have relied mainly on interpretation, even clear propaganda, to fulfill a sense of mission; and dissenting factions, especially the revolutionaries in and after the 1860s, have organized themselves around newspapers and journals.

Conflict between official opinion and dissent is a prominent theme in Russian journalism history, however,¹⁹ and dissident communication has been a type of journalism in at least one sense. That is, as a customary, regular activity of dissent, discontented elements in tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union have managed to convey their messages, whether literary, interpretative, ideological, or otherwise, to audiences. The communication has been done openly and secretly, effectively and ineffectively, but it has been done. Thus, the concept of Russian dissent journalism, including its clandestine segment, relies not so

¹⁸Leo Gruliow, "The Role of the Press," Problems of Communism, XII (January-February, 1963), 40.

¹⁹Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 403.

much on specific characteristics as on a recurring theme of protest against oppression.

Statement of the Problem

How did underground communication develop in Russia? What methods have been used by dissidents in both open and secret communications? What is the current status of the underground media movement? What conclusions can be drawn from the Russian rebels' heritage of communicating their dissidence?

The answers to these questions form the crux of the problem in this thesis, which is an historical interpretation of dissent journalism, and primarily of underground communication, in tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union.

Purposes

The purposes of this project are (1) to identify the reasons for and processes of the clandestine media in Russia and (2) to utilize the study for an interpretation of the media's significance.

Hypothesis

The main hypothesis of this thesis is: since the early part of the seventeenth century dissidents have shared a legacy of communicating dissent openly and secretly despite perpetual oppression from Russian governments.

Other hypotheses or interpretations will be considered in the conclusions in the final chapter.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this thesis, the basic definition of dissent will be: disagreement with and protest against the official policies of Russian governments. Dissent will assume various natures, such as literary or ideological, and it will be both open and clandestine.

The thesis will base its conception of dissent journalism on the unique characteristics discussed earlier. Therefore, it is important to remember that such journalism has strong characteristics of being literary, interpretative (and, often, propagandistic), and an element of organization for various factions.

The word samizdat has not appeared in Russian dictionaries, but its use and meaning are important to dissenters in the Soviet Union. The literal translation is "self-publishing," and the idea linked to the word stirs deeply within dissidents: the word is an acronym in defiance of Gosizdat, the State Publishing House, and declares that "I myself do the publishing"--not necessarily of my own work, but of my own free will, without begging for anyone's permission."²⁰ The word has offspring in magnetizdat,

²⁰Julius Telesin, "Inside Samizdat," Encounter, XL (February, 1973), 25.

materials secretly taped and distributed; radioizdat, illegal broadcasting; and tamizdat, allowing works suppressed in the Soviet Union to be published elsewhere. The thesis will use these words in sections concerning illicit communications of the past two decades because the words did not appear in dissent vocabulary until the 1950s.

Review of Literature

With one exception, previous research on the Russian underground media has ignored the journalism aspect. Numerous works on censorship, literature, society, and politics touch only peripherally on sub rosa journalism. Even standard introductory essays such as those by Jay Jensen and Richard Bayley in Journalism Quarterly,²¹ Richard Olsen in his book,²² and DeWitt Reddick in Journalism Quarterly²³ ignore to great extent underground communication in Russia.

The exception is an unpublished master's thesis by Elliot Schreiber. His research concentrates on published and samizdat dissent in the Soviet Union since 1953. He

²¹Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 403-415, 436.

²²Richard Olsen, The History Makers (Baton Rouge, La., 1966), pp. 301-332.

²³DeWitt Reddick, "Development of the Press in Nineteenth Century Russia," Journalism Quarterly, XXI (March, 1944), 45-54.

surveys the history of dissent since 1953 and its handling by authorities. He concludes the authorities' response to dissent since 1953 has been influenced by world opinion, that the authorities have treated well-known and lesser-known dissidents differently, and that the younger generation of Russia may prove to be the most disaffected of all malcontents in the Soviet Union.²⁴

E. E. Kluge's study of the revolutionary periodicals of the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century contains a roll call of eighty important secret publications. However, the text offers only brief discussions about motives and conditions. There is no English translation available.²⁵

The memoirs and other writings of some dissidents contain important primary material on the goals, operations, and philosophies of the secret press in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Among the most important

²⁴Elliott Schreiber, "Soviet Press Theory and Dissent in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1953-1974," unpublished master's thesis, School of Journalism, Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania, 1974.

²⁵E. E. Kluge, Die russische revolutionare Presse (Zurich, 1948).

writings are those of Alexander Herzen,²⁶ Sergey Kravchinsky (who wrote under the pseudonym Stepnyak),²⁷ and Lenin.²⁸ Each of these ideologists believed strongly in a cause, however; they were not motivated by objective scholarship, and their works must be read with that understanding.

The underground literary movement of the past two decades has produced an abundance of primary materials. Except for Peter Reddaway's Uncensored Russia,²⁹ however, investigators have overlooked the journalism angle of dissent. Reddaway's book is a thorough translation and explanation of the first eleven issues of Khronika tekushchikh sobytiy (Chronicle of Current Events). Since the Chronicle first appeared in 1968 it has been an irrepressible news journal of the dissent movement, and the

²⁶Alexander I. Herzen, My Past and Thoughts: The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen, 4 vols., translated by Constance Garnett, revised by Humphrey Higgins (New York, 1968). Herzen discusses the Kolokol, his prototypal underground new journal, at various places in his memoirs but he concentrates on it and the Free Russian Press of London in vol. 3.

²⁷Sergey M. Kravchinsky (Stepnyak), Underground Russia: Revolutionary Sketches and Profiles from Life (New York, 1883).

²⁸See Page 5, note 17.

²⁹Peter Reddaway, editor and translator, Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union (New York, 1972). Reddaway is also preparing a companion volume on subsequent issues of the Chronicle.

Chronicle has been unique because of its factual, unemotional reporting and, normally, publication at regular intervals.

Neither Mark Hopkins' comprehensive book on the media of the Soviet Union³⁰ nor Antony Buzek's survey of the Communist press in Eastern Europe³¹ analyzes underground journalism. This is true also of Alex Inkeles' widely cited study of Soviet public opinion.³²

Justification

No general study has devoted an entire theme to the historical development of underground communication in tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union. By identifying that development of the clandestine media, this thesis will try to fill a gap in the history of Russian journalism.

Limitations

The thesis will investigate the development of dissent underground communication in Russia. It will not devote equal emphasis to political or other aspects of dissent. Beginning with the 1860s, the thesis will concentrate on the clandestine media and will not discuss dissent in the

³⁰Mark Hopkins, Mass Media in the Soviet Union (New York, 1970).

³¹Antony Buzek, How the Communist Press Works (New York, 1964).

³²Alex Inkeles, Public Opinion in Soviet Russia (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

authorized publications such as the liberal trend in Novy Mir in the 1950s and early 1960s. The project also will not examine in detail the specific tributaries of Soviet dissent, such as the nationalists, the religious dissenters, and others.

A main limitation of the project is the paucity of previous research specifically on Russian dissent journalism. Another limitation is the lack of primary materials available.

Methodology

This project will employ the historical approach for research and interpretation.

After researching the general area of Russian dissent and the specific area of clandestine journalism, the project will organize pertinent material for chronological presentation. The thesis will make conclusions based on that material.

Among works which will be utilized will be general surveys of Russian history, interpretative works on specific subjects such as political thought or the development of literature, the memoirs and collected writings of major personalities, articles from journals, and newspapers. Major primary sources will be the works of Lenin, Herzen, Kravchinsky, and other activists from underground communication, the compilations of samizdat materials such as

those in Reddaway, and three newspapers--the Times (London), Christian Science Monitor, and New York Times.

The thesis will use the transliteration system of the U. S. Department of State's Romantization Guide issued in 1964. However, neither diacritical nor the soft and hard signs will be represented. Unless otherwise noted within the thesis body or within citation, all translations will be original.

Organization

Chapters will follow a chronological presentation.

Chapter II will study the earliest dissident messages which circulated, the development of Russian journalism and underground literature in the eighteenth century, and the emergence of censorship as a repressive measure near the end of the century.

Chapter III will discuss the first organized underground movement in Russia, the widespread use of the underground by literati during the reign of Nicholas I, and the expanding social consciousness felt by many liberals during that time.

Beginning with Chapter IV, the thesis will emphasize clandestine communication rather than the broad scope of published and illicit dissent which was presented in previous chapters. The reason for this is that in the 1860s revolutionaries developed an extensive illegal press

movement whereas before underground communication often was simply a channel for literary and philosophical works which were parallel to open dissent in journals and newspapers. The chapter will study the role of Herzen's Kolokol (Bell) in initiating the underground press movement, the use of secret journals, newspapers, and manifestoes by diverse factions, and the crucial role of the underground by Lenin and others in the twenty years before the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

Chapter V will begin the study of underground communication since 1917, evaluating reasons for its dormancy during the rule of Joseph Stalin and for its reawakening in the 1950s. The study will continue in Chapter VI, which will discuss some of the characteristics of modern dissidents, the methods they use in disseminating underground messages, and the role of the Chronicle of Current Events as the primary news journal of dissidence.

Chapter VII will contain a summary and conclusions.

CHAPTER II

FROM "SEDITIONOUS LETTERS" TO RADISCHEV:

DISSENT LITERATURE DEVELOPS

The printed word provoked suspicion in Russia long before dissenting literature arose in the eighteenth century.

Ecclesiastics in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries felt that the pervasive authority of the Russian Orthodox Church was threatened by religious works printed in and near Russia. The clergymen considered themselves as guardians of Russia's heritage from Byzantine culture, and they abhorred Western innovations such as printing.¹ The earliest printers in Muscovy, the grand duchy which evolved into modern Russia, were drowned, imprisoned, and forced to flee for their lives by vengeful clergymen and Orthodox believers.² Priestly intrigues constantly stirred suspicions among the populus, and increasing harassment from the clergy and the laity finally forced printing out of the capital.

¹Eugene Prostov, "Origins of Russian Printing," Library Quarterly, I (July, 1931), 258.

²Alfred Rambaud, Vol. I of History of Russia from the Earliest Times to 1882, 3 vols., edited by Nathan Haskell Dole, translated by L. B. Lang (Boston, 1882), p. 303

In the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries, printing spread into the provinces.³

Despite the movement of printing out of the capital, however, the first illegal manuscripts which were directed against the government were "seditious letters" printed by hand, not by presses. The earliest of these propaganda leaflets appeared during one of the most tumultuous chapters in Russian history, the Time of Troubles (1604-1613). Severe famine, unrest at all levels of society, and bloody challenges against weak tsars marked these first years of the century until the election of Mikhail Romanov as tsar in 1613. The illegal leaflets of the first False Dmitri, who in 1604 assumed the identity of a tsarevich dead since 1591, combined the three elements of famine, social discontent, and challenge in order to arouse his supporters. The pretender's agents spread letters berating the pestilence of Boris Godunov's reign and promising better conditions for peasants and noblemen alike. The propaganda flowed across the countryside and into towns, inciting what Paul Avrich calls "a wave of rebellion and mass hysteria."⁴ The letters eventually helped the pretender win the throne as the fourth

³Jay Jensen and Richard Bayley, "Highlights of the Development of Russian Journalism, 1553-1917," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Summer, 1964), 404.

⁴Paul Avrich, Russian Rebels, 1600-1800 (New York, 1972), p. 16.

tsar within a year, but he did not sit for long. Vasili Shuisky, Dmitri's murderous successor, soon faced another onslaught of illegal propaganda.

This campaign came in 1606-1607 from the forces of Ivan Bolotnikov, a runaway slave who led the first of the four great peasant rebellions which shook Russia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The revolts had many similar characteristics such as geography and severity, but one of the most important characteristics was the widespread dissemination of incendiary propaganda in the "seditious letters": the letters played a crucial role in the campaigns to win the hearts and minds of peasants during the rebellions by Bolotnikov, Stepan Razin (1670-1671), Kondrati Bulavin (1707-1708), and Emleyan Pugachev (1773-1774).⁵ The leaflets were printed by hand, then were smuggled into the tsar's strongholds or were nailed to village posts. Agents read the letters to illiterates. Peasants, villagers, tribesmen, and other malcontents were susceptible to the rhetoric of accusations, promises, myths, and rumors. By the time of Pugachev's Revolt against Catherine II, the illicit messages had developed into eloquent appeals with specific programs for action.⁶

The "seditious letters" show that the commitment by Russian dissidents to spread their messages by any means

⁵Ibid., pp. 1-2.

⁶Ibid., p. 227.

possible has historical antecedents even before the growth of dissent literature in the eighteenth century. The rebels of Bolotnikov, Razin, Bulavin, and Pugachev effectively conveyed their dissident messages to audiences when such activity was forbidden, and this is an inheritance shared by all Russian dissenters since the early 1600s. The "seditious letters" were the crudest origins of illegal communication in Russia.⁷

Those crude origins took almost a century after the final letters in 1773-1774 to evolve finally into an identifiable movement of clandestine communication. In the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, many dissidents published openly although hampered by strict censorship. They preferred periodicals as media, and the dissidents used a variety of deceptions such as satire, literary criticism, and Aesopian language to camouflage true discontent.

Given the development of Russian journalism in the first half of the eighteenth century, it was predictable that periodicals would assume a primary role in dissent communication then and later: the early Russian press and the dissent faction which grew from it shared the nature of

⁷N. G. Georgieva, "Nelegalnaya listkovaya pechat Rossii kontsa XIX - nachala XX veka," Voprosy istoriya, XLVI (June, 1972), 36.

being exclusive. News was in the domain of government, so alternative opinions were developed elsewhere--in journals, and by an emerging literary class.

Until 1703, news in Russia was a state secret entrusted only to the tsar and his most dependable advisers.⁸ The kuranty (courants), the earliest of which is dated 1621, were newsletters which repeated diplomatic, commercial, and military information culled from foreign newspapers.⁹ On January 2, 1703, however, Peter I issued the first printed Russian newspaper, and news became a substantial tie between the tsar and his subjects: the paper, Vedomosti (Gazette), related details about the court, about the European societies which Peter admired, and about the ruler's policies and orders.¹⁰ In 1728, three years after Peter's death, the Sankt-Petersburgskie Vedomosti (St. Petersburg Gazette), replaced his newspaper. Supplements with "historical, general, and geographical comments"¹¹ appeared with the newspapers, which were issued by the Academy of Sciences. The supplements eventually grew into the first periodical

⁸Richard Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime, History of Civilization Series (New York, 1974), p. 111.

⁹"Zhurnalist," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Vol. XVI (Moscow, 1950-1959).

¹⁰Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 405.

¹¹"Zhurnaly," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Vol. XVI (Moscow, 1950-1957).

for popular consumption, Ezhemesyachnye sochineniya (Monthly Collections), started in 1755 by scientist and writer Mikhail Lomonosov. His 1754 treatise, "On the Position of Journalists," was the guiding work on embryonic journalism in Russia for the period's writers.¹²

Lomonosov arose from the peasantry of Russia, but the nobility dominated the growth of periodicals during the latter half of the eighteenth century. A dissident force evolved primarily out of the nobility, but the evolvment widened the chasm between the government and all Russians.¹³ Dissent, and the communication of dissident thought, grew in the vacuum.

The satirists who developed dissenting literature in the second half of the eighteenth century identified the disparity between autocratic reactionism and alternative liberalism for the first time in Russian history.¹⁴ Ironically, the government gave the literary faction time and opportunity to perceive and to express dissidence: state requirements for service by the dvoryane--the aristocrats who were strong, rich, educated, and protected by

¹²"Zhurnalist," op. cit.

¹³Thornton Anderson, Russian Political Thought, (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), p. 137.

¹⁴Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 407.

law¹⁵--loosened after the death of Peter I in 1725, thus facilitating the pursuit of private interests by the nobility. Literature was the most popular diversion. Peter III's Manifesto of 1762 freed the nobility from all state service, creating a class which neither served the government nor paid taxes and which had plenty of time and resources to become serious literati.¹⁶ Literature, a primary motif of which was the satirical journal, became what Richard Pipes calls "a private realm,"¹⁷ a battleground between official opinion and dissent for 200 years.

Lomonosov, A. P. Sumarokov, and M. M. Kheraskov were among writers who, during the early years of Catherine II's reign (1762-1796), began to consider "nascent Russian public opinion."¹⁸ N. I. Novikov was the prominent figure of the period, however. Shortly after Catherine in 1769 covertly established a weekly journal for her own interests, several noblemen issued polemical periodicals which satirized Russian conditions and which catered to an elitist audience.¹⁹ Only Catherine's Vsyakaya vsyachina (This and That) and Novikov's Truten (Drone) survived the year:

¹⁵Pipes, op. cit., p. 171.

¹⁶Anderson, op. cit., p. 137.

¹⁷Pipes, op. cit., p. 254.

¹⁸Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 406.

¹⁹Effie Ambler, Russian Journalism and Politics: The Career of A. S. Suvorin, 1861-1881 (Detroit, 1972), p. 14.

Catherine's weekly because it was hers, Novikov's journal because it was the most serious and the most outspoken opposition to the regime.

For the next four years, private journals of light satire and inconsequential debates appeared and disappeared. Novikov, however, continued to challenge Catherine on most of the major issues of Russian society and especially on serfdom. He encouraged the maturation of Russia's dissent journalism during this period, but his freedom to publish did not last. After Pugachev's "seditious letters" exposed deep currents of unrest in the country in 1773-1774, Catherine began to curtail her permissiveness with the new journalism. The French Revolution of 1789 increased her suspicion of free thought. Catherine denounced such thought and punished her critics, thus eventually destroying the roots of culture which, she once had envisioned, would have enlightened Russia.²⁰

Even before Catherine's affair with Enlightenment ended so bitterly, eighteenth-century Russian writers were accustomed to circulating some manuscripts only by hand. This practice grew more popular among nineteenth-century poets, dramatists, philosophers, and other intellectuals until it evolved into the underground press movement in the second half of the 1800s.

²⁰Michael T. Florinsky, Vol. I of Russia: A History and Interpretation, 2 vols. (New York, 1953), p. 602.

Antioch Kantemir was among the first writers in the eighteenth century to use this private method of disseminating ideas. His satires, written between 1729 and 1739, were aimed at the successors of Peter I. The manuscripts roamed within aristocratic circles even long after the author's death in 1744.²¹

Eighteenth-century Russian dissenters who wrote sub rosa works used other genres besides satire to criticize, debate, and lament over the ills of society. Serious treatises on history, economics, and other subjects were copied by hand for limited distribution among friends. Mikhail Shcherbatov's On the Decline of Morals in Russia was a prime example. Descended from one of Russia's most ancient titled families, Shcherbatov was a beneficiary of the 1762 Manifesto. He used his freedom and resources to compile, among other works, a six-volume study of Russian history. But Decline is Shcherbatov's memorable work. Written in 1788, it recorded in detail the debaucheries of Peter I's successors, including Catherine II, and it longed for a return to the virtues of old Muscovy. Shcherbatov wisely refused to publish the work for Catherine's eyes, but Decline was a popular clandestine manuscript. It was not

²¹D. S. Mirskii, A History of Russian Literature, edited and abridged by Francis J. Whitfield (New York, 1949), pp. 40-41.

printed until 1858 and then not in Russia but in London by Alexander Herzen's Free Russian Press.²²

Some of the most popular hand-to-hand works were more bawdy than Shcherbatov's Decline. For example, Ivan S. Barkov's pornographic verses, such as "Baccanalia and Erotic Poems," were widely circulated. The Imperial Library even accepted a compilation of the scurrilous works.²³ Alexander Pushkin, as a boy of nine or so, secretly read such notorious writings hidden in his father's bookcase. Later, when any new dissident poem or letter which circulated without permission was attributed to Pushkin because so many of his works were read that way, he complained to a friend, "All the subversive manuscripts went under my name, just as all obscene ones go under the name of Barkov."²⁴ Secret pornography was hardly a threat to the government in Barkov's time, and it was not a significant era in clandestine, dissent journalism, but it does have a

²²Florinsky, op. cit., p. 602.

²³"Barkov," Russkii Biograficheskii Slovar, Vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1896-1918). Barkov was not a dissolute dilettante, however; he was a serious translator and satirist.

²⁴Alexander S. Pushkin, The Letters of Alexander Pushkin, translated by J. Thomas Shaw (Madison, Wisc., Milwaukee, and London, 1967), pp. 314-315.

parallel even today in some of the underground works in the Soviet Union.²⁵

Whether satire, history, or pornography, none of the unauthorized works which circulated by hand had the impact of one truly self-published book in 1790, Alexander N. Radishchev's A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow. The book exposed the "seamier sides of Russian provincial life"²⁶ and clearly espoused Radishchev's belief in French Enlightenment, particularly Enlightenment's anti-monarchical views.²⁷ Through bureaucratic oversight, the book had the censor's stamp of approval: A St. Petersburg censor ordered numerous changes in Radishchev's text and then sent the work to the police chief for reading, but the chief signed an approval without looking at the manuscript. Radishchev took the book to his printer but the printer refused to touch the work even though it had the censor's stamp. Taking advantage of a 1783 decree allowing some private ownership

²⁵For example, the adventures of Oktyabriana, a female James Bond, and naked except for ammunition belts, mocks Kremlin puritanism. Such political pornography is popular for escapism, according to Antoli Kuznetsov. See Times (London), October 29, 1971, p. 10.

²⁶Pipes, op. cit., p. 258.

²⁷Florinsky, op. cit., p. 599.

of presses, Radishchev printed and distributed copies himself.²⁸ Catherine was outraged, and she persecuted him into submission. Despite Radishchev's later recantation and his burning of spare copies, the Empress sentenced him to death, later commuting the punishment to exile in Siberia.

The furor raised by the controversial book and the subsequent ruining of the author's life by his ruler were precursory to the fate of later writers who published illegally. Whether their ideas have been disseminated openly or secretly, dissenters in Russia have had to face forbidding obstacles meant to stifle freedom of thought.

Censorship has been one of the main instruments used by Russian rulers for suppressing dissent. Catherine's increasing abhorrence of the Pugachev Revolt and its implications of deep unrest in the country, of the rise of Freemasonry, of the French Revolution, and, finally, of the possible backlash from Radishchev's case culminated in her censorship decree of 1796, the first in Russia. The decree smothered any lingering hopes by dissidents for a free press in Russia.²⁹ It also was the first in a long series of censorship laws which perpetuated tsarist

²⁸Leon I. Twarog, "Literary Censorship in Russia and the Soviet Union," Essays on Russian Intellectual History, edited by Leon Gordon Blair (Austin, 1971), pp. 103-104.

²⁹Ibid., p. 100.

suppression of Russian literature and journalism: subsequent measures in 1804, 1826, 1828, 1830, 1848, 1865, 1872, and 1905 influenced to varying degrees the growth of open and underground dissent until 1917.

Censorship and poor pay contributed to an uncontroversial period in Russian journalism during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Some of the specialized journals which arose in the period obliquely discussed radical themes, however.³⁰

Before the reign of Alexander I ended in 1825, however, there appeared publishing trends which would continue to develop through the middle of the nineteenth century. The most significant of these trends were (1) the growth in the number of periodicals with diverse content, (2) the spread of periodical journalism into the provinces, and (3) the publication of specialized journals by government departments.³¹ Parallel to these trends was the increasing use of clandestine communication among dissidents who disseminated ideas by any means possible, legal or illegal. This was true to the tradition of the peasant rebels in the great revolts, of the satirists in Russia's earliest leisure and literary class, and of the neo-radicals of the late eighteenth century.

³⁰"Zhurnaly," op. cit.

³¹Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 408-409.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY UNDERGROUND: REVOLUTIONARIES AND LITERATI

Neither peasant rebels nor nobility satirists initiated Russia's first underground movement. The members of the earliest secret societies were young army officers, educated, aristocratic, and impressionable. They drove deep into Europe to defeat Napoleon, and there they fell under a spell of liberalism and nationalism.¹ When these neo-radicals returned to autocratic Russia they were resolved to cure the ills of their society, culture, and government: they sought to revolutionize Russia. The most radical discussion and planning societies which developed had to be secret, as did their communications.

The Union of Salvation, formed in 1816 by twenty or so of the officers from the tsar's elite Semyonovsky Guards, spawned the two major factions of the abortive December Revolt (1825), the Northern and Southern societies. Periodicals such as Sorevnovatel' prosveshcheniya i blagotvoreniya (The Emulator of Enlightenment and Philanthropy) and

¹Richard Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime (New York, 1974), p. 1881.

Nevsky zritel (Neva Spectator) spoke for the visible elements of elements of the radical movements.² However, members of the societies also relied on clandestine propaganda spread within the army to prepare for what was planned to be a peaceful transition from autocracy to republicanism or to constitutional monarchy.³

Tributaries broke away from the main theme of radicalism. In vogue during the times were numerous discussion groups whose select membership included officers, writers, students, dilettantes, and others; they had the time, education and resources to spend hours debating about Russia. Members of clubs such as the Arzamas and the Green Light, both of which Alexander Pushkin was a member, exchanged letters, poems, essays, and other manuscripts without the censor's approval. Some of the writings were light or ribald, but some were serious treatises on contemporary and future Russia. Many texts envisioned a Russia free from autocracy, serfdom, and censorship. Some of Pushkin's major works of this period were read initially through underground circulation, including "Ode to Liberty" (1817) and "Hurrah! He's Back in Russia" (1819). The ideas of Pushkin and other writers began to seep down through all

²"Zhurnaly," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Vol. XVI (Moscow, 1950-1957).

³Thornton Anderson, Russian Political Thought (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), p. 160.

levels of Russian society, except perhaps to the very lowest, and the ideas encouraged other thoughts to be spread in the same way.⁴ Among other famous works which circulated by hand was Alexander Griboyedov's satiric play, Woe from Wit, which avoided the censor's stamp for five years before an abridged version was printed in 1830.⁵

Circulation sub rosa was a popular method of dissidents who sought to influence the thoughts and behavior of Russians outside the autocracy. It was popular because under Alexander I, Sidney Monas asserts, public opinion was "the opinion of the genry class and, above all, those who served in the army."⁶ Journals and newspapers suffered under intense governmental supervision. Although the periodical press managed to grow in size and content,⁷ the opinions held by the majority of Russians were dictated by the regime. Nicholas I, Alexander's successor, considered

⁴Henri Troyat, Pushkin, translated by Nancy Amphous (Garden City, N. Y., 1970, pp.

⁵D. S. Mirskii, A History of Russian Literature, edited and abridged by Francis J. Whitfield (New York, 1949), p. 109.

⁶Sidney Monas, The Third Section: Police and Society under Nicholas I (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), p. 53.

⁷Jay Jensen and Richard Bayley, "Highlights of the Development of Russian Journalism, 1553-1917," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Summer, 1964), 408.

a dormant public opinion as the best public opinion: public affairs belonged solely to the monarch.⁸

The reign of Nicholas began with a conspiratorial revolt and ended in the final throes of a lost war. The thirty years of Nicholas' rule, 1825-1855, were difficult ones for the tsar and for his subjects. He used his personal chancellory as the central instrument to control an extensive bureaucracy which pervaded the country. The Third Department, one of the five in the chancellory, best represented Nicholas' consuming desire to know and control everything that happened or was said in Russia: it was the secret police and censorship section. It was the most influential organ of Nicholas' reign--his personal spy, censor, investigator, disciplinarian, judge, and bureaucratic watchdog. But Nicholas assigned to the Third Department two irreconcilable duties: (1) to instill in Russians a deeper, stronger degree of support for the regime, and (2) to preserve absolute control by the autocracy.⁹ The Department only widened the substantial chasm between the tsar and his subjects.

⁸Leon Stilman, "Freedom and Repression in Prerevolutionary Russian Literature," Continuity and Change in Russian Thought and Soviet Society, edited by Ernest J. Simmons (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), p. 424.

⁹Monas, op. cit., p. 286.

Like their predecessors in the previous two centuries, Russian dissidents in Nicholas' reign peered into the chasm and railed at what they thought they saw. Unlike their predecessors, however, the nineteenth-century dissenters had to contend with a censorship police, the Third Department. The Department worked mainly from the 1826 Statute, the Iron Code. By this law, an author was responsible for answering to the tsar even if the work in question had been approved by censors and printed.¹⁰ Despite the milder 1828 statute, censorship tightened once again after the European Revolutions of 1830. Sergei Uvarov, Nicholas' minister of education, waged a relentless campaign against periodicals and newspapers: among the prominent publications suppressed were Nikolai Polevoi's widely read Moskovskii Telegraf (Moscow Telegraph) for a critical review of an absurdly patriotic play, and Ivan Kireevsky's Evropeisk (European) for recurring themes of enlightenment, freedom, and rule by constitution.¹¹

The growing consciousness of Russian dissent was irrepressible, however, as it sought new directions, new strengths, and new advocates. This consciousness eventually produced the forces which steered tsarist Russia toward

¹⁰Stilman, op. cit., 419-420.

¹¹Ibid., p. 422.

1917, forces dominated by middle and upper class intellectuals, but which included almost anyone committed to revolutionizing Russia.

Richard Pipes asserts that after the failure of the Decembrists, Russian intellectuals turned from the Enlightenment of the French and American revolutions and to German Idealism. The change, and the new philosophy, gave the intellectuals more confidence than at any time in previous Russian history.¹² Pipes continues,

The educated class . . . steadily expanded and in expanding changed its character: what had been a small band of rich youths with troubled consciences and patriotic aspirations, became a large pool of people of all estates for whom intellectual work was a way of making a living.¹³

It is appropriate to call this emerging element the "intelligentsia," although the term was not introduced until the 1860s. Then, editor and author Pyotr Bobrykin used the term to describe an educated, upper class which, alienated from autocracy, sought to speak for the Russian national conscience.¹⁴ Pipes adopts a definition based primarily on the intelligent's commitment to improving society, a definition which places education and social standing

¹²Pipes, op. cit., pp. 259-260.

¹³Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁴Martin Malia, "What is the Intelligentsia," The Russian Intelligentsia, edited by Richard Pipes (New York, 1961), p. 3.

secondary.¹⁵ D. S. Mirskii sees the intelligentsia's spirit as the prominent characteristic, a spirit of "social idealism, of the passion for improving the world, of disrespect for all tradition, and of highly strung, disinterested enthusiasm."¹⁶ Russian dissidents began to feel this spirit in their emerging consciousness of the 1830s.

Pipes also identifies five institutions in which the nineteenth-century intelligentsia exchanged ideas and formed friendships: (1) the salons, some of which were gaming clubs with coincidental discussions on public affairs, and others of which were serious, ideological forums; (2) the university, in which Russian youth felt its first freedom to oppose authority; (3) the zemstva, organs of self-government which developed after 1864 to replace serfowners' authority and to do what the bureaucracy could not do; (4) the tolstyĭ zhurnal, fat journal, each of which espoused a philosophy for a certain clientele, and which played a crucial role in forming public opinion in the provinces after Alexander II eased censorship in the middle 1850s; and (5) the circle, a gathering of intellectual allies who met away from the salons for periodic debates, discussions, and

¹⁵Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime, p. 253.

¹⁶Mirskii, op. cit., p. 167.

studying.¹⁷ Such circles often met secretly, the members communicating with each other through manuscripts which were passed clandestinely.

The diverse philosophical texts which traveled across St. Petersburg and Moscow joined a stream of poetry, plays, and other literature. All of the writings circulated from authors to friends, who made copies and then disseminated the copies among trustworthy compatriots. This underground network of literature was similar to the samizdat movement in the modern Soviet Union: the authors of literary, political, religious, and other works today give manuscripts to friends, who provide copies--by typing, photocopying, or various other methods--for trusted friends, and it is all done secretly, illegally.¹⁸

The Third Department often tolerated the widespread manuscript circulation, but sometimes the Department attacked the network with vengeance. The Department's targets, such as Pyotr Chaadayev and Mikhail Lermontov, then suffered.

In Chaadayev's case, the Department acted when his work finally was published, not when the treatise denying Russian history was in the underground. Chaadayev's

¹⁷Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime, pp. 262-265.

¹⁸Julius Telesin, "Inside Samizdat," Encounter, XL (February, 1973), 30.

"Philosophical Letters" circulated in manuscript for several years before one of the essays was printed in N. I.

Nadezhdin's Teleskop (Telescope) in September, 1836. The work depicted Russia as backward, far from the mainstream of European development, and suffering from a history of autocracy and serfdom. The author blamed the Eastern Church for this retardation. He called for Russia to seek social progress from Europe and spiritual guidance from the Western Church. The Third Department reacted swiftly when the essay appeared openly: the Department set into motion the eventual suppression of the Teleskop and declared Chaadayev insane. He was confined to his apartment for a year and underwent daily examinations by a doctor appointed by Nicholas. The philosopher finally agreed to quit writing, and Nicholas declared him sane.¹⁹

Many of Russia's modern dissidents also suffer accusations of insanity, but they do not "recover" in their own homes, if they "recover" at all: they undergo treatments in psychiatric hospitals and under the care of doctors chosen by the government.²⁰

Pushkin's death on January 29, 1837, inspired a wave of clandestine tributes, including Lermontov's "On the Death of Pushkin." The Third Department seethed at the

¹⁹ Monas, op. cit., pp. 164-173.

²⁰ New York Times, April 21, 1970, p. 4.

twenty-three-year-old Lermontov's indictment of the regime: he accused it of unmercifully harassing Pushkin while he was alive and of allowing a foreign nobleman to kill Russia's greatest poet in an illegal duel. Nicholas expelled the young officer from the Semyonovsky Guards and exiled him to the Caucasus. However, Lermontov's underground manuscript reached thousands of Russians of all estates, and it had a profound impact.²¹

Discontent at all levels in Russia spread as Nicholas' reign continued its oppressive course. The degree of intensity in the regime's arbitrariness seemed to produce an equal degree of resistance. Like the emergence of Alexander Solzhenitsyn as a major writer in the controlled society of the Soviet Union, many of Russia's greatest literary figures appeared during Nicholas' rule: Pushkin, Griboyedov, Lermontov, and Nikolai Gogol wrote and died during the Gendarme of Europe's tenure, and Fyodor Dostoevsky, Leo Tolstoy, Ivan Turgenev, and Ivan Goncharov published early works.²²

A public whose concern for Russia was growing began to scoff at the shallow news and opinions in the ofitsioz publications, which were "ostensibly independent but secretly

²¹Monas, op. cit., p. 184.

²²Stilman, op. cit., p. 425.

backed by the government to unofficially present an official point of view."²³ F. V. Bulganin, N. I. Grech, and O. I. Senkovksy in particular enjoyed the regime's favor. They controlled several periodicals and newspapers of the ofitsioz type, including Bulganin's Severnaya pchela (Northern Bee), which was the only non-official newspaper allowed to print political news.²⁴ Together, the numerous publications of Bulganin, Grech, and Senkovsky reached more than half of the Russians who subscribed to the private press.²⁵ Ivan Golovin, an outspoken opponent of Nicholas' regime, saw Russian journalism at this time as being "in a state of the deepest degradation . . . against every free spirit, and against every heart that has the least independence."²⁶

Starting in the middle of the 1830s, however, a new genre in journalism began to appear: literary criticism. It was not illicit journalism, but it played a crucial role in the growing social commitment of Russian intellectuals.

The seminal literary critic of Russia was Vissarion G. Belinsky. The son of a poor army doctor, Belinsky was

²³Effie Ambler, Russian Journalism and Politics: The Career of A. S. Suvorin, 1861-1881 (Detroit, 1972), p. 22.

²⁴Jensen and Bayley, op. cit., 409.

²⁵Monas, op. cit., p. 187.

²⁶Ivan G. Golovin, Vol. II of Russia Under the Autocrat, Nicholas the First, 2 vols. (London, 1846), pp. 242-243.

primarily self-educated although he spent three years in Moscow University. He was a probing critic, and Mirskii attributes the beginnings of "Russian intelligentsia journalism" to the publication of Belinsky's "Literary Musings" in Teleskop in 1834.²⁷ Over the next decade or so, Belinsky's reviews and essays in three major journals cut deeply into the directions and purposes of Russian literature and, at the same time, of Russian society. He was among the first journalists to influence directly public opinion on a wide scale, and his passion for improving Russia bequeathed to later intelligentsia a principle of social idealism.²⁸ The Russian writer learned from Belinsky that literature should play a role in improving society.²⁹

The public was aware of the weaknesses of Russian autocracy; readers eagerly sought the literary critiques of Belinsky and others. Censorship so heavily shrouded the country that it was impossible for the mainstream of the newspapers and journals to probe social problems; however, novels or plays could "reflect" these problems, Hugh McLean points out. McLean continues,

²⁷Mirskii, op. cit., pp. 165, 167.

²⁸Ibid., p. 167.

²⁹Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime, p. 269.

Then, under the guise of literary criticism, the journalist could discuss what was reflected in the novel; but everyone knew that he was really discussing not the novel but the "real" social and ideological problems themselves.³⁰

In order to evade censorship, literary criticism also inspired techniques of deception such as Aesopian language, in which symbols and phrases stating an apparently innocuous idea actually hid more radical thought. There developed what one revolutionary of the next generation called "a secret understanding . . . between writers and readers" so that ideas abhorred by the rulers still passed "from mind to mind."³¹

The combination of a popular dissent journalism and the European Revolutions of 1848 elicited from Nicholas a final chapter, perhaps the most severe in his oppressive reign. Soon after the upheaval in France in 1848, two committees began to control censorship and censors more sternly than had the Third Department or the Ministry of Education. On April 2, 1848, the Buturlin Committee implemented, upon the orders of Nicholas, several recommendations made by the Menshikov Committee. The most significant recommendations

³⁰ Hugh McLean, "The Development of Modern Russian Literature," The Development of the USSR: An Exchange of Views, edited by Donald Treadgold (Seattle, 1964), p. 90.

³¹ Sergey M. Kravchinsky (Stepnyak), Russia Under the Tzars, translated by William Westfall (New York, 1885), p. 327.

made censors responsible for the works they approved, banned articles about the present and future policies of the regime, and strengthened the censorship code.³² With Russia's entrance into the Crimean War in 1854, the government increased its campaign against dissident trends.

Thus, it became imperative for dissent literature to rely on passing "from mind to mind," on passing secretly and uncensored. The minds of many Russians were changing, beginning to perceive the currents which would sweep the country toward 1917. An underground of clandestine newspapers, journals, and manifestoes--a movement, rather than a popular but uncoordinated practice by literati--became a vital operation for the Russian revolutionaries who were in the middle of those currents. The times of Pushkin and Chaadayev were over, and the times of Herzen and Lenin were beginning.

³²Daniel Balmuth, "The Origins of the Tsarist Epoch of Censorship Terror," The American Slavic and East European Review, XIX (December, 1960), 512-514.

CHAPTER IV

FROM BELL TO SPARK: THE UNDERGROUND PRESS AS A MOVEMENT

Reflecting on the joy and hope he felt for Russia in 1855, Alexander Herzen wrote, "With the Crimean War, with the death of Nicholas, a new time came on; out of the continuous gloom there emerged new masses, new horizons; some movement could be sensed."¹

The movement was a stirring of social consciousness in Russia, a restlessness among the intelligentsia who believed their duty was to serve Russia by saving it. Dissent changed character: it left the domain of authors and philosophers for the activity of political revolution. The dissemination of ideology, of programs and polemics, became vital for social idealists who opposed the Russian government. One of Herzen's significant contributions to this emerging revolution was his Kolokol (Bell), the prototypal clandestine publication for the underground press which flourished in the final half century of tsarist Russia.

¹ Alexander I. Herzen, Vol. III of My Past and Thoughts: The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen, translated by Constance Garnett, revised by Humphrey Higgins (New York, 1968), p. 1297.

Herzen left Russia in 1847, harassed by the Third Department for liberal activities and enamored with Western Europe for its historical development. After observing the French and Italian revolutions in 1848, however, he realized that the revolution he sought for Russia would have to go beyond politics: it would have to be the complete transformation of Russian society. Herzen grew inclined more toward socialism than toward republicanism.² In 1852 he settled in London to begin his campaign for social revolution in Russia.

Herzen established in 1853 the Volnaya Russkaya Tipografiya (Free Russian Press), the first Russian emigre publishing enterprise intended solely for Russians. Nicholas' regime made it impossible for Herzen's works to be imported; the early publications, such as an 1853 demand for serf freedom, remained unsold and undistributed.³ It seemed that Russian free speech, even when exercised out of Russia, was bound by the country's history of suppression.

Soon after Alexander II's ascent to the tsar's throne in 1855, Herzen published the first issue of an annual almanac, Polyarnaya zvezda (Pole Star). Smuggled into

²Thornton Anderson, Russian Political Thought, (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), p. 201.

³"The Russian Press in London," The Saturday Review, June 27, 1863, pp. 835-836.

Russia by Herzen's agents and by travelers from the upper classes, the almanac of critique and comment met a reading public that was refreshed by the end of Nicholas' rigid rule. Herzen later wrote,

What was the use now of rest and sleep? . . . To work! And to work I set myself with redoubled energy. The work no longer went for nothing, no longer vanished in dark expanse: loud applause and burning sympathy were borne to us from Russia. The Pole Star was bought up like hot cakes. The Russian ear, unused to free speech, became reconciled to it, and looked eagerly for its masculine solidity, its fearless frankness.⁴

Nikolai Ogarev joined Herzen in the spring of 1856. The Free Press increased its bibliography until finally, on July 1, 1885, Herzen and Ogarev published the first number of Kolokol. Whereas Polyarnaya zvezda was an annual, Kolokol was published twice monthly, and Herzen wrote of this important difference,

Without a fairly close periodicity, there is no real bond between a publication and its readership. A book remains, a magazine disappears; but the book remains in the library and the magazine disappears in the reader's brain and is so appropriated by him through repetition that it seems his very own thought; and, if the reader begins to forget this thought, a new issue of the magazine, never fearing to be repetitious, will prompt and revive it.⁵

The underground press movement of Russia had begun with its first periodical.

From London, Herzen usually published about 2,500 copies of Kolokol. The issues were smuggled into Russia

⁴Herzen, op. cit.

⁵Ibid., pp. 1297-1298.

from East and West, by aristocrats and revolutionaries, in shoes, shawls, and trunks with false layers, and between the pages of other journals.⁶ Every edition of the early Kolokol was sold out, copied, and redistributed among eager readers from all estates. Ironically, the tsar's court also circulated the Kolokol, and the sovereign seethed at the journal's factual accounts of intimate details of the court. One issue in 1858 chided the Empress for her child-rearing methods which were known only to a few relatives, servants, and the tsar's closest advisers. Another issue in 1861 repeated the proceedings of the Council of State's secret session about the peasantry just two weeks after the meeting.⁷

The journal's omnipresent eyes and ears caught everything: state secrets, the numbers assigned to political prisoners, the corruptions of Imperial and minor officials, and the intimacies of the tsar's court. The government often retaliated by arresting smugglers and confiscating as many issues as could be found: once, more than 100,000 copies of Kolokol which had entered via Asiatic Russia were discovered in Nizni-Novgorod.⁸

⁶"The Russian Press in London," op. cit., p. 836.

⁷Herzen, op. cit., p. 1299.

⁸Alfred Rambaud, Vol. III of History of Russia from the Earliest Times to 1882, 3 vols., edited by Nathan Haskell Dole, translated by L. B. Lang (Boston, 1882), p. 271.

Herzen gathered his news from a variety of sources inside Russia. Most were intellectuals and members of the upper classes; some were dissidents, but some of the correspondents tried to use Kolokol to avenge personal grievances with the tsar.⁹ The Kolokol related news which Russians could not find in their published journals and newspapers, but much of the news was slanted: Kolokol, after all, was Herzen's ideological sheet, an instrument in his avowed campaign against Russian autocracy. In this aspect of impartiality and propagandizing, Kolokol was different from today's Chronicle of Current Events, the news journal of of dissidence in the Soviet Union.

Herzen's Kolokol reiterated his program: liberate the serfs with land, abolish corporal punishment, and free the press.¹⁰ The Kolokol, along with Polyarnaya zvezda, also reflected Herzen's pre-eminence in one of the two major schools of nineteenth-century Russian thought, that of the Westerners. They and the Slavophiles were intellectuals who, "aloof from the government by choice and from the people by education,"¹¹ looked to the West for answers to a crucial question, "What is Russia, and how must it, by the

⁹ Herzen, op. cit., pp. 1297-1299.

¹⁰ Anderson, op. cit., p. 203.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 195.

laws of its own nature, develop?"¹² Westerners sought guidance from the achievements of Europe: they were achievements which could create a new, better Russia. The Slavophiles saw the West differently: the West accentuated Russia's uniqueness, and the country had to use its own peculiarities to develop a better civilization.¹³ Pyotr Chaadayev's "Philosophical Letters," which circulated widely through the intellectuals' underground in the 1830s, were seminal to the development of both schools: the essays condemned Russian history and identified the crucial differences between Russia and the West. Unlike the Slavophiles, however, Chaadayev "did not find the major advantages on the side of Russia, and unlike the later Westerners he did not see Europe as a source from which to borrow but rather as a school from which to learn."¹⁴

The Kolokol was the prominent underground organ for either of the two schools. Members of the movements usually passed manuscripts among themselves.

Herzen's clandestine periodical, which continued to circulate widely in the early 1860s, inspired other factions to disseminate illegal publications. Russian radicals

¹²Sidney Harcave, Russia: A History, 5th ed. (Philadelphia and New York, 1964), p. 254.

¹³Anderson, op. cit.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 197.

congregated in multifarious circles, and the more organized or determined of these circles smuggled presses into Russia or built their own. The government then discovered the secret presses after only a few illegal manifestoes appeared: many of the circles were more zealous than careful, and the noisy, heavy presses were detected easily. At this time, to hide a secret press "was only an idle dream, a waste of money, and useless and senseless waste of men," wrote one revolutionary, Sergey Kravchinsky.¹⁵ The underground network of communication grew, however, out of the dissidents' determination. One secret circle even existed in the headquarters of the St. Petersburg General Staff and issued, in the summer of 1861, three clandestine editions of Velikoruss (Great Russia).¹⁶

Within five years after Kolokol's first appearance, the Russian underground was reflecting a sense of political activism among intellectuals who were breaking away from the traditional Western and Slavophile philosophical movements. The anarchists and the narodniki, the major activists who arose, relied heavily on clandestine propaganda.

¹⁵Sergey M. Kravchinsky (Stepnyak), Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life (Boston, 1883), p. 187.

¹⁶E. E. Kluge, Die russische revolutionäre Presse (Zurich, 1948), p. 33.

Although Russian anarchism derived from Western European thought and especially from Pierre Joseph Proudhon, the concept also had native antecedents, according to Thornton Anderson. The tradition of peasant revolts such as those in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the raskol, the separation of government from governed, were primary among the antecedents.¹⁷ Russian anarchists were individualistic and idealistic, believing in the capability of the Russians to revolutionize the country. The anarchists also were divergent in several views, such as in the belief in violent overthrow of the state, a principle espoused by Mikhail Bakunin, contrasted by the belief in passive revolution, the view of Leo Tolstoy.¹⁸ Whatever their program, the anarchists were ardent underground publicists. Bakunin preferred to fight on the barricades rather than at a writing desk, but he took time to write several underground tracts. More importantly, in 1863 Bakunin and Emil von Qvanten established the Northern Underground. This efficient avenue through Sweden, Norway, and Finland carried streams of clandestine newspapers, pamphlets, manifestoes and other political materials for the next fifty years.¹⁹

¹⁷Anderson, op. cit., p. 232.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 247.

¹⁹Michael Futrell, Northern Underground (London, 1963), p. 25.

The underground writings of Bakunin were antithetical to those of the narokniki, intellectuals who went v narod, "to the people." They saw in the peasantry the base for building a socialist Russia.²⁰ The standard translation for narodniki is "populist;" however, as Anderson points out, the movement "was not a movement of the people, but almost purely of the intelligentsia on behalf of the people, primarily the peasants."²¹ The narodniki faced Russia's crucial problems--overwhelming illiteracy which combined with rural life for a gulf between the masses and the intelligentsia, and the government's realization that in this gulf lay subversion--and, Anderson continues, they asked a question:

Should the intellectuals themselves undertake to carry out the revolution of the people, with or without the help of the masses, or should they educate and help the people in their own search for justice and in their spontaneous uprisings?²²

The ensuing debates unleashed a flood of underground literature.

Two clandestine manuscripts represented important differences which were emerging within the narodniki. Nikolai Shelgunov's and Mikhail Mikhailov's To the Young Generation, which appeared in 1861, was an optimistic

²⁰Anderson, op. cit., p. 235.

²¹Ibid., p. 248.

²²Ibid., pp. 248-249.

appeal for Russians to prepare for freedoms in the future socialist Russia. A year later, Pyotr Zaichnevsky's Young Russia saw for the future a "bloody and pitiless" revolution.²³ These were typical manuscripts in the underground: they reflected varying degrees of opinions and proposals parallel to the spreading concern by social revolutionaries for fulfilling Russia's socialist potential. Other important narodniki underground publications were Pyotr Lavrov's Historical Letters, which embodied the guiding doctrines for the narodniki of the 1870s who submerged into the peasantry; Lavrov's Vpered (Forward), which was published 1873-1876 from Zurich; and Pyotr Tkachev's Nabat (Tocsin), which was published 1875-1880 from Geneva for professional revolutionaries.²⁴

The influence of Herzen's Kolokol receded as the underground press inspired by it spread. Ideals, programs, and commitments all went through divergent changes in the 1860s in response to the Polish uprisings, Alexander II's reforms, and the intelligentsia's growing consciousness. Herzen wrote of the time, "We hardly ever wrote letters to Russia: we had nothing to say to our old friends, for we were drifting ever farther and farther away."²⁵ He moved

²³Ibid., pp. 249-250.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 252-255.

²⁵Herzen, op. cit., p. 1324.

Kolokol to Geneva for the journal's final three years, 1865-1868. By then a fresh wave of radicalism had absorbed Russian dissidents.

Several currents of that fresh wave in the late 1860s collected their general programs into one loose movement, Zemlya i volya (Land and Liberty), an obvious symbolic appeal to a peasantry which believed freedom resulted from possession of land. By the middle of the 1870s, however, the narodniki had failed to inspire the masses. In 1876, a more cohesive, activist Zemlya i volya reorganized under the leadership of Kravchinsky and George Plekhanov, among others. A year later, Aaron Zundeleovich established a busy secret printing office in the heart of St. Petersburg. For four years, until its suppression, it was Russia's most successful underground press. Reams of revolutionary propaganda in newspapers and pamphlets rolled from the small press for distribution across Russia.²⁶

The two men and two women who worked in the office led a monastic life, rarely leaving their apartment of false walls and thick curtains. They took extraordinary measures to preserve the secrecy: often, the four spent hours hiding the press just so they could invite an outsider--the cleaning lady, or a city bureaucrat--into the apartment, hoping that the outsider's view of the "typical" rooms

²⁶Kravchinsky, op. cit., p. 187.

would satisfy curiosity or suspicion. The press itself was a heavy, cloth cylinder with small jars of ink, a few brushes, some glue, print trays, and stacks of paper.²⁷

Kravchinsky wrote after his only visit to the apartment,

I was assailed by profound melancholy, at the sight of these people. Involuntarily, I compared their terrible life with my own, and felt overcome with shame. What was our activity in the broad light of day amid the excitement of a multitude of friends, and the stir of our daily life and struggles, compared with this continuous sacrifice of their whole existence, wasting away in this dungeon. . . .

. . . Are not these people, I thought, the real representatives of our party? Is not this the living picture which typifies in itself the character of our whole struggle? A feeling of enthusiasm fired my heart. We are invincible, I thought, while the source is unexhausted whence springs so much heroism, the greatest of all heroism; we are invincible while the party has such adherents.²⁸

Thus, the underground press was not only a channel of communication, it also was a source of inspiration for Russian dissidents.

The failure of the narodniki to stir the masses provoked the question, "What now?" In 1879, Zemlya split over the options: the People's Will believed terrorism was the answer; the Black Partition sought peaceful change through propaganda and more work within the peasantry. Each of the two factions operated an extensive underground publishing network. The Narodnaya volya (People's Will), which was the clandestine journal for that group, was a typical

²⁷Ibid., pp. 189-195.

²⁸Ibid., p. 195.

propaganda and polemical organ: widely circulated among revolutionaries and some segments of society, it was intended both to indoctrinate the masses and to maintain contact with European radical currents.²⁹

Even during the Russian government's alternating periods of permissiveness and repressiveness in the 1870s and 1880s, the underground press grew to be pervasive. An active emigre press, the Northern Underground, the fervence of revolutionaries inside Russia, the availability of presses--these were among the most important factors which increased the activity of the clandestine communications in Russia. The press reflected dissidence's deepening entrenchment into society. Through the 1880s, however, Russian dissidents had placed secondary emphasis on organization. Early in the 1890s organized opposition became the first principle of dissidents as a series of labor strikes and a devastating famine underscored the inefficiency and weakness of Nicholas II's government. The emergence of a new phenomenon, illegal political parties, arose on underpinnings of the underground press.

Major parties such as the Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries, and Zemstvos deluged Russia with illicit

²⁹B. S. Itenberg, "Rasprostranenie izdaniy Russkoi sektsii I internatsionala v revolyutsionom podpole Rossii," Voprosy istoriya, XXXVI (October, 1962), 41.

propaganda: the large parties debated their opponents and outlined ideologies, and scores of splinter factions added their own programs. The political underground press was the primary means of communication among the dissidents, and it also provided them their closest contact with other discontented Russians who were not active revolutionaries. For example, in one three-year period (1901-1904), the Social Democrats employed forty-three secret printing groups in twenty-four cities to issue 848 clandestine publications.³⁰ During this initial period of organized opposition, V. I. Lenin's Iskra (Spark) was outstanding among the underground newspapers.

Lenin considered a newspaper as a vital component in the organization of political authority. Concerning the need for ideological journalists to convert--and to control--the Russian populus, he wrote in 1902,

. . . the masses will never learn to conduct the political struggle until we help to train leaders for this struggle, both from enlightened workers and from among the intellectuals. Such leaders can acquire training solely by systematically evaluating all the everyday aspects of our political life, all attempts at protest and struggle on the part of the various classes and on various grounds. . . . The publication of an All-Russian political newspaper

³⁰L. T. Senchakova, "Podpolnye Sotsial-Demokraticheskie Tipografii (1901-1904)," Istoriya SSSR, 1974 (September-October), pp. 110-111, 113.

must be the main line by which we may unswervingly develop, deepen, and expand the organization.³¹

Lenin used the emigre and Russian underground to circulate his major ideological writings, out of which grew the concepts for the Bolshevik Revolution and the creation of the Marxist-Leninist Soviet state. Like many of the leading revolutionaries of the 1890s and early 1900s, Lenin relied on the Northern Underground as a main route for publishing clandestine newspapers and other materials. As his Bolsheviks intensified their push toward 1917 they used the route more successfully than anyone else.³²

Lenin published the first Iskra in December, 1900, from Leipzig. From then until July, 1902, he published from Munich. He moved Iskra to London for the next year, and then to Geneva. It was in a 1902 issue that he wrote the treatise, "Where to Begin?," which contained his dictum on the press as a collective propagandist, collective agitator, and collective organizer.

The Iskra became the rallying center for Lenin's forces. It was an organization around which there revolved numerous secret circles throughout Russia. Lenin saw Iskra as the crucial terminal of contact between ideology and

³¹V. I. Lenin, Vol. V of Collected Works, 39 vols. (Moscow, 1961), pp. 500-501. In this and other quotations all words with emphasis are Lenin's.

³²Futrell, op. cit., p. 110.

the people: the newspaper was the instrument necessary for "gathering, organizing, and mobilizing a permanent army."³³

Lenin used Iskra as his propaganda and training organ until October, 1903. One of his many conflicts with the Mensheviks ended his involvement with the newspaper. The factions of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks emerged from the 1903 Congress of the Social Revolutionaries. The crucial point in their split concerned who should be party members: Lenin wanted a tightly knit organization of professional revolutionaries in a monolithic party; Julius Martov wanted a party with a broad base of supporters who were party members because they so identified themselves. Unwilling to concede to demands for equal editorial input from Mensheviks, Lenin resigned his editorial position and thereafter criticized Iskra's character and purpose under the Mensheviks.

In the final decade or so before the 1917 Revolution, Lenin and other dissidents openly published political newspapers and journals; tsarist rule was disintegrating. The publications fought censorship with a variety of deceptions, including Aesopian language reminiscent of dissenters seventy years earlier. The prominent publication was Lenin's Pravda, which used eight different names before it

³³Lenin, op. cit., p. 510.

was finally suppressed in 1914. Lenin used Pravda as he had used Iskra: for propaganda and organization. With it, the Bolsheviks gained control of Petrograd labor movements and built a base for mass support.³⁴

Lenin's Iskra was the epitomy of a half century of the political underground press in Russia: it was ideological, radical, and activist, and it served as an organization for dissidence. Lenin himself became the ultimate dissenter, the one who tore down the Russian autocracy that had existed for three centuries. He had utilized well the underground press which had developed from Herzen's first issue of Kolokol. Lenin also realized that dissent's illegal communication could continue in his new Russia, and he acted quickly to suppress that possibility.

³⁴Whitman Bassov, "The Pre-Revolutionary Pravda and Tsarist Censorship," The American Slavic and East European Review, XIII (February, 1954), 47.

CHAPTER V

SAMIZDAT, PART I: THE LEGACY SURVIVES

Russian journalism was among the first elements of society to feel repercussions from the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

On November 8, 1917, the day after the Revolution, the new rulers closed several newspapers in Petrograd to prevent any outbreak of opposition. Two days later, the government authorized the suppression of any newspaper which spoke against the regime. Other decrees for monopolizing advertising and for seizing private presses soon followed.

V. I. Lenin, who had used the open and the underground press of tsarist Russia to organize the Revolution, understood well the threat of a dissident communications network.¹

Nevertheless, since the seventeenth century Russian dissidents had managed to spread their messages through a variety of ways. The philosophy and structure of the Russian state had changed in 1917, but oppression simply had assumed new ideological tones. The continuation of

¹Mark Hopkins, Mass Media in the Soviet Union (New York, 1970), pp. 62-64.

dissent was inevitable. Today, almost six decades after Russia's momentous revolution, the underground publishing movement is more active than at any other time in Russian history, including the last half century of tsarist Russia. In this, the legacy of underground communication has survived.

The extensive underground of today matured only in the past twenty years, however. Until the 1950s, a combination of factors retarded the development of a significant movement of illegal publishing.

One factor was the ambivalence of the intelligentsia toward the Communist rulers in the first decade after the 1917 Revolution. The intelligentsia divided into three camps: (1) ardent dissidents such as Ivan Bunin and Leonid Andreyev who immediately rejected the new Russia, and who emigrated at the first opportunity; (2) creative artists such as Ilya Ehrenburg and Maksim Gorky who decided to cope with the Marxist-Leninist state in order to be able to work in their homeland; and (3) subservient intellectuals such as Alexander Blok and Andrey Bely who embraced the new state.² The divisions among the intellectuals who normally produced dissident communications, and the extensive emigration of many of Russia's leading liberals in the 1920s,

²Max Hayward, "Introduction: Soviet Literature 1917-1961," Partisan Review, XXVII (Nos. 3-4, 1961), 333-334.

lessened chances for the development of a clandestine literature movement. Scattered groups circulated some opposition works among themselves, but such activities were isolated and often brief.³

A second factor was the severe dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. The decade of the 1930s under Stalin was a period of collectivization, purges, and deepening oppression. During this period of the "consolidation of totalitarianism," Donald Treadgold points out, Stalin was altering human nature, creating a "new Soviet man."⁴ In the early 1930s, Stalin began to emphasize the crucial role of socialist realism in the arts: whereas critical realists had used truthfulness to negate society, Soviet writers had to teach man to accept "less of what was than of what ought to be."⁵ Dissidents were wary of speaking in their own apartments among friends, and organized resistance through a secret press movement was unthinkable.

At least one dissident publication circulated through a narrow underground during this period, however: Leon Trotsky's Bulletin Oppozitisii (Bulletin of Opposition).

³Anthony Adamovich, panel member, "The System of Formal Censorship," *Studies on the Soviet Union*, XI (No. 2, 1971), 69-40.

⁴Donald Treadgold, Twentieth Century Russia, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1964), p. 296.

⁵Ibid., p. 343.

Trotsky printed the first Bulletin in July, 1929, after he settled in exile near Istanbul. He subsequently printed it from Paris and then from Berlin. Trotsky used the Bulletin to debate inner affairs of the Communist Party, to maintain contact with any oppositionists in the leadership of the Soviet Union, and, above all, to attack Stalin. Trotsky gathered most of his material from the same sources who smuggled the Bulletin into Russia: discontented Party members who made diplomatic trips abroad as long as they enjoyed the dictator's favor. Only about 1,000 copies of each Bulletin were printed, but Trotsky's polemics spread rapidly once inside what opposition existed under Stalin.⁶

Like Alexander Herzen's Kolokol in the late 1850s, Trotsky's Bulletin was a lone dissenting voice in the underground. Unlike the Kolokol, it could not inspire the of other clandestine publications. The secret groups which existed, such as the catacomb congregations of the Russian Orthodox Church, were isolated and unorganized, as were their communications.⁷

World War II was a third factor that discouraged the development of an underground publishing movement until

⁶Issac Deutscher, The Prophet Outcast, Trotsky: 1929-1940 (London, 1963), pp. 22, 84.

⁷William Fletcher, A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia, 1927-1943 (New York, 1965), pp. 92-96.

the 1950s. The need for an illicit press was far from the concerns of a country that was unified in a desperate struggle against Germany.

The end of the war prompted a final factor, the Zhdanovshchina, which translates roughly as "the time and circumstances of Zhandov." As the war drew to a close many Russians hoped that Stalin's gratitude for their sacrifices would manifest itself in liberalization. Instead, the dictator initiated a series of oppressive measures, beginning in 1946 with widespread campaign against dissidents. Andrei Zhdanov, Stalin's closest aide, began the campaign with virulent attacks on such prominent literary figures as poetess Anna Akhmatova and satirist Mikhail Zoshchenko. The war against proclaimed and potential dissenters spread into other fields. Although Zhdanov died in 1948, his campaign continued. For the final seven years of Stalin's regime, 1946-1953, the government suppressed dissidence as vengefully as before the war. The only clandestine materials available were verses copied by hand or, more infrequently, retyped excerpts from foreign publications.⁸ As during the 1930s, a significant movement of illegal literature could not develop.

Beginning in the middle of the 1950s, however, Russian dissidents started to utilize the underground to

⁸Treadgold, op. cit., pp. 450-452.

disseminate a variety of oppositionist and creative literature. Several factors encouraged the revitalization of sub rosa publishing: (1) the death of Stalin in 1953; (2) the ensuing cultural "thaws" of 1953-1954 and 1956-1957, periods in which the new Soviet leadership tread between Stalinism and liberalism in order to define the legitimacy of Party authority after Stalin; (3) the authorities' campaign against Boris Pasternak; and (4) Soviet suppression of revolts in Hungary and Poland.

The period 1956-1966 created a "politicized counter-culture" which broadened the base of dissent among intellectuals, according to Rudolf Tokes.⁹ Communications between the dissidents became vital because the spreading of ideas and protests indicated the directions of dissidence. Themes of dissent emerged: radical skepticism of the Soviet leadership, literary experimentation, and emphasis upon truth and openness were prominent themes.¹⁰ Late in the 1950s, one underground poet wrote "samsebyaizdat" on his manuscript in the place reserved for the name of the state's publishing house. The poet's "publishing house for

⁹Rudolf Tokes, "Dissent: The Politics for Change in the USSR," Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970s, edited by Henry W. Morton and Rudolf L. Tokes (New York, 1974), p. 13.

¹⁰David Burg, "The Cold War on the Literary Front, Part I: The Writers' Underground," Problems of Communism, XI (July-August, 1962), 7-10.

oneself" inspired the widespread use of a shorter word, and samizdat, "self-publishing," became the underground publishing movement.¹¹

The "politicized counterculture" arose shortly after Nikita Khrushchev's de-Stalinization speech at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956. During the period that followed the secret speech, Khrushchev tried to erase the terroristic specter of Stalin while maintaining control over Soviet society. In 1962, Khrushchev began to liberalize the regime's attitude toward the arts: it was a political move because Khrushchev needed support for his policies, which were under increasing attack within the leadership. He sought this support from intellectuals, whom he thought he could co-opt into the regime. His ploy failed however. Khrushchev's loosening of control showed that dissidents were prepared to ignore all strictures except terrorism in their opposition to Communist authority. Khrushchev returned to the Soviet regime's usual position of suppression and terror against dissent.¹² The dissidents returned to samizdat with renewed vigor.

¹¹Julius Telesin, "Inside Samizdat," Encounter, XL (February, 1973), 25.

¹²Patricia Blake, "Freedom and Control in Literature, 1962-63," Politics in the Soviet Union: 7 Cases, edited by Alexander Dallin and Alan F. Westin (New York, 1966), pp. 168-171, 202.

Underground journals representing a broad spectrum of thoughts on the arts, politics, and religion appeared with some regularity after 1959. They normally were typed on onionskin paper with several fuzzy carbon copies; retyped issues also added to the potential of circulation. The journals, which passed among trusted friends and not within the general populus, generally were local, literary, and modernist.¹³ The most important were: Yuri Galanskov's Feniks 66 (Phoenix 66), the first journal to offer in one compilation diverse articles on literature, philosophy, politics, and other subjects; Tetradi sotsialiticheskoy demokratii (Notebooks of Social Democracy), which probed for truth in Soviet history; Russkoye slovo (Russian Word), which sought a cultural renaissance; and Kolokol (Bell), a neo-Marxist, exclusively political journal published by an organization of chemistry students in Leningrad.¹⁴

Circles for discussions, debates, and readings met quietly in locked apartments. Artists, balladeers, and authors often presented their unorthodox creations in such circumstances. Larger groups which were more active than the circles also appeared: the Ryleev and Berdyayev

¹³Abraham Rothberg, The Heirs of Stalin: Dissidence and the Soviet Regime, 1953-1970 (Ithaca, N. Y., and London, 1972), p. 328.

¹⁴Peter Reddaway, panel member, "Soviet Underground Literature: A Discussion," Studies on the Soviet Union, VIII (No. 3, 1969), 70-72.

factions and SMOG (an acronym for either "boldness," "thought," "image," and "depth," or "The Youngest Society of Geniuses") were active underground publishers. In universities and institutes, typed or mimeographed "wall newspapers" were posted on bulletin boards. These sheets prompted quick oral communication between dissidents before being torn down by the authorities.¹⁵

Many works which were forbidden in the Soviet Union were smuggled abroad by Soviet dissidents who were allowed to travel, their sympathizers, and foreigners. The works then were published with or without the author's permission. This process, tamizdat, "publishing 'over there,'" continues today. One case of tamizdat led to a crucial turning point in the postwar history of Soviet dissent when "politicized counterculture" evolved into a "national movement" beginning in 1965-1966.¹⁶

On September 8, 1965, Soviet authorities arrested Andrey Sinyavsky, a philologist, and Yuli Daniel, a poet and translator. Both were active samizdatchiki (self-publishers). The authorities initially planned to prosecute them for allowing works to be published abroad without official approval and under pseudonyms, "Abram Tertz" for Sinyavsky, "Nikolai Arzhak" for Daniel. Immediate foreign

¹⁵Burg, op. cit., 10-11.

¹⁶Tokes, op. cit., p. 15.

diplomatic protests against the illegality of the charges against the two prominent dissidents--the Soviet criminal codes did not prohibit directly such activity--persuaded the government to change its strategy.¹⁷ The prosecutors then charged Sinyavsky and Daniel under the catch-all Article 70 of the Criminal Code. The government has relied on this law more than any other in prosecuting underground publicists since Sinyavsky and Daniel. The law reads in part,

Agitation or propaganda carried on for the purpose of subverting or weakening Soviet authority or of committing particular, especially dangerous crimes against the state, or circulating for the same purpose slanderous fabrications which defame the Soviet state and social system, or circulating or preparing or keeping, for the same purpose, literature of such content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of six months to seven years, with or without additional exile for a term of two to five years, or by exile for a term of two to five years.¹⁸

The trial showed the Soviet regime's initial campaign against both the spread and content of dissident writings: "Many Soviet writers have been imprisoned, banished, executed or driven into silence, but never before after a trial in which the principal evidence used against them

¹⁷Max Hayward, editor, On Trial: The Soviet State versus "Abram Tertz" and "Nikolai Arzhak," rev. ed. (New York, 1967), pp. 41-42, 44.

¹⁸Harold J. Berman, Soviet Criminal Law and Procedure: The RSFSR Codes (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), p. 180.

was their literary work."¹⁹ The court sentenced Sinyavsky to seven years at hard labor, Daniel to five.

The Sinyavsky-Daniel episode crystallized budding political dissent into the primary focus for samizdat. Illegal circulation of unorthodox literary works was still important, but the underground became more political, more radical, and more purposeful. Writers, academicians, professionals--someone from almost every walk of intellectual life--began to mold a national movement in which specific challenges to the Party's legitimacy as ruler formed the platform. Among the primary demands were ones for political democracy, nationality rights, human rights and socialist legality, religious autonomy, and artistic freedoms.²⁰

Two of the important samizdat materials which appeared parallel to the Sinyavsky-Daniel case were Alexander Ginzburg's White Book and Vyacheslav Chornovil's "The Misfortune of Intellect."

Ginzburg, who in 1959 had issued the first identifiable samizdat periodical, Sintaksis (Syntax), compiled documents and essays on Sinyavsky-Daniel into the White Book. The Book circulated widely in 1966, and the

¹⁹Hayward, On Trial, p. 26.

²⁰Tokes, op, cit., pp. 15-16.

authorities arrested Ginzburg in January, 1967. In a joint trial, Ginzburg and Galanskov (who was being tried for his Feniks 66) were convicted under Article 70.²¹

Chornovil's "Misfortune" was an expose of secret police tactics in the prosecutions of twenty prominent dissidents in the Ukraine. He had rebelled after he had covered a series of trials, an assignment he received while he was still an unobtrusive, unassuming television reporter. The "Misfortune" and essays, letters, and appeals concerning Ukrainian dissent eventually were compiled into the Chornovil Papers and were published in the West. Chornovil also was convicted and imprisoned.²²

The expanding political consciousness of the dissidents demanded an even more active samizdat than in earlier years. The range of views widened, and underground protests hit on issues which appealed to a larger segment of unhappy Russians--non-intellectuals, for example.²³ Within two years after Sinyavsky-Daniel, there were so many diverse activities and schools of thought among dissidents that some common link was necessary for cohesion.

²¹Rothberg, op. cit., pp. 206-208.

²²Vyacheslav Chornovil, The Chornovil Papers (New York, 1968), p. 77, et passim.

²³Abraham Brumberg, "Dissent in Russia," Foreign Affairs, LII (July, 1974), 784.

That link came in 1968 with the first issue of Khronika tekushchikh sobitiy (Chronicle of Current Events). The Chronicle became the unique publication of samizdat, the first news journal of dissidence.

CHAPTER VI

SAMIZDAT, PART II: DISSENTERS

AS PUBLISHERS

Before examining the role of the Chronicle of Current Events as the most significant news journal of the dissent movement, it is necessary to understand who the dissenters are and how they publish their messages.

The Composition of the Movement

Members of the dissent movement most often are referred to as the "intelligentsia," but this general term does not include all the protesting elements of Soviet society. Unlike the intelligent in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Soviet member of the intelligentsia does not live by a spirit of socialist idealism and commitment to improving society. In the Marxist-Leninist state of the Soviet Union, the concept of "intelligentsia" is based on theories of labor: the intelligentsia are highly qualified mental workers in the creative, executive, and technical strata.¹

¹David Lane, Politics and Society in the USSR (New York, 1970), pp. 389-390.

In general definition, the modern intelligentsia includes, for the most part but not exclusively, those people who are more educated than the great majority of the citizenry; who perform important duties in the executive, technical, scientific, educational, and cultural spheres of society; and who, if unobtrusive and obedient, are better paid than most Russians. There are between fifteen and twenty million people in this general grouping, but only about 2,000 have dared to speak in opposition to modern Soviet polity.² These are the active dissidents, the ardent samizdatchiki. It is impossible to determine the number of people who silently support the dissenting voices or who prefer to work so quietly as to remain anonymous except to a tight circle of friends.

Dissidents exist in almost all segments of society, including the professional personnel and bureaucracy of the Communist Party's supporting structure.

Lewis Feuer identifies the leading factions of the dissenting intelligentsia as the scientific opposition, "rejecting dialectical materialism in favor of the logic of science," and the literary opposition, which believes "there is a universal moral law, binding every man and

²Peter Reddaway, Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union (New York, 1972), p. 23.

expressing the underlying human qualities in him."³ Sidney Monas also perceives these two elements but classifies them as "engineers-politicals and martyrs-metaphysicals." He places great faith in the latter to be discovered as not only the "true poets" but also the "true revolutionaries" because "their secret knowledge is that in order to change the world you have to make it new from within yourself."⁴ This position is close to the conviction of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who believes there is a need for a "moral revolution" in which "you sacrifice yourself, and maybe justice will be established."⁵ Rudolf Tokes identifies the dissidents as being polarized around two basic ideologies, "moral absolutist" and "instrumental pragmatic." After 1970, the dissidents began to lose the unity so apparent among themselves after 1965-1966, and the resultant return to activities which are individual, uncoordinated, and intermittent has been more beneficial for the pragmatics

³Lewis S. Feuer, "The Intelligentsia in Opposition," Problems of Communism, XIX (November-December, 1970), 10.

⁴Sidney Monas, "Engineers or Martyrs: Dissent and the Soviet Intelligentsia," In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today, edited by Abraham Brumberg (New York, 1970), p. 37.

⁵"Solzhenitsyn's Press Conference, November 1974," Radio Liberty Supplement, February 14, 1975, p. 15.

than for the moralists.⁶ The views of Feuer, Monas, and Tokes are only three among many of the dissections of the dissident movement in the Soviet Union.

The movement does not have an organizational framework, and perhaps it does not need one, according to Abraham Brumber. He writes of the movement,

It is heterogeneous, embracing people who wish to reform the system from within, people concerned with the correction of certain specific abuses, as well as individuals thoroughly alienated from the official ideology, even in its "purest" and most "Leninist" form.⁷

Some writers criticize the use of the term "movement" to describe the activities of the many varieties of dissenters: the dissidents are a minute faction of the society, atypical of any class or nationality, disparate in ideologies and goals, and inclined to communicating only among themselves (partly because they do not have access to the media).⁸

The concept of a "movement" of Soviet dissidence, however, could be based more on the idea of an ongoing activity against the regime rather than on the identifying of unifying characteristics.

⁶Rudolf L. Tokes, "Dissent: The Politics for Change in the USSR," Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970s, edited by Henry W. Morton and Rudolf L. Tokes (New York, 1974), pp. 18-30, 32-37.

⁷Abraham Brumberg, "The Rise of Dissent in the U.S.S.R.," In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today, edited by Abraham Brumberg (New York, 1970, p. 12.

⁸Susan Jacoby and Anthony Astrachan, "Soviet Dissent: An Ebb Tide," World, June 19, 1973, p. 14.

Soviet dissidents share an isolation from both the regime and the great mass of Russian people. The estrangement is frustrating to the dissidents: isolation sharpens their critical faculties, but it also dulls their sensitivities to the majority of the Soviet population and to the polity which the oppositionists see as in need of change.⁹

Among other convictions, the dissenters see rule by law as the way to save a troubled socialist society: the Soviet Constitution provides the rights which are necessary for freedom and justice, but those rights must be reaffirmed by the governing body.¹⁰ Thus, the disaffected factions criticize the manipulations by the Communist Party in perpetuating a particular system which is not the system projected by the original theorists of socialism and communism. The dissenters try to distinguish between what should be the true results of an elitist dictatorship detrimental to society. The system is stagnant, the dissidents say, and it is unresponsive to the spiritual and material needs of the people.¹¹

One of the constants of the dissent movement in the Soviet Union is the diversity of its components. The

⁹Jonathan Harris, "The Dilemma of Dissidence," Survey, XVII (Winter, 1971), 108.

¹⁰Reddaway, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

¹¹Harris, op. cit., 113.

movement is fed by many tributaries, such as the dissidents for civil and human rights, the nationalists who want autonomy, and the religious dissenters. The movement also contains a segment of extremists.¹² The more prominent general themes, the narrow dogmas of extremists, and the individually conceived protests of such famous dissidents as Solzhenitsyn and Andrey Sakharov all converge into the rhetoric of contemporary Soviet dissidence. Underground communication of such diverse beliefs and programs is essential for dissidents who do not have access to an open market of ideas.

Samizdat: How It Works

The many varieties of Soviet dissidents normally utilize the same procedures, instruments, and channels for disseminating clandestine messages.

Personal contact is a vital element in the underground press. The Soviet regime enforces pervasive postal censorship and telephone surveillance of its citizens, thus forcing samizdatchiki and their sources to meet personally.¹³ The underground communicators who go beyond spreading only

¹²Bohdan Bociurkiw, "Political Dissent in the Soviet Union," *Studies in Comparative Communism*, III (April, 1970), 99-102.

¹³"Impediments to the Free Flow of Information and Ideas in the Soviet Union," Radio Liberty Dispatch, November 1, 1974, p. 4.

their own ideas gather information from other activists, from sympathizers, and from careful listening and observation.

The typewriter is the basic instrument of samizdat, along with tissue paper, which produces three times as many carbon copies as does ordinary Russian typing paper. Typewriters are not registered officially as they were under Stalin, and they are available for reasonable prices. The authorities are not suspicious of everyone who buys a typewriter because many artists, scholars, scientists, and students type their works themselves.¹⁴

The samizdatchik either types his material and makes as many as ten carbons for trusted friends, who in turn retype the document with more carbons, or the samizdatchik bargains with someone to type it for him. Factors such as the typist's enthusiasm and dependability, the sensitivity of the material, and the size of the job enter into the bargaining. The finished document, which usually is unbound, then passes by hand from one dissident to a few allies whom he knows well. This symmetrical production and circulation continues until the message reaches anyone who is interested or, more exactly, anyone who is trusted.¹⁵

Duplicating equipment is controlled tightly by the state, and Soviet authorities are sensitive about the

¹⁴Julius Telesin, "Inside Samizdat," Encounter, XL (February, 1973), 30.

¹⁵Ibid., 29-32.

potential underground use of photocopiers and mimeograph machines. As one example, the photocopier in a Moscow scientific library is available only to selected employees. On weekends, the room in which the photocopier is located is sealed with ropes and wax, and windows are screened. Electronic surveillance is common in such rooms. Still, some dissidents have managed to utilize the duplicators for underground publishing.¹⁶

Printing presses are owned by the state, and they are watched closely during and after their operating hours.¹⁷

Dissidents sometimes photograph clandestine materials, but the practice is infrequent because of the technical skill involved, the limited amount of material that can be reproduced on thick print paper, expenses, and the prerequisite of a clean original document (the third, fourth, and subsequent carbons are too fuzzy for reproduction).¹⁸

Apart from the political and literary publications which pervade the underground, a variety of materials passes in samizdat. For example, unorthodox scores by musicians

¹⁶New York Times, January 20, 1973, p. 10.

¹⁷"Impediments to the Free Flow of Information and Ideas in the Soviet Union," op. cit.

¹⁸Telesin, op. cit., 30-31.

are copied and circulated for playing among close friends.¹⁹ The samizdat also has produced speculators. They usually record samizdat from foreign broadcasts and sell the transcripts, or they take notes on the broadcasts--for example, on a Radio Liberty reading of one of Solzhenitsyn's works--and then fill in their own words later. The speculators sell the material to anyone with rubles.²⁰

Extremist groups also feed their works into the underground press. Bigoted samizdat is in a small minority but it is available in such works as A Word to the Nation: A Manifesto of Russian Patriots, a 1971 treatise that was racist, totalitarian, and virulent in attacking Soviet Jews.²¹

Underground publishing does not ignore prurient interests, either. Much of the modern Russian pornography is political, attacking the Soviet regime's puritanism, but it also is mild compared to similar works available outside the Soviet Union. Members of one group, P.P.P. (the Russian initials for "Relaying Political Pornography") created and spread the exploits of the most notorious figure,

¹⁹"Censorship of Music," Studies on the Soviet Union, XI (No. 2, 1973), 96.

²⁰Christian Science Monitor, October 15, 1974, Sec. B, p. 5.

²¹Abraham Brumberg, "Dissent in Russia," Foreign Affairs, LII (July, 1974), 784.

Oktyabriana, and eventually tried to sell part of the collection of 5,000 drawings to Western publicists.²²

Clandestine communication also utilizes two channels besides underground printing: radioizdat and magnetizdat.

Illegal broadcasting, radioizdat, has concentrated on entertainment by youths who either steal transmitter parts or build their own. The usual content is Western and unorthodox Soviet songs, rumors, jokes, and, occasionally, political discussions. However, recent harsh campaigns against secret broadcasters indicate that some strongly dissident radioizdat is available.²³

Underground tape recording, magnetizdat, reaches a more general audience than does samizdat. There are two reasons why: the wandering troubador is a popular figure in Russian folk history, and today's balladeers often sing of tribulations known well by all Soviets in their daily lives. The magnetizdat has produced folk heroes such as Bulat Okudzhava and Alexander Galich, but otherwise popular dissident communicators generally are absent from the underground.²⁴

²²New York Times, April 19, 1970, Sec. 2, p. 3.

²³Pauline B. Taylor, "Underground Soviet Broadcasting," Russian Review, XXXI (April, 1972), 173-174.

²⁴Alexander Malyshev, panel member, "Soviet Underground Literature: A Discussion," Studies on the Soviet Union, VIII (No. 3, 1969), 73.

The film medium lacks an identifiable underground movement because of the medium's technical base and expenses. Some dissidents, however, believe that clandestine "shorts" are shown on apartment walls by film-makers who have the equipment and trust of the authorities.²⁵

Finally, dissidents continue to send some of their works outside the Soviet Union for publishing. Foreign radio networks such as Radio Liberty often beam these works into the Soviet Union despite constant jamming by the government. The Soviet Union's acceptance of the 1974 International Copyright Convention pact, however, may affect foreign distribution of such works in the future.

Dissent News and the Chronicle

The numerous clandestine publications, broadcasts, and recordings have created a subculture of communication. Beginning with issue No. 1 of the Chronicle of Current Events, dated April 30, 1968, the subculture had its first news journal, a centralized documentation of the activities by of both dissidents and authorities.

The first twenty-seven issues of the Chronicle appeared regularly, once every two months, until October, 1972. Then, an intense campaign by the Kremlin silenced the journal for what proved to be an eighteen-month period.

²⁵New York Times, April 19, 1970, Sec. 2, p. 3.

The campaign, Secret Police Case 24, apparently resulted from a secret resolution passed on December 30, 1971, by the Central Committee of the Communist Party: widespread dissemination of dissent literature was the target.²⁶

Throughout the spring and summer, police searched hundreds of flats, made numerous arrests, and confiscated reams of samizdat material. The Chronicle, however, continued to circulate regularly; one of its last issues before it disappeared carried abundant news on trials, arrests, and investigations.²⁷

The Chronicle suspended publication apparently more out of moral conviction than because of police success. During the Kremlin's attack, a wave of interrogations and arrests followed each new Chronicle; the police had promised to arrest at least one prominent dissident for each edition. The publishers decided to quit circulating the Chronicle until the pressure decreased. The twenty-seventh issue was dated October 26, 1972.²⁸

In May, 1974, issues 28, 29 and 70 surfaced in Moscow. The three issues were smaller than usual and contained minimal news about dissent, but the foreword of No. 28 explained why the Chronicle had resumed publication:

²⁶Times (London), February 4, 1972, p. 1.

²⁷Times (London), September 27, 1972, p. 8.

²⁸New York Times, May 13, 1974, p. 4.

"continued silence would have indicated support, even if indirect and passive, of 'hostage tactics,' incompatible with the right, morality, and dignity of man."²⁹ Subsequent issues have followed with an expanded number of pages and with more recent news, the latest issue being published in May, 1975.³⁰

The journalists of the new journal are anonymous. The editors probably live in or near Moscow since the Chronicle appears there initially. The unemotional language and minimal material on literary activities, plus the fact that the Chronicle drew some inspiration from Ginzburg's White Book that included numerous essays by technical intellectuals, indicates that scientists are more involved with the journal than are writers.³¹

Correspondents, whether they are active dissidents or sympathizers, are dedicated listeners and observers. News travels in the routine samizdat methods. Leaks and even secret documents come from informants within the government. The Chronicle also is fed by an extensive network of reporters throughout Russia; a recent study estimated that all but two of the populated areas in Russia--the Far East

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Christian Science Monitor, May 5, 1975, p. 2.

³¹Reddaway, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

region on the Pacific and the Azerbaijan region that borders Iran--have contributed dissent news.³²

The Chronicle is cautious in this widespread gathering of news, however. Issue No. 5 told readers who had information,

tell it to the person from whom you received the Chronicle, and he will tell the person from whom he received the Chronicle, and so on. But do not try to trace back the whole chain of communication yourself, or you will be taken for a police informer.³³

After gathering and editing the information, the publishers circulate the journal outward through the chain, including some issues for foreign correspondents in Moscow, and the process begins anew.

Coinciding with the collection, management, and dissemination of news, and its regular appearance, the Chronicle also displays journalistic qualities in content and presentation. The bulk of the reporting is impartial, documentary, and terse. Editorials and political articles are avoided, as are extravagant commentaries.³⁴ The journal also is the only samizdat publication that makes a special effort to be accurate: it is willing to correct any error, however small, and it asks readers to notify the editors about the errors.³⁵

³²Ibid., pp. 29-30

³³Ibid., p. 54.

³⁴Christian Science Monitor, July 25, 1970, p. 16.

³⁵Christian Science Monitor, September 18, 1970, p.

By compiling and publishing news on the many themes of the dissent movement, the Chronicle fulfills an unparalleled role as the news journal of Soviet dissent. It has inspired the appearance of some other news-oriented journals, most notably the Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania and the Zionist Iskhod (Exodus), but they do not have the scope and consistent journalistic qualities of the Chronicle.

The Chronicle's "deepest meaning," Reddaway believes, probably is in the moral qualities it reveals in its editors, reporters, and readers: "For above the extravagant rhetoric of many of the world's persecuted groups, the Chronicle's coolness, moderation, and objectivity in the face of adversity speak with a deeper resonance."³⁶

³⁶Reddaway, op. cit., p. 39.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Dissident Russians continue to rely on the underground communication of dissent as a viable form of protest. Since the seventeenth century, neither tsarist nor Soviet suppression of free speech has managed to eradicate the dissidents' urge to disseminate messages by any means possible.

This study identified the earliest dissident communications as the propaganda leaflets of peasant rebels in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Dissent communication became more literary in the eighteenth century with the development of Russian journalism and the emergence of a literary class. The new literati also initiated the custom of privately circulating some manuscripts. This practice continued through the reign of Nicholas I when some of Russia's seminal literature appeared both openly and secretly. During this period, a new intelligentsia concerned with social action began to think of saving Russia as their obligation.

Alexander Herzen's Kolokol inspired factions of the socially conscious intelligentsia to produce their own clandestine publications. An underground press movement

evolved with the social revolutionaries' reliance upon illicit communications for debating and propagandizing. Dissident political parties emerged in the 1890s, and from then until the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 Russian revolutionaries, especially V. I. Lenin, utilized both the underground press and open dissent in authorized publications to destroy Russian autocracy.

After a period of severe suppression during the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin, underground communication reappeared in the 1950s as an active literary and political movement. Since then, a variety of dissidents have utilized samizdat, self-publishing, and its parallel channels in broadcasting, tape recording, and publication outside of the Soviet Union. The wide diversity of the protest movement's components has been a chief factor in the underground success of the Chronicle of Current Events, a news journal which informs dissidents of the movement's activities.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the development of underground communication in Russia. The first is that illicit communication has evolved because tsarist and Soviet regimes have suppressed freedom of speech. Underground communication in the past and in the present has fulfilled a crucial role by offering some form of free expression in Russia.

Another conclusion is that dissidents have shared some similarities in the methods of communication. One similarity is their utilization of any channel available: handwritten manuscripts, printed materials when presses were available, and, today, a melange of materials from typewriters, photocopiers, mimeographs, personal darkrooms, secret transmitters, and tape recorders. Another similarity is that, for the most part, dissidents have spread their underground messages only for other dissidents: the mass propaganda in the peasant rebellions and the social revolutionaries' use of publications for contact with the masses are significant exceptions.

The third conclusion is that, whereas earlier underground publications were either literary or philosophical, as through the first half of the nineteenth century, or political and revolutionary, as from then until 1917, the samizdat of today is a synthesis of modern dissent's many varieties. As a result, the underground literature reflects a diversity of themes. These themes tell dissidents as well as outside observers the direction and scope of dissent and about the otherwise closed society that inspired the dissent.

The fourth conclusion is that underground communication has reflected the unique characteristics of Russian journalism since the eighteenth century. Among the primary characteristics used by the underground press have been the

popularity of journals, the literary tone and content of publications, the propagation of ideologies, and the reliance upon newspapers or journals as organizations for dissident elements.

Finally, this study concludes that the Chronicle of Current Events is unparalleled as a news journal in the history of Russian dissent. It is the first to be concerned solely with the news of dissidence, and it is a vital link in the communications between dissidents. The Chronicle's standards of impartiality, documentation, terseness, regular appearance, and concern for accuracy separate it from the mainstream of underground publications of the past and of today.

The five conclusions are drawn from the historical development of underground communication in Russia since the seventeenth century. Numerous factors in the complexity of the modern Soviet Union will shape the future scope of dissent. Among these factors are: the role of dissent in the Soviet polity; the effects of detente upon the leadership's policies toward internal affairs; the Soviet regime's alternatives for suppressing dissent, such as co-optation of dissidents; and, more generally, the societal development of the Soviet Union.

Despite these and other factors which will affect the future of dissent in the Soviet Union, the dissidents share

an advantage in their heritage: they have depended upon underground communication to perpetuate the history of Russian dissent and, after three centuries, that legacy still survives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ambler, Effie, Russian Journalism and Politics: The Career of A. S. Suvorin, 1861-1881, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1972.
- Anderson, Thornton, Russian Political Thought, Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Avrich, Paul, Russian Rebels, 1600-1800, New York, Schocken Books, 1972.
- Berman, Harold J., Soviet Criminal Law and Procedure: The RSFSR Codes, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Blake, Patricia, "Freedom and Control in Literature, 1962-63," Politics in the Soviet Union: 7 Cases, edited by Alexander Dallin and Alan F. Westin, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966.
- Brumberg, Abraham, "The Rise of Dissent in the U.S.S.R.," In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today, edited by Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Buzek, Antony, How the Communist Press Works, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1964.
- Chornovil, Vyacheslav, The Chornovil Papers, copyright by Ukrainian National Federation of Canada, Inc., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Deutscher, Issac, The Prophet Outcast, Trotsky: 1929-1940, London, Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Fletcher, William, A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia, 1927-1943, New York, MacMillan Company, 1965.
- Florinsky, Michael, Vol. I of Russia: A History and an Interpretation (2 volumes), New York, MacMillan Company, 1953.

- Futrell, Michael, Northern Underground, London, Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1963.
- Golovin, Ivan G., Russia Under the Autocrat, Nicholas the First (2 volumes), London, Henry Colburn, 1846.
- Harcave, Sidney, Russia: A History, 5th ed., New York and Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964.
- Hayward, Max, editor, On Trial: The Soviet State versus "Abram Tertz" and "Nikolai Arzhak," rev. ed., New York, Harper and Row, 1967.
- Herzen, Alexander I., Vol. III of My Past and Thoughts: The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen, translated by Constance Garnett, revised by Humphrey Higgings (4 volumes), New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.
- Hopkins, Mark, Mass Media in the Soviet Union, New York, Pegasus, 1970.
- Inkeles, Alex, Public Opinion in Soviet Russia, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Kluge, E. E., Die russische revolutionare Presse, Zurich, Artemis-Verlag, 1948.
- Kravchinsky, Sergey (Stepnyak), Russia Under the Tzars, translated by William Westfall, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- _____, Underground Russia: Revolutionary Sketches and Profiles from Life, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.
- Lane, David, Politics and Society in the USSR, New York, Random House, 1970.
- Lenin, V. I., Vol. V of Collected Works (39 volumes), Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961.
- McLean, Hugh, "The Development of Modern Russian Literature," The Development of the USSR: An Exchange of Views, edited by Donald Treadgold, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1964.

- Malia, Martin, "What is the Intelligentsia?," The Russian Intelligentsia, edited by Richard Pipes, New York, Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Mirskii, D. S., A History of Russian Literature, edited and abridged by Francis J. Whitfield, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.
- Monas, Sidney, "Engineers or Martyrs: Dissent and the Intelligentsia," In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today, edited by Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- _____, The Third Section: Police and Society Under Nicholas I, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Olsen, Richard, The History Makers, Baton Rouge, La., Louisiana State University Press, 1966.
- Pipes, Richard, Russia Under the Old Regime, History of Civilization Series, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.
- Pushkin, Alexander S., The Letters of Alexander Pushkin, translated by J. Thomas Shaw, Madison, Wisc., Milwaukee, and London, University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Rambaud, Alfred, Vols. I, III of History of Russia from the Earliest Times to 1882, edited by Nathan Haskell, translated by L. B. Lang (3 volumes), Boston, Page Company, 1882.
- Reddaway, Peter, editor and translator, Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union, New York, American Heritage Press, 1972.
- Rothberg, Abraham, The Heirs of Stalin: Dissidence and the Soviet Regime, 1953-1970, Ithaca, N. Y. and London, Cornell University Press, 1972.
- Ruud, Charles A., "Censorship and the Peasant Question: The Contingencies of Reform Under Alexander II (1855-1859)," Vol. V of California Slavic Studies, edited by Nicholas Riasanovsky and Gleb Struve (annual volumes), Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, University of California Press, 1970.

- Stilman, Leon, "Freedom and Repression in Prerevolutionary Russian Literature," Continuity and Change in Russian Thought and Soviet Society, edited by Ernest J. Simmons, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Treadgold, Donald, Twentieth Century Russia, 2nd ed., Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964.
- Troyat, Henri, Pushkin, translated by Nancy Amphoux, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970.
- Tokes, Rudolf L., "Dissent: The Politics for Change in the USSR," Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970s, edited by Henry W. Morton and Rudolf L. Tokes, New York, Free Press, 1974.
- Twarog, Leon, "Literary Censorship in Russia and the Soviet Union," Essays on Russian Intellectual History, edited by Leon Gordon Blair, University of Texas Press, 1971.

Articles

- Balmuth, Daniel, "The Origins of the Tsarist Epoch of Censorship Terror," The American Slavic and East European Review, XIX (December, 1960), 497-520.
- Bassov, Whitman, "The Pre-revolutionary Pravda and Tsarist Censorship," The American Slavic and East European Review, XIII (February, 1954), 47-65.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan, "Political Dissent in the Soviet Union," Studies in Comparative Communism, III (April, 1970), 74-105.
- Brumberg, Abraham, "Dissent in Russia," Foreign Affairs, LII (July, 1974), 781-798.
- Burg, David, "The Cold War on the Literary Front, Part I: The Writers' Underground," Problems of Communism, XI (July-August, 1962), 1-14.
- "Censorship of Russian Music," Studies on the Soviet Union, XI, No. 2 (1973), 93-103.
- Feuer, Lewis S., "The Intelligentsia in Opposition," Problems of Communism, XIX (November-December, 1970), 1-16.

- Georgieva, N. G., "Nelegalnaya listkovaya pechat Rossii kontsa XIX - nachala XX veka," Voprosy istoriya, XLVI (June, 1972), 35-46.
- Gruliov, Leo, "The Role of the Press," Problems of Communism, XII (January-February, 1963), 34-40.
- Harris, Jonathan, "The Dilemma of Dissidence," Survey, XVII (Winter, 1971), 107-122.
- Hayward, Max, "Introduction: Soviet Literature, 1917-1961," Partisan Review, XXVII, Nos. 3-4 (1961), 333-362.
- Itenberg, B. S., "Rasprostranenie izdaniy Russkoi sekstii I internatsionala v revolyutsionom podpole Rossii," Voprosy istoriya, XXXVI (October, 1962), 40-49.
- Jacoby, Susan and Anthony Astrachan, "Soviet Dissent: An Ebb Tide," World, June 19, 1973, pp. 13-19.
- Jensen, Jay and Richard Bayley, "Highlights of the Development of Russian Journalism, 1553-1917," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Summer, 1964), 403-415, 436.
- Prostov, Eugene, "Origins of Russian Printing," Library Quarterly, I (July, 1931), 255-277.
- Reddick, DeWitt, "Development of the Press in Nineteenth Century Russia," Journalism Quarterly, XXI (March, 1944), 45-54.
- "The Russian Press in London," The Saturday Review, June 27, 1863, pp. 835-836.
- Senchakova, L. T., "Podpolnye Sotsial-Demokraticheski Tipografii (1901-1904)," Istoriya SSSR, 1974 (September-October), pp. 109-114.
- Smith, Paul A. Jr., "Protest in Moscow," Foreign Affairs, XLVII (October, 1968), 151-163.
- "Soviet Underground Literature: A Discussion," panel discussion with Leonid Vladimirov and others Studies on the Soviet Union, VIII, No. 3 (1969), 67-85.

Taylor, Pauline B., "Underground Soviet Broadcasting,"
Russian Review, XXXI (April, 1972), 173-174.

Telesin, Julius, "Inside Samizdat," Encounter, XL
(February, 1973), 25-33.

Walkin, Jacob, "Government Controls Over the Press in
Russia, 1905-1914," Russian Review, XIII (July, 1954),
203-209.

Encyclopedia Articles

"Barkov," Russkii Biograficheski Slovar, Vol. II,
St. Petersburg, Obschestvo Imperatorskago
Russkago Istoricheskago, 1896-1918.

"Zhurnalist," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya,
Vol. XVI, Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe Nauchnoe
Izdatelstvo, 1950-1957.

"Zhurnaly," Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Vol. XVI
Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe Nauchnoe Izdatelstvo, 1950-
1957.

Newspapers

Christian Science Monitor, selected issues, 1969, 1970,
1974, 1975.

New York Times, selected issues, 1970, 1973, 1974.

Times (London), selected issues, 1971, 1972.

Unpublished Material

Schreiber, Elliot, "Soviet Press Theory and Dissent in
the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1953-1974,"
unpublished master's thesis, School of Journalism,
Pennsylvania State University, State College,
Pennsylvania, 1974.

Special Material

"Impediments to the Free Flow of Information and Ideas in the Soviet Union," Radio Liberty Dispatch, November 1, 1974, pp. 1-9.

"Solzhenitsyn's Press Conference, November 1974," Radio Liberty Supplement, February 14, 1975, pp. 1-27.