



**Censorship in Translation in the Soviet Union in the
Stalin and Khrushchev Eras**
Samantha Sherry

This thesis examines the censorship of translated literature in the Soviet Union between the 1930s and the 1960s. It has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh in 2012.

From the archives of the website
The Master and Margarita

<http://www.masterandmargarita.eu>

Webmaster

Jan Vanhellemont
B-3000 Leuven
+32475260793



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Censorship in Translation in the Soviet Union in the Stalin and Khrushchev Eras

Samantha Sherry

Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh
2012

Abstract

This thesis examines the censorship of translated literature in the Soviet Union between the 1930s and the 1960s. Reconsidering traditional understandings of censorship, I employ a theoretical approach influenced by Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu in order to understand censorship as a set of inter-related practices enacted by multiple agents, occupying points on a continuum of censorship that ranges from external authoritarian intervention to internalised, unconscious norms. An analysis of literary texts translated from English into Russian in the literary journals *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* is supplemented by examination of archival material from these journals and the censorship agency, Glavlit; I aim to reconstruct the various layers of censorship carried out by translator, editor or external agents. My analysis begins with a study of the publications patterns of the journals, examining the inclusion and exclusion of texts as an attempt to impose a canon of foreign literature. Employing internal reviews and records of editorial meetings, I demonstrate that ideological control of foreign literature was not completely repressive, and that a number of texts not conforming to Soviet standards found their way onto the pages of the journal. The next chapters study censorship on the textual level. A chapter on puritanical censorship discusses how sexual and vulgar language was removed from the texts, noting the relative easing of censorship in the post-Stalin era. Puritanical censorship was often incomplete, inviting the reader to reconstruct the original meaning. The chapter on political censorship shows how taboo topics were removed or entirely misrepresented in the Stalin era, but modified less drastically in the post-Stalin texts. The following study of the censorship of ideologically marked language examines how censorship aimed to erase unorthodox uses of certain terms, imposing an authoritative meaning on these texts, and ensuring the continued circulation of canonical symbols in a limited discursive framework. Ideological censorship also created intertextuality between the English texts and the Soviet context, attempting to make those texts a part of Soviet discourse. Through an examination of these intersecting censorship practices I problematise the phenomenon, highlighting ways in which the regulation of foreign texts could be incomplete, and ways in which censorial agents often sought to undermine censorship, even as they acted as censors.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is entirely of my own composition, and all work contained herein is my own. It has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Note

Transliteration of Russian names adheres to the Library of Congress system without diacritics, except in direct quotations. Translations into English in quotations from secondary sources are my own unless otherwise indicated. All back-translations from Russian to English of citations from primary sources are my own.

Acknowledgments

There have been many people who have provided me with all kinds of help throughout the writing of this thesis. Firstly, I am hugely indebted to my supervisors, Doctor Lara Ryazanova-Clarke of the University of Edinburgh and Doctor Andrei Rogatchevski of the University of Glasgow for their careful, insightful reading and constant encouragement.

The Centre for Russian Central and East European Studies at the University of Glasgow awarded my PhD scholarship, and I am grateful to the Economic and Social Research Council not only for the initial funding but also for funding my field trip to Moscow in early 2010; the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies also provided valuable assistance for further archival research in 2011. In this vein, I thank Doctor Polly Jones and Doctor Alex Titov for organising the 2009 Russian Archival Training Scheme trip to Moscow, which not only introduced me to the archives, but was also the spur for many continuing collaborations and friendships.

I am indebted to the archivists at the Rossiiskii gosudarsvtennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva and the Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi federatsii, as well the librarians at the Vse-rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi biblioteka inostranoi literatury in Moscow, who provided me with many trolleys full of issues of *Internatsional'naia literatura*.

On a personal level, I must mention some of my fellow travellers, Rhona Gordon, JJ Gurga, Victoria Irvine and Lucy Weir, who all understand the great importance of coffee and cake to the PhD process. Of course, particular gratitude goes to my parents, Anne and Colin Sherry, and my brother, Colin, who always have been unfailing in their love and support. Finally, I thank Ashley Good who, since I began work on my PhD, has been boyfriend, fiancé and husband.

This thesis is dedicated to Jenny Malone and Jean Sherry, who would both, I am sure, have enjoyed boasting about it, and also to Frank Malone, from Doc.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Research Aims and Questions	5
Structure of the Thesis	7
Translated Literature in the Soviet Union	10
Introduction to the Comparative Analysis	16
Earlier Journals	17
<i>Internatsional'naia literatura</i>	18
<i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	20
Literature Review	23
Censorship and Translation	23
Censorship of Translation in Russia and the Soviet Union	30
Chapter 2: Censorship and the Censor	38
Theorising Censorship	38
Censorship Practices	47
Who was the Censor?	50
Glavlit and the Soviet Censorship Apparatus	50
The Editor as Censor	57
The Translator as Censor	67
Chapter 3: The Choice of Texts as Censorship	77
Inclusion and Exclusion: Creating a Text of Texts	81
<i>Internatsional'naia literatura</i>	84
<i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	100

Criteria for Inclusion: Editorial Reviews	107
Conclusion: The Performative Dimension	119
Chapter 4: Puritanical Censorship	122
Excision	125
Euphemism	132
Ambiguity in Puritanical Censorship	140
Structural Censorship: Deficiencies of the Soviet Language	145
Signalling Censorial Intervention	153
Conclusion: The Role(s) of the Censor	157
Chapter 5: Political Censorship	163
Political Censorship in the Stalin Period	163
Attacks against the Soviet Union and Soviet Ideology	164
Non-persons	170
The Spanish Civil War	173
Germany and the Second World War	177
Jewishness and the Second World War	180
Political Censorship in the Khrushchev Period	189
Insults against Communism and the Soviet Union	189
Peaceful Coexistence	195
Non-censorship	201
Conclusion: Rewriting or Showcasing Foreign Discourses?	202
Chapter 6: Ideological Censorship	206
The Ideologeme	209
Semantic Shifts of The Ideologeme in <i>Internatsional'naia literatura</i>	214
Semantic Shifts of the Ideologeme in <i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	227

Paratextual Elements as a Means of Governing Interpretation	240
Conclusion: Controlling Readers' Interpretation	251
Chapter 7: Conclusion	256
Strategies of Censorship	256
The Formative Aspect of Censorship	262
Censorship and Resistance	264
The Ambiguity of Censorship	275
Appendix 1: Authors Translated from English in Internatsional'naia literatura, 1933-1942	280
Appendix 2: Authors Translated from English in Inostrannaia literatura, 1955-1965.....	282
Appendix 3: Texts Used in Close Comparison Case Studies.....	284
<i>Internatsional'naia literatura</i>	284
<i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	285
Bibliography	287
Archival Sources	287
Sources Consulted Directly	287
Sources Cited in Published Collections	287
Primary Sources	287
<i>Internatsional'naia literatura</i>	287
<i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	289
Secondary Sources	291

Chapter 1: Introduction

There has been a long history of cultural and intellectual contact between Russia/ the Soviet Union and the West, and much of this contact has been facilitated by the import of foreign and translated literature into Russia. Russia and the Soviet Union have, to a large extent, been shaped by the import of foreign products and ideas; the relationship is reciprocal: ‘foreign writers are placed in a Russian frame; they are read through Russia, and Russia in turn is read through them’.¹ Following Iurii Lotman, Priscilla Meyer argues that ‘Russians view the foreign cultural world through the lens of their own national self-image and create a construct of the West in contrast with Russia’s own dominant codes, a process that is inevitably dialectical’.²

Translation, as a meeting point between two languages and cultures, serves as a powerful force of cultural interaction and mutual influence. Being situated within a particular network of power relations, translation is ‘not the production of one text equivalent to another text, but rather a complex process of rewriting that runs parallel both to the overall view of language and the “Other” people have throughout history, and to the influences and balance of power that exist between one culture and the other’.³ In the Soviet Union, where the attitude to foreign cultures was ambivalent and even hostile at times, translated literature was particularly strongly affected by

¹ Rachel Polonsky, *English Literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 6.

² Priscilla Meyer, *How the Russians Read the French: Lermontov, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), p. 4.

³ Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal, ‘Translating: A Political Act’, in *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008), p. 5.

the prevailing ideological atmosphere. Anxiety over the presence and influence of the West in the Soviet Union was a significant factor in Soviet self-definition,⁴ and, resulted in the ideological control of foreign discourses. The clearest manifestation of ideological control is probably the censorship system; thus, censorship of translation in the Soviet Union can be viewed as an attempt to regulate the circulation of foreign discourses, which are influenced by ‘ideas and ideologies about the outside world’.⁵

This thesis will, through an examination of censorship practices relating to translated literature, discuss how foreign discourses were mediated in the Soviet Union at a time when the West was an ideological Other. A comparative study of English source and Russian target texts will draw upon two literary journals published in the Stalin and post-Stalin period respectively: *Internatsional’naia literatura* (*International Literature*) and *Inostrannaia literatura* (*Foreign Literature*). This study will foreground an analysis of censorial agents and processes in the two periods, in order to understand how censorship practices developed diachronically and, of course, to examine the contrast between the cultural policies of foreign culture of the Stalin era and the Thaw era. The texts are drawn from Western literature written originally in English, mainly from the United Kingdom and United States, but including a minority from Ireland and Australia. Texts written in English from non-Western countries (by African writers, for instance) do not feature here, since the primary focus is on censorship of the literature of the West and the cultural and ideological relations between the Soviet Union and the West. A close

⁴ On this subject see, for example: Michael David-Fox, ‘The Fellow Travelers Revisited: The “Cultured West” Through Soviet Eyes’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 75 (2003), 300-335; Sergei I. Zhuk, *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dnepropetrovsk, 1960–1985* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).

⁵ Michael David-Fox, ‘The Implications of Transnationalism’, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 12 (2011), 885-904 (p. 904).

comparison is carried out of source and target texts, in order to highlight the discrepancies between the two. Where changes have been made, the technique (excision, substitution, etc.) and category (what kind of material is altered — sexual, political etc.) of the change is noted — these categories are somewhat elastic, as the forthcoming chapters demonstrate. For instance, censorship of sexual content or vulgar language may have a political aspect,⁶ while changes that might appear to fall readily under the category of political can be more complex (as chapter 6 will explore). The results of the comparative studies are analysed in terms of broad categories of censorship: political censorship, puritanical censorship and ideological censorship.

These close comparisons form the basis for a micro-level examination of the practices of censorship, accompanied by an examination of the relevant archival documents held in the *fondy* of the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI) for *Inostrannaia literatura* and *Internatsional'naia literatura*. Where possible, the study of censorship processes has been supplemented by information about the censorial agents contained in the archive. For the texts from *Inostrannaia literatura* — the information is, unfortunately, lacking in the archival holdings for the earlier journal — this information comes from translators' typescripts, which are altered in the editors' hand, and carry the editors' signatures of approval. For these texts, therefore, it is possible to trace the different 'layers' of censorship from the translators' initial alterations through the various editorial processes, thus distinguishing which changes were made by translators and which were made by editors. In this way, censorial processes and agents can be traced from the stage of

⁶ Herman Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917-1991* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), p. xii.

initial text production to publication, allowing for a more in-depth picture of censorship than has previously been the case. As well as shedding light on the situation at the textual level, archival holdings also illuminate the situation at the higher level. I make use of editorial reviews and minutes of internal meetings to reconstruct the debates occurring within the journal, and between the staff and higher-level institutions such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In addition to the documents held in RGALI, the wider context of the textual changes is illustrated by the archival holdings of the Soviet censorship authority, Glavlit, which are held in the State Archive of the Russian Federation in Moscow (GA RF). Glavlit's holdings are somewhat limited: only three of a supposed nine *opisi* are currently available for consultation by researchers. Among the documents held at GA RF, there is a significant lack of censors' reports on individual texts, or information relating to decisions made about particular texts by Glavlit agents. This can partly be explained by the fact that censorial decisions were commonly transmitted by telephone, leaving no paper trail.⁷ It is likely that some documents were destroyed or never lodged with the archive.⁸ Alternatively, useful documents may be contained in the six *opisi* whose contents are unknown. The majority of Glavlit's documents are operational records — financial accounts, records of staffing issues, etc. Perhaps most useful to the researcher are the end-of-year reports from the various *oblity* (regional branches of Glavlit) and *gorlity* (city branches). The majority of these reports that remain in GA RF cover the 1950s; they contain collated numbers of censorial interventions, organised by category, and lists of representative

⁷ This is known as '*telefonnoe pravo*'. See Ermolaev, p. 145.

⁸ Vladimir Solodin, the ex-head of Glavlit hints at the destruction of censorial documents in an interview carried out in the 1990s. See Steven Richmond and Vladimir Solodin, "The Eye of the State": An Interview with Soviet Chief Censor Vladimir Solodin, *Russian Review*, 56 (1997), 581-

examples of censors' interventions and notes about the results — whether the offending section was removed, or the text banned altogether. These reports also contain notes about the conduct of the censors over the preceding year; criticisms are made of censors' 'mistakes' in, for example, allowing unsuitable material to be published or, conversely, in removing material which was harmless and should have circulated freely. While these documents do not allow for the systematic review of censorial practices in relation to specific publications that is the main focus of this thesis, since they are only partial records, they do give an indication of general trends and debates within Glavlit and go some way to illuminating the day-to-day activities of the censorship authority.

Research Aims and Questions

Through the analysis of the translated texts and archival documents, I will focus on a number of inter-related research aims and questions. My first aim is to reconsider censorship in the Soviet Union, and to take steps towards a problematisation of censorship as a phenomenon in light of a body of recent scholarship originating in the West, which draws theoretical inspiration from Michel Foucault's work on power and authority. As a result, this thesis attempts to move away from a 'traditional' conceptualisation of censorship, as it is usually understood by scholars studying the Soviet period and in research based in Russia. This broad, overarching aim produces a number of more narrowly focused research questions. The first is to consider the agents involved in the censorship process(es). Who acted as a censor? What were their specific roles and responsibilities? How was authority distributed among them? In focusing on agents and practices, I will also examine *what* was censored in these

texts; I will discuss at length the question of what themes or topics from Western literature were deemed unsuitable and subject to censorship in the Soviet context, and which censorship techniques or strategies were applied.

The use of translated texts is a particularly enlightening way of examining these questions, since the multiplicity of actors involved in the translation and publication process means that roles and authority can be delineated and different parts of the censorship process can be separated out and examined in some detail. Censorial actions can be traced through the publication process, and each stage in the process from the English source text through the editorial documents to the final Russian target text is exposed. Thus, the comparative analysis presented here is an attempt to build a picture of the censorship processes as applied to a particular set of texts. I will expose the multiple actions and 'layers' of censorship, showing the interactive input of the many various agents involved in the text production process.

As well as an examination of the functions of censorship practices and agents, central to this study is an attempt to understand the effects and impact of censorship on Soviet discourse. This leads to the other main research question concerning the portrayal of the West. In analysing the purpose and impact of censorship practice on the text, I seek to understand how the West as a discursive object was mediated in the Soviet Union, and how that object was created within particular discursive parameters. This question arises from the fact that translation is a site where different and conflicting cultures and discourses are brought together, generating ideological and political friction. One of the main questions to be posed in the analysis of the texts, therefore, will be how this friction was mediated, how an acceptable cultural product was created, and how this relates to broader Soviet discourses on the West.

Related to the idea of acceptability is that of resistance. This follows on from Foucault's idea of the 'correlativity of power and resistance',⁹ what he calls 'the locking together of power relations with relations of strategy and the results proceeding from their interaction'.¹⁰ My focus on agents and their actions will allow for an examination of the potential for resistance to censorship, and to the question of whether this is a useful category for analysis. In effect, I intend to integrate recent scholarship on ideology and discourse with studies of Soviet censorship. In doing so, I will provide new insights not only into the mechanisms of censorship, but also into its use as a way of mediating (literally and ideologically) foreign discourses in the Soviet Union.

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis will include seven chapters in total. Chapter 1 establishes the background of the study, outlining the historical and theoretical context in which the case studies are placed. Following a description of practices of foreign literature publishing in the Soviet Union, I will review the literature on translation in Russia and the Soviet Union and then introduce the case studies through a history of the journals from which the comparative case studies are taken. The second chapter will approach the issue of censorship itself, initially through a discussion of theoretical approaches to the phenomenon that seeks to problematise the notion and bring recent Western scholarship to the study of the Soviet context. Following that discussion, the multiple ways in which censorship operated in the specific Soviet context will be described; I

⁹ Kevin John Heller, 'Power, Subjectification and Resistance in Foucault', *SubStance*, 25 (1996), 78-110 (p. 100).

¹⁰ Michel Foucault, 'The Subject and Power', *Critical Inquiry*, 8 (1982), 777-795 (p. 795).

will outline the functions of the institutional censorship apparatus and discuss how individual agents in the text production process could also act as censorial agents. I will focus on translators and editors as most relevant to the present study, attempting to place these agents in the hierarchical structure of the cultural field.

Following these introductory chapters, the study of censorship practices in *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* will begin in chapter 3. This chapter will engage with censorship above the textual level, and will discuss patterns of text inclusion and exclusion from the journals as a censorial practice. I will examine the Stalin-era text selection in the light of contemporary political debates, including the adoption of socialist realism as the official mode of literary production, the denigration of formalism and the presence of fellow travellers in the Soviet cultural and political sphere. In examining the post-Stalin processes of text-selection, *Inostrannaia literatura's* internal reviews, held in RGALI, are used in order to highlight debates surrounding the inclusion of foreign texts, and to establish the norms of the discourse in which these texts are situated. I will touch upon the idea of the performative function of reviews, in which the discourse of socialist realism is used to justify both inclusion and exclusion of particular texts.

The three subsequent chapters will focus on censorship on the textual level, where possible making use of translators' typescripts to illuminate the processes of censorship. Each chapter will examine a different aspect of censorial practice. Assessing censorship in this way, rather than separating, for example, translators' self-censorship from editorial censorship will allow me to examine dominant themes and discourses that unite variable practices.

Chapter 4 will examine how censorship was applied to sexual or violently graphic content and swear words; it will show how graphic material was excised or manipulated in order to adhere to the standards of Soviet decency, which were ideologically established. This chapter groups together techniques of textual manipulation, assessing censorship strategies. I will examine the complexity of censorship practices by also highlighting changes that stem from the relative difficulty of including sex or swearing in Soviet texts, stemming from the cultural and lexical asymmetries between Russian and English. Chapter 5 focuses on what is perhaps one of the most ‘traditional’ manifestations of censorship, the alteration of material that was politically taboo. This chapter is arranged thematically, analysing the approach to politically suspect material relating to subjects that were loaded in Soviet discourse including fascism, the Jewish experience and the cold war. I will examine to what extent censorship aims at not only excising unacceptable material, but also controlling the interpretation of that material. The subject of chapter 6 is, to some extent, related to the political mode of censorship but also differs in many important ways; in this chapter I deal with the function of censorship which aims to control and limit the unauthorised or non-canonical use of Soviet ideologemes — words or sections of a text which are closely associated with the dominant ideology and which have canonical meanings in the Soviet discourse. This category of censorship is shown to be concerned with the potential for meaning creation on the part of the reader and so seeks to impose the authorised meaning upon these key items through the substitution of a non-marked referent for a marked one in the original — or through the insertion of Soviet ideological language where it was not present in the English. I conclude the discussion of these examples by calling upon

Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the unification of the linguistic market, showing that censorship of ideologically marked language sought to create a single discursive field and establish the primacy of Soviet authoritative discourse.¹¹

The concluding chapter attempts to integrate the various themes and observations made in relation to the individual case studies and study of censorship practices, noting that censorship strategies are reproduced across the various modes of censorship. This final chapter will also return to a theoretical discussion, attempting to highlight how the multiplicity of censorial modes, strategies and agents can render censorship ambiguous, and how censorship — and its accompanying imposition of authoritative discourse — can be resisted and undermined by the censorial agents, who are supposed to be enacting it. I return to ideas of performativity and creativity on the part of the censor in order to produce an overview of censorship in all its significant complexity.

Translated Literature in the Soviet Union

The treatment of foreign literature in the Soviet Union reflected, to a large extent, the broader political atmosphere. In this sense, Soviet attitudes to foreign literature were ambivalent and changeable: foreign influences could be helpful in enriching Soviet culture or teaching the Soviet people about the world outside its borders, but they also brought 'potentially dangerous influences' into the Soviet sphere.¹² In the immediate post-revolutionary era and through the 1920s, attitudes to foreign

¹¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. by John Thompson, trans. by Matthew Adamson and Gino Raymond (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p. 50.

¹² Marianna Tax Choldin, 'Censorship via Translation: Soviet Treatment of Western Political Writing', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 21-52 (p. 29).

literature were warm and welcoming. Translating literature was seen as a way to further Soviet internationalist policies, and the number of translations published rose dramatically after the revolution. A major project entitled *Vsemirnaia literatura* (World Literature) was established in 1918 by Maksim Gor'kii; it aimed to publish a large number of translations of Western and Oriental literature, to form and enhance links between the workers of different countries, and to educate the Soviet public.¹³

This ambitious project was disbanded in the mid-1920s in accordance with a shift in the official view of translation and foreign literature.

In Petrograd, the publishing house *Academia* was established in 1921, attached to Petrograd University. *Academia*, which transferred to Moscow in 1929 and was absorbed into the state publisher Goslitizdat in 1937, published works in the humanities and classics of Western writing, including a series called *Treasures of World Literature*. Among the items published in translation were works by Balzac, Dante, Swift and Byron.¹⁴ Translation criticism and theory were important issues for *Academia*, and it issued Chukovskii's *Iskusstvo perevoda* [The Art of Translation] in 1936.¹⁵

In the 1930s, the number of foreign titles published dropped sharply. Soviet publishing statistics indicate that in 1940 only 348 titles were published in a total number of 5.1 million copies.¹⁶ It was also during this time that many translators became victims of the purges, while others were forced into translation when it

¹³On the history of 'Vsemirnaia literatura', see I. Shomrakova, 'Knigoizdatel'stvo "Vsemirnaia literatura" 1918-24', *Kniga: Issledovaniia i materialy*, 14 (1967), 175-193; E. I. Zamiatin, 'Kratkaia istoriia vsemirnoi literatury ot osnovaniia i do sего dnia', *Pamiat': Istoricheskii sbornik*, 5 (1981), 237-314.

¹⁴O.S. Ostroi, 'Izdatel'stvo "Academia"', *Kniga: Issledovaniia i materialy*, 18 (1969), 155-174 (p. 168).

¹⁵Ostroi, pp. 155-174 (p. 170).

¹⁶*Pechat' SSSR v 1955 Godu* (Moscow: Vsesoiznaia knizhnaia palata, 1955), p. 65.

became impossible to publish their original works.¹⁷ However, this was also a period in which translation acted as a powerful indicator of what Katerina Clark has recently highlighted as the Soviet Union's paradoxical cosmopolitanism.¹⁸ Even as Soviet culture became more closed and authoritarian, links with foreign cultures continued to flourish; 'at precisely this time the Soviet cultural world became more cosmopolitan, more open to products from the West. The horizon of Soviet culture widened as translation took off'.¹⁹ Clark notes that translation was one way of placing the Soviet Union in 'world literature' by assimilating the best of other nations and 'develop[ing] them further in a new Marxist-inflected canon vaunted as their consummation.'²⁰ She states that 'an important motive behind the spate of translations that appeared in the Stalinist thirties was national ambitions in the international arena'.²¹

One literary institution that was important in the creation of the West as a discursive object in Stalinist society was the journal *Literaturnyi kritik*. This journal, founded in 1933 and closed in 1940, was the principal output for literary criticism in the first half of the 1930s and was dominated by leading formulators of literary theory such as György Lukács.²² The journal's significance lay in its critical attitude to literature and it 'successfully fought against the "ultra-leftist" orientation of [The Russian Association of Proletarian Writers] and, in 1935-1936, against vulgar

¹⁷ Maurice Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia: A Cultural History* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), p. 114.

¹⁸ See Katerina Clark, *Moscow, The Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931-1941* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).

¹⁹ Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 16.

²⁰ Clark, *Moscow: The Fourth Rome*, p. 22.

²¹ Katerina Clark, 'The Role of Translation in the Formation of National Culture', in *Kultur und/als Übersetzung. Russisch-deutsche Beziehungen im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Christine Engel and Birgit Menzel (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2011), pp. 121-142 (p. 127).

²² Katerina Clark, 'M. M. Bakhtin and "World Literature"', *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 32 (2002), 266-292 (p. 268).

sociology'.²³ *Literaturnyi kritik* contributed to the pro-European orientation in early 1930s culture. At that time, when the Soviet Union sought to establish its place in world culture and world literature, the journal published a great number of critical articles on Western literature and thought, as well as works by foreign authors in translation including, in 1934, a translation of Hegel's *Aesthetics*.²⁴

No journal dedicated to Western foreign literature was published between the end of the war and Stalin's death, but another important periodical, *Druzhba narodov* (Friendship of Nations) continued to publish translations from the literatures of the various Soviet republics. Some translators who worked from Western languages also translated from the national languages of the USSR, often from interlinear texts or *podstrochniki*. As well as publishing translations, *Druzhba narodov* was also an important forum for discussion of translation theory and practice. Translation from the languages of the republics 'was to contribute to the creation of a global Socialist Realist canon, as well as a Soviet canon of "representative" expressions of national cultures from within the empire';²⁵ translation from these languages was an important factor in producing the canon of Soviet literature.

In the 1950s, the numbers of translations published began to rise, compared with the immediate post-war period, from 341 book titles and 16.6 million copies in

²³ Hans Günther, 'Soviet Literary Criticism and the Formulation of the Aesthetics of Socialist Realism, 1932 - 1940', in *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 90–108 (p. 101).

²⁴ Katerina Clark, 'Germanophone Contributions to Stalinist Literary Theory: The Case of Georgy Lukacs and Michail Lifšic, and Their Roles in Literaturnyj Kritik and IFLI', *Russian Literature*, 63 (2008), 513–532 (p. 520).

²⁵ Susanna Witt, 'Between the Lines: Totalitarianism and Translation in the USSR', in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), pp. 149–170 (p. 151).

1950 to 763 titles in 71.5 million copies in 1955.²⁶ In 1955, 9037 translated titles in total were published (as books), 1450 of these titles were translated into Russian. 818 titles were translated into Russian from foreign languages. In accordance with other cultural changes in the post-Stalin era, attitudes towards translation became more positive at this time. The number of translations continued to rise to a high of 1830 titles in 1960. Through the first half of the 1960s, the number of books published fell back to the levels of the late 1950s, with only 1255 titles being translated into Russian in 1965. Nonetheless, foreign literature continued to occupy an important place in Soviet culture in the late Soviet period. One example harks back to the optimistic atmosphere of earlier years: during the 1970s a two hundred volume series, the Library of World Literature (*Biblioteka vseмирnoi literatury*) was published, which aimed to present the Soviet reader with ‘a universal version of world culture that would fit into a Soviet flat’.²⁷ This series was an attempt to create a canon of Russian and foreign literature for the Soviet reader, publishing translations of works from ancient Greece up to the 20th century.

The publication of foreign literature, as part of the publishing system as a whole, was complicated, centralised and extremely hierarchical. Although many organisational and political changes were implemented over the years, the publishing industry was characterised by centralisation and political control. A number of specialist publishing houses all answered to a committee for publishing. When first established in 1919, this was called *Gosizdat* and, after several name changes, became *Goskomizdat* in 1973. Subordinate to this organisation were the publishing houses themselves, as well as printing facilities and distribution networks. All these

²⁶ Brown, p. 63.

²⁷ Stephen Lovell, *The Russian Reading Revolution: Print Culture in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Eras* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), p. 69.

structures were themselves overseen by the Council of Ministers and, ultimately, the Party leadership. The Writers' Union controlled royalty payments and could offer incentives such as dachas and sponsored visits to those judged to conform to the required norms. The Publishing House of Foreign Literature (*Izdatel'stvo inostrannoi literatury*) was set up in 1946 to publish Russian translations of foreign literature as well as books on social and scientific topics. The publishing house was linked to the All-Union State Library of Foreign Literature, founded in 1948. The publishing house selected material from the library as well as purchasing a large number of foreign books and journals from abroad.²⁸

The Ministry of Culture had the right to coordinate publication of translations by all publishing houses.²⁹ The choice of texts was regulated: translators had to obtain at least two recommendations for the translation from scholarly institutions or specialists, and secure the agreement of the appropriate chief editorial office in the State Committee for Publishing before submitting details of the work for 'coordination' to the State Committee or (in the case of scientific and technical works) to the State Scientific and Technical Library. The choice of translators, and of authors to write any notes or introduction to the work, had to be approved by a senior editor or the head of an editorial office.³⁰ As well as regulation by the publishers, all foreign literature was subject to the overarching censorship of Glavlit, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

²⁸ Boris Ivanovitch Gorokhoff, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959), pp. 156–7.

²⁹ Gorokhoff, p. 44.

³⁰ Gregory P.M. Walker, *Soviet Book Publishing Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 119.

Introduction to the Comparative Analysis

The texts that form the basis for my analysis are selected from the journals *Internatsional'naia literatura* (International Literature) and its successor *Inostrannaia literatura* (Foreign Literature), and were published between 1933 and 1963. Since literature in translation is a huge topic, it is necessary to focus on a narrower sub-area, in order to provide a focused enquiry of concrete evidence, and these two journals form a particularly suitable corpus for this study, since it is possible to examine a range of texts by different authors and translators, and archival material such as translators' typescripts, editorial instructions and translators' correspondence is readily available. The availability of texts and archival material allows one to trace the 'story' of the texts from translation to publication, allowing an in-depth analysis of censorship processes and agents at different stages in the publication process and in their various manifestations.

There are two principal studies of the journals presented here. Nailya Safiullina's PhD thesis examines translation as a cultural phenomenon in the Stalin era through a history of *Internatsional'naia literatura*.³¹ Focusing on the agents connected to the journal — editors and translators — Safiullina highlights the significance of the translators in the 1930s, demonstrating that translators were influential cultural figures during this period. She highlights the 'canonisation' of particular Western writers during this period and the development of a corpus of translators based on translators' social profiles. As well as providing a historical account of translation from Western languages in the Stalin period, the thesis also emphasises issues of repression and resistance, both on the part of translators

³¹ Nailya Safiullina, 'The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture Under Stalin' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Manchester: University of Manchester, 2009).

themselves and on the part of the reader. Through a study of readers' responses to *Internatsional'naia literatura*, Safiullina shows that readers reacted creatively to the works published in the journal, implicitly challenging the propagandistic presentation of foreign literature and exhibiting 'his or her own attitude to literature'.³² Safiullina characterises the translation culture of the 1930s as complex and governed by factors including, but certainly not limited to, politics and ideology.

Birgit Menzel has presented an account of *Inostrannaia literatura* as a forum for cultural interaction, focusing on its role in bringing foreign culture into the Soviet Union. She notes that while the journal played its political role as an instrument of cold war politics, it also served to undermine the dominant discourse of Soviet dominance in world culture. In the 1960s and 1970s especially, *Inostrannaia literatura* played an important role in eroding authoritative discourses and creating an imagined West for Soviet readers.³³

Earlier Journals

Inostrannaia literatura, which is still published today, (albeit in a significantly smaller print run than during the Soviet period) and *Internatsional'naia literatura* are only two links in a long chain of publications dedicated to foreign literature in Russia/ the Soviet Union. One of the first journals, *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* (Herald of Foreign Literature) was first published in 1891 and survived until 1917. After a gap of several years a successor journal with the same name was founded in 1928; this journal, headed by Anatolii Lunacharskii, the people's commissar for

³² Safiullina, p. 157.

³³ Birgit Menzel, 'Die Zeitschrift "Inostrannaja literatura" als Medium kultureller Übersetzung', in *Kultur und/als Übersetzung. Russisch-deutsche Beziehungen im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Christine Engel and Birgit Menzel (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2010), pp. 143-176 (p. 154).

enlightenment, was created after the first conference of the International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature (*Mezhdunarodnoe biuro revoliutsionnoi literatury*: MBRL);³⁴ it was published in Russian, French, German, and English. The foreign versions aimed to find a market abroad, adapting material for these countries by publishing Soviet literature in translation and other cultural materials such as reviews. The Russian version claimed to acquaint its readers with the most important literary and cultural developments of foreign countries. Privately, it was considered by its founders to steer Soviet readers' interpretations of foreign works and control the import of foreign literature in the Soviet Union.³⁵ Following a reorganisation of the MBRL into the International Association of Revolutionary Writers (*Mezhdunarodnoe ob"edinenie revoliutsionnykh pisatelei*, MORP), *Vestnik* was replaced from 1931-2 by a journal called *Literatura mirovoi revoliutsii* (Literature of the World Revolution). This was replaced in turn by *Internatsional'naia literatura* in 1933.

Internatsional'naia literatura

Internatsional'naia literatura was considered as not only a literary journal but also a socio-political one.³⁶ Despite its ideological focus, it was valuable in introducing major works of foreign, particularly Western, literature to the Soviet audience. Because *Internatsional'naia literatura* was intended to 'create a favourable image of

³⁴ Aleksei Mikheev, 'Mezhd dvumia "ottepeliامي"', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/mi20.html>> [accessed 18 August 2011].

³⁵ Ludmilla Stern, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union, 1920-40: From Red Square to the Left Bank* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 52.

³⁶ Arlen Viktorovich Blium, "'Internatsional'naia literatura": Podtsenzurnoe proshloe', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/bl21.html>> [accessed 18 April 2011].

the Land of the Soviets in the pinkshaded eyes of western intellectuals’,³⁷ the journal focused on publishing work by proletarian and revolutionary writers, although it also included ‘works of those left-bourgeois foreign writers, who portray the real actuality of the capitalist world’.³⁸ *Internatsional’naia literatura* was dedicated to publishing ‘progressive’ literature, but also had some freedom to publish bourgeois authors, particularly during the first half of the 1930s, when cultural conditions were such that it had relative freedom to publish. At this time, the journal ‘had the potential to become a cultural “bridge” between the USSR and the West’.³⁹ In the second half of the 1930s and into the 1940s, there was a reduction in the leeway granted to the journal, alongside purges of translators and editorial staff. The journal refocused its attention on proletarian and ‘classic’ writers, as well as political content. *Internatsional’naia literatura*’s print-run was 7500 at the time of its launch, rising first to 8000 in 1936 and 15000 in 1937. In terms of content, most translations were made from English (or *amerikanskii*, as the journal referred to the language of the USA), then German, French and Spanish. As well as the literary section, which included novels, poetry and other literary texts, the journal dedicated sections to ‘theory and criticism’, ‘literary memoirs’ and, as a venue for political discussion or proclamation, ‘reportage’ and ‘polemic’. Letters from famous foreign authors also occasionally featured. Until the mid-1930s, most of the prose works published were heavily abridged, with novels often being cut to fit only five or ten pages of the journal. These were sometimes acknowledged as extracts, sometimes not, though it is difficult to imagine a reader mistaking these publications for full works. The editorial

³⁷ Arlen Viktorovich Blum, ‘George Orwell in the Soviet Union: A Documentary Chronicle on the Centenary of His Birth’, *The Library*, 4 (2003), 402-416 (p. 403).

³⁸ Mikheev, ‘Mezhdu dvumia ’ottepeliami’ <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/mi20.html>>.

³⁹ Safiullina, p. 27.

staff sought advice externally regarding the choice of text and potential abridgements. Archival documents contain letters on these subjects to the National Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, Agitprop and the Comintern.⁴⁰

After the closure of MORP in 1935, *Internatsional'naia literatura* was taken over by the Foreign Commission of the board of the Soviet Writers' Union. The journal was disbanded in 1943 and for a number of years there was no major journal dedicated to foreign literature. With the onset of war, international culture became less and less relevant for the Soviet cultural authorities.⁴¹ The Politburo instructed that foreign writers be published instead in book form and on the pages of the other 'thick' journals, *Oktiabr'*, *Novyi mir* and *Znamia*.⁴²

Inostrannaia literatura

In the post-Stalin era, international cultural contact between the Soviet and the West increased: visits from foreigners became more popular and Soviet citizens began to travel abroad more frequently (although these visits were still tightly regulated). Political attitudes towards the West started to become more positive, and by the beginning of the Thaw diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the West began to improve. After a gap of over a decade, and only after Stalin's death, a new journal dedicated to translated literature was founded. *Inostrannaia literatura* was established in 1955 upon the instruction of the second congress of the Soviet Writers'

⁴⁰ Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI), f. 1397, op. 1, d. 25. Correspondence between *Internatsional'naia literatura* and various agencies on topics relating to content, publishing and distribution of the journal, 1937-1942.

⁴¹ Mikheev, 'Mezhdu dvumia 'otpepeliami' <http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/mi20.html>.

⁴² Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsio-politicheskoi istorii (RGASPI), f. 17, op. 163, d. 1361, l. 19. Instruction of the Politbiuro on the journal "Internatsional'naia literatura", 18th February, 1943. Cited in Leonid Maksimenkov, *Bol'shaia tsenzura: Pisateli i zhurnalisty v strane sovetov 1917-1956* (Moscow: Materik, 2005), p. 536.

Union. The journal was administered by the Writers' Union under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture. It published works of literature, journalism, poetry and literary criticism, translated into Russian from a large number of languages. As with its predecessor, one of *Inostrannaia literatura*'s areas of interest in the Soviet period was so-called 'progressive literature' and those writers 'fighting for independence against colonialism and imperialist aggression'; the journal undertook to pay 'great attention to the themes relating to the building of a new life in the Socialist countries'.⁴³ In the 1950s and 1960s, English was by far the most significant language of translation followed by French and German with around half as many translations each. Following these languages were the other European languages, with a small number of translations from non-European languages.

Inostrannaia literatura was a major journal: in the 1950s the print run was seventy thousand, and in the 1960s the number of subscribers rose dramatically to between two hundred and fifty thousand and three hundred thousand.⁴⁴ This compared favourably with other 'thick' journals such as *Novyi mir* and *Oktiabr*' — *Novyi mir*'s circulation rose to between two hundred and fifty thousand and three hundred thousand by the Brezhnev era (and to over two and a half million by 1990).⁴⁵ Some of the translated texts were published in book form after serialisation in one of the 'thick' journals such as *Inostrannaia literatura*, and they were often subject to increased textual censorship in comparison to the journal editions.⁴⁶ Of course, external political agents also played a role in the journal's functioning, as

⁴³ 'Inostrannaia Literatura', *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia*, ed. by Aleksandr Mikhailovich Prokhorov (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1969), p. 288.

⁴⁴ Menzel, pp. 143-176 (p. 154).

⁴⁵ Alla Latynina and Martin Dewhirst, 'Post-Soviet Russian Literature', in *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature*, ed. by Neil Cornwell (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 234-250 (p. 235).

⁴⁶ *Tsenzura inostrannykh knig v Rossiiskoi Imperii i Sovetskom Soiuze: Katalog vystavki*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin (Moscow: Rudomino, 1993).

with its earlier counterpart. At its beginning, in the mid-1950s, there was some debate within the journal's editorial team over its role in representing foreign cultures — should it privilege friendly nations, or publish major works from, for example, America? And how should the personal ideologies and actions of individual authors be handled?⁴⁷ The Central Committee's Culture Section recommended an explicitly ideological approach to the publication of 'bourgeois' writers: *Inostrannaia literatura* should focus on the publication of realist works, which "battled with capitalism", while criticizing the weak and reactionary sides of these works.⁴⁸ To a great extent, as will be demonstrated when examining the titles translated from English, this recommendation was followed. Nonetheless, the same document makes clear that *Inostrannaia literatura* was not a tool of ideological struggle, but, rather, should reflect it. The journal acknowledged the ideologically important role it played, in publishing the best 'progressive' foreign authors, as well as those 'bourgeois' authors who wrote on important social themes; in the foreword to its first issue,⁴⁹ as well as in internal memos, the editorial team stresses its intention to 'publish the works of the best writers, who, with their works, struggle for peace and socialism, and also those who, although they stand outside this struggle, depict their society correctly'.⁵⁰

Inostrannaia literatura published literary texts by foreign authors as well as journalistic and critical pieces, helping to normalise the West in the eyes of Soviet

⁴⁷ RGANI [Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii], f. 5, op. 36, d. 3, l. 71-74. Letter from A.B. Chakovskii to M. A. Suslov about the working principles of the journal *Inostrannaia literatura*, 23rd December, 1955. *Apparat TsK KPSS i kul'tura 1953-1957: Dokumenty*, ed. by K. Aimermakher and others (Moscow: Rosspen, 2001), pp. 457-459.

⁴⁸ RGANI, f. 5, op. 36, d. 3, l. 75-77. Notes from Central Committee on letter from A. B. Chakovskii on the work of *Inostrannaia literatura* and cooperation with foreign cultural figures. Included in Aimermakher and others, pp. 477-479.

⁴⁹ 'Ot Redaktsii', *Inostrannaia Literatura*, 1 (1955), 3-4.

⁵⁰ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 3, l. 38. Correspondence between *Inostrannaia literatura* and the Central Committee of the KPSS.

citizens, although Raisa Orlova, who worked on the editorial board of the journal from its foundation until 1961, remembers in her memoirs that the editorial board refused to print works such as Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *Le petit prince* and the novels of Heinrich Böll on ideological grounds, and notes an internal struggle between liberals and reactionaries in the journal's staff.⁵¹ Political interference was often unofficial — instructions were frequently received by telephone and their existence is unrecorded, which significantly complicates the study of censorship processes.⁵² Despite political interference of this kind, the journal acted as a small window onto a different culture and ideology, filling a 'spiritual vacuum'.⁵³ The studies taken from these journals will attempt to make sense of the struggles that took place, both among the editorial board and between the journals and political institutions. By focusing on these two journals, I will be able to show how practices of cultural regulation and limitation functioned more widely.

Literature Review

Censorship and Translation

Censorship of translation has become something of a growing area in the translation studies literature. This is a result of the increasingly serious focus on sociological and ideological questions: what the scholarly literature terms a 'social

⁵¹ Raisa Orlova, *Vospominaniia o neproshedshe vremeni: Moskva, 1961-1981 gg* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1983), p. 207. Orlova was later involved in the human-rights movement and emigrated to West Germany in 1980.

⁵² Robert Looby, 'Looking for the Censor in the Works of Sean O'Casey (and Others) in Polish Translation', *Translation and Literature*, 17 (2008), 47-54 (p. 48).

⁵³ Orlova, p. 207.

turn'.⁵⁴ Much of the attention has focused on authoritarian regimes and a large body of work has emerged on, for example, Nazi Germany, Francoist Spain and Fascist Italy. This is, perhaps, understandable, given the contemporary availability of previously closed archives. One of the earliest volumes to examine the topic is the special issue of the translation studies journal *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction (TTR)*, edited by Denise Merkle.⁵⁵ This collection of articles features a broad range of case studies, each of which examines an individual instance of censorship in different European countries, outlining the contours of this topic of inquiry within translation studies. A later volume, *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*,⁵⁶ has a clear theoretical agenda. In her introduction, the editor Francesca Billiani draws upon the work of Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha to provide a framework uniting the case studies from distinct national and historical contexts, and drawing together the common threads from the individual case studies. These case studies push the study of censorship forward through their variety, as they cover film, literature and theatre; historically the range is from the 5th to the 20th century. Despite this admirable breadth, the geographical focus is narrower, covering only European countries. The Soviet Union is represented only insofar as Chloë Stephenson's chapter 'Seeing Red' deals with the

⁵⁴Two recent major studies of the sociology of translation are *Übersetzen - Translating - Traduire: Towards a "Social Turn"?*, ed. by Michaela Wolf (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2006); *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, ed. by Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007).

⁵⁵*TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, Special issue: Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental / Censorship and Translation in the Western World, ed. by Denise Merkle, 15 (2002).

⁵⁶*Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007).

reception of Soviet films in Fascist Italy.⁵⁷ Despite this gap, the collection provides a firm base for future research.

Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin and Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin's recent collection *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* covers much the same geographical ground as Billiani's, focusing mainly on European case studies.⁵⁸ There is one chapter on the Soviet Union: Aoife Gallagher's 'Pasternak's Hamlet: Translation Censorship and Indirect Communication'.⁵⁹ The chapters here are split into four sections entitled 'Theory', 'Classical and Renaissance', 'Censoring Regimes' and 'Sensitivities', and so are divided theoretically and thematically. The essays go over the theoretical ground laid by Billiani, and build upon it. Maria Tymoczko, for example, references Antonio Gramsci's work on hegemony to examine how translators practise self-censorship.⁶⁰ Through a close study of four German translations of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, Elisabeth Gibbels demonstrates how censorship is internalised in the habitus of the translator through 'their recognition of the rules of the game',⁶¹ citing both Pierre Bourdieu and Judith Butler in her analysis. Perhaps the only weak point of this

⁵⁷ Chloë Stephenson, 'Seeing Red: Soviet Films in Fascist Italy', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani, pp. 235-256.

⁵⁸ *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009).

⁵⁹ Aoife Gallagher, 'Pasternak's Hamlet: Translation, Censorship and Indirect Communication', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 119-131.

⁶⁰ Maria Tymoczko, 'Censorship and Self-censorship in Translation: Ethics and Ideology, Resistance and Collusion', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 24-45.

⁶¹ Elisabeth Gibbels, 'Translators, the Tacit Censors', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 57-75 (p. 73).

collection is the essay on the ‘Soviet bloc’ by Piotr Kuhiwczak.⁶² Promising a ‘systemic approach’, Kuhiwczak examines the collaboration of translators with the censorship apparatus in Communist countries, principally East Germany, the Soviet Union, Romania and Czechoslovakia. He states that translation was used as a part of the overall cultural policy, as a way of regulating the presence of new influences and other cultures, and notes that there was a ‘well-evolved system of self-censorship’ in these countries.⁶³ This insight is, however, hampered by a rather sweeping approach and overly simplistic statements. He insists, for example, that only authors who actively supported socialist realism or were critical of the bourgeoisie could be published until 1956. To take one example, the publication of Joyce’s *Ulysses* in *Internatsional’naia literatura* (albeit later censored) would seem to indicate a more complex situation than Kuhiwczak describes.

Another recent collection is Michel Ballard’s *Censure et Traduction*. This volume groups together papers from a conference held at the University of Artois in 2007, and the individual contributions cover a wide range of contexts.⁶⁴ With a particular focus on Iberian cultures and the countries of Eastern Europe, including two essays on the Russian context,⁶⁵ the volume allows for the comparison of communist and capitalist regimes, as well as a diachronic view censorship of translation in different historical contexts. The collection portrays an admirable breadth, especially in papers dedicated to the more subtle actions of self-censorship

⁶² Piotr Kuhiwczak, ‘Censorship as a Collaborative Project: a Systemic Approach’, in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 46-56.

⁶³ Kuhiwczak, pp. 46-56 (p. 53).

⁶⁴ *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011).

⁶⁵ Natalia Teplova, ‘Prol gomènes à une tude historiographique de la censure et de la traduction en Russie’, in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011), pp. 295–304; Nikolay Garbovskiy, ‘Les inderdits dans la traduction sous le r gime sovi tique’, in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011), pp. 283–294

and structural censorship.⁶⁶ In this volume, Nikolay Garbovskiy emphasises the numerous agents involved in censorship, including editors, critics, teachers etc.⁶⁷

A collection of essays edited by Denise Merkle, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer and Michaela Wolf takes as its focus nineteenth-century Europe, filling a gap in the literature to date, which focuses mostly on the twentieth century.⁶⁸ This collection, which takes as its subject print censorship in what the editors term a 'neglected century',⁶⁹ presents a number of theoretical approaches, and describes various types of censorship, ranging from institutional censorship to structural censorship. This collection, more than the preceding two, develops the idea of the variety of censorial approaches, exploring issues of resistance and productive censorship, particularly evident in Brian James Baer's chapter on translation and the evasion of formal censorship in the time of the Decembrists.

In addition to these collections, a number of major long-term projects have produced a large body of research since the 1990s. Perhaps the largest is TRACE (TRANslation and Censorship), which is based in Spain. This project uses corpus-based translation studies methodologies to examine the censorship of narrative, poetry, theatre and audio-visual texts in Spanish translation, and has produced a huge body of methodological studies and individual case studies.⁷⁰ The TRACE project

⁶⁶ e.g. Teresa Tomasziewicz, 'Le traducteur entre la censure politique imposée et l'autocensure pratique', in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universitaires, 2011), pp. 341–354.

⁶⁷ Garbovskiy, pp. 283–294 (pp. 284–285).

⁶⁸ *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle and others (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010).

⁶⁹ Denise Merkle and others, 'Exploring a Neglected Century: Translation and Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle and others (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2011), pp. 7–28 (p. 7).

⁷⁰ See, for example Raquel Merino, 'Censored Translations in Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project-Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish)', *TTR*, 15 (2008), 125–152. A long list of publications is available at the project's website: <http://trace.unileon.es/>

also produced a number of contributions to a recent collection of censorship case studies, *Translation and Censorship in Different Times and Landscapes*.⁷¹

Another major focus of translation studies in the area of censorship is Germany. Kate Sturge, for example, has examined the publication of translated literature in Nazi Germany as a cultural and political phenomenon,⁷² as well under censorship more specifically.⁷³ She concentrates mainly on the official role of the state in controlling the flow of literature into Germany and in regulating the kinds of authors and texts that could be published. Sturge's work points to the ambiguity of state control and the continued influence of the market as an important factor in regulating translated texts, even in a totalitarian context.⁷⁴ Sturge's article on censorship in Nazi Germany is part of one of the first collective attempts to elucidate the censorship of translation in the special issue of *TTR*.

Fascist Italy has also been a prominent subject in the literature. Christopher Rundle's work has examined patterns of censorship in translation — his work is heavily statistical, describing the flow of foreign literature into Italy and how the choice of works by publishers was influenced by the 'threat' of the regime's intervention.⁷⁵ The intervention of the state only after printing had taken place 'allowed the regime to maintain the pretence that this was not a system of preventive censorship but merely the natural intervention of the state when unworthy works

⁷¹ *Translation and Censorship in Different Times and Landscapes*, ed. by Teresa Seruya and Maria Lin Moniz (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008).

⁷² Kate Sturge, "'A Danger and a Veiled Attack': Translating in Nazi Germany", in *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*, ed. by Jean Boase-Beier and Michael Holman (Manchester: St. Jerome, 1999); Kate Sturge, *The Alien Within': Translation into German During the Nazi Regime* (Munich: Iudicium, 2004).

⁷³ Kate Sturge, 'Censorship of Translated Fiction in Nazi Germany', *TTR*, 15 (2002), 153-169.

⁷⁴ Sturge, 153-169 (p. 169).

⁷⁵ Christopher Rundle, 'The Censorship of Translation in Fascist Italy', *The Translator*, 6 (2000), 67-86 (p. 82).

appeared on the bookshelves'.⁷⁶ Rundle, like Sturge, emphasises the continuing importance of the market in making pre-emptive decisions about what to publish. His work builds a comprehensive picture of the macro-level of censorship, but does not focus on the texts themselves, except to note that the translations were reviewed and 'where necessary were bowdlerized',⁷⁷ and his impressively comprehensive studies of the censorship system can be usefully supplemented by case studies such as that produced by Jane Dunnet, which presents a detailed study of the censorship of the novels of John Steinbeck in their Italian translation in the late 1930s.⁷⁸ By comparing the source and target texts — supplemented by the publisher's correspondence — she demonstrates how books were made suitable through 'relatively superficial textual and para-textual adjustments'.⁷⁹ Dunnet's work usefully situates the textual censorship in the wider context, making links between the actions of editors and publisher and those of the government.

Although it would be fair to say that the bulk of the literature on censorship of translation focuses on authoritarian regimes, there is a significant strand of research on democratic societies, and the censorship of translation in Victorian Britain has become something of a growth area.⁸⁰ This branch of the body of research focuses more on the subtler machinations of censorship, often focusing on the

⁷⁶ Christopher Rundle, *Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), p. 22.

⁷⁷ Rundle, 67-86 (p. 82).

⁷⁸ Jane Dunnet, 'Foreign Literature in Fascist Italy: Circulation and Censorship', *TTR*, 15 (2008), 97-

123.

⁷⁹ Dunnet, 97-123.

⁸⁰ See among others Denise Merkle, 'M. French Sheldon, Translator of Gustave Flaubert's *Salammbô*: Transauthorship and the Mechanics of Censorship in Late-Victorian Britain', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle and others (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010); Carol O'Sullivan, 'Translation Within the Margin: The "Libraries" of Henry Bohn', in *Agents of Translation*, ed. by John Milton and Paul Fadio Bandia (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009), pp. 107-130; Carol O'Sullivan, 'Censoring These "Racy Morsels of the Veranacular": Loss and Gain in the Translation of Apuleius and Catullus', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleannáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 76-92.

influence of market forces.⁸¹ Studies of censorship in Britain also tend to focus on the acts of translators, as opposed to governments: Katja Krebs' study of theatre censorship under the Lord Chamberlain shows how translators anticipate external censorial intervention and demonstrate the interplay between the censor and the censored.⁸²

Censorship of Translation in Russia and the Soviet Union

While the recent literature on the censorship of translation covers much ground, geographically, theoretically and methodologically, significant research on censorship in Eastern Europe, particularly Russia and the Soviet Union is striking by its absence. This is linked to the linguistic expertise and research interests of those scholars working in translation studies; moreover, despite the increasing focus of Russian and Soviet studies on issues of language, power and ideology, the sociological issues in translation have not been a major focus of this discipline. In the broader field of historical and cultural studies, a relatively large body of research exists on cultural contact between the Soviet Union and the West. Most of this centres around the formal systems of intellectual and political exchanges, such as those carried out by the VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Links with Foreign Countries (*Vsesoiuznoe obshchestvo kul'turnoi sviazy s zagranitse*).⁸³

⁸¹ One such examination is Siobhan Brownlie, 'Examining Self-Censorship: Zola's *Nana* in English Translation', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani, pp. 205-234.

⁸² Katja Krebs, 'Anticipating Blue Lines: Translational Choices as Sites of (Self-) Censorship: Translating for the British Stage Under the Lord Chamberlain', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani, pp. 167-186.

⁸³ Major studies include: Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba 1928-1978* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); Stern; Frederick C. Barghoorn, *The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

While research on the linguistic aspects of Russian translation has a long history, studies of translation as a social or cultural phenomenon are somewhat less common. Two important book-length cultural studies of Russian translation exist. The earlier of the two is Lauren G. Leighton's *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America*.⁸⁴ Leighton attempts to compare the 'schools' of translation in America and Russia, though rather more space is devoted to the Russian context, and more attention to the theory and practice of translation — especially the translation of colloquial or nonstandard language — and to criticism of translation practices. This is a more polemical than sociological work, and it has significant weaknesses. Foremost is perhaps Leighton's weak engagement with the relevant theoretical literature; Catriona Kelly notes, for example, his 'confusion on basic linguistic terminology'.⁸⁵ In addition, Leighton's work is not historically comprehensive, and as an account of translation practice and theory it fails on account of being more anecdotal than analytical. Rather more successful is Maurice Friedberg's *Literary Translation in Russia: A Cultural History*,⁸⁶ which is the first major study of the history of Translation in Russia. The historical scope of the book spans Russian translation from its earliest origins in Kievan Rus' to the twentieth century giving, perhaps understandably, more attention to the last two centuries. Friedberg also deals with theoretical questions and issues of the 'translators' trade',⁸⁷ although the two chapters on these topics rather overlap. Overall, however, this is a pioneering first work in this area and lays a firm base for further study.

⁸⁴ Lauren G. Leighton, *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1991).

⁸⁵ Catriona Kelly, 'Review of Lauren G. Leighton, *Two Worlds One Art*', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 70 (1992), 535-537 (p. 536).

⁸⁶ Friedberg, *Literary Translation*.

⁸⁷ Friedberg, *Literary Translation*, p. 109.

More recently, coinciding with the expansion of translation studies beyond Western European borders as the discipline grows, more attention has begun to be paid to Russian translation. A significant development in this area is the recent collection, *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts*,⁸⁸ which presents Eastern Europe and Russia ‘as a unique translation zone’.⁸⁹ The essays cover a broad historical timeframe, examining issues of ideology, political influences on translation and questions of nationalism, and seek to question the assumptions of Western translation studies. For example, Susanna Witt’s contribution engages with Bakhtin’s work, and examines the politics of translation in the Stalin era and shows how interlinear trots can act as a ‘space in-between’.⁹⁰

The largest and most wide-ranging body of work is Marianna Tax Choldin’s, on the import of Western texts into the Soviet Union, on which subject she has produced several articles and monographs. A librarian, Choldin focuses to a great extent on the import of texts to the Soviet Union and how political forces affect access to foreign literature, stressing the ideological controls placed upon foreign texts and the use of closed library collections to limit readers’ access, particularly in her articles on the book trade between the Soviet Union and the West.⁹¹ A major early work in the field of censorship and translation is the exhibition and related

⁸⁸ *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011).

⁸⁹ Brian James Baer, ‘Introduction: Cultures of Translation’, in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer, pp. 1-18 (p. 10).

⁹⁰ Susanna Witt, ‘Between the Lines: Totalitarianism and Translation in the USSR’, in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer, pp. 149-170 (p. 164).

⁹¹ See Marianna Tax Choldin, ‘Good Business, Bad Business, No Business: Selling Western Books to the Soviets’, in *Books, Libraries and Information in Slavic and East European Studies: Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Slavic Librarians and Information Specialists*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin (New York: Russica, 1986), pp. 254-271; Marianna Tax Choldin, ‘Access to Foreign Publications in Soviet Libraries’, *Libraries and Culture*, 26 (1991), 135-150.

catalogue compiled by Choldin in Moscow in 1993.⁹² The catalogue's excellent introductory material examines how translation of foreign works was situated in the Soviet system, and also contains a large list of books that were affected by textual censorship or placed in the closed library stacks. Choldin has also examined the censorship of translated literature in the nineteenth century, providing an in-depth historical background to the current research on the Soviet era.⁹³ Focusing on translations from German to Russian, she examines both the censorship apparatus including the censors themselves and the censorship process as applied to the target texts in question. She concludes that this system was largely ineffectual, being unable to stop the flow of foreign texts into Russia; and allowing potentially subversive works — such as Marx's *Das Kapital* — into the country while censoring irrelevant material.⁹⁴ Choldin has also carried out a number of investigations into censorship of foreign publications on a textual level. Drawing upon case studies focusing mainly on political texts, she discusses examples of textual manipulation in some detail,⁹⁵ concluding that the changes are evidence of active censorship.⁹⁶ However, she does not examine in detail precisely which changes are made by the translator, editor, or censor and so her work may be supplemented by further research that looks at the role of the translator him or herself and their interactions with editorial staff and indirect interactions with Glavlit.

Arlen Blum, who has published a number of important historical works on Soviet censorship, has also examined the censorship of foreign literature published in

⁹² Choldin, *Tsenzura inostrannykh knig*.

⁹³ Marianna Tax Choldin, *A Fence Around the Empire: Russian Censorship of Western Ideas Under the Tsars* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1985).

⁹⁴ Choldin, *A Fence Around the Empire*, pp. 202–203.

⁹⁵ Marianna Tax Choldin, 'The New Censorship: Censorship by Translation in the Soviet Union', *Journal of Library History*, 21 (2008), 334–349 (pp. 345–346).

⁹⁶ Choldin, pp. 21–52 (p. 48).

Internatsional'naia literatura. Translated literature was subject to the same pre-publication censorship process as Soviet literature, although it was often subject to less stringent restrictions, partly due to the desire of the Soviet Union to maintain a positive image abroad. Blum notes that the ideologically motivated choice of left-wing authors was balanced by the inclusion of major Western writers such as Hemingway and Joyce, and examines archival material relating to the publication of George Orwell, Ernest Hemingway and Heinrich Mann, demonstrating the complex negotiations which took place in order to publish material and make it acceptable for Soviet consumption.⁹⁷

A close examination of the censorship of a literary text was carried out by Julius Telesin, who listed and characterised the cuts made in the Soviet version of Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. The changes were, according to this analysis, made for ideological or political reasons: to avoid contravening Soviet political orthodoxy or presenting the Soviet Union in a negative light.⁹⁸ However, as I will show, censorship does not simply consist of the removal of material, but also in the manipulative re-writing of the source text. It would be useful then to re-examine the target text for signs of manipulation. Ann Vinograd has also carried out a case study of a single text, examining the alterations made to Kurt Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse 5*. She identifies changes made to material dealing with political language, sexual material and swearing, which she judges to be 'not justified by

⁹⁷ Blum, 'Internatsional'naia literatura' <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/bl21.html>>.

⁹⁸ Julius Telesin, 'For Whom the Scissors Cut: How to Improve Hemingway (Moscow Style)', *Encounter*, 46 (1976), 81-86.

translator's licence',⁹⁹ so resulting in 'an unscholarly, questionable job of translation'.¹⁰⁰

Focusing particularly on translations published in *Inostrannaia Literatura* in the 1980s, Teresa Cherfas examines how censorship operated in the selection and presentation of foreign texts. As well as the texts themselves, she focuses a great deal of attention on meta-texts, that is introductions and afterwords, which provide context for the translations. The choice of works is considered to be ideologically motivated and alterations are made to the text in order that they conform to Soviet standards of decency.¹⁰¹ The use of introductions in order to ideologically place the text is considered to be highly significant: 'more often than not, a Soviet introduction to the work will point out to the reader that one or another aspect of social collapse, human alienation, moral weakness is being depicted here, thus heralding the final disintegration of [Western] social fabric'.¹⁰²

After a gap of some years, a recent spate of studies has begun to emerge. Aoife Gallagher (cited above) has examined Pasternak's manipulation of *Hamlet* as a form of self-censorship, and its use of Aesopian language. Noting that Pasternak's translation uses current political language to make the figure of Hamlet more one-dimensional and more conventionally Soviet, she concludes that Pasternak subverts these norms and uses them to hide a representation of himself in the text.¹⁰³

Gallagher's most significant conclusion highlights the complexity of the translation/censorship process. Neither resistance nor compliance can be clearly delineated; the

⁹⁹ Ann C. Vinograd, 'A Soviet Translation of Slaughterhouse-Five', *Russian Language Journal*, 93 (2008), 14-18 (p. 14).

¹⁰⁰ Vinograd, 14-18 (p. 18).

¹⁰¹ Teresa Cherfas, 'Waugh and Peace Revisited: Russian Readers, Western Writers', *Encounter*, 64 (1986), 64-68 (p. 67).

¹⁰² Cherfas, 64-68 (p. 65).

¹⁰³ Gallagher, pp. 119-131 (pp. 128-129).

translator's reaction and the process of negotiation that occurs under censorship are extremely complex.¹⁰⁴

A recent article by Judith Inggs focuses on the censorship of children's literature in translation, a subject that has not yet received any attention in research relating to Russia or the Soviet Union. Inggs analyses Alexander Volkov's 1939 adaptation of *The Wizard of Oz* (*Volshebnik izmrudnogo goroda*), showing how censorship manifested itself in a number of simultaneously operating processes.¹⁰⁵

She also examines the way in which this adaptation, which differed in significant ways from its English source, gained its own cultural capital and functioned as a text in its own right in the Soviet context.¹⁰⁶

Some of the most interesting work on censorship of translation in Russia has been published by Brian James Baer. His work, which is heavily informed by the work of Michel Foucault, focuses not simply on the repressive aspects of censorship — the main focus of the earlier studies — but rather on the ways in which translators sought to evade censorship and engage with the reader, thus producing oppositional discourses. He has examined the ways in which Russian liberals sympathetic to the Decembrists sought to institute a covert literature, which readers could decode and reconstruct,¹⁰⁷ and an article on resistance in the work of gay translators in the Soviet period shows how they took advantage of the censors' blindness to homosexuality in

¹⁰⁴ Eil an Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris, 'Introduction', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 9-24 (p. 19).

¹⁰⁵ Judith A. Inggs, 'Censorship and Translated Childrens Literature in the Soviet Union: The

¹⁰⁶ Inggs, 77-91 (p. 88).

¹⁰⁷ Brian James Baer, 'Literary Translation in the Age of the Decembrists: The Birth of Productive Censorship in Russia', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle and others (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010), pp. 213-238.

literature to produce a ‘closet canon’.¹⁰⁸ Baer’s work is significant for its theoretical engagement, and for its willingness to adopt a broad definition of censorship that effectively engages with issues of resistance. This is an encouraging development from earlier case studies, which have tended towards describing how texts are destroyed or damaged in translation.

The literature on censorship in translation in Russia, then, is not extensive, but it seems that a new body of research, which draws upon contemporary theoretical frameworks, and views censorship as a more complex phenomenon is beginning to grow. What many, though not all, of the works cited on the Russian censorship of translation have in common is that they are relatively narrow case studies of one aspect or instance of censorship. A more comprehensive overview that combined study of both the macro level and the textual level would be a valuable addition to the work that has already been done.

¹⁰⁸Brian James Baer, ‘Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia: A Case Study in Productive Censorship’, *Translation Studies*, 4 (2011), 21-40 (p. 21).

Chapter 2: Censorship and the Censor

Theorising Censorship

Traditionally, accounts of Soviet censorship have tended to treat the phenomenon as a simplistic, top-down application of repressive power; these accounts tend to understand censorship as the action of authority against a downtrodden artist, and references and comparison to George Orwell's *1984* are frequently made.¹ Arlen Blum, who has written at length on the Soviet censorship system, and has produced several detailed histories of the censorship apparatus, argues forcefully that censorship is 'one of the most awful of humanity's inventions; it is, in my opinion, an absolute evil'.² In this work, while he acknowledges the variations in censorial action — and makes passing reference to Freud's writing on censorship, Blum defines censorship as a strictly repressive phenomenon:

A systematic, single-minded and universal control, enacted by the state (in countries with a secular regime) or an official church (in a theocratic state) over the functioning of the media by means of particular actions of a more or less violent character.³

These statements contain an implicit understanding of the *uncensored* text as pure, free expression that would exist were it not for the actions of the censorial authority. Even where these studies acknowledge the various agents who may act as censors in

¹See, for example: Tomas Ventslova, 'Igra s tsenzorom', *Staroe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 1 (2001) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/slo/2001/1/tomvench-pr.html>> [accessed 15 April 2011]; Arlen Viktorovich Blum, *Za kulisami "ministerstva pravdy": Tainaia istoriia Sovetskoi tsenzury, 1917-1929* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1994).

²Arlen Viktorovich Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade: Tsenzura v gody Ottepeli, Zastoia i Perestroiki 1953-1991* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2008), p. 253.

³Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, pp. 253–254.

the Soviet context,⁴ there is a tendency to treat censorship only as a destructive force and a focus on censorship as a conscious, deliberate act.

Western scholarship has, in the last two decades, questioned these assumptions. The literature on this topic has focused increasingly on the redefinition of censorship. Michel Foucault's theorisations of power have contributed greatly to this 'new censorship'.⁵ The following statement of his is particularly enlightening:

The exercise of power is not simply a relationship between partners, individual or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others. Which is to say, of course, that something called Power, with or without a capital letter, which is assumed to exist universally in a concentrated or diffused form, does not exist. Power exists only when it is put into action, even if, of course, it is integrated into a disparate field of possibilities brought to bear upon permanent structures. This also means that power is not a function of consent. In itself it is not a renunciation of freedom, a transference of rights, the power of each and all delegated to a few (which does not prevent the possibility that consent may be a condition for the existence or the maintenance of power); the relationship of power can be the result of a prior or permanent consent, but it is not by nature the manifestation of a consensus.⁶

Foucault's work posits a new theorisation of power as a decentred phenomenon, a relationship between agents, rather than a force exerted from above. This kind of description of power has had a great impact on conceptualisations of authority and

⁴ See for example these two studies which outline the structure of Soviet censorship and describe the role of authors, editors etc: Arlen Viktorovich Blum, *A Self-administered Poison: The System and Functions of Soviet Censorship* (Oxford: Legenda European Humanities Research Centre, 2003); *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* ed. By Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg.

⁵ Beate Müller, 'Censorship and Cultural Regulation: Mapping the Territory', in *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*, ed. by Beate Müller (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 1-32 (p. 5).

⁶ Foucault, 777-795 (p. 787).

power relations, and, as a result, of censorship, which is a practice embedded in relationships of authority. The erasure of binary divisions of total freedom versus total repression has been seized upon by Western critics to expand the borders of what has traditionally been considered censorship, putting forward compelling arguments against conceiving of it (only) in terms of ‘sovereign agency and [...] as deliberate policy put into practice by those in power’,⁷ and arguing for the existence of censorship as a broad cultural phenomenon which exists in all aspects of society, and which governs behaviour in multiple ways. In this vein, Stanley Fish argues that without discursive limits, no discursive production would be possible and, therefore, that limitation is always a necessary precondition of speech: ‘restriction, in the form of an underlying articulation of the world that necessarily (if silently) negates alternatively possible articulations, is constitutive of expression’.⁸

The idea that limitation is a precondition of speech is proposed by Pierre Bourdieu. His essay ‘Censorship and the Imposition of Form’ minimises the individual responsibility of the agent for limiting speech, shifting the focus instead to more abstract, dissipated forces that do not reside in any one agent. Bourdieu describes the way in which discourse is initially limited as ‘structural censorship’, stating, ‘it is the structure of the field itself which governs expression by governing both access to expression and the form of expression’.⁹ In the literary field, for example, agents are positioned in a hierarchy of relations, with tension existing between producers of cultural goods and various authorities or legitimising

⁷ Müller, pp. 1-32 (p. 5).

⁸ Stanley Fish, *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech: And It's a Good Thing Too* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 102.

⁹ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.

institutions.¹⁰ This ‘structural censorship’ is, according to Bourdieu, an initial, unconscious and necessary condition of all discursive production. The emphasis here is on field over agent, highlighting the way in which the structure of the field creates discourse, by defining what is sayable:

By imposing form, the censorship exercised by the structure of the field determines the form [...] and, necessarily, the content, which is inseparable from its appropriate expression and therefore literally unthinkable outside of the known forms and recognized norms.¹¹

Structural censorship is linked to the action of the habitus, the ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ embedded in agents through their positioning in the field. The habitus is inculcated in the agent by the milieu in which that agent is located and governs and limits the agent’s behaviour — it both structures the actions of the agent and is structured by that agent’s actions and experiences. The action of the habitus has also been described as knowing the ‘rules of the game’, or the unconscious internalisation of norms.¹²

Other critics have taken a lead from Bourdieu’s work in the theorisation of censorship. Michael Holquist characterises censorship as all-encompassing and unavoidable, stating, ‘to be for or against censorship as such is to assume a freedom no one has. Censorship *is*. One can only discriminate among its more and less repressive effects’.¹³ This description sees censorship as a deep means of controlling discourse. The understanding of censorship as a structural necessity foregrounds the

¹⁰ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), p. 122.

¹¹ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 139.

¹² Pierre Lemaire and Pierre Bourdieu, ‘From Rules to Strategies: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu’, *Cultural Anthropology*, 1 (1986), 110-120 (p. 113).

¹³ Michael Holquist, ‘Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship’, *PMLA*, 109 (1994), 14-25 (p. 16).

productive nature of censorship, following on from Foucault's work which foregrounds the dissemination of power, and its productive nature.¹⁴ If censorship is all-encompassing, then there is no such thing as an *uncensored* text, 'but a proliferation of always already-revised, already-partial, always already-censored versions'; texts are 'always already censored'.¹⁵ This contradicts the general description of censorship in accounts by scholars of the Soviet Union, who conceive of censorship as the repression or destruction of literature, of the state versus the otherwise free creative author.¹⁶ Theorists of the 'new' censorship make it clear that the reality of censorship is far more complex.

However, an extremely broad definition of censorship, although it opens up new avenues for investigation, also poses several problems. Sue Curry Jansen, in her book *Censorship: the Knot that Binds Power and Knowledge* (the title strongly recalls Foucault's own writing), goes even further, proposing an extremely broad definition of censorship as an essential force in all societies:

My definition of the term encompasses all socially structured proscriptions or prescriptions which inhibit or prohibit dissemination of ideas, information, images, and other messages through a society's channels of communication whether these obstructions are secured by political, economic, religious, or other

¹⁴ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), p. 194.

¹⁵ Richard Burt, '(Un)Censoring in Detail: The Fetish of Censorship in the Early Modern Past and the Postmodern Present', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 17-41 (p. 30).

¹⁶ This is strikingly demonstrated in the title of Katherine Bliss Eaton's edited collection of essays, *Enemies of the People: The Destruction of Soviet Literary, Theater, and Film Arts in the 1930s*, ed. by Katherine Bliss Eaton (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2002).

systems of authority. It includes both overt and covert proscriptions and prescriptions.¹⁷

This definition, to my mind, conflates the overt and covert regulation of discourse. By grouping such diverse notions as the Western literary market and the repression and even murder of writers, under one umbrella term, Jansen implicitly erases the very real differences between them. This model of censorship provides no way to distinguish between and compare different practices of regulation, seeming to render them all equally benign by association.

Another significant problem with the ‘new’ censorship is that its advocates rarely discuss concrete examples, preferring instead to see censorship in broad and fairly abstract terms. Jansen’s own examination of censorship *in situ*, especially her examples of censorship in the Soviet Union, tend to focus on state or institutional control of discourses in the traditional sense: she focuses particularly on the fates of authors, mentioning the purges of Pil’niak and Zamiatin which ‘signalled an expansion of the role of the state in the restrictive control of literature’,¹⁸ and in the actions of the state embodied in Lenin and Stalin. The difficulty of avoiding reference to state power is particularly marked in the Soviet context where instances of official control continually arise. This aspect of Soviet censorship practices is clearly reflected in the concept of *vsetsenzura*,¹⁹ the perceived ubiquity of censorship in the Soviet Union: censorship was seen as an integral part and instrument of the

¹⁷ Sue Curry Jansen, *Censorship: The Knot That Binds Power and Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 221.

¹⁸ Jansen, p. 116.

¹⁹ For a survey of censorship based upon this term, see: T. M. Goriaeva, *Politicheskaia trsenzura v SSSR. 1917-1991 gg.*, Kul’tura i vlast’ ot Stalina do Gorbacheva. Issledovaniia (Moscow: Rosspen, 2002).

Soviet system as a whole,²⁰ ‘possessing differing means of manipulation’.²¹ *Vsetsenzura* also encompasses the idea that external censorship exercises such a strong influence on text producers that the norms of censorship become internalised.²² Soviet censorship is thus regarded as an integral part of literary and cultural production.

Structural censorship, then, can be an elusive concept, often appearing to be slightly beyond the reach of the researcher. Consequently, some critics have voiced concern that this postmodern reaction against simplistic models of censorship has moved too far in the other direction, that these theorisations define *all* limitations of discourse as censorship. As Müller notes, ‘while censorship always implies the control and regulation of discourses, the reverse is not true because not all discourse regulation is equivalent to censorship’.²³ This tendency to gather all forms of social control under the term ‘censorship’ even prompts Frederick Schauer to say that, ‘censorship per se is not as ontologically useful as a category as we have often thought’.²⁴

Thus, ‘it is essential that we define boundaries lest the term “censorship” become meaningless’;²⁵ this is especially important when discussing the Soviet experience. Whereas authority may be dissipated in the capitalist system, the Soviet cultural field remained extremely hierarchical and dominated by an imposed

²⁰ Martin Dewhirst and Robert Farrell, *The Soviet Censorship* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1973), p.

2.

²¹ T. M. Goriaeva, ‘Nesvobodnoe radio dlia nesvobodnykh liudei’, in *Iskliuchit’ vsiakie upominaniia*, ed. by T. M. Goriaeva (Moscow: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 78-106.

²² Goriaeva, p. 7.

²³ Müller, pp. 1-32 (p. 12).

²⁴ Frederick Schauer, ‘The Ontology of Censorship’, in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 147-168 (p. 164).

²⁵ Klaus Petersen, ‘Censorship! Or Is It?’, in *Interpreting Censorship in Canada*, ed. by Klaus Petersen and Allan C. Hutchison (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), pp. 3-18 (p. 13).

ideology. It seems inappropriate to treat an innate awareness of appropriate language norms and the system of purges, repression and camps as one and the same thing, and we risk trivialising real acts of violence and ‘flatten[ing] distinctions among kinds of power’,²⁶ and its associated mechanisms. It would be appropriate, then, to attempt to make some distinction between structural censorship and individual acts or systems of censorship without losing the valuable breadth of understanding that has been created by postmodern theorists. Bourdieu, although most often cited as seeing censorship in terms of dissipation, acknowledges a link between structural censorship and explicit forms of control:

The need for this censorship to manifest itself in the form of explicit prohibitions, imposed and sanctioned by an institutionalised authority, diminishes as the mechanisms which ensure the allocation of agents to different positions (and whose very success ensures their anonymity) are increasingly capable of ensuring that the different positions are occupied by agents able and inclined to engage in discourse (or to keep silent) which is compatible with the objective definition of the position.²⁷

This acknowledgement of a link seems to imply some kind of separation between two forms of control: implicit and explicit. Historical accounts of Soviet censorship seem to point to censorship as a set of multiple practices, with several actors at all levels in the hierarchy: the leader, the Party, the censorship agency, the editor and the author (translator). These agents perform differently, but all are, at various points, involved in censorship, whether explicitly (Glavlit’s removing a work from circulation, for example) or implicitly (an author choosing not to use a taboo word

²⁶ Robert Post, ‘Censorship and Silencing’, in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post, Issues & Debates. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 1-16 (p. 4).

²⁷ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.

without prior instruction). Implicit and explicit censorship may be practised by one and the same agent.

In this study, therefore, I characterise Soviet censorship as a system of control which can range from explicit orders to the implicit actions of the author him/herself, all of which result from the overarching state ideology, responding to a call from Judith Butler to regard censorship as a continuum, from explicit censorship to implicit censorship.²⁸ Employing this concept allows for an appreciation of the various manifestations of censorship, which ‘is not created through contrast with popular or naive usage of the term. Instead, it responds to its common application’.²⁹

Crucially, to conceptualise censorship as a continuum allows for an appreciation of the ways in which censorship is historically located and inherently pluralistic. Without negating the welcome breadth of view achieved by Foucauldian theorists of censorship, an understanding of censorship as operating along a continuum offers a frame to view instances of censorship individually, while making connections to broader social forces. Such a view prompts a comparative approach — the researcher is able to make judgements about specific censorial acts in relation to others, historically and geographically. Jan Plamper notes:

Once the nature of the interaction between censors and cultural producers is no longer determined a priori, once practices of cultural regulation in different times and places open up for comparison, the historian’s task becomes one of figuring out the

²⁸ Judith Butler, ‘Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor’, in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 247-260 (p. 249).

²⁹ Helen Freshwater, ‘Towards a Redefinition of Censorship’, in *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*, ed. by Beate Müller, Critical Studies (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 225-245 (p. 242).

commonalities and differences and ultimately the logic at work in each case.³⁰

Similarly, Helen Freshwater states that ‘censorious events should be analysed with critical emphasis upon their socio-historical specificity: such an approach foregrounds the *differences* between different types of censorship and the decisions taken by numerous censorious agencies, as well as their interaction’.³¹ This approach, comparing and contrasting instances of censorship and relating them to a broader whole seems to me a more fruitful approach than attempting to make one overarching definition, which appears to set a simple model of destructive censorship against the more complex operations of structural censorship. Indeed a focused treatment of specific censorial events may find that there is more than meets the eye to the operation of traditional state censorship.

Censorship Practices

I propose then to examine censorship not simply as an application of repressive power, but as a multiple, dispersed network of practices that vary geographically and historically. Bourdieu’s work on practice is extremely relevant here: his theoretical writing provides a useful framework for the study of censorship as a set of practices. Firstly, his conception of the field, which I have referenced above, is extremely useful for describing the interrelation between these agents and their practices. The field is the dynamic space in which practices are produced; any social formation is made up of fields, which adhere to their own set of rules and which are structured by the relative position of the agents that make it up. Bourdieu emphasises the

³⁰ Jan Plamper, ‘Abolishing Ambiguity: Soviet Censorship Practices in the 1930s’, *Russian Review*, 60 (2001), 526-544 (p. 527).

³¹ Freshwater, pp. 225-245 (p. 242).

autonomy of fields, stating that they have their ‘own laws of functioning, independent of those of politics and the economy’, a position which ‘runs counter to [...] the tradition of external explication, which one normally associates with sociology and which related the works directly to the economic and social conditions of the moment’.³² In the Soviet context, of course, external social conditions and events were at play in discursive production, and Bourdieu does accept the possibility of fields being affected by external conditions through refraction; a field with a lower ‘refraction coefficient’ was less autonomous and more susceptible to being altered by external determinants.³³ The Soviet literary field was unusual, since it ‘was a complex socio-political institution completely governed by the field of power’;³⁴ literary capital and political capital were closely connected in the Soviet context. I have already highlighted this fact in relation to interference in the journals’ work by institutions such as the Central Committee and, of course, the censorship agency, Glavlit. By viewing the agents in their respective fields, we can conceptualise their hierarchical relation, with tension existing between, producers of cultural goods and the various legitimising institutions.³⁵

The field, being the milieu in which an agent is located, governs and limits that agent’s behaviour, producing a set of dispositions, which Bourdieu terms the *habitus*. The *habitus*, the system of

³² Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, pp. 162–163.

³³ Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, p. 182. In addition, I bear in mind Ann Komaromi’s proposal of ‘reading Bourdieu artistically rather than scientifically’ and a model which stresses the permeability of boundaries between fields. Ann Komaromi, ‘The Unofficial Field of Late Soviet Culture’, *Slavic Review*, 66 (2007), 605–629 (p. 629).

³⁴ Maria Zalambani, ‘Literary Policies and Institutions’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Marina Balina (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 251–268 (p. 251).

³⁵ Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, p. 121.

endurable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organise practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them.³⁶

The habitus accounts for the actions of censors, since it is the habitus that defines the limit of the sayable in any given field. In relation to censorial practices, ‘the practical cognition and recognition of the immanent laws of a market and the sanctions through which they are manifested determine the strategic modifications of discourse’.³⁷ External interference on the part of institutions can structure dispositions, instilling in the censorial agents a deeply held understanding of what may (or may not) circulate in the field. Thus, a focus on censorship practices allows us to better appreciate how censorial events occupy points on the continuum of censorship, and also highlights the link between structural and explicit censorship. By conceiving of censorial agents as existing in a hierarchy within the Soviet cultural field, the relationship between the agents and their overlapping practices can be better illuminated. In this thesis, I will show how multiple agents could act as censors in the Soviet literary field; my choice of the term ‘censorial agents’,³⁸ highlights that these agents need not be officially designated as censors, or, indeed, act as censors at all times, and that censorship practices could vary in different locations in the field: ‘the agents involved in the selection of texts to be translated as well as in the selection of translation strategies are manifold and are all interwoven

³⁶ Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 72.

³⁷ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 78.

³⁸ Throughout I will try to identify censorial agents as translator, editor, Glavlit operative. Where this cannot be determined I will use ‘censor’ as an overarching term.

[...] Censorship is active at every single stage'.³⁹ In the next section I will discuss the position of these agents in the field, and their actions as censors.

Who was the Censor?

Glavlit and the Soviet Censorship Apparatus

Soviet censorship was all-encompassing in many ways. All printed and audio output — books, journals, newspapers, posters and radio programmes — were subject to control by the official censorship apparatus. The Main Administration of Literature and Publishing Affairs (*Glavnoe upravlenie po delam literatury i izdatel'stv*), usually known as Glavlit)⁴⁰ was founded in 1922 under the leadership of Pavel Ivanov Lebedev-Polianskii and employed around 1500 people to oversee the publication of literature, mass media and foreign publication.⁴¹ Glavlit carried out preventative censorship —approving texts for publication — as well as post-publication censorship; the organisation held responsibility for the censorship of manuscripts and printed periodical and non-periodical publications such as photographs, drawings and maps. In addition, it could forbid the publication of texts and issue instructions related to printing and publishing.⁴² During the 1920s, Glavlit's functions increased to take in other areas of cultural production such as theatre and radio scripts, 'continually grasping, through political censorship, ever newer spheres

³⁹ Michaela Wolf, 'Censorship as Cultural Blockage: Banned Literature in the Late Habsburg Monarchy', *TTR*, 15 (2002), 45-62 (p. 50).

⁴⁰ The name of the organisation changed several times between 1922 and Glavlit's dissolution in 1991 to coincide with changes in its place in the government structure, although the acronym Glavlit remained the same. Most significantly, the agency adopted responsibility for military and state secrets in 1946.

⁴¹ Richmond and Solodin, 581-590 (p. 582).

⁴² T. M. Goriaeva, 'Sovetskaia politicheskaia tsenzura: (Istoriia, deiatel'nost', struktura)', in *Iskliuchit' vsiakiie upominaniia: Ocherki istorii Sovetskoi tsenzury*, ed. by T. M. Goriaeva (Moscow: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 13-64 (p. 181).

of public life and even public perception [...] in relation to this tendency, Glavlit's apparatus and its local organs became complicated, enlarged and multiplied, turning into a kind of monster'.⁴³ In the following decade a noticeable strengthening of censorship took place, coinciding with the spread of repression and terror in other areas of society. The focus of the censorship apparatus' attention shifted: not only were economic and military secrets banned, political censorship was strengthened. As the Stalinist regime became more repressive, the censors themselves were also subject to purges, with several important members of Glavrepertkom (the censorship agency with responsibility for theatre) and Glavlit being removed from their posts.⁴⁴ This trend was to continue until Stalin's death; indeed, the years between 1946 and 1953 are referred to as 'the worst period in the history of Soviet literature and censorship'.⁴⁵ Political control of literature was extremely strict, and campaigns were carried out against 'cosmopolitan' and otherwise un-Soviet literature.

After Stalin's death, alongside processes of de-Stalinization in other spheres, a number of changes were implemented in the censorship apparatus and functions. Glavlit was placed under the direct control of the ministry of internal affairs in 1953, in order to 'prevent any unrest in the wake of Stalin's death';⁴⁶ at some later point in 1953, Glavlit was attached to the Committee for the Press under the Council of Ministers. Its name was changed to the Main Administration for the Preservation of Military and State Secrets in Print under the Council of Ministers of the USSR (*Glavnoe upravlenie po okhrane voennykh i gosudarstvennykh tain v pechaty pri Sovete Ministrov*), and the 'reattachment of Glavlit to the USSR Council of Ministers

⁴³ Gorიაeva, p. 182.

⁴⁴ Gorიაeva, p. 209.

⁴⁵ Ermolaev, p. 99.

⁴⁶ Ermolaev, p. 142.

represented a step in the direction of curtailing the functions of the security police'.⁴⁷

In 1954, Glavlit communicated to the Central Committee of the Communist Party that in all there were 6708 employees, of whom seventy-seven per cent were Party members; 305 worked in the central office.⁴⁸ Glavlit's previous responsibilities began to be taken over by other specialist bodies such as the Ministry of Culture, and so the Khrushchev period was characterised by 'Glavlit's shrinking authority',⁴⁹ as responsibility for censorship practices was transferred away from official censors towards editors and editorial boards, facilitating a move from a system of external censorship to one predominantly characterised by internal censorship. Editors worked together with authors to bring a manuscript into a publishable state, only at the very end submitting it to Glavlit for authorisation to publish. On occasion, high-ranking members of the Party, including Khrushchev, became involved in the censorship process. The increasing independence of editors allowed relaxation in the censorship process; this period is notable for some liberalisation of literature.

Like Russian items, foreign texts were also regulated by Glavlit, and in this regard, Glavlit's first function was to control the import of untranslated texts into the Soviet Union. Foreign items were intercepted upon arrival in the Soviet Union by Glavlit operatives at the main post office and checked by Glavlit agents who, in the Stalinist period at least, removed unsuitable sections from imported texts. The censorship agency, Glavlit, was one of the primary agencies involved in regulating the import of foreign, untranslated, texts into the Soviet Union. The foreign section (*Inootdel*) was set up at the same time as Glavlit itself to regulate the flow of foreign items into the Soviet Union, and dealt with artistic literature, newspapers, and

⁴⁷ Ermolaev, p. 143.

⁴⁸ Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 14.

⁴⁹ Ermolaev, p. 144.

periodicals. This sub-section was staffed by political editors with higher education and knowledge of two or three languages; by the 1950s *Inootdel*'s 47 employees dealt with around forty languages between them.⁵⁰

Glavlit seized items that contained anti-Soviet material (insults against the USSR, its policies and leadership, and the Red Army), so-called fascist or Trotskyite material,⁵¹ and insults against Marxism and communism. In addition to removing harmful material from circulation entirely, *Inootdel* operatives controlled readers' access to foreign literature, making sure that it was received only by the appropriate institutions, and preventing the broad distribution of unsuitable items. In the post-Stalin era censorial activity focused only on the approval, or otherwise, of imported items and, as before, was primarily concerned with the blocking of anti-Soviet and religious messages in foreign texts.⁵² Readers' access to inappropriate material was one of *Inootdel*'s main concerns. A 1957 letter to the Central Committee notes, 'in censorial control, all publications containing anti-Soviet material, leaflets, vulgar publications and religious propaganda are retained and not distributed to private persons. On average, Glavlit retains and destroys around two thirds of all publications sent to private addresses'.⁵³ As well as outright destruction, access to potentially harmful foreign texts could be limited by depositing them in the

⁵⁰ Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 14.

⁵¹ The terms 'fascist' and 'Trotskyite' had specific, negative, meanings in Soviet discourse; Trotskyism was used as a generic insult against all positions deviating from the Stalinist, 'correct', way. Fascist was also used to define the Soviet Union's enemies; the epithet 'fascist' was used indiscriminately to refer to America and other capitalist countries in the Stalinist era, since 'fascism' was seen as the 'ultimate other'. S. G Payne, 'Soviet Anti-Fascism: Theory and Practice, 1921-45', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 4 (2003), 1-62 (p. 56).

⁵² Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GA RF), f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, ll. 25-30. Correspondence with the Central Committee, ministries and departments on questions of foreign literature. 1957.

⁵³ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, l. 96.

spetskhran — a special library collection with limited access.⁵⁴ A huge number of texts were placed in *spetskhrany*; the Lenin Library's, for example, held more than one million items.⁵⁵ The *spetskhrany* were regulated by Glavlit; *Inootdel* held a catalogue of books and periodicals that had already undergone censorship with notes on the censors' decision.⁵⁶ The censor checked this catalogue before reading a given item, and noted the previous judgement in his or her report;⁵⁷ this catalogue helped the censors decide which items should be placed in the *spetskhran* and which could be allowed for general access. The fate of a foreign title depended on a number of factors: the 'censor had to be aware of the political platform of an author and his [sic] loyalty towards the Soviet Union and Communist Party'.⁵⁸ Many books in foreign languages were automatically placed in a *spetskhran* upon receipt at the post office in the Soviet Union.⁵⁹ Access to these *spetskhrany* was limited to those with a particular purpose, such as specialist researchers and translators, and was on a reference-only basis.⁶⁰ Only once a translator had permission for and a contract to translate could a working copy of a text held in the *spetskhran* be made. At *Inostrannaia literatura* those members of staff who did not have a specific need to

⁵⁴ For a personal account of the *spetskhran*, see Andrei Rogatchevski, 'Homo Sovieticus in the Library', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 54 (2002), 975-988.

⁵⁵ *Tsenzura v Tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuz: Materialy konferentsii 24-27 maia 1993 g.: Moskva*, ed. by T. V. Gromova (Moscow: Rudomino, 1995), p. 16.

⁵⁶ According to former censor Vladimir Solodin, by the end of the 1980s this card catalogue held more than one million records; it was destroyed upon the liquidation of Glavlit owing to a lack of computers onto which the information could be recorded and the absence of a suitable archive into which it could be placed (N.A. Mitrokhin and Vladimir Solodin, "Ubezhdenn, chto rabotal na stabil'nost' godudarstva" Interv'iu V.A. Solodina', in *Iskliuchit' vsiakiye upominaniia: ocherki istorii Sovetskoi tsenzury*, ed. by T. M. Gorjaeva (Moskva: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 315-331.), despite the fact that the Glavlit archive is currently held by the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF). This source would undoubtedly have held a huge amount of useful information on the current topic.

⁵⁷ Gromova, p. 16.

⁵⁸ Olga Sinitsyna, 'Censorship in the Soviet Union and Its Cultural and Professional Results for Arts and Art Libraries', *Inspel*, 33 (1999), 35-42 (p. 38).

⁵⁹ Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 88.

⁶⁰ GARF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1088, l. 9. Correspondence with the Central Committee on questions of literature seized on entry to the USSR or export abroad, 1961.

read foreign literature could only access the *spetskhran* of Foreign Literature Publishing House with special permission of the editorial board.⁶¹ The *spetskhran* was no black hole; texts could be returned, political climate permitting, to general circulation. The process of returning texts to the open collections began in the Khrushchev era,⁶² and many foreign and Soviet works were rehabilitated at this time. Of course, the opposite was also true: if political circumstances changed and topics or names became taboo then texts were deposited in the *spetskhran*. Solzhenitsyn, for example, is one of the most famous victims of these changing fortunes, becoming a victim of increased censorship in the “stagnation” of the Brezhnev period. This fluidity highlights the fact that censorship practices were defined by currently politically acceptable topics and themes: the control of text choice was aimed at ‘forcing the public to read what was prescribed for it, not allowing people any space outside state control. The obligatory literary selection should be the only one accessible to the whole of the country’s population’.⁶³

Glavlit’s functioning was distinguished by its secrecy: the existence of ideological censorship was not officially acknowledged, as Glavlit’s stated aim was the protection of state secrets. However, it was widely known among writers, editors and readers that texts were continually censored for ideological and political reasons. Glavlit’s censorial staff was comprised of political editors overseen by administrators. They were split into Russian and foreign literature departments and an administration and control department. The editors worked in accordance with the *perechen’*, sometimes informally called the *Talmud*. This document contained

⁶¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 2. Instructions to *Inostrannaia literatura* staff, 1955.

⁶² GARF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1113, l. 15. Minutes of meeting of Glavlit staff, 1962.

⁶³ V. D Stelmakh, ‘Reading in the Context of Censorship in the Soviet Union’, *Libraries and Culture*, 36 (2001), 143-150 (p. 145).

guidelines on forbidden topics and information, and defined what information was considered a state secret; it contained lists of authors and texts banned from circulation. The censorship and publication process was long and complex: for literary texts the manuscript was first checked by the journal's or publishing house's editors and, subsequently, a Glavlit censor attached to the journal or publisher checked printed proofs which were authorised and stamped accordingly. After this, a number of copies were made up and distributed to the Glavlit plenipotentiary, the publishing house, the local Glavlit office and the Press Section of the Party Central Committee. If this was approved, production commenced and the first issues of the run were sent to the NKVD, the Central Book Chamber and the research libraries of the Russian Republic. All items were checked both pre- and post-printing, and censorship was handled by a large number of people. In the censorship of literature, negotiations between censors, editors and authors were very often entered into: the editor acted as go-between, and authors had no direct contact with censors. The censorship process was seen as a way to educate writers and explain the faults in their texts: censorship had a pedagogical nature.⁶⁴ This fact is significant when considering the relatively informal censorship applied to translated literature which was principally in the hands of editors and translators, rather than official censors, a point to which I will return in the course of the analysis. Retrospective censorship could be carried out in a number of ways: products were withheld from circulation, or retrieved from circulation if already published; products were placed in

⁶⁴ Jan Plamper, 'Russia: Archives of Soviet Censorship', in *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. by Derek Jones (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001), pp. 2093-2095 (p. 2094). On the censor as pedagogue see also Laura Bradley, 'GDR Theatre Censorship: A System in Denial,' *German Life and Letters*, 59 (2006), 151-162 (pp. 154-155).

spetskhrany to which the general public was not admitted; alterations and annotations could be made to products after their circulation.⁶⁵

The Editor as Censor

Below the institutional level, there is a less unitary model of censorship, particularly in the post-Stalin era. Translated literature is an excellent forum for exposing the multiple agents and practices. This is not to say that Glavlit had no influence in the work of journals and publishers — but the practices of the editors and translators are extremely important here. When moving below the institutional level, examining censorship practices becomes a more difficult task, and censorship becomes a more ambiguous phenomenon. The processes at work are more subtle and, often, not formally recorded; when editors and translators function as censorial agents, ‘there comes into being a system of nods and winks in which everyone — editors, authors, publishers, translators, readers — more or less knows the rules’.⁶⁶ For this reason, the archival documents available for the case studies examined here are invaluable for drawing out the details of editors’ and translators’ censorship, where it might otherwise be obscure to the researcher — typescripts and other documents are available for the texts published in *Inostrannaia literatura*.

In the post-Stalin period, Glavlit began to occupy a less central role in the implementation of censorship; in the fifties the Central Committee transferred the main burden of censorship to editors and publishers, with Glavlit checking texts only as the final proofs were printed, and only strictly holding responsibility for the

⁶⁵Plamper, 526-544 (p. 531).

⁶⁶Looby, 47-54 (p. 48).

protection of state and military secrets.⁶⁷ Glavlit's internal documents emphasise that censors 'are not political editors and do not interfere in the functioning of the editors'.⁶⁸ In order to manage this transfer of power and outline their new advisory role, Glavlit introduced in 1962 a series of *besedy* [conversations or discussions] with editors and representatives of publishing houses to teach them about the censorship requirements; the *besedy* were consciously aimed at instituting the internalisation of censorship standards and knowledge of the *perechen*'.⁶⁹ Glavlit agents thus began to act increasingly as partners in the censorship process; the formal censorship system became, to a greater extent than in the Stalinist period, a multi-agent process. Glavlit internal circulars document this change: 'individual actions turn out poorly: we need to act collectively. The censor does not have the right to make reprimands of a political-ideological character to editors'.⁷⁰ Glavlit came to act more as a control mechanism in the publication process,⁷¹ since editors and other text producers were judged to have internalised the standards for publication.⁷² Despite these claims, it is clear that there was still interference from further up the hierarchy, albeit more subtle than in previous years; nonetheless, editors did begin to act as the first, if not the last, line of censorship.⁷³ Editors served as the link between the official censorship apparatus and the author or translator. Glavlit's agents rarely came into contact with authors or translators, conducting

⁶⁷ Mitrokhin and Solodin, pp. 315- 331 (p. 321).

⁶⁸ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 969, l. 14. Glavlit yearly report for 1957.

⁶⁹ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1113, l. 21. Minutes of meeting of Glavlit board, 1962.

⁷⁰ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1114, l. 109. Minutes of meeting of head Glavlit workers with head of Glavlit, 1962.

⁷¹ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 202. Minutes of Glavlit conference, 1959.

⁷² Blum, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 46.

⁷³ Ioulia Zaretskaïa-Balsente, *Les Intellectuels et la censure en URSS (1965-1985): de la vérité allégorique à l'érosion du système* (Paris: Harmattan, 2000), p. 145.

correspondence via the responsible editor.⁷⁴ Tension could arise between the censor and editor due to the variance in each agent's professional task.⁷⁵ Boris Zaks, who served as an editor at *Novyi mir* during the Khrushchev era, characterises the relationship as purely antagonistic, judging *Novyi mir* to have enacted a victory over Glavlit.⁷⁶

In the texts under examination in this study, there is significant evidence of editorial involvement; typescripts from the archival holdings of *Inostrannaia literatura* show repeated alterations in editors' hands, and minutes of meetings allow us to examine debates on the editorial side about the content of the works published. While there is no concrete evidence available for *Internatsional'naia literatura*, since the translators' typescripts for these texts do not survive in the archive, it seems reasonable to assume that editors did carry out many of the textual changes analysed here, albeit perhaps with more direct involvement from Glavlit. The editor's role, in addition to their normal literary duties, was to ensure that unsuitable material did not make it through the text-selection, translation and publication processes. The responsible editor checked and signed off the typescript at every stage. First, the translated typescript was checked; examination of typescripts shows that the editors made both stylistic and political changes at this point. Once this was done — it could take two drafts — the typescript was printed and checked again, and then signed off by the editor. Five copies of the printed proofs were produced: the first was the

⁷⁴ Boris Zaks, 'Censorship at the Editorial Desk', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg, pp. 155-161 (p. 158).

⁷⁵ Elina Erzikova, 'Subversion of Censorship in Soviet Journalism: Komsomolskaya Pravda's Contribution in Preparation for Gorbachev's Perestroika and Its Implications for the Contemporary Russian Media' (presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, 2008)
<http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/3/2/0/0/p232005_index.html>
[accessed 23 June 2010].

⁷⁶ Zaks, pp. 155-161 (p. 156).

printing copy; the second was signed by the chief editor and his deputy; the third was sent to the 'checking section' which checked and signed off facts, dates and names. The fourth and fifth copies were distributed to members of the editorial board.⁷⁷ Once it had passed through the tight net of editorial sanction, the text was approved for printing. Then, as with all literary publications, the galley proofs were submitted to Glavlit for checking, although, by this point *Inostrannaia literatura*'s documents show that almost all the changes that appear in the published texts had been made. The final signature issues were submitted to Glavlit yet again before the issue was approved for distribution.

Since they formed a link between the Party apparatus and literary actors, editors were closely connected to the interests of the Party and political authority. Erna Shakhova referred bitterly to the changes she made to John Updike's *Rabbit, Run* as 'idiotic', and spoke of her attempts 'not to completely spoil the author's text'.⁷⁸ Bourdieu characterises as 'double personages' those agents, such as publishers or gallery directors, who embody contradictory dispositions, and who therefore negotiate between different fields.⁷⁹ Stephen Parker and Matthew Philpotts, whose work focuses on *Sinn und Form*, a key literary journal in the German Democratic Republic, propose that editors also function as a double personage or double agent, since they require the ability to mobilise both cultural and economic capital in their role.⁸⁰ In an authoritarian culture, the editor's duality is likely to be split between the literary and political fields, with editors having to negotiate

⁷⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 2, l. 1. Instructions to *Inostrannaia literatura* staff, 1955.

⁷⁸ Erna Shakhova, 'Rol' redaktora v izdanii knigi', in *Översättning som kulturöverföring: Rysk-svenska och Svensk-ryska översättningsproblem*, ed. by Barbara Lönnqvist (Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag, 1993), pp. 131-145 (p. 145).

⁷⁹ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), p. 216.

⁸⁰ Stephen Parker and Matthew Philpotts, *Sinn und Form: The Anatomy of a Literary Journal* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), p. 172.

between producers of symbolic and political capital; the editor is caught between the forces of autonomy and heteronomy.⁸¹ Parker and Philpotts propose the existence of a general editorial habitus — a particular set and combination of dispositions that embody the in-between status of the editorial role and the need to ‘combine the dispositions of the poet and of the (political) professional’.⁸² For the editors of the journals under investigation here, the disposition of the poet is strongly linked to their contacts with the West; editors occupied a privileged position in the cultural field, having access to foreign writers and trips abroad. They acted as representatives of the Soviet Union in the West and producers of the image of the West in the Soviet Union. The editors therefore combined a ‘Western’ literary habitus, conditioned by their exposure to and interaction with the foreign writers whom they published, and privileging literary qualities, with their Soviet habitus. The dispositions of the literary field were most valued by the authors and Western observers; the dispositions of the political field were valued (and, indeed, imposed) by the agents of authority.

The editor’s role was, therefore, contradictory by nature: at once the producer and controller of information, the editor as censor simultaneously played a policing role while trying to realise the interests of society as they saw them, by allowing at least some information to circulate.⁸³ This is attested to by editors themselves: some felt that censoring the texts was a compromise required in order that a text could be

⁸¹Parker and Philpotts, p. 172.

⁸²Parker and Philpotts, p. 173.

⁸³G. V. Zhirkov, ‘Ot tsenzorov-professionalov k tainym tsenzoram’, in *U mysli stoia na chasakh... tsenzory Rossii i tsenzura*, ed. by G. V. Zhirkov (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel’stvo Sankt-Petersburgskogo universiteta, 2000), pp. 3-23 (p. 20).

published in some form, holding to the attitude of ‘better something than nothing’.⁸⁴

The attitude that censorship was a necessary evil required to ensure the circulation of desired texts in the Soviet context seems to have been widespread among editorial staff, and has been compared to a Western writer making changes so that their work will be acceptable in the market place.⁸⁵ Quoting a conversation with the dissident intellectual Raisa Orlova, a founding member of the editorial board at *Inostrannaia literatura*, Maurice Friedberg states, ‘Orlova looked at me with some compassion; obviously I was a child who did not understand the facts of life. She said that they had to censor Hemingway because there was no other way to publish him’.⁸⁶

Editorial staff constantly negotiated between their own sense of literary worth and the requirements of the field of power, whether communicated via Central Committee decree or simply understood and internalised.⁸⁷ Editors, therefore, had to grasp the ‘rules of the game’ of the literary field and the field of power — this is the essence of the dual habitus.

Training manuals for editors also stressed this dual role, characterising the practice of editing as simultaneously a political, academic and literary act.⁸⁸

According to these textbooks, the editor has a responsibility both for the ideological and the artistic aspects of the texts:

First of all, the Soviet editor should master Marxist-Leninism, the knowledge of which is necessary for every active and conscious member of Communist construction and especially for workers on

⁸⁴Yuri Yaram-Agaev, ‘Soviet Censorship: Discussion’, in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg, pp. 53-67 (p. 61).

⁸⁵Gromova, p. 37.

⁸⁶Maurice Friedberg, ‘Soviet Censorship: A View from Outside’, in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice, pp. 21-28 (p. 26).

⁸⁷Orlova, p. 115.

⁸⁸Maurice Friedberg, *A Decade of Euphoria: Western Literature in Post-Stalin Russia, 1954-64* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), p. 152.

the ideological front [...] All this, however, is not enough to be a skilful, qualified, editor. The work of the editor is literary work.⁸⁹

Thus, the ideological and political aspects of editing are conceived of as part of one overarching creative process: the editor must work with the author or translator to balance the ideologically and artistically important aspects of the text; the editor acts as a mediator. Official instructions, of course, privilege the ideological aspect of text production, noting the editor's requirement to adhere to ideological norms: 'It is indisputable, for example, that the editor does not only have the right, but a duty, to demand that the contents of the manuscript meet the interests of the Soviet state, the principal of party-mindedness [*partiinnost'*] of literature, the tasks of safeguarding state and military secrets in print, the norms of language and style'.⁹⁰ It is surely significant that ideology, language and style are accorded the same importance in this pedagogical work. Editing manuals emphasise the Leninist foundation of editing as a profession, and see it as an act encompassing issues of both style and ideology. Indeed, style is seen as ideological in itself: 'in all his work on language and style, Lenin was most concerned with the great effect of the printed word, its influence on the toiling masses'.⁹¹

Inostrannaia literatura's documents demonstrate very clearly the action of the editor's dual habitus in their internal documents; they were constantly aware of the need for censorship in order to make texts suitable for inclusion in the journal, and they acknowledged that this sometimes resulted in the destruction of the artistic

⁸⁹ Friedberg, *A Decade of Euphoria*, pp. 83–84.

⁹⁰ N. M. Sikorskii, *Teoriia i praktika redaktirovaniia* (Moscow: Vysshiaia shkola, 1971), p. 262.

⁹¹ Sikorskii, p. 79.

structure and intention in the text by, for example, abridging a novel.⁹² It was normal for editors to suggest changes to texts in order to make them suitable for publication. E. Trushchenko, an editor and critic who wrote on the work of the French communist writer Louis Aragon, and the topic of socialist realism outside the USSR, noted of Wilson's *Meeting at a far Meridian* that, 'from many places in the book it is possible to take out the sense that in the cold war both we and they are to blame'.⁹³ Chakovskii, the chief editor, agreed, stating 'in the novel there are a number of moments which it would be desirable to remove or soften in translation'.⁹⁴

Editorial censorship was not simply instigated by editors themselves, of course; agents in the political field also influenced editorial practice, inasmuch as they made recommendations to, and had significant leverage over the actions of the editors, unsurprisingly, given the prominence of official censorship structures. For instance, one paragraph in an unnamed article proposed for the journal, which compared the American Arthur Miller and the Czech poet, playwright and reformist communist Pavel Kohout, was criticised in a letter from D. A. Polikarpov, head of the culture section of the Central Committee, to the chief editor Chakovskii: 'Linking under one heading, the "fashionable" "foreign" and risqué [*pikantnykh*] plays of [Arthur] Miller and the young communist writer from our brotherly country P. Kohout is in itself irresponsible.'⁹⁵ The archives record one illuminating instance of this interaction from spring 1960, centred on Wolfgang Koeppen's novel, *Der Tod in Rom* (*Death in Rome*). Chakovskii wrote a number of letters to Polikarpov asking

⁹²RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 239, l. 11. Report of editorial meeting concerning issue 1 of the journal for 1960.

⁹³RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 10. Minutes of meeting of editorial staff, 1960.

⁹⁴RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 10.

⁹⁵RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 23. Correspondence between D. A. Polikarpov and A. B. Chakovskii, 1960.

him to advise as to the suitability of this work for publication in the journal. Included with the letters were a partial translation of the novel and a *spravka* [note or piece of information] containing information on the author. While Chakovskii admitted that the book had some serious failings, he pointed out its merits, acknowledging the ability of the Central Committee to forbid its publication:

I would like to remind you that without an answer in the next one to two days, the journal will be put in a difficult position. If the Section decides against printing, then the journal of course will not enter into these difficulties. However we would not like to ruin two issues only because there was no answer.⁹⁶

Polikarpov attended a meeting of the editorial staff on 12 May 1960 and spoke about *Der Tod in Rom*. He proposed that specific changes be made in the novel, stating ‘the second part of the book excludes any possibility of publication’ and continuing ‘the question of the anti-communist places in the book could be removed by three cuts’.

⁹⁷ Polikarpov ended his contribution to the meeting by advising strongly against publication of the novel, given its alleged anti-Semitic and anti-communist content. It is significant, however, that at no point did he explicitly forbid its release, instead couching his language in terms of what would be preferable or better for the reader. He recognised the difficult position of the journal, which is ‘concerned with the literature of bourgeois society in the period of imperialism’.⁹⁸ In the event, Koeppen’s novel was published in *Inostrannaia literatura* years later, in 1965.

⁹⁶ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 53. Correspondence between D. A. Polikarpov and A. B. Chakovskii, 1960. Interestingly, Chakovskii, in appealing to the Central Committee to take the decision for him, is, to some extent, abdicating his censorial responsibility, attempting to act only as a literary agent, and not a political one.

⁹⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 58-60. Minutes of editorial meeting of *Inostrannaia literatura*, 12 May 1960.

⁹⁸ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 58.

Inostrannaia literatura's archival documents show that editors clearly conceived of this aspect of their work as censorship, and discussed it among themselves in precisely those terms. Chakovskii stated, at a meeting regarding the possible publication of Mitchell Wilson's *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, 'we need to underline with our "censor's pencil" places that provoke any kind of political doubt'.⁹⁹ Editorial changes to the text were, in theory, to be cleared with the author of the original text, and Chakovskii noted at the same meeting that 'we discussed these places for a long time with Mitchell Wilson, and he objected to some of them'.¹⁰⁰ Agreement with authors was not always forthcoming. A member of the editorial board, a certain Fradkin, complained at an editorial meeting in 1959 about unneeded and unauthorised changes:

Why does the journal sometimes make unauthorised cuts? It is, in a sense, the politics of the ostrich. We see the danger which threatens us tomorrow, but we do not see the danger that threatens us the day after that. It was not necessary to make any cuts in Remarque's novel, especially since some of them were made for reasons of excessive prudishness. There are some cuts that soften some political reminiscences in the novel. These should not have been made either. Perhaps you received a reprimand from some person in authority, but these unauthorised changes can create a situation in the West where you find yourself in an unpleasant situation and portrayed in a poor light; this could have been foreseen and avoided.¹⁰¹

Fradkin's comments display the operation of the dual habitus: while understanding his duties as a political actor, he emphasises the Western context and literary aspect

⁹⁹ RGALI, f. 1574, op. 3, d. 10, l. 10. Minutes of editorial board meeting, 1960.

¹⁰⁰ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 14.

¹⁰¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 66. Meeting of editorial board, translators and others connected with the journal, 28 December 1959.

of his work. Chakovskii responded strongly to this, stating that the cuts were indeed necessary, since they included portrayals of a brothel and a portrait of Trotskii; moreover, cuts in the texts were always acknowledged — this was a matter of pride for the journal. However, Chakovskii was being disingenuous here: while truly abridged texts — that is, those which were published only as extracts or selected chapters of a larger work — were certainly presented as such to the readers, other changes on a smaller scale were never acknowledged.

The editors' dual habitus resulted in a complex challenge to the work they carried out. Editors sought to balance the political and literary aspects of their work; in addition they had to balance their attachments to the Western context and their position in the Soviet cultural hierarchy, in order to produce texts that were suitable for publication, and that adequately reflected the Western culture they sought to portray.

The Translator as Censor

Perhaps even more so than the editorial staff, translators occupied multiple roles. They were artistic actors, but channelled the words of others; they were cultural actors in their own right, members of literary circles who often maintained close friendships with the foreign authors whose work they translated,¹⁰² but were also Soviet citizens, exposed to Soviet propagandistic public discourse and the instructions of the Party, the Union of Writers and other institutions. As cultural agents, translators occupied a difficult position between the source and target

¹⁰²For particularly interesting recollections of translators' relations with foreigners, see: Tat'iana Alekseevna Kudriavtseva, *Prevratnosti odnoi sud'by: Zapiski literatora i perevodchika* (Moscow: R. Valent, 2008); Elena Kalashnikova, *Po-Russki s liubov'iu: Besedy s perevodchikami* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2008).

cultures and between official institutions and literary production. Occupying the role of ‘double personage’ like the editor, the translator’s position prompts another prominent step in the censorship process. Censorship by the translator before the typescript is submitted to the editor can be considered self-censorship. Self-censorship occurs ‘prior to publication when the cultural agent censors his or her work voluntarily, in order to avoid public censorship, and/or in order to achieve approval from the dominating sector in society. Self-censorship may be conscious or unconscious (in which case social norms have been internalized)’.¹⁰³ Self-censorship is anticipatory, and ‘all texts produced for the censor would have presupposed the censor’; all cultural producers were aware of the censorship apparatus.¹⁰⁴ Elisabeth Gibbels emphasises the internal action of self-censorship among translators, calling them ‘complicit’ in reproducing authorised discourse and noting a tendency to err on the side of caution when translating.¹⁰⁵ She states:

Translators as tacit censors do not simply replace words that may cause offence or omit passages that could draw the attention of censorious institutions. They tinge the tone of the texts and make them readable and acceptable. This is no conscious choice, but an effect of their position in the system of symbolic production.¹⁰⁶

Of course the extent to which a translator is unconsciously anticipating censorship — in which case structural censorship is at play — and the extent to which the translators make conscious and calculated decisions is a vexed question, particularly in the Soviet context.

¹⁰³ Brownlie, pp. 205-234 (p. 206).

¹⁰⁴ Krebs, pp. 167-186 (p. 173).

¹⁰⁵ Gibbels, pp. 57-75 (p. 73).

¹⁰⁶ Gibbels, pp. 57-75 (pp. 74–75).

On one hand, it has been suggested that the dominant theory of translation promoted censorship via translation.¹⁰⁷ Realist translation usurped formalism as a method and became the dominant theory of translation in the Soviet Union from the 1930s. This school of translation was, as the name suggests, viewed as a branch of socialist realism,¹⁰⁸ and decreed that realist translation should truthfully represent the reality depicted in the text, that is, the ‘living reality as mediated by the original’,¹⁰⁹ striving for unity of form and content. The translator was expected to be aware of acting within the particular Soviet context and should attempt to portray in the translation all that was relevant and progressive for that context. This could entail minor omissions of unnecessary details of the source text that were not sufficiently progressive or useful.¹¹⁰ The emphasis on expressing reality and the focus on content granted the translator an interpretive role which, given the system of patronage and ideology, allowed them to alter the text to express what the original should say, rather than what it does say. Thus, there was an understanding that the translator had a right (or even a responsibility) to approach the texts with which they worked from an ideological standpoint, and censor them accordingly; censorship can be considered an integral part of the translators’ approach, embedded in the habitus.

Archival documents and personal statements made by translators indicate that, in addition to having an internalised understanding of norms, translators were, at least some of the time, reacting consciously to explicit instructions passed down from above, or learned through the experience of working as a translator attached to

¹⁰⁷ Friedberg, *Literary Translation*, p. 105.

¹⁰⁸ Ivan Kashkin, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel, 1968), p. 443; Givi Razhdenovich Gachechiladze, ‘Realism and Dialectics in the Art of Translation’, *Babel*, 13 (1970), 87-91.

¹⁰⁹ Givi Razhdenovich Gachechiladze, *Vvedenie v teoriu khudozhestvennogo perevoda* (Tbilisi: Izdatelstvo Tbilisskogo universiteta, 1970), p. 89.

¹¹⁰ Kashkin, p. 451.

the journal. The actions of *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura*'s translators were certainly prompted at a higher level: editors openly acknowledged that they could, for example, 'soften in translation' certain unacceptable sections.¹¹¹ Returning to the discussion of Koeppen's *Der Tod in Rom*, it is clear that Polikarpov's interference extended to the translators themselves. Deriding the book as 'disgusting', he expressed concern about the effects of its 'pornographic' aspects on young readers, and noted that, as well as his recommended editorial cuts, 'something can be done by way of *free translation*'.¹¹² It seems reasonable to assume that such a suggestion was intended as an instruction and was taken as such. Minutes of an editorial meeting from 1960 noted that the translator of *Death in Rome* wrote to the author for permission to make cuts to places 'of an openly erotic-naturalistic character (the main character is a homosexual)';¹¹³ the norms of the translation process were handed down from positions of authority, even if these authorities did not interfere in the actual process of translation directly.

Glavlit's own internal documents also noted the importance of translators as a link in the censorship chain. A report from 1958, for example, rebuked a translator for allowing 'mistakes' to survive in a text, necessitating their removal by the censor after it had been submitted to Glavlit.¹¹⁴ A similar memo from 1959 noted with disapproval 'insufficiently careful' translations.¹¹⁵ There was, therefore, a general understanding that an important role of translators was to censor their work before it reached Glavlit, and of course these official expectations filtered down to the

¹¹¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 17.

¹¹² RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 59. Minutes of meeting of editorial meeting attended by representatives of the Central Committee, 12 May 1960. Emphasis added

¹¹³ RGALI, f. 1537, op. 5, d. 304, l. 17. Minutes of meeting of editorial staff regarding plan for issue 5 for 1960.

¹¹⁴ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 42. Protocol no. 6, from meetings of senior staff in Glavlit, 16 November 1958.

¹¹⁵ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 442. Record of meeting of senior staff in Glavlit, 25 August 1959.

translators. Translators themselves, in the rare moments when they speak about this aspect of their work, sometimes acknowledge that they censored their translations. V. B. Dubin, a translator and sociologist, makes light of the constraints, treating them as a normal and unimportant part of life under socialism. He notes, ‘although it always seemed to us (or we convinced ourselves) that censorship was a terrible thing, omnipresent, all-powerful, all-knowing etc., it turned out that it was just funny stories not worthy of attention’.¹¹⁶ Some translators seemed to see, or at least publically portrayed, their translation choices as natural and necessary: Viktor Golyshev, a translator since the early 1960s, who has worked for *Inostrannaia literatura*, argues for the necessity of modifying erotic content and non-normative language when translating into Russian; he considers this to be a necessary consequence of the different cultural contexts, and implies that this kind of censorship is actually an *artistic* act:

They [i.e. Western audiences] have already become used to this, and when you repeat it, you destroy the proportions, so it comes out stronger than it does there. I think, therefore, that one should follow the author only in moderation. At the end of the seventies, I felt that translating was becoming more difficult, because *they* already wrote about *that*, and we did not. [...] And since we lag behind in what we consider normal literature, I think that we must take the complicated situation in our literary language as a starting point: you will soften [the text], and the censor will act, but not as an official person, you yourself will be the censor.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ Cited in Gromova, p. 33.

¹¹⁷ Irina Volevich and others, “‘Vsekh etikh slov po-russki net...’ (Kruglyi stol “IL”, posviashchennyi perevodu nenormativnoi leksiki)”, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1999) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/1999/7/krugl.html>> [accessed 7 March 2011]. Emphasis in original.

Translators' own complex understanding of their actions as censorship demonstrate the difficulty of making a clear distinction between censorship and non-censorship — that is, between the censored text and free expression or the 'evil' censorship and 'heroic' translator.¹¹⁸ In examining self-censorship, it is difficult to draw a constant and distinct line between external and internal, or conscious and unconscious, censorship.

Maria Tymoczko has described self-censorship as an example of Gramscian hegemony, as the point where institutional power acts to enforce dominant discourses and induce appropriate behaviour — active consent — in agents, stating that hegemony 'lies at the root of self-censorship in translation and self-limitation in general'.¹¹⁹ The existence of institutional censorship incites censorial action on the part of the translator, since formal censorship creates and enforces social, political and linguistic norms — this is what Bourdieu is referring to when he discusses the influence of external control on structural censorship.¹²⁰ External and internal censorship are thus closely intertwined and exist in a complex, mutually reinforcing relationship with one another. Tymoczko's use of Gramsci's terminology highlights the complex interaction between external and internal forces in censorship practice, and also the various forces at play here. Censorship was supported, if not always enacted, by the editorial staff of the journals, so the translators must have understood the standards that held sway. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish which *specific* examples of manipulation in translation are conscious censorship and which are the result of an unconscious internalisation of discursive norms, as Beate Müller reminds us:

¹¹⁸ Tymoczko, pp. 24-45 (p. 30).

¹¹⁹ Tymoczko, pp. 24-45 (p. 31).

¹²⁰ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.

Even authors who say they exercised self-censorship in recognition of potential repressions will not be objective, reliable witnesses to their own creations. For self-censorship is not necessarily a conscious process whereby the writer weighs the pros and cons of including or excluding a possibly contentious passage; the internalization of norms cannot easily be overcome, let alone reversed.¹²¹

The Translators' Section of the Soviet Writers' Union was responsible for ensuring the internalisation of censorship norms by translators. The Writers' Union, which was established in 1934, was a hierarchical and centralised institution that regulated writers and their work; its existence allowed for extensive Party control over literature.¹²² For translators, membership of the Translators' Section was *de facto* obligatory. Thus, the Translators' Section acted to enforce norms in several ways. Firstly, as a professional institution, it could govern the entry (or otherwise) of translators into the literary field. Secondly, as a forum for the training and education of translators, it was an important factor in the creation of their habitus and in the articulation of norms. A 1959 discussion in *Literaturnaia gazeta* on the position of translators in the Union portrays their role as explicitly ideological, stating that translators stood 'on the ideological front'.¹²³ Such a characterisation would certainly have had an impact on translators' understanding of their work.

One factor that must have impacted greatly on the extent of self-censorship practised by translators was the changing political context, particularly following Stalin's death. As other cultural agents felt an increasing freedom in the Thaw period, so too did translators. It is difficult to make concrete conclusions about the

¹²¹ Müller, pp. 1-32 (p. 25).

¹²² John Garrard and Carol Garrard, *Inside the Soviet Writers' Union* (London: Tauris, 1990), p. 9.

¹²³ Ia. Nemchinskii, 'Nebokhodima Konkretnost', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 3 May 1959, p. 3.

development of censorial practices over the course of translators' careers, but some tentative points might be made here.

Three of the translators of the texts examined here worked both for *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura*: Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina and Evgeniia Kalashnikova. There is a subtle indication of a move towards liberalization in the body of texts of the individual translators. If this simply reflects the increasing liberalisation of the Soviet literary field or is as a result of individual translators' personal development or, more likely, is a combination of the two, is a question that merits further attention. The two texts translated by Nina Daruzes differ in terms of their subject matter and in terms of the changes made at the level of the text. *Trouble in July* is an account of a lynching in the Depression-era South and, as such, is rather typical of the Stalin-era journal's preoccupation with highlighting the faults of American society.¹²⁴ *Jenny by Nature* is a marked contrast: the main character of this light-hearted novel an ex-prostitute and the novel is not intended as a negative judgement of her occupation. There is also a clear difference in Daruzes' approach to the texts. The variance in subject matter resulted in a far greater number of changes on the level of the text (examined in the forthcoming chapters). In the case of the other two translators, it is more difficult to discern a development in their approach. Evgeniia Kalashnikova translated *Native Son*, another examination of race relations in the USA for *Internatsional'naia literatura*, and her 1962 translation of *The Winter of Our Discontent* also focused on class and the supposed moral degeneration of American society, albeit perhaps less didactically than Wright's earlier novel. There

¹²⁴This topic will be examined further in chapter 3.

is a stronger sense of continuation in Natal'ia Volzhina's translations, which include two novels by John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (in *Internatsional'naia literatura*) and *The Pearl* in 1956.

It is relatively difficult to ascribe particular attitudes to individual translators in these journals, in terms of being risk-takers or conservatives. For instance, Rita-Rait Kovaleva, who is generally regarded as being a liberal figure, given her famous translations of works by J. D. Salinger, Kurt Vonnegut and Franz Kafka, also translated the communist Howard Fast's openly political novel *The Story of Lola Gregg* for *Inostrannaia literatura*. Undoubtedly, although personal feelings were at play, the importance of other, non-political factors — the need for a steady income, for example — must be borne in mind when examining individuals' actions.

Although the evidence here is ambiguous, what is clear is that translators had an intimate understanding of the norms of the literary field and how those norms developed with wider political and cultural changes. The extent to which internalised norms could or could be overcome, or to which individual factors had an influence here is debatable, and I will engage further with this question in the textual analysis. It is worth noting initially that the position occupied by translators in the cultural field was complex and, in certain crucial senses, privileged compared to other actors: it is well known, for instance, that the translation of foreign literature was seen as a safer space for expression, and studies have pointed out how the space of translation was used by these writers to insert messages that would not be tolerated in autochthonous literature.¹²⁵ Thus, we must examine translators' self-censorship as arising from a complex and changeable role in the cultural field.

¹²⁵Gallagher, pp. 119-131; Lev Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship: Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature* (Munich: Sagner, 1984), p. 77.

Susanna Witt, discussing the multi-voicedness of translation, highlights the way in which the many actors who contribute to a translated text — censors, translators, editors, critics, etc. — all, in some sense, share responsibility for the text.¹²⁶ All the agents who contributed to the publication process, creating this multi-voiced text, also played their part as censorial agents; in this sense, the censor is everywhere. Witt's statement emphasises the need to understand censorship not as a monolithic act, but as a set of practices, carried out by different agents at different times and encompassing complex interactions between agents' habitus in the making of a single text. I will continue to emphasise the various action of agents in the analysis of publishing patterns and in the texts published in the journals. In the choice of texts for publication, editorial censorship is dominant, and interference from above was common. On the textual level, the picture is varied, with evidence of both editors' and translators' intervention at various points. The actions of these censorial agents will be discussed in due course in the following chapters.

¹²⁶Witt, pp. 149-170 (p. 153).

Chapter 3: The Choice of Texts as Censorship

When adopting a broad definition of censorship, it is possible to examine the selection of texts for translation and publication as a censorship mechanism. I turn again here to Billiani's definition of censorship as 'a form of manipulative rewriting of discourses by one agent or structure over another agent or structure, aiming at filtering the stream of information from one source to another'.¹ The most important aspect of Billiani's definition of censorship is the focus on discourses, not just individual texts; the exclusion of texts from a discourse as it passes from the producing to the receiving culture can serve to manipulate this discourse and produce a filtered image of the discourse for the receiving context. The first stage in this filtering process is the selection and exclusion of texts.

The process of creating and shaping discourses in this manner can be related to the concepts of the canon and canon-formation. Traditionally, the concept of the canon has been the province of literary studies and they have tended to approach the problem from one of two sides: one argues for the primacy of aesthetics in forming the canon, while the other argues that the canon is formed on an ideological basis, which explains the traditional exclusion of minority voices. However, both these arguments often refer unproblematically to *the* canon: a collection of literary texts that represent the most significant and aesthetically worthy works in (Western) cultural history. Problematising the concept of the canon allows one to move away

¹ Francesca Billiani, 'Assessing Boundaries: Censorship and Translation, an Introduction', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani, pp. 1-25 (p. 3).

from an overly simplistic conception of canons either as quasi-mythological items that simply arise spontaneously or as constructed deliberately by monolithic agents with clear, defined agendas. As with censorship, it is useful to view the concept of the canon as a complex, socially constructed structure of cultural regulation. Foucault's concept of the archive is useful here; the archive functions as a cultural repository that governs discursive possibility. The archive preserves what is deemed valuable and determines hierarchies of knowledge.² The archive is not simply a store, but rather preserves what is deemed culturally important:

far from being only that which ensures that we exist in the midst of preserved discourse, it is that which differentiates discourses in their multiple existence and specifies them in their own duration [...] It does not have the weight of tradition; and it does not constitute the library of all libraries, outside time and place; nor is it the welcoming oblivion that opens up to all new speech the operational field of freedom; between tradition and oblivion, it reveals the rules of a practice that enables statements both to survive and to undergo regular modification. It is the general system of the formation and transformation of statements.³

This statement leads to a more nuanced view of the concept of the canon, and an acknowledgement of 'the existence of multiple, historically located canonical formations, that is, of different canons, produced at different times and in different geographic locations by individuals, groups, and institutions pursuing at times very different agendas'.⁴ Canonical formations are functional, participating not only in the

² Anna Brzyski, 'Introduction: Canon and Art History', in *Partisan Canons* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), pp. 1-26 (p. 11).

³ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Routledge, 1989), pp. 129-130.

⁴ Brzyski, pp. 1-26 (p. 3).

storage of knowledge but also in its production.⁵ Each subdivision of the cultural field has corresponding canonical formations, a factor which is particularly important when studying translation.

Bourdieu also highlights the importance of institutions, not just formal political institutions, but also literary and educational ones,⁶ in the reproduction and legitimisation of cultural products in the field, and the creation of canonical formations:

The functions of reproduction and legitimation may, in accordance with historical traditions, be either consecrated into a single institution, as was the case in the seventeenth century with the French Académie Royale de Peinture, or divided among different institutions such as the educational system, the academies, and official and semi-official institutions of diffusion (museums, theatres, operas, concert halls, etc.).⁷

Canonical formations are constituted by the accumulation and distribution of cultural capital. John Guillory points out the importance of linguistic and symbolic capital in defining what is canonical,⁸ and I would point out that in the Soviet Union, ideological capital is extremely relevant. The Russian literary canon was subject to change in accordance with ideological trends and specific political situations. Dostoevsky, for instance, although regarded favourably in the post-revolution era, was considered reactionary in the Soviet period; in the post-war period particularly, his works were published in smaller print runs and literary criticism denounced his

⁵ Further references to canon will assume this meaning of ‘canonical formation’.

⁶ Most of the important critical literature on canon has focused on the educational system and the teaching of literature as the main force that creates *the* canon. (See particularly John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).)

⁷ Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, p. 123.

⁸ Guillory, p. ix.

philosophical writing.⁹ He was, in effect, removed from the canon of nineteenth-century literature. Censorship as canon formation, then, is the process by which the ‘cultural products placed closest to the ideological centre of Soviet society’,¹⁰ are selected, and by which products that do not fit are excluded. The process of canon-creation was actively embarked upon by the Soviets, who attempted to embed canonised products in the cultural memory, in an effort to build an ‘ideological canon’, to use Aleida Assmann and Jan Assmann’s term, a canon formed ‘under pressure of constant articulation and repetition of [their] fixed nucleus of meaning. The truth [...] never becomes quietly self-evident, it asks to be confirmed from all sides’.¹¹

Censorship practices were one means of forming the ideological canon, as a ‘huge propaganda machine constantly celebrated the newly canonized cultural products and tried to embed them in collective memory’.¹² The total conflation of censorship and canon formation can, however, be questioned:

Canons primarily operate by singling out certain works of art as exemplary, and representative of a certain tradition, in order to influence the production and reception of works of art. While canons essentially try to reach a consensus among an audience about the heightened significance and quality of the works concerned, censorship wields bigger clubs – deterral strategies such as bans and showcases intended to mark the no-go-areas the canon has just left aside by focusing its attention elsewhere. It is

⁹ Marc Slonim, ‘Dostoevsky Under the Soviets’, *Russian Review*, 10 (1951), 118-130 (p. 128).

¹⁰ Plamper, 526-544 (p. 531).

¹¹ *Kanon und Zensur*, ed. by Aleida Assmann and Jan Assmann (Munich: Fink, 1987). Qtd in Plamper, 526-544. I use this term cautiously, bearing in mind that ‘ideological’ here is a problematic term. All canons, by their very nature, are formed by ideological forces. Nonetheless this term in its limited meaning is useful for highlighting the presence of canonical institutions, which are created and enforced by agents, and institutions.

¹² Plamper, 526-544 (p. 532).

important to appreciate these differences between censorship and the canon in order to see how they relate to each other and where there are overlaps, rather than trying to subsume the one under the other or to over-accentuate their similarities in an attempt to employ a seemingly all-encompassing umbrella term.¹³

However, this opinion rests on the complete equation of censorship and canon-formation. It would be more appropriate to say that censorship was one of the factors that influence the creation of canons by regulating the texts that circulate in the cultural field. This was particularly relevant in the Soviet cultural field, where the bureaucracy of censorship was embedded in the publishing system, thus ensuring that only officially sanctioned products were released; in as much as all institutions in the literary field act as censorial institutions they may therefore also act as canonical institutions, since they legitimate cultural products and regulate the circulation of those products in the field. Censorship was one of the forces that constructed the ideological canon and contributed to the image of foreign culture circulating in the Soviet literary field.

Inclusion and Exclusion: Creating a Text of Texts

Censorship was used extensively in the Soviet Union with the aim of altering the perception of foreign cultures,¹⁴ and attempted to construct an ideological canon of foreign texts. A canon is a 'texts of texts,'¹⁵ which can itself be read as a cultural product. Thus, the question arises — how can this text of texts be characterised?

¹³ Müller, pp. 1-32 (p. 14).

¹⁴ Herman Ermolaev, 'Zapad glazami sovetskoi tsenzury 1946-1953 Godov', *Studia Rossica Posnaniensia*, 25 (1993), 75-81 (pp. 75-76).

¹⁵ Trevor Thornton Ross, *The Making of the English Literary Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), p. 23.

Examining publication patterns can prove instructive in this regard, particularly in a context where publishing is strictly controlled by the censorship apparatus.

In the Soviet Union, the canon of Western literature was relatively limited: the number of translated titles was relatively small, while print runs were in the millions, meaning that a small number of authors served to represent foreign literatures in their entirety. The classics of Western literature were well represented; some of the most widely published English-language authors in the 1950s were Charles Dickens, Jack London and O. Henry. Where more contemporary literature was concerned, left-wing authors who wrote on social and political themes were most prominent; Upton Sinclair, Ernest Hemingway, William Faulkner and John Steinbeck were some of the most famous and widely published.¹⁶ Some of these authors were minor figures in their home countries, but were published in print runs of millions in the Soviet Union. Works published tend to centre on themes of Western social injustice such as the oppression of African Americans or the fight against McCarthyism.¹⁷ It should be pointed out that what is being examined in this study is not the popularity of these foreign texts/ authors, since the reception of these works and the extent to which they were read and appreciated by the general public is debatable at best, particularly given the widespread consumption of foreign literature in samizdat in the post-Stalin era.¹⁸ The focus here is on the official

¹⁶ Yuri Gvosdev, 'Publishing and Book Distribution in the U.S.S.R.', *Library Quarterly*, 28 (1958), 269-276 (p. 272).

¹⁷ Melville J. Ruggles, 'American Books in Soviet Publishing', *Slavic Review*, 20 (1961), 419-435 (p. 428).

¹⁸ For example, the circulation of a samizdat version of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in the 1960s is discussed in Friedberg, *A Decade of Euphoria*, p. 43. Natal'ia Trauberg, a translator of religious literature, describes how she altered parts of her samizdat translations in the same decade: Natal'ia Trauberg, 'Vsegda li pobezhdaet pobezhdennyi? Natal'ia Trauberg o khristianskom samizdate', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 27 April - 2 May 2000. <<http://dlib.eastview.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/sources/article.jsp?id=1481>> [accessed 12 July 2011].

representation of foreign literature, or, to be more precise, the place of the officially constructed canon of foreign literature in Soviet discourse.

The ‘filter of [...] Soviet publishing’¹⁹ ensured that unsuitable authors were excluded, as the editor Erna Shakhova comments of her work in the 1950s and 1960s: ‘For many years, it was impossible to publish books by foreign authors simply because they contained excessively graphic descriptions of sexual scenes, or references to homosexuals and lesbians, or — even worse — politically problematic [ostrye] sections’.²⁰ Likewise, the presence of desirable authors was exaggerated. The result is eloquently described by Melville J. Ruggles:

The image of America projected by the American literature published in the USSR [...] seems to be fairly clear, in the light of the evidence presented here. The America that the Russian knows from the American literature available to him [sic] is a land of Simon Legree, the coonskin cap, the heroic sled dog, the share cropper, the sweatshop, the dispirited defeated and depraved, the frivolous, the bloated billionaire, the regimented traveller in space. The American he is given opportunity to read conveys to him little notion of how we think, of how we live, of our true virtues or of our true faults.²¹

The rest of this chapter will analyse the censorial selection of texts in terms of canon-formation asking, how effective was the choice of texts in creating an ideological canon? In addition to studying publication practices, the second half of the chapter will use *Inostrannaia literatura*’s editorial reviews and minutes of editorial meetings to explore in further depth the dynamics of text inclusion and exclusion.

¹⁹ Maurice Friedberg, ‘The U.S. in the U.S.S.R.: American Literature Through the Filter of Recent Soviet Publishing and Criticism’, *Critical Inquiry*, 3 (1976), 519-583 (p. 519).

²⁰ Shakhova, pp. 131-145 (p. 144).

²¹ Ruggles, 419-435 (pp. 431-432).

Internatsional'naia literatura

Nora Gal', a translator who worked on the editorial staff of *Internatsional'naia literatura*, remembered in her memoirs:

What was the journal *Internatsional'naia literatura* for us students and, later, postgraduates studying the West in the 1930s before the war? Perhaps it was something like the cave from *A Thousand and One Nights*, full of fairy-tale treasures. We opened up other worlds. There were no *Cements* or *Hydrocentrals*,²² or poetic refrains in the style of 'the cranes rumble in the construction pit';²³ We discovered Kafka, Joyce and Dos Passos, Caldwell and Steinbeck, Heinrich and Thomas Mann, Brecht and Feuchtwanger, Jules Roman, Martin du Gard and Malraux, albeit partially, in abridged form. These are the encounters for which we are indebted to the journal. The discovery of Hemingway was a huge shock, not only for us — we were generally inexperienced — but for all readers.

Of course in Interlit we could not avoid the rhetoric of world revolution, the primitive sloganeering of the 'proletarian writers of all countries'. But it turned out that we could find the new paths and crossroads of human fate in the deepest depths of our soul.

We had not suspected that one could write like *that* in our time.²⁴

Generally, *Internatsional'naia literatura* can be regarded as a space with (limited) freedom to publish, at least for some years in the 1930s. In the eleven years of its existence, literary works by roughly fifty Western authors were translated from

²² *Tsement*, 1925 novel by Fedor Gladkov; *Gidrotsental'*, a 1930-1931 Socialist realist novel by Marietta Shaginian.

²³ From Alexander Bezymenskii's parody of Gogol's 'Chuden Dnepr'.

²⁴ Nora Gal', *Vospominaniia, stat'i, stikhi, pis'ma, bibliografiia*, ed. by Dmitrii Kuz'min and Edvarda Kuz'mina, 5th edn (Moscow: ARGO-RISK, 1997)

<<http://www.vavilon.ru/noragal/memoir.html>> [accessed 10 August 2011]. Emphasis in original.

English into Russian and published in *Internatsional'naia literatura*.²⁵ These authors' works cover several genres: poetry, drama, prose fiction and some autobiographical and journalistic writing (I have excluded articles of literary criticism). There is a greater preference for non-fiction in *Internatsional'naia literatura* than in its successor journal, but overall, there is a clear inclination towards artistic literature, particularly from the second half of the 1930s into the early 1940s. Many of the longer texts were published in heavily abridged form — novels were usually cut to around ten to twenty pages — until around 1937, when it became the norm to publish whole, or almost whole, texts, sometimes over several issues. Writers from 'bourgeois' countries predominated: after English, the most commonly translated languages were German and French.

While publishing houses such as the *Academia* or *Goslitizdat* focused more on the publication of classics of world literature, *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* tended more towards very contemporary texts. Thus, it must be borne in mind that the canonical formation presented by the journals would have differed somewhat from the wider publication patterns. The smaller time lag between publication in the West and in the Soviet Union and the accompanying emphasis of contemporary political and social concerns portrays Western culture from a somewhat different angle.

Gal' somewhat contemptuously divides the authors and texts published in the journal into those writers who represented proletarian literature and those who opened up a new, bourgeois world. This reverses the official attitude to foreign

²⁵ It has been impossible to make a completely accurate count since the holdings of *Internatsional'naia literatura* in Moscow's All-Russian State Library of Foreign Literature are missing a small number of issues, and no published indexes exist for this journal. 'Western' here includes writers from the USA, Ireland, Great Britain and Australia.

literature, as it was outlined by Karl Radek at the 1934 Soviet Writers' Congress. Radek's speech urged writers to draw upon contemporary realist literature as models for socialist realism; he wished Soviet literature to take the best 'proletarian' writers, whom he associated closely with socialist realism;²⁶ in the same speech he vigorously denounced modernism. Radek implicitly divided foreign authors into those who were on the side of the Soviet Union and those who were against it, and, therefore, on the side of fascism.²⁷ This has been described as a distinction between '*nashi*' [ours] and '*nenashi*' [not ours];²⁸ writers were either 'for us' or 'against us'. The idea of *nashi* and *nenashi* is useful for highlighting the tensions inherent in publishing authors who did not adhere to the dominant political preferences. The standards for inclusion in the group of '*nashi*' authors seem to come from the institutional level. In his 1934 speech, Radek noted that foreign proletarian literature was valuable for the development of Soviet literature itself: proletarian writers were able to come to the aid of Soviet literature, which had not, at that point, sufficiently mastered the Western theme, and could not 'depict the face of the international enemy of the proletariat, the face of imperialism, preparing for war, the face of fascism which is its weapon'.²⁹ There is a strong sense of instrumentality here, and of usefulness as defined by the ideological and political properties of a text; these texts should be chosen for their fit into the Soviet discourse about foreign cultures, and Radek denounces most bourgeois writers as having 'kneeled before the Moloch of war',³⁰

²⁶ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934: Stenograficheskii otchet* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1934), p. 302.

²⁷ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 298.

²⁸ Safiullina, p. 57.

²⁹ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 309.

³⁰ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 295.

There is an understanding in Radek's speech of the existence of a proletarian literature, albeit existing under different conditions to the literature of the Soviet Union, and it is this literature — Radek namechecks Rolland, Shaw, Gide, Sinclair among others — that is most prominent in *Internatsional'naia literatura*. Radek makes it clear that these writers have strong links with the Soviet Union and that the relationship is interdependent; he states that Soviet writers should learn from the best of 'proletarian revolutionary literature abroad' and teach these writers how to 'create a picture of our country';³¹ it is clear that foreign proletarian writers were assessed in terms of their relationship to the Soviet Union. In addition, Radek tasks those foreign writers present at the congress with showing the Soviet audience about life abroad: with depicting, for a Soviet audience, rather than a Western audience, the authors' natural readership, the life of the worker in their countries. Radek thus implies that the 'proletarian' writer's natural readership is the Soviet one; he goes on to be more explicit about the place of the foreign writer and foreign literature in the Soviet context, stating 'to our foreign comrades, we say: under the banner of the struggling [*boriushegosia*] proletariat, in the struggle for that for which Soviet workers fought, in the struggle for that for which the best people of the working class in all the world died, you will create great literature'.³² Radek's speech clearly implies the existence, or future existence, of a single revolutionary literature or canon, albeit based upon the example of Soviet literature, which has already paved the way for foreign writers to follow: 'This literature, which we are creating with you, will be a great literature

³¹ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 318.

³² Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 318.

of love for all the downtrodden [...] it will be a literature of the struggle for socialism, a literature of the victory of international socialism'.³³

The official preference, then, was for left-wing, proletarian authors, and this is, to a great extent, displayed in the journal's choice of authors. For instance, some of the most significant names of twentieth-century French left-wing thought feature prominently: in 1933, the first year of publication, (abridged) works by several members of the French Association of Revolutionary Artists and Writers (*l'Association des Ecrivains et Artistes Révolutionnaires*) were published. Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Louis Aragon, André Gide and Romain Rolland, as well as being members of the *Association* also formed the directing committee of its journal *Commune*, which saw itself as 'the standard bearer of French socialist realism'.³⁴ Many of the authors included in *Internatsional'naia literatura* could be regarded as fellow travellers.³⁵ Romain Rolland, for example, maintained Soviet contacts through the International Association of Revolutionary Writers (MORP).³⁶ Lionel Britton, the working-class author of *Hunger and Love* (published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* in 1933) spent time in the Soviet Union under the auspices of MORP, although, like many fellow travellers, he became disillusioned with the Soviet experiment after seeing it up close. The publication of translated works of Western authors was an extension of the phenomenon of intercultural relations between the Soviet Union and the West, 'a particularly twentieth-century cross-cultural encounter, in which the insertion of ideological as well as cultural and economic

³³ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 318.

³⁴ Association des écrivains et artistes révolutionnaires, 'A.E.A.R. - Historique' <<http://www.aear.net/Textes/HistoriqueAEAR.html>> [accessed 7 December 2010].

³⁵ Fellow travellers were 'non-party members sympathetic to the Communist cause'. See Stern, p. 16.

³⁶ Michael David-Fox, 'The "Heroic Life" of a Friend of Stalinism: Romain Rolland and Soviet Culture', *Slavonica*, 11 (2005), 4-29 (p. 19).

comparisons shaped new and consequential calculations of superiority and inferiority between Russia and the West'.³⁷

In general, those active on the left wing of politics in their respective countries are well represented in *Internatsional'naia literatura*. For example, the American Josephine Herbst was a member of the communist party in her home country. Upton Sinclair was a member of the socialist party and twice ran for the office of Governor in California.³⁸ Rafael Alberti, who published poems dedicated to the revolution in Spain (January 1935) and the siege of Madrid (April 1937) in *Internatsional'naia literatura* was a member of the Spanish Communist Party from 1931, attended the First Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934, and was awarded the Lenin Prize in 1965. A significant minority of works were translated from Spanish, and the subject of the Spanish Civil War is a common one. For example, Federico García Lorca, whose work was published five times between 1936 and 1941, had a poem about an attack by the Civil Guards against gypsies, 'Romance de la guardia civil española', published in issue 9-10 in 1940.

In the 1930s, Soviet anti-fascism also was a strong motivating factor in the inclusion of works by a particular author; *Internatsional'naia literatura*'s archive holds a list of anti-fascist authors judged suitable for publication.³⁹ An anti-fascist policy would explain the inclusion of authors such as Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser and, particularly, refugees from Germany, such as Willi Bredel, a German communist who, displaced by the rise of Nazism, spent time in the USSR in the 1930s. Bredel played an active role in *Internationale Literatur*, the journal's

³⁷ David-Fox, 300-335 (p. 301).

³⁸ His failed attempts are recounted in Upton Sinclair, *I, Candidate for Governor: And How I Got Licked* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935).

³⁹ RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69. List of anti-fascist authors.

German-language version.⁴⁰ German authors who were closely associated with the German Communist Party, such as Johannes Becher, and Ernst Ottwalt, a communist who immigrated to the Soviet Union from Germany, were also frequently published in the journal. Ottwalt was one of the first of the German intellectual émigrés to be persecuted by the Stalinist regime: he was arrested in 1936 and died in a prison camp in 1943.⁴¹

The Soviet Union's entry into the war in 1941 proved to be a key turning point in the journal's history, and one that highlights the highly politicised nature of text choice. Where criticism of Germany was avoided during the time of the Non-Aggression Pact,⁴² the start of the war in the Soviet Union prompted a huge propaganda campaign and the journal turned, once again, towards anti-fascism. The suddenness of the change in policy was problematic, and a letter written by the chief editor Timofei Arnol'dovich Rokotov in September 1941 noted that 'complete bedlam' was reigning: the journal did not know what to publish and was struggling to obtain anti-fascist literature.⁴³ Around the same time, advice was sought from the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs and Agitprop about the suitability of publishing particular items.⁴⁴ At this time, the journal's '*reportazh*' and '*publitsistika*' sections were filled with propagandistic essays and articles, such as E. Fedorova's 'Pisateli ubitye fashizmom' (Writers Killed by Fascism). The journal refocused its attention on antifascist works, and the topic of war loomed large. In

⁴⁰ Katerina Clark, 'Germanophone Intellectuals in Stalin's Russia: Diaspora and Cultural Identity in the 1930s', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2 (2001), 529-551 (p. 530).

⁴¹ Jean Michel Palmier, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America*, trans. by David Fernbach (New York: Verso, 2006), pp. 181-182.

⁴² This is examined in the chapter on the political mode of censorship.

⁴³ RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 31, l. 67. Letter from Timofei Arnol'dovich Rokotov to Zoia Moiseevna [Zadunaiskaia], 11 September 1941.

⁴⁴ RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 25, ll. 165; 167. Letter from editorial board of *Internatsional'naia literatura* to People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs; Agitprop, 1941.

1942, the last year of the journal's existence, two English-language war novels were published. The first was *Mr Bunting in Peace and War*,⁴⁵ an examination of the English experience of the Blitz through the eyes of the 'little man' by the English author Robert Greenwood; the second was Upton Sinclair's Pulitzer-winning novel *Dragon's Teeth*, which looks at the fate of a Jewish family in Nazi Germany in the 1930s.⁴⁶

Despite official attempts to create a canon of foreign literature that corresponded to the socialist realist canon, there was, as the earlier citation from Gal' highlights, some room for manoeuvre on the part of the *Internatsional'naia literatura* editorial staff. Arlen Blium describes this as a result of the instrumental attitude of the Party and its attempt to co-opt the West in the formation of an 'anti-fascist front', and to construct literary 'Potemkin Villages' to fool Western liberals into sympathy with the Soviet Union.⁴⁷ In the early 1930s, the journal had a quite free choice of authors, at least until 1936.⁴⁸ Even after this, documents demonstrate that the editorial board did not wholly subscribe to the politicised choice of authors and texts. A 1940 letter from Rokotov to the deputy head of Agitprop Petr Nikolaevich Pospelov focused on the writer Thomas Mann. Arguing for the suitability of Mann's novel *Lotte in Weimar*,⁴⁹ he proposed that rather than entirely abandoning those writers who had criticised the Soviet Union, the journal should continue to court them and attempt to change their opinions: Mann had been

⁴⁵ This work combined the two novels *Mr Bunting* (1940) and *Mr Bunting at War* (1941).

⁴⁶ The Russian translation was heavily abridged and subject to extensive censorship on the textual level; this is discussed in the chapter on political censorship.

⁴⁷ Arlen Viktorovich Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epoku total'nogo terrora: 1929-1953* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000), p. 225.

⁴⁸ Nailya Safiullina, 'Window to the West: From the Collection of Readers' Letters to the Journal *Internatsional'naia Literatura*', *Slavonica*, 15 (2009), 128-161 (p. 129).

⁴⁹ The novel was published in issues 3-6 in 1941, but was subsequently torn out in the version held in the All-Union State Library of Foreign Literature.

sympathetic to the USSR before, and he could be so again.⁵⁰ Rokotov's point here is against the politically motivated narrowing of the journal's scope, and for the inclusion of works 'of great cultural and historical interest' to the readers.⁵¹ Most significantly, Rokotov resists the instrumental inclusion of foreign texts, stating, 'It seems to me that our task and our policy in relation to important writers such as [Mann] cannot be narrowly opportunistic, and should come from an attempt to win them over to our side'.⁵²

Although Blium characterises the inclusion of non-communist authors as a cynical ploy, Gal's reminiscences indicate that the editorial staff attempted to stress literary rather than political qualities, and a significant number of works outside the ideological canon were published, particularly in the first half of the 1930s; these included modernist, apolitical or bourgeois authors, authors who would have been categorised as *nenashi*. One of the most striking examples of *Internatsional'naia literatura's* freedom is the publication of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Episodes from Joyce's novel were published over ten issues in 1935. It is surprising that this modernist classic should have been published at all after Radek's uncompromising condemnation of Joyce at the first Writers' Congress only the year before. Scathing in his description, Radek characterises the novel as the petty, pointless ramblings of the bourgeoisie and describes it as 'a heap of manure, in which swarm worms, filmed with cinematographic apparatus through a microscope'. One of Joyce's greatest failings, according to Radek, is that he ignores the Irish Republican movement entirely, in favour of the small life of small people and 'the stagnant waters of a

⁵⁰ RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69, l. 8. Letter from Timofei Adol'fovich Rokotov to Petr Nikolaevich Pospelov, 15 April 1940.

⁵¹ RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69, l. 8.

⁵² RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69, l. 8.

small pond and swamps where frogs live'.⁵³ Radek's comments were prescient. *Ulysses* was subjected to post-publication censorship: the entire novel was torn out of the journal and the contents page inked out in some issues.⁵⁴ One of the team of translators, Igor' Romanovich, was arrested in 1937 and died in a labour camp.⁵⁵ Romanovich's wife, according to Ekaterina Genieva, who was acquainted with her as a child and is now the Director of the All-Russian State Library for Foreign Literature (formerly the All-Union State Library for Foreign Literature), believed that the translator was arrested 'because of Joyce'.⁵⁶ None of Joyce's works were published in Russian translation until the 1970s.

Another modernist published in the early and mid-1930s was Bertolt Brecht — Brecht was a Marxist, and sympathetic to the Soviet Union. The first of his works published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* was *Die Mutter*, an adaptation of Gor'kii's *Mat'*, (published in issue 2 for 1933), and the inaugural issue of the journal contained his 'In Honour of Lenin'. Thus, even those authors who went beyond the bland sloganeering that Gal' appears to despise are represented in their more obviously pro-Soviet form. Modernist or formalist experimentation, though not approved in socialist realism, was permitted when accompanied by the correct political messages.

⁵³ Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, p. 316.

⁵⁴ This approach is not uncommon in the holdings of this journal in the Library of Foreign Literature. The researcher will encounter a number of articles that have been cut out, leaving unexpected holes in the pages, or large sections that have been sliced out. Often, authors' names or photographs are also inked out, making it almost impossible for the reader to know what was previously published. However, those contents pages which are left intact indicate that most of the excised sections are articles by authors, both Soviet and foreign, who had, at some point, been deemed as enemies and therefore non-persons.

⁵⁵ The translation was carried out by Ivan Kashkin's First Translators' Collective, which was established in the 1930s and contained many of the most significant translators of the Kashkin 'school'

⁵⁶ Ekaterina Iur'evna Genieva, 'Iz-za Dzhoisa', *Vestnik Evropy*, 15 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/vestnik/2005/15/ge41.html>> [accessed 29 December 2010].

A further unorthodox inclusion in the journal was Aldous Huxley's dystopian novel, *Brave New World*, published in issue 9 in 1935. The novel was published in an extremely shortened form, running to only twenty-eight pages in the Russian version. Its inclusion in the journal was 'possible only after Huxley had participated in the anti-fascist Congress for the Defence of Culture held in Paris in the summer of 1935. In his new capacity as a liberal public figure, Huxley was judged worthy of public attention'.⁵⁷ *Brave New World* was judged by Aleksandr Arosev, the head of VOKS, to be 'basically directed against fascism'.⁵⁸ Despite the initial positive attitude, a critical campaign against him was launched as the political climate changed, and his works ceased to be published until many years after Stalin's death.

Ernest Hemingway was published in the journal despite occasionally negative critical and political reaction to his writing in the Soviet Union, again demonstrating that there was at least some freedom to print the works of the modernists, even in the face of official disapproval. Hugely popular among Soviet readers, Hemingway was a major author, and as a 'great' figure of world literature, and, moreover, one whose political views were broadly acceptable, was judged appropriate for inclusion in the journal. Five works by Ernest Hemingway were published between 1935 and 1939. These included the following: *Fiesta* (known in English as *Fiesta* or *The Sun also Rises*), published in 1935; *The Fifth Column*, a play published in 1939, which dealt with the Spanish Civil War and was of great interest in the Soviet Union;⁵⁹ and the short story 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber'. *Internatsional'naiia literatura* also published the essay 'Who Killed the Vets?' an angry response to the

⁵⁷ Nina Diakonova, 'Aldous Huxley in Russia', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 21 (1997), 161-167 (p. 326).

⁵⁸ David-Fox, 300-335 (p. 326).

⁵⁹ Stephen Jan Parker, 'Hemingway's Revival in the Soviet Union: 1955-1962', *American Literature*, 35 (1964), 485-501 (p. 485).

American government's handling of the Labour Day hurricane that killed several hundred people, in 1935. Although this essay spoke of a localised event, this piece fitted the pattern of strong criticism of the USA, an important theme of the journal. Publication of Hemingway ceased in 1940, after *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, which portrayed communists in the Civil War as brutally violent and made negative judgements of Comintern figures. The novel was only published in the Soviet Union many years later and no work of Hemingway's was published at all until the appearance of *The Old Man and the Sea* in the first issue of *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1955.

Even where it is clear that the authors being published do not fit into the 'proletarian' mould, the choice of texts is often politically charged. The publication of foreign authors in the 1930s occurred within the broader context of an emerging discourse of Soviet superiority, which created tension between the desire to include (and use) representations of foreign culture and the need to assert the Soviet Union's cultural achievements: 'the challenge became how to integrate the exemplars of contemporary western civilization into a new Stalinist orthodoxy that by the mid-1930s asserted the outright superiority of Soviet culture'.⁶⁰ As the discourse of Soviet cultural supremacy gained ground, the idea of Soviet literature as world leading became entrenched. This led to a view of other literatures as inferior, and of Soviet literature as a model to which foreign literature should also adhere. As Nailya Safiullina states:

From 1936 onward, the myth of Soviet literature became entrenched as dogma and as a true reflection of reality. Accepted as true, the myth then became the cornerstone of Soviet cultural

⁶⁰David-Fox, 4-29 (p. 8).

policy until the end of the Soviet period. For cultural ideologues, the notion that Soviet literature was the best in the world was no longer a myth, but rather a sound basis for making decisions such as how to evaluate foreign writers and whom to translate.⁶¹

The clear tendency that developed over the course of the thirties and that can be observed in the texts published in the journal in the decade of its publication is to use individual authors as representatives of a particular subsection of Western literature, presenting them as the sanctioned form of Western literature. While the early thirties saw some variation in the works published — and some striking inclusions — the later years of the 1930s, and the war years of the early 1940s. In the wake of the anti-formalist campaign, the policy of socialism in one country and the spread of a discourse of Soviet superiority, the variety of works and authors published diminished. The majority of authors published in the later years of the journal's existence were politically orthodox.

The split between politically orthodox authors and modernist authors highlights the tension that existed between the officially sanctioned representation of the West and the desire to emphasise literary qualities over political ones. Whether an attempt to introduce the best of Western literature to the Soviet reader, or to create a falsely open image of Soviet culture, the choice was always politically charged. Rather than simply reproducing Western patterns of publication in the Stalinist cultural field, a new canonical formation of the West was created, shaped by the norms that defined the authoritative literary canon, which was manifested in the literary field by the official dominance of socialist realism. The manipulative processes of canon formation, enacted through censorship practices, were shaped by

⁶¹Safiullina, p. 58.

the presence of a defining canon in the cultural field. The inclusion of particular authors, and the politically charged nature of their inclusion, meant that they served as a representation of the West as a whole, and ‘Soviet institutionalized practices of situating and approaching individual foreigners as representatives of broad collectivities, when wedded to the inbuilt conspiratorialism of the party-state and its thrust to alter mental outlook, explain how Soviet cultural diplomacy took the instrumentalism that was inherent in the endeavour to radical extremes’.⁶² The careful choice of authors and texts created strong parallels between the foreign texts and the Soviet canon.

It has been suggested that the translation of foreign texts attempts to create a kind of foreign socialist realist genre, incorporating the canon of foreign literature into the canon of Stalinist Soviet literature, contributing ‘to the creation of a global Socialist Realist canon’.⁶³ Stephen Hutchings proposes a relationship between the Socialist realist canon and Stalinist film adaptations of foreign texts, and categorises the adaptations as a sub-category of the socialist realist film canon:

Stalinist adaptations of foreign literary classics served several functions. On one hand they established socialist realism’s organic relationship to the pantheon of world culture. Conversely, they proved the opportunity to demonstrate the organic presence of revolutionary sensibilities within key Western cultural texts.⁶⁴

The adaptation of foreign texts for film and the translation of texts into the Soviet context have obvious parallels, particularly given that foreign texts were adapted from translations. These texts are used in order to establish an ideological link

⁶²David-Fox, 300-335 (p. 334).

⁶³Witt, pp. 149-170 (p. 151).

⁶⁴Stephen C. Hutchings, *Russian Literary Culture in the Camera Age* (London: Routledge, 2004), p.

between the Western canon and the Soviet canon: foreign literature is made an important part of Soviet culture. These interlinked processes of censorship and canon formation demonstrate the interaction of two canons — the socialist realist canon and the foreign (contemporary) canonical formation, and potentially the incorporation of one into the other. This is not to say that the foreign canon cannot shape or influence Soviet literary production, but rather that the canon is an imaginary construction of the foreign which occupies a particular position in the cultural field.

Canonical formations are imaginary constructs, and censorship processes helped to shape this construct and give it a specific function in the Soviet context. The text producers claimed to be creating a typical representation of Western literature and culture, although, as this analysis demonstrates, the construction of Western literature was in fact distorted in favour of ideologically sympathetic works and authors. The creation of a distorted representation of Western literature recalls Alexei Yurchak's concept of the Imaginary West, a 'Soviet imaginary "elsewhere" that was not necessarily about any real place [that was] produced locally and existed only at the time when the real West could not be encountered'.⁶⁵ The Imaginary West was a discursive formation containing cultural objects linked to the West, or originating there which 'gradually shaped a coherent and shared object of imagination'.⁶⁶ Yurchak's use of the concept relates specifically to the period of late socialism and focuses principally on non-official cultural practices such as jazz music and youth fashion, but the data examined here demonstrates the existence of a similar, parallel construct much earlier in Soviet history. I have discussed here the use of censorship to create a canon or a virtual construction of the West for Soviet

⁶⁵ Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), p. 161.

⁶⁶ Yurchak, p. 161.

consumption. The Soviet canon of Western literature shares many of the defining characteristics of Yurchak's imaginary West: it is linked to the West, but distorted through its removal from that context; it forms an object in Soviet discourse that bears little relation to the empirical reality of the West, but which has significant representative power in the Soviet Union. This 'official' West is ideologically distorted, creating the West as a discursive object with a particular ideological orientation. While the official West had links with popular Soviet consumption of Western culture (the genuinely popular and widely read Hemingway being a case in point), it is difficult to say to what extent this construction genuinely had resonance with the Soviet reader. Nonetheless, this construction occupied an important position in Soviet culture, forming the authoritative picture of the West and thus defining the West as a concept or object of discourse. One might characterise the official West as a way of meeting the challenge of potentially dangerous contact with the West. The construction of the official West defines in advance, so to speak, the portrayal of the West and creates an object of understanding for the Soviet subject, thus guarding against an 'incorrect' comprehension of the West that would stem from unrestricted access to Western culture. Of course, the readers' reception of this imaginary, censored, construct did not necessarily coincide with how it was conceived of by the censorial agents. In the complex interplay of agents and products in the cultural field, new and unintended meanings were released. Additionally, the readers of these journals, as — broadly speaking — members of the intelligentsia, were likely to have access to other sources of foreign culture including, at certain points, samizdat or original texts covertly imported. Thus the consequences of this discursive construct

may have radically differed from what was intended, and I will expand upon this when discussing the censorship at the textual level.

What the examination of publication patterns in *Internatsional'naia literatura* has shown is that in the Soviet context of cultural production there were (at least) two canonical formations in circulation, each interacting with the other. The criteria for inclusion in the ideological canon of foreign literature were defined broadly (though not exclusively) by the norms of the dominant discursive canon. Censorship, through the exclusion of texts that did not conform to these accepted norms, was one of the principal factors in the creation of the canon of foreign literature. This censoring and distorting of the contemporary Western literary canon reflects Katerina Clark's statement that 'newly translated literature was reworked and incorporated into the national cultural treasury'.⁶⁷

The construction of the 'imaginary West' also allowed for the inclusion of those modernist and non-Soviet texts that were viewed as a window on the West. Examination of the archival documents held for *Inostrannaia literatura* will allow a deeper analysis of how this construction of the West was achieved, foregrounding the debates among censorial agents and the ways in which a politically motivated canonical formation might be resisted and challenged during the period after Stalin's death.

Inostrannaia literatura

Like *Internatsional'naia literatura*, its successor demonstrates a similar tension between ideological correctness and literary quality. Like the earlier journal,

⁶⁷ Clark, *Moscow, The Fourth Rome*, p. 18

Inostrannaia literatura was also overtly ideological in its aims: it intended ‘to publish works of those writers who struggle in their work for peace and socialism, and also those who, although they stand outwith this struggle, nevertheless depict their society correctly’.⁶⁸ *Inostrannaia literatura*’s internal discussions demonstrate that choosing the correct texts was not without its problems; the journal’s editorial documents display a concern for the ideological suitability of their choice of texts, and personal accounts testify to an attempt to balance a wish to publish the best of foreign literature with their wish or need to publish what was suitable for Soviet readers and to adhere to the wider ideological aims of the journal.

The documents relating to text selection demonstrate that negotiation with agents outside the journal was a characteristic feature of the censorship process; several actors, including editors, reviewers and other external agents, had an important part to play. *Inostrannaia literatura*’s editorial staff often sought the advice of foreign bodies, such as the British Publishers’ Association, whom they asked, via the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR, to recommend authors for publication.⁶⁹ Contacts were often mobilised via Soviet embassies abroad, in order to obtain recommendations of good foreign authors, and cultural figures like Howard Fast, Paul Robeson and Pablo Neruda were approached for articles or other texts.⁷⁰

In addition, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs also occasionally sent in works that it recommended. One letter from Vladimir Erofeev, an official of the Ministry, enclosed a book of poems by the New Zealand author Rewi Alley, who moved to

⁶⁸ RGALI, f. 1573, op.1, d. 3, l. 38. Letter to Central Committee of the Party concerning *Inostrannaia literatura*’s founding and operation, 1955.

⁶⁹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35, l. 86. Correspondence with the Central Committee, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of Culture on questions relating to publication, 1956.

⁷⁰ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 11, ll 1-4. Correspondence with writers and cultural organizations in the USA and Latin America about publication of their work, 1955.

China in the 1920s and was a member of the Chinese Communist Party, passing on a recommendation from the Soviet diplomat K. A. Efremov that it would be ‘expedient to translate these poems’.⁷¹ When texts had been received from the various sources — imported texts had, of course, to first be approved by Glavlit — the editorial board had to select appropriate items for inclusion in the journal. Internal circulars demonstrate that, as with the initial choice of texts for consideration, the editorial staff worked with political institutions in order to clear works for publication or to ask for further advice. Editors cooperated closely and frequently consulted with the Culture Department of the Central Committee, providing them with plans of texts to be published over following months.⁷² From the correspondence held in the *Inostrannaia literatura* archive, it appears that the Culture Department was heavily involved in the selection of texts. A letter to the Central Committee, regarding an article about Einstein, points out its ideological problems — it applies Freudian theory and ignores Marxist theory — and asks for advice on whether the article should be published.⁷³ A letter from chief editor Chakovskii to Aleksei Surkov, then first secretary of the Writers’ Union, also demonstrates a complex awareness of the functioning of literary texts in the Western and Soviet contexts. In this letter, Chakovskii expresses concern that a particular story by an unnamed Japanese author would, instead of functioning as a tale of social life in Japan, become unnecessarily politicised in the Russian context, and seeks the advice of the Writers’ Union, stating, ‘I consider it extremely important that, before the meeting of the journal’s

⁷¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35, l. 104. Vladimir Erofeev was the father of author Viktor Erofeev.

⁷² RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35, l. 74-6.

⁷³ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 3, l. 56. Correspondence with the Central Committee and Council of Ministers about publication of foreign authors, 1955.

editorial staff that you give your opinion on [this] question'.⁷⁴ The editorial staff was, therefore, aware of the different roles of texts in different contexts, taking this into account when considering the choice of texts, and saw itself as part of a wider literary field. The editorial staff's actions and choices could be affected not only by the interference of external agents from the Union of Writers and the Central Committee, but by problems encountered in access to the *spetskhrany* or with Glavlit in importing items from abroad.⁷⁵ *Inostrannaia literatura*'s remit was to publish principally new foreign writing, and so it published mainly contemporary authors. This means that compared to the figures for book publication, which were heavily dominated by 'classic' nineteenth century authors such as Jack London and Charles Dickens,⁷⁶ *Inostrannaia literatura* had a much more modern slant, often publishing works only months after the original language publication (and, in the case of *Meeting at a far Meridian*, before the English version).

Political involvement was not just enforced officially and on the record, a fact that significantly complicates the study of censorship. Selections of proposed texts, including the typescript of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* (published 1955), were also sent on a regular basis to be examined and approved.⁷⁷ Raisa Orlova remembered a particularly enlightening episode. This was an encounter between Viacheslav Molotov, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, and chief editor Chakovskii: Molotov told Chakovskii that the novel was 'stupid' and that there was no possibility of publication. This discussion is also referred to in internal memos between the

⁷⁴ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 79. Correspondence between Chakovskii and Surkov, 1955.

⁷⁵ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, ll. 23-24. Letter from *Inostrannaia literatura* to Glavlit administration. 11 April 1957.

⁷⁶ See for example, *Ezhgodnik knigi SSSR* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia knizhnaia palata, 1955).

⁷⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 3, l. 56. Letter from Aleksandr Chakovskii to Evgenii Filipovich Trushchenko at the *otdel nauki i kul'tury*, enclosing a copy of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. 11 February 1955.

chief editor Chakovskii and Ilia Erenburg, then a member of the editorial board, in which Chakovskii reminds Erenburg ‘after you recently informed me of your conversation, [you] said that you would ask about publishing Hemingway’. ⁷⁸

Crucially, Molotov gave no official instruction to the editors, and publication was therefore delayed for several months until Molotov told Ilia Erenburg (again in person and off the record) that the journal was able to decide for itself on this issue, and the work was published. ⁷⁹ It is clear, then, that even in the post-Stalin era, there was a significant amount of external interference in the journal’s activities, even at the highest levels of the Party. Clearly, the import of foreign literature was the subject of some political anxiety.

The choice of authors for publication reflects the editorial struggle to strike a balance between great literary works and those that carried the correct ideological message. The list of authors published from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s demonstrates the importance of politically significant works in forming an image of Western literature and culture. If this choice was promoted as representative of the West — and *Inostrannaia literatura*’s editors represented it as so ⁸⁰ — the representation was clearly ideologically distorted. This list of authors bears little relation to lists of contemporary popular authors in the West. For instance, the *Publishers Weekly* fiction bestsellers lists for 1955-1965 contain only three of the authors published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in the same years: Salinger, Steinbeck

⁷⁸RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 94.

⁷⁹Orlova, p. 211.

⁸⁰RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 238, l. 5. Minutes of joint meeting of journal staff and consultants from the foreign commission of the Union of Writers about the plan for the journal for 1960. 7 September 1959.

and Faulkner; these three can be considered bourgeois authors.⁸¹ The discrepancy between the status and popularity of ‘the writers of social protest’ and apolitical authors is marked. Mitchell Wilson, for example, was widely published in the USSR, yet was relatively little known in his native USA. Howard Fast, a recipient of the Stalin prize who was lauded in the Soviet Union, was also a minor figure in the West.

Examination of the journal’s publication patterns demonstrates the importance of the political aspect in the selection of an author’s work. Four of the authors whose work was translated from English — Carter Dyson, Howard Fast, Doris Lessing and Katherine Susannah Pritchard — were members of the communist parties of their respective countries. Of the rest, the majority held left-leaning views and tended to write on strongly social themes; certainly it is their more socially minded works that tend to predominate in *Inostrannaia literatura*. As in earlier years, several of these writers had links with the Soviet Union; Langston Hughes and Alan Sillitoe, for example, visited and wrote about the Soviet Union. The journal also received foreign authors like the English writer James Aldridge and American John Updike in 1964.⁸² Graham Greene made a visit to the offices of the journal in 1960, and he was referred to as ‘our old friend’ by Chakovskii.⁸³ Interestingly, Greene is aware of, and makes reference to, the censorship of foreign texts, noting, in relation to the Soviet dramatization of *Our Man in Havana*, that ‘in the novel there are some tendencies which could not be met with sympathy in the Soviet Union, and

⁸¹ Bestseller lists are compiled in Michael Korda, *Making the List: A Cultural History of the American Bestseller, 1900-1999: As Seen Through the Annual Bestseller Lists of Publishers Weekly* (New York: Barnes & Noble Publishing, 2001).

⁸² RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 521. Record of a conversation with J. Aldridge (England) and J. Updike (USA) and others, 24th October, 1964 and 20th November, 1964.

⁸³ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 311, l. 2. Record of a conversation with the Writer Graham Greene (England) with the editorial staff, 4th April, 1960.

these parts could have been removed at the wish of the adapter. However, he did not do that, they were not removed, and I make note of that and appreciate it'.⁸⁴ Greene made no mention at this meeting of any of the changes made to his novel in the journal publication. It was owing to its particular position in the cultural field that the editorial board was able to establish relationships with a number of foreign authors and, indeed, many involved with the journal maintained long and close friendships, such as the translator Rita Rait-Kovaleva's friendship with Kurt Vonnegut (Vonnegut had close links with the journal in the 1970s, and described himself as closer to Rait-Kovaleva than anyone else outside of his family).⁸⁵ The editors also wrote to authors with whom they were close, requesting books and suggestions.⁸⁶

It is clear that although archival documents demonstrate that the post-Stalin period was marked by negotiation between censorship agents, there are some general attributes common to all the literary texts included in the journal. Firstly, the ideological standpoint of the text was of great importance: non-communist texts were frequently included, although openly left-wing writers make up a large part of those included. Secondly, works were expected to be socially minded, if not explicitly political. Those works that dealt with the social problems suffered by the people of the West (such as racism) were treated very favourably and dominate the pages of *Inostrannaia literatura*. Thirdly, anti-Soviet texts were, of course, completely taboo, but non-political texts, particularly those by writers with a strong international reputation, were approved and included. As the Thaw progressed, there appeared to be an increasing liberalisation of the choice of authors and texts. Of the authors

⁸⁴RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 311, l. 9.

⁸⁵Kurt Vonnegut, *Fates Worse Than Death: An Autobiographical Collage* (New York: Berkley Books, 1992), p. 180.

⁸⁶RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 11, ll. 3-4. Correspondence with writers and social organisations of the USA and Latin America, 1956.

published in *Inostrannaia literatura* who can be regarded as politically neutral, most were published in the later 1950s and 1960s. Some, such as Jack Kerouac and J. D. Salinger, would be regarded as internationally significant and had strong literary reputations in the West. Other, like the American writer James Purdy, had occasional short pieces published. On the whole, then, the early 1960s saw a seemingly greater appreciation of literary worth. Indeed, Trushchenko, a member of the editorial board, claimed at a 1960 meeting on the contents and direction of the journal that ‘we are creating a cult of bourgeois writers. Progressive writers are outraged’.⁸⁷ He asked also:

Do we not exaggerate the place of some writers in Western literature, thereby giving our readers an incorrect image of their proportion and power in that literature? Neither Remarque nor Cronin today occupies the place in the world that we give them.⁸⁸

Chakovskii also admitted in the question and answer session with Graham Greene that the journal was sometimes criticised abroad for not giving a true picture of English life, of publishing authors that were not fashionable in their home countries.

⁸⁹ The picture of foreign life that the journal sought to portray can be understood more fully through study of the standards applied to texts considered for publication.

Criteria for Inclusion: Editorial Reviews

The process of choosing and excluding texts can be analysed through examination of internal reviews, bearing in mind that ‘the genre of the internal review had a peculiar

⁸⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 238, l. 42.

⁸⁸ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 238, l. 14.

⁸⁹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 311, l. 16. Record of a discussion between Graham Greene and editorial staff, 4 April 1960.

significance in Soviet literary life. It was often used as a form of informal censorship and was resorted to when the publication of a book had to be prevented without the employment of overtly administrative measures' that is, formal state-level intervention.⁹⁰ Internal reviews were produced by current members of the editorial board and selected experts from outside. They assessed new foreign publications received by the journal, judging their suitability for publication. Evidence of the reviewers' identity is limited (only four authors are identified in the reviews examined here as the reviews tend to be unsigned) but what is available shows that the reviewers were drawn from literary circles and were specialists in foreign literature — this is unsurprising, as the reviews were of the original-language versions. Sulamif' Mitina, the translator of J. D. Salinger's stories, reviewed three texts: Jay Deiss' *The Blue Chips* (which was published in the journal in 1960); Haakon Maurice Chevalier's *The Man who would be God*; and Ring Lardner's *The Ecstasy of Owen Muir*. A. A. Elistratova, who published a book on William Blake in the 1950s and another on young American writers in 1963, reviewed Philip Bonosky's novel *The Magic Fern*. Another reviewer is named as N. Panov and a fourth is the translator B. Izakov. Petr Vasil'evich Palievskii of the Institute of World Literature (*Institut mirovoi literatury*) also submitted a review to the journal. The reviewers were sometimes involved in other aspects of the journals' production; Elistratova, for example, published a piece of literary criticism in the journal in 1958. Additionally, partial test translations were sometimes produced to assist in the process of text-selection, although few of these remain in the archival holdings.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Galin Tihanov, 'Viktor Shklovskii and Georg Lukács in the 1930s', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 78 (2000), 44-65 (p. 45).

⁹¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 112. Correspondence among editorial board.

The terms of analysis in the reviews tended to coincide with the stated aims of the journal, with some exceptions. Writers whose political standpoint was at odds with a Soviet worldview were often not recommended for publication.⁹² The ‘correct’ portrayal of Western political struggles is a constant topic in the reviews.⁹³ It almost goes without saying that books with a general or pervasive anti-Soviet point of view were not recommended for publication. James Aldridge’s novel *A Captive in the Land* was rejected in 1962 because of its consistently negative portrayal of Moscow and the Soviet system as a whole; the reviewer objects to ‘especially numerous unpleasant, excessive and tactless observations by the main character and his wife about the Soviet people and Moscow and, moreover, openly hostile utterances about the Soviet social system’.⁹⁴ The author’s stated intentions — to uncover the real, positive nature of the Soviet people beneath the drab, great exterior — are irrelevant when the text contains such negative material. The rejection of one book did not mean a complete rejection of the author in this period — Aldridge had already published *I Wish He Would Not Die* in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1957, and continued to be well received in the Soviet Union, receiving the Lenin Peace Prize in 1972. Wyndham Lewis’ 1955 *Self-Condemned* was rejected outright, the review noting that the main character

speaks with particular anger of the ‘falsification’ of history by Soviet authors [...] In general the attitude of the bourgeois liberal historian to the Soviet Union is marked by its animosity and bias [...] Because of the clearly anti-Soviet position of the writer, it

⁹²RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 480, l. 102.

⁹³RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 199, l. 9. Reviews of manuscripts and books by English authors, 1958.

⁹⁴RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 428, l. 24. Reviews of manuscripts and books by English authors, 1962.

would not be appropriate to translate the novel into Russian for the mass reader.⁹⁵

Reviews were only the first stage in choosing texts. Once reviews had been received, the texts were often made the subject of editorial meetings; this was particularly important for those texts that were borderline cases. The minutes of the meetings demonstrate the negotiation among censorial agents that resulted from tension between liberals and traditionalists. This means that while the ideological ‘rules of the game’ were always present in the minds of the editors, there was also an urge on the part of some to expand the canon of foreign literature and publish ‘great’ works of literature, as opposed to only so-called progressive or politically sympathetic, authors. This tension can be observed in the minutes of internal meetings: the record of an editorial meeting in 1957, for instance, shows that there was a desire among some members of staff to be braver about the choice of works. One member, Shmeral’, expressed a desire to publish those works that, while not anti-Soviet, nonetheless expressed a different world view to that found in Soviet literature. Another member of the board, a translator called Breitvurd, disagreed, stating that the journal’s privileged position as a barometer of foreign culture meant that they had to be particularly careful about the choice of works.⁹⁶ ‘Reactionary’ writers such as Samuel Beckett remained unacceptable,⁹⁷ although as the Thaw progressed there were discussions about broadening the ideological horizons of the journal.⁹⁸ Significantly, however, the terms of debate — that is, the language used in the

⁹⁵RGALI f. 1573, op. 5, d. 77, ll. 15-16. Reviews of manuscripts and books by English authors, 1956.

⁹⁶RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 126, ll. 3-4. Minutes of editorial meeting attended by translators, 13 June 1957.

⁹⁷RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 15.

⁹⁸RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 50.

reviews — did not really change with the advance of the Thaw; 1960s reviews described the works in much the same terms as the earlier reviews.

Despite the editorial internalisation of norms and the interference of external agents, the choice of texts published as the Thaw progressed became wider and less politicised. J. D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*, for instance, was published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1960, and was something of a literary phenomenon. The novel was extremely popular among Soviet readers and well received by critics.⁹⁹ In the same year, an extract of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* was also featured in the journal. With its glorification of drug use and the beat lifestyle, it could not be further from the official standards of Soviet literature although, interestingly, the Soviet critic Morozova compared Kerouac to the protest writers of the 1930s and described the beatnik movement as a rejection of official capitalist propaganda. The editor Nina Ivanovna Trifonova is similarly positive about Western texts, claiming, 'we are armed with a Leninist understanding of Tolstoi, a methodology that allows us to see and evaluate accordingly those artists who occupy an ideological position far from ours'.¹⁰⁰ The ideological line of the journal is constantly referred to: at a meeting in 1957, an editor, Savva Artemevich Dangulov stated:

We should continue to follow this line — the line of combative defence of socialist realism and active offensive against our enemies. But this should not be the only line in the journal. We need to continue to actively strengthen our relationship with those

⁹⁹ Elena Romanova, 'What American Novels Do Russians Read?', *Soviet Literature*, 7 (1961), 178-182 (p. 180).

¹⁰⁰ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 58.

in foreign circles who show loyalty to us, understand our position
and can be our partners in the struggle.¹⁰¹

The attempt to strike a balance between strict adherence to the rhetoric of authoritative discourse and the authoritative literary mode of socialist realism, and the desire to represent the best of foreign writing is a constant preoccupation, and informs much of the editorial activity, and is reflected in the balance between ideologically correct and less politically motivated authors in the journal itself. Reviewers displayed an awareness of the potential for censorship on the textual level, and texts that contained anti-Soviet content could be endorsed if the offending parts were removed. For instance, Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* is criticised for its non-socialist attitude and its focus on a bourgeois university professor at the expense of the working masses, Bradbury does not account for the socialist struggle for peace. Nonetheless, this book was judged by the reviewer to be suitable for publication (in the end it was not published in *Inostrannaia literatura*): 'It seems to me that it is definitely possible to remove anything that is unsuitable for the Soviet reader.'¹⁰² It was quite typical of the reviewers to state, 'as regards several mistaken assertions of the author, it seems to me that it is possible to neutralise them by means of footnotes and editorial notes'.¹⁰³

Processes of editorial negotiation can be demonstrated in the minutes of a meeting about the publication of Mitchell Wilson's novel *Meeting at a Far Meridian*. This novel, which recounts a visit by an American scientist to the Soviet Union, was

¹⁰¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 73, l. 15. *Inostrannaia literatura*'s staff in the 1950s and 1960s featured several figures who occupied a prominent place in Soviet literary culture. Savva Artemevich Dangulov (1912-1989) was no exception. As well as serving as a diplomat and correspondent in the 1940s, Dangulov also published several political novels, and, from the late sixties, served as editor of the journal *Soviet literature*.

¹⁰² RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 121.

¹⁰³ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 57. Reviews of manuscripts and books by American writers, 1959.

published in the journal in 1961. Some members of the editorial staff supported the inclusion of the novel because it was ‘interesting’ to the Soviet reader and because Western works portraying the Soviet Union in a sympathetic light were rare; it was also seen as politically useful in the sense that it asserted the necessity of peaceful coexistence between the two countries.¹⁰⁴ More conservative editors focused mainly on the portrayal of the romantic interest, Valia, arguing that this factor should prevent publication. Her falling in love with the American hero and her behaviour in this regard would, according Dolmatovskii, a member of the board, ‘provoke a storm of indignation in the Soviet Union’,¹⁰⁵ since the main American female character is better behaved by comparison. The indignation may have arisen among the editors because Valia’s romantically assertive character did not correspond to the normal portrayal of women in Soviet discourse. There was also some discomfort over a tendency to ‘equate the two worlds’,¹⁰⁶ and mistakenly suggest that they are both equally to blame for the cold war. In this case, the argument was one by the progressives. Although Chakovskii concluded that censorship and attentive editing would be necessary,¹⁰⁷ the novel was published over four issues in 1961.

The discussion about *Meeting at a Far Meridian* demonstrates how liberal editors argued more often for increased focus on the artistic merits of the text, and believed that too often the journal published works that were ideologically suitable, but artistically weak. Nonetheless, even those who supported the novel’s inclusion in the journal argued their case in ideological terms, always bearing in mind the norms of Soviet discourse. To take one example, Tamara Lazarevna Motyleva, who was in

¹⁰⁴ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 6.

¹⁰⁵ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 9. The archival documents contain only the surname, but it is possible that this Dolmatovskii is the poet, Evgenii Aronovich (1915-1994).

¹⁰⁶ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 6.

¹⁰⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 17.

charge of the criticism section, argued for inclusion because Soviet society was shown in a sympathetic light. Where references to poor conditions were made, they served to demonstrate the Soviet people's struggle, endurance and morality, and were included 'not out of exoticism'.¹⁰⁸ It is difficult to say whether these agents wholeheartedly agreed with the terms of the debate; nonetheless they employed these norms either positively or negatively in arguing for or against the presence of a particular text in the journal. The debates, and the actions based on them, are always framed in the terms of the authoritative discourse; this is manifested most obviously in the application of norms of socialist realist literature, the literary model sanctioned in the official discourse. Wilson's novel, despite some editorial misgivings, was published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1961, with the character of Valia remaining intact, and a number of alterations made to the political content of the novel, which I will discuss further in the chapter on political censorship.

The idea of the correct portrayal of the foreign culture is related to the concepts of usefulness and the novel as an educational tool; socialist realism as a literary doctrine privileged the literary text as a means of teaching the reader and portraying the correct ideological and political standpoint. The reviewer, Elistratova, noted approvingly that Philip Bonosky's *The Magic Fern* would 'acquaint Soviet readers with the processes and tendencies in the contemporary American workers' movement, which until now have not been made known to us in artistic literature'.¹⁰⁹ Usefulness is a recurring theme in these reviews. Giving the Soviet reader information on foreign countries, details of foreign life and the foreign political context is an important function of these texts. From Archibald Cronin's *Northern*

¹⁰⁸RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10. l. 5.

¹⁰⁹RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 10.

Light (published in the journal in 1959), for example, ‘we learn a lot about the life of the New York financial hierarchy’.¹¹⁰

Purely personal stories were often described by the reviewers as ‘boring’, while novels with social themes, those concerned with the workers and wider society were regarded much more favourably.¹¹¹ The usefulness of a particular text to the Soviet audience — in terms of what it could teach them about social questions — was of prime importance for the reviewers.¹¹² Doris Lessing’s work *The Antheap* was judged suitable for inclusion principally on the grounds of its treatment of the theme of racism, and it was deemed that Lessing approached the issue ‘from a position of bourgeois humanism, the writer protests against racial discrimination, attesting to the brotherhood of people, no matter the colour of their skin’.¹¹³ The topic of American race relations was prominent in Soviet writing about the USA: foreign works on the theme were widely published and well received,¹¹⁴ and those writers who fought against racism in their works were lionised in Soviet criticism and widely published. Nonetheless, there appears to be a desire in these reviews to view these writers in terms of their adherence, or not, to Soviet positions. B. Krylov, reviewing Martin Luther King’s *Why We Cannot Wait* comments: ‘it should be noted that Martin King is completely silent about the social, class character of racism in the USA and the Negroes’ struggle for civil rights’.¹¹⁵ This type of observation is repeated in the review of Ann Braden’s memoir *The Wall Between*, which recounts the struggle of Braden, her husband and their African American friend, Andrew Wade: the couple

¹¹⁰RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 42.

¹¹¹RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 428, l. 26.

¹¹²RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 475, l. 21. Reviews of manuscripts and books by English authors, 1963.

¹¹³RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 128. Reviews of books for potential inclusion in *Inostrannaia literatura*, 1955.

¹¹⁴Ruggles, 419-435 (p. 428).

¹¹⁵RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 480, l. 96.

bought a house for Wade's family, allowing him to move into a white area, and were attacked by the local people. The reviewer notes that Braden herself approaches the problem of racism from the 'wrong' angle, that of liberal democracy: she cannot see the social side of their actions, acting on a purely moral basis. Her husband, who is interested in Marxism, is treated more with greater approval.¹¹⁶ Nonetheless, the reviewer states that Andrew Wade's bravery should not be over-exaggerated because, rather than being a struggle for universal fairness, his actions stemmed from a bourgeois, family-centred view of the world.¹¹⁷ Since he sought to protect only his own life rather than take a wider social stand, he is judged negatively.

The focus on the norms of Soviet discourse is common to almost all of the reviews studied here. The tropes of socialist realism are paid particular attention, works being assessed in terms of how well they adhere to Soviet ideological norms and explicit reference is made to these norms. The significant symbols of socialist realist discourse were therefore accorded special attention by reviewers. To take one example of this tendency, Catherine Hutter's *The Alien Heart* is praised for its anti-fascist stance, but is most harshly criticised for what it *omits*: the reviewer notes the absence of discussion of the workers' involvement in the February uprising in Austria in 1934, and criticises her attachment to bourgeois democracy and her 'glorification of the American way of life'.¹¹⁸ The review continues, 'not a word is said about the German invasion of the Soviet Union, about the character of the war, not a word about how the Americans profited from the war, no critical note is sounded in relation to American post-war politics in Europe'.¹¹⁹ The most important

¹¹⁶RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 19.

¹¹⁷RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 22.

¹¹⁸RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 83, l. 40. Reviews of manuscripts and books by American writers, 1956.

¹¹⁹RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 83, l. 42.

evaluative criteria are those that are prominent in Soviet discourse about the war, and form part of the dominant discursive canon.

The overall impression gained from a study of these reviews is of a kind of tick list of qualities that are desirable for inclusion. This list is defined by socialist realist clichés: the treatment of class issues, the portrayal of workers and other political issues are used as a means of assessing the suitability of the works examined for inclusion. A striking aspect of the reviews is the way in which they adopt the discourse of socialist realism to argue both for and against a given decision. For example, Archibald Cronin's *Northern Light*, which was published in the journal in 1959, is criticised for not sufficiently setting out the terms of the novel's central conflict;¹²⁰ this was a device that was an important part of the socialist realist master plot.¹²¹ Additionally, books that were otherwise treated favourably by the reviewer could be rejected for having a hero who was not entirely positive, such as would be expected in Soviet literature. A novel by Colin MacInnes, for example, is criticised for this reason;¹²² reviewers therefore indicate that the hero should fulfil the same function in these translated texts as the heroes of socialist realist fiction and be the main focus of the text: it is inappropriate for other characters to outshine the main character — both in terms of their status as a moral example and in terms of the strength of characterisation.¹²³ An apolitical depiction of workers was also deemed unacceptable by the reviewers; this is demonstrated in the review of Harvey Swados' collection of stories entitled *On the Line*. The reviewer indicates that they are

¹²⁰RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 199, l. 9.

¹²¹Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 2nd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 258–259.

¹²²RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 203, l. 12. Reviews of manuscripts and books by American authors, 1958.

¹²³RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, ll. 10–11.

unhappy about the presentation of workers as uninterested in politics, as being connected to each other only ‘mechanically’.¹²⁴

The impression that foreign texts were viewed through a socialist realist frame, or the frame of Soviet authoritative discourse, is enhanced by the frequency of key words typically associated with Soviet texts such as ‘tendentious’,¹²⁵ ‘bourgeois’ or ‘reactionism’.¹²⁶ Works could be accused of ‘decadence’,¹²⁷ and ‘formalism’, and B. Krylov’s 1963 review of Martin Luther King’s *Why We Cannot Wait* is critical of the author’s ‘petty-bourgeois position’.¹²⁸ These terms had particular meanings and uses specific to Soviet discourse, and were rarely, if ever, used in this sense in Western literary criticism. ‘Decadence’, for example, is a term often used with reference to the West; it was applied to Western-oriented literature, and comes to act as a marker of the text’s otherness, a standard epithet. Phrases such as ‘glorification [*voskhvalenie*] of the American way of life’¹²⁹ were clichés that circulated in Soviet discourse, almost as set phrases and the reviews seem to simply reproduce this discourse. One must also take into account that the reviews adhered to a standard structure: the plot or main theme is outlined, the positive aspects of the book are discussed and the flaws — always expressed using the key terms — are highlighted. This strengthens the idea that there was a stock set of discursive markers and discursive forms used by the reviewers.

In the Soviet context, it is important to consider how we read these reviews: internal documents were also subject to ideological controls and it is likely that

¹²⁴RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 75.

¹²⁵RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 475, l. 6.

¹²⁶RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 203, l. 9.

¹²⁷RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 21, l. 8.

¹²⁸RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 480, l. 94.

¹²⁹RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 83, l. 40.

reviewers wrote with a mind to the standards required of them, and to the external agents — we can therefore acknowledge the action of the habitus on the reviewers involved: they knew the ‘rules of the game’ and internalised and reproduced the standards of discourse in their reviews. This impression is strengthened when one considers that the same clichés are present both in negative and positive reviews; works are rejected because of these qualities or approved in spite of them, the reviewers’ discourse is circular and non-productive.

Conclusion: The Performative Dimension

With the circularity of the reviews’ discourse in mind, comparing the terms used in the Thaw-era reviews with the reality of the publication patterns, exposes a certain disconnect, particularly in the later 1950s and early 1960s. Whereas the reviews articulate their judgement in terms of orthodox norms of Socialist realism, the books published tend towards the ‘bourgeois’, even the radical in the case of *On the Road*. Alexei Yurchak’s work can be employed to account for this discrepancy: disputing simplistic binary models of Soviet culture, Yurchak argues for a more complex framework of understanding than ‘dissident’ versus ‘repressed’. A major achievement in the theorisation of late Soviet culture is to emphasise the performative dimension of Soviet discourse. Following John Austin, Yurchak argues that the performative aspect of discourse in the late Soviet era became increasingly important, and the constative aspect less so: a ‘performative shift’ occurred, where ‘some discursive acts or whole types of discourse can drift historically in the direction of an increasingly expanding performative dimension and increasingly open

or even irrelevant constative dimension'.¹³⁰ The primacy of the performative dimension 'enabled the emergence of diverse, multiple, and unpredictable meanings in everyday life, including those that did not correspond to the constative meanings of authoritative discourse'.¹³¹ In the *Inostrannaia literatura* reviews, the importance of the performative aspect is immediately clear. Firstly, it is demonstrated in the structural repetitiveness of the reviews: on the author's social position or beliefs, and a seemingly obligatory negative comment. Secondly, the texts are described and evaluated only in the terms of authoritative discourse — I have described how the foreign texts are evaluated against the yardstick of socialist realism and how key terms of Socialist realism are repeatedly used to justify either exclusion or inclusion. Despite the constant employment of this discourse, the Thaw-era journal often published work well outside the parameters of socialist realism. While this can be accounted for to some extent by the changing political mood, it is more difficult to account for the unproductive nature of this discourse, except, perhaps, through the concept of the 'performative shift'. It is possible to see the reviews as performative acts that fulfil a ritual aspect of Soviet discourse, allowing for the presence of new, 'unofficial' texts as long as the formal aspects of censorship practices were adhered to, the editors had some freedom to include new texts and discourses into Soviet culture. As Yurchak notes, 'these acts are not about stating facts and describing opinions but about doing things and opening new possibilities'.¹³²

This examination of the patterns of publication of foreign literature in these journals, and the micro-level analysis of *Inostrannaia literatura*'s internal editorial

¹³⁰Yurchak, p. 24. Yurchak focuses mainly on the Brezhnev period, but notes that the performative shift was in effect in the Khrushchev era.

¹³¹Yurchak, p. 25. Emphasis in original.

¹³²Yurchak, p. 25.

demonstrate that the editors used the performative aspect of reviews to ‘do things’,¹³³ opening up new possibilities using the closed system of authoritative discourse in order to justify the inclusion of texts that might have been officially considered unacceptable. The use of ritualised, authoritative forms of discourse can, perhaps counter-intuitively, actually allow for the inclusion of new, foreign discourses.

¹³³To use Austin’s term. See John Langston Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Chapter 4: Puritanical Censorship

In this chapter, I will shift my analysis to the level of the text itself, and discuss the comparative studies of Russian and English texts. Here, the focus is on puritanical censorship, also called ‘moral censorship’, as it ‘appeals to public decency’.¹ The term is borrowed from Herman Ermolaev, who divides censorship practices into ‘puritanical’ and ‘political’, and states:

Puritanical censorship weeded out what was considered incompatible with the moral or aesthetic education of the Soviet man [sic]. Deletions of a puritanical nature concern such things as sex, gore, foul language, offensive odours, unpleasant appearance, bad manners, personal uncleanness and certain parts and functions of the human body.²

The immediate post-revolutionary period into the 1920s was marked by a strikingly new sexual freedom, as new conceptions of the family appeared and debates over free love and studies of sexuality and relationships flourished. This was dramatically reversed in the 1930s: the sociological study of sexual life disappeared, the works of Freud, widely discussed in the previous decade, were banned, and the state began to institute centralised control over the private life of its citizens to an unprecedented degree, resulting in a ‘veritable triumph for a Russian version of puritanism’,³ and the ‘profound sexual phobia of Soviet society’.⁴ Literary production was, of course, affected by this politicisation of sex and the policy of

¹ Janelle Reinelt, ‘The Limits of Censorship’, *Theatre Research International*, 32 (2007), 3-15 (p. 6).

² Ermolaev, p. xiii.

³ George Gibian, *Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature During the Thaw, 1954-1957* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), p. 75.

⁴ Brian James Baer, ‘Russia’, *Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature* (London: Routledge, 2006), 1141-1145 (p. 1141).

puritanism. Physical love, sex and the body were almost completely removed from Soviet literature in the 1930s. Texts of the 1920s were censored in later editions to conform to contemporary moral norms. For instance, in the early 1930s Fedor Gladkov's *Tsement*, for instance, lost scenes of sexual desire and sexual violence; in Nikolai Ostrovskii's *Kak zakalialas' stal'* (*How the Steel was Tempered*), descriptions of impotence were cut.⁵ This suppression of sex was slightly eased in the Khrushchev era.⁶ Censorship of erotic material in Soviet literature became less significant, and some excisions made to texts published in the Stalin period were even reversed in the late 1950s.⁷

As well as sex, instances of swearing and vulgar language were also regulated by the censors, and I will discuss specific examples in this chapter. Official disapproval of swearing and vulgar language were part of a political striving for the creation of the cultured Soviet person,⁸ which manifested itself in official campaigns against *mat* and in the struggle for cultured speech that began in the 1920s and continued into the 1930s.⁹ Soviet material was harshly censored by editors, and probably also by Glavlit, in order to remove any and all mention of this taboo subject in the 1930s and 1940s. Glavlit issued official instructions in the mid 1930s concerning the 'fight' against bad language;¹⁰ as a result, Russian literature of that period was cleansed of vulgar language through ellipsis.¹¹ The cultural products of

⁵ Ermolaev, p. 92. Ermolaev traces the censorship of the various editions of these and other texts from the 1920s to 1991.

⁶ Igor Kon, 'Sexuality and Culture', in *Sex and Russian Society*, ed. by James Riordan and Igor Kon (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), pp. 15-44 (p. 25).

⁷ Ermolaev, p. 175.

⁸ David L. Hoffmann, *Stalinist Values: The Cultural Norms of Soviet Modernity, 1917-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), p. 43.

⁹ S. A. Smith, 'The Social Meanings of Swearing: Workers and Bad Language in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia', *Past and Present*, 1998, 167-202 (p. 192).

¹⁰ Ermolaev, p. 56.

¹¹ Ermolaev, p. 92.

the West were also censored for sexual content; films, for example, were subject to ‘wholesale cuts [...] before they could be viewed by the public’.¹² The ways in which Western literature was made acceptable will become clear in the course of this chapter.

Although I have separated political and puritanical censorship for the purposes of analysis, one cannot simply — or unproblematically — separate political and puritanical motives. Ermolaev notes perceptively that ‘occasionally, the line between political and puritanical excisions is blurred. Similar moral or aesthetic defects might have been removed from the portrayal of politically friendly characters but left intact in the description of enemies’,¹³ so that politics did affect how censorship impacts on texts, particularly where material that might otherwise have been censored was left intact to contribute to a negative characterisation of an enemy figure. The politicisation of Soviet cultural life and the importance of political concerns in establishing cultural and aesthetic norms result in a blurring of boundaries between the two; politics and sexual life were intimately connected. This will be touched upon in the examples to follow. It should be borne in mind, then, that there is often a political context to seemingly puritanical changes and, indeed, that the broader ideological context (or *habitus* of the text producers) is always at play.

This chapter will examine puritanical censorship through an analysis of censorship techniques, examining how and why techniques of excision and euphemism were employed and what the effects on the target texts were; the examination will draw out pertinent issues relating to censorial action and its ambiguities.

¹² Igor Kon, pp. 15-44 (p. 25).

¹³ Ermolaev, p. xiii.

Excision

In the texts of the 1930s and 1940s, there are numerous instances of excisions of vulgar and sexual content. A paragraph in Joseph Freeman's autobiography *An American Testament* (published in the journal in 1937) referring to the act of sex — albeit obliquely — was removed altogether:

The novelist explained at great length that dancing was immoral because it was nothing more than a form of sex play. It's not true, we said; or true so remotely that it is practically unimportant. And, suppose dancing is a form of sex play, what of it?¹⁴

Although Erskine Caldwell's *Trouble in July* (published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* in 1940) retained one or two references to female nudity, two sexually explicit sections were cut from a passage describing a violent sexual encounter between two characters, Katy and Milo. The first is an oddly poetic description of Katy:

I'm here to tell you I never saw a prettier sight than I saw then. She stretched out on the cotton, all naked and soft-looking. Where her legs came together at her belly it looked exactly like somebody had poked his finger in one of those toy balloons, and the place had stayed there. She —¹⁵

Красивей мне ничего видеть не приходилось, это я вам прямо скажу, растянулась на хлопке вся голая, нежная такая. Она...¹⁶

¹⁴ Joseph Freeman, *An American Testament: a Narrative of Rebels and Romantics* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1936), p. 249.

¹⁵ Erskine Caldwell, *Trouble in July* (London: Falcon Press, 1948), p. 62.

¹⁶ Erskine Caldwell, 'Sluchai v iule', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 7/8 (1941), 4-64 (p. 26). [I've never seen anything more beautiful, I tell you that straight, stretched out on the cotton, completely naked, so tender. She...]

The second extract is a description of her sexual aggression. This entire paragraph, and the two following it were removed from the Russian text:

‘What did you do then?’ the barber urged. One of the other men took out a bottle and passed it around. They drank it empty and tossed it aside. ‘I didn’t do nothing then, to tell the truth,’ Milo said, wiping his mouth with the back of his hand. ‘She lay there carrying on with herself like I never saw before in all my life. Then the next thing I knew she had started in on me the same way. We started rolling around getting at each other. That fieldhouse of Bob Watson’s is about thirty or forty feet square on all sides, and one time we would be bumping up against the side of one wall, and the next time against the other wall, that far away. She got hold of me with her teeth, and I thought she was going to kill me, it hurt so much.’¹⁷

In John Hyde Preston’s novel *The Liberals* (Russian publication: 1938), a quasi-scientific pronouncement by one character relating to his newest book was cut drastically, because of the continued repetition of sexual imagery and the enthusiastic attitude of this character towards sex:

You have never studied life scientifically. For example, what is an orgasm about? It’s just a magnificent spasm of the body. That’s precisely what a book should be — unquestionably and entirely that and nothing more. A book is a climactic spasm of creative energy produced by satisfying friction with the sensual properties of life. But must you always describe the elements, the precise causes, of the spasm? Absurd. Moronic. The tiresome effort of little men. Let us be content, my friends, to say that such a spasm occurs — and a good book is the occurrence of it. Must you always

¹⁷ Caldwell, *Trouble in July*, pp. 62-63.

be able to describe a woman to have a satisfactory orgasm? Can you

have an economic orgasm? A social orgasm? Why, ridiculous. That's why a lasting book is about nothing. Because life is about nothing. It is a spasm of nothing embracing nothing. Nothing at all. Just a dirty joke.¹⁸

У вас нет научного подхода к жизни. Настоящая книга должна быть ни о чем. Спазм пустоты, объемлющей пустоту, абсолютную пустоту. Неприличный анекдот — и только.¹⁹

In addition to erasing the sexual metaphor, the Russian translation misrepresents the ideological thrust of the speaker's utterance. The equation of a philosophically pointless orgasm with the production of a novel means that it cannot and should not have any economic or social relevance and is dangerously close to a championing of the avant-garde; here, moral censorship has a distinctly ideological edge. *The Liberals* presents an interesting case where it appears almost as if there is a limit to what can be said: sex can be mentioned, but only a limited number of times, and not in an overly descriptive or explicit way. Thus the neutral and medical-sounding 'он был импотентом',²⁰ is the translation of 'he was impotent',²¹ but the following long description is cut in the Russian text:

He took off his flannel shirt, then his ski-pants, and hung them with Ann's on the chair. The shelter had seemed warm with his clothes on, but when he got them off he knew how cold it was. Ann was still laughing and moving excitedly under the blankets. Shivering, he got in and held her close. He thought he had never felt her body

¹⁸ John Hyde Preston, *The Liberals: A Novel*. (New York: John Day, 1938), p. 263.

¹⁹ Preston, John Hyde, 'Liberaly', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina and Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 11-12 (1938), 14-78; 23-119 (vol. 12, p. 75). [You do not have a scientific approach to life. A real book should be about nothing. A spasm of emptiness, embracing emptiness, absolute emptiness. An dirty joke, that is all.]

²⁰ Preston, 'Liberaly', vol. 11, p. 43.

²¹ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 33.

so warm and soft, with the lovely breasts cool against him. He played with her hair and buried his face in its smell. He had thought

that he had wanted her before, that he could never want her more than he had before, but now he wanted her so wildly that it was as if they were not the same people. He lost all sense of time and space. They were floating away. He held on to her as they floated. It made no difference where they went. Ann's eyes were hazy and she was tossing her head furiously from side to side. They floated above the earth, gently at first, and then they were rushing. They were rushing wildly. Philip shut his eyes and heard her voice — no words, only her voice like something in the wind. Then they came back. They had been far away and they came back slowly and wonderfully. Ann lay against him her eyes half closed, laughing softly. Her soft golden hair was thick in her neck. Philip was taking deep breaths of the balsam under the blanket. 'Oh let's never leave here!' Ann said at last. He held her tight.²²

Он снял фланелевую рубашку, потом лыжные штаны, и повесил их на тот же стул. Пока он был одет, в домике казалось тепло, и только раздевшись, он почувствовал, как здесь холодно. Весь дрожа, он залез под одеяло и притянул ее к себе. —Как не хочется уходить отсюда! —сказала она. Филипп обнял ее крепче.²³

In a later novel, *Key to the Door* (Russian publication: 1963) the end of a similarly descriptive paragraph is also removed from the Russian version.

²²Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 329.

²³Preston, 'Liberality', vol. 12, p. 96. [He took off his flannel shirt, then his ski pants, and hung them on the same chair. While he was clothed the house had seemed warm, but as soon as he undressed, he felt how cold it was here. Shivering, he crawled under the blanket and pulled her towards him. —I don't want to leave here! she said. Philip held her more strongly.]

They kissed, and lay down on the rug, and knowing that no one would disturb them that night he drew skirt and blouse and underwear from her white and passionately waiting body. Her face glowed from the nearness of the blazing fire, and from the unfamiliarity of allowing her nakedness to be seen by him. She grew towards his caresses, a thoughtless process of kissing that, as he undressed, passed into an act of *love-making* that was slow and marvellous, submerging their closed eyes into a will over which neither thought of having any control. They lay together with no precaution between the final pleasure, into a smooth rhythm of love and a grip of arms to stop them crying out at the climax of it.²⁴

Зная, что никто не помешает им сегодня, он стянул юбку, блузку и белье с ее белого, трепетавшего в горячем ожидании тела. Лицо ее пылало от близости горящего камина и от неизведанного чувства, вызванного тем, что он видит ее наготу. Она потянулась навстречу его ласкам, и они бездумно слились в поцелуе, а потом, когда он тоже разделся, они снова слились в медленном и чудесном *объятии* и, закрыв глаза, отдались желанию, которое ни один из них и не думал сдерживать.²⁵

In these examples, the most explicit part of the passage is removed completely. The action of this censorship technique is akin to the film technique of showing the beginning of a scene and subtly cutting away, or fading out: enough of an impression is made that the reader understands what is going on, without having to be overtly told. It would appear that the censor understands the effect of their actions on the

²⁴ Alan Sillitoe, *Key to the Door* (London: W.H. Allen, 1961), p. 371. Emphasis added.

²⁵ Alan Sillitoe, 'Kliuch ot dveri', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by N. Dekhtereva, B. Rostokin and V. Smirnov, 6 (1963), 50-107 (p. 149). Emphasis added. [Knowing that no-one would bother them today, he pulled down the skirt, blouse, and underwear from her white body, trembling with hot expectation. Her face glowed from the nearness of the hot fire, and from the strange feeling evoked by his seeing her nudity. She stretched to meet his caresses, and they unthinkingly merged into kisses, and then, when he had also undressed, they again merged into slow and wonderful embraces, and, closing their eyes, gave into the desire that neither of them thought of controlling.]

reader. In this case, the censorial act has a perlocutionary force, acting upon the reader to make them aware of the censorship applied to the text. Thus, one might see censorial action in the light of John Austin's statement that 'saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience or of the speaker, or of other persons: and it may be done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing them'.²⁶ The perlocutionary force of censorial action, as I will demonstrate in some of the examples to follow, is a defining feature of the puritanical mode of censorship.

The removal of 'just enough' is particularly clearly demonstrated in Erskine Caldwell's novel *Jenny by Nature* (published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1963). In the 1960s, it must be noted, political conditions were becoming more fluid, and translators and editors appear to have sought to exploit loopholes where they could. The impression garnered from these extracts is that censorial agents removed just enough from the texts to allow the inclusion of at least some explicit material. In fact, the inclusion of this novel on the pages of the journal is noteworthy in itself, given that its subject is the story of a reformed prostitute who rents out rooms in her house to various misfits and unsavoury characters. It could be argued that the text is intended to be read as a critique of capitalist society, as was often the case with material not usually suitable for a Soviet audience, however, the subject of sex still had to be depicted appropriately. As one might expect, the source text contains numerous references to sex. Sometimes these references are omitted: these changes are made by the editor, with the translator retaining the 'explicit' original. The following passage is cut from the published Russian text: 'Now that she's got man-

²⁶ Austin, p. 101.

fever, she's got no more shame than a naked whore on a bed-quilt with a big spender on a binge', ²⁷ with the translator's version reading 'А сейчас, тогда когда ее потянуло на мужчину, у нее стыда не больше, чем у голой шлюхи, которая лежит в постели с тароватым кутилой'. ²⁸ And the end of the following passage is removed by the editor:

That's the kind of man you've got to get away from before any dangerous biting and hitting starts, even if you have to climb out of a window *and leave your knickers behind*. *I had a friend once who had one of her nipples bitten clean off, and it was a sad sight to see on a woman*. I don't know anything more pitiful to think about. That wasn't what happened to you, was it, honey? ²⁹

От таких мужчин надо держаться подальше, прямо бежать от них, пока они не начали кусаться и драться, даже если придется выскочить в окно. Ведь ничего такого с вами не случилось, деточка? ³⁰

Here, the most violent and graphic part of the passage is removed. In the Russian the link between the first and second sentences is not very clear, because of the excision: the word 'такого' [like that] has no referent in the Russian version. This might demonstrate the relative importance of ideological decency versus literary style, but it also indicates to the reader an absence, hinting, perhaps, at the fact of censorship. In another scene in this novel, where Jenny argues with her neighbour over her lover, Veasey, the humorous reference to sex is erased:

²⁷ Erskine Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature* (London: Heinemann, 1961), p. 208.

²⁸ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 1033, l. 159. Erskine Caldwell, *Dzhenni*. Translator's typescript with editorial corrections. [And now, when she is attracted to a man, she has no more shame than a naked slut, who is lying in bed with a lavish hedonist.]

²⁹ Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 90. Emphasis added.

³⁰ Erskine Caldwell, 'Dzhenni', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 12 (1962), 71-162 (p. 108). [You should keep away from men like that, just run away from them, before they start to bite and fight, even if you have to jump out of a window. Nothing like that happened to you, dear?]

He belongs to me — and I'm not going to let you get him inside
your house to have a good time with! [...] Veasey's my jockey-boy,
and don't you forget it!³¹

Он мой — и я не позволю тебе его переманить!³²

Thus, excision is a commonly applied technique used to erase or limit unsuitable material, adhering to the acceptable limit, but often also serving to alert the reader to the presence of censorship.

Euphemism

In addition to excision, sexual content and vulgar language were censored through euphemism. Euphemism is related to social taboo,³³ and the term refers to the employment of 'an alternative to a dispreferred expression, in order to avoid possible loss of face: either one's own face or, through giving offence, that of the audience, or of some third party'.³⁴ Euphemism is 'the linguistic process which, by means of associative formal or semantic resources, achieves the lexical neutralisation of the prohibited word';³⁵ there are a number of ways in which euphemism functions in discourse, including 'lexical substitution, phonetic alteration, morphological modification, composition or inversion, syntagmatic grouping or combination, verbal or paralinguistic modulation or textual description'.³⁶ The nature of translation, of

³¹ Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 54.

³² Caldwell, *Dzhenni*, p. 93. [He's mine—and I won't let you lure him away!]

³³ Language and taboo are discussed in Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

³⁴ Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used As Shield and Weapon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 11.

³⁵ Miguel Casas Gomez, 'Towards a New Approach to the Linguistic Definition of Euphemism', *Language Sciences*, 31 (2009), 725-729 (p. 732).

³⁶ Gomez, 725-729 (p. 738).

course, is such that euphemism is achieved through lexical substitution. Keith Allan and Kate Burridge outline some techniques of lexical substitution, including:

circumlocution and abbreviation, acronym or even complete omission and also by one-for-one substitution; by general-for-specific and part-for-whole substitution (terms we prefer to the more traditional “synecdoche” and “metonymy”); by hyperbole and understatement; by the use of learned terms or technical jargon instead of common terms, and by the use of colloquial instead of formal terms.³⁷

In *Lucky Jim* by Kingsley Amis (*Inostrannaia literatura* publication: 1958), the phrase ‘sexual encounters’³⁸ is translated simply as ‘свиданий’ [dates];³⁹ ‘sexual feelings’⁴⁰ is translated ‘чувственного влечения’ [sensual attractions]⁴¹ and ‘to start any kind of sexual relationship with her’⁴² becomes ‘чтобы сойтись с нею’ [to come together with her].⁴³ A further example from *Jenny by Nature* serves to illustrate this censorship technique. A description of Jenny is softened in translation. The phrase ‘she was a loose-titted prostitute and a bare-assed whore as far as he was concerned’⁴⁴ is translated ‘все равно она развратная женщина, с его точки зрения’.⁴⁵ The statement is shortened through the combination of the two specific attributes into one more general category. The substitution of a non-vulgar adjective also alters the phrase; it becomes a general description of Jenny’s moral standards rather than her actual work, and it avoids naming her as a prostitute (of course, the

³⁷ Allan and Burridge, *Euphemism and Dysphemism*, p. 14.

³⁸ Kingsley Amis, *Lucky Jim* (London: Penguin, 1954), p. 57.

³⁹ Kingsley Amis, ‘Schastlivchik Dzhim’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by T. Ozerskaia and N. Treneva, 10-12 (1958), vol. 10, p. 49.

⁴⁰ Amis, *Lucky Jim*, p. 72.

⁴¹ Amis, ‘Schastlivchik Dzhim’ vol. 10, p. 54.

⁴² Amis, *Lucky Jim*, p. 235.

⁴³ Amis, ‘Schastlivchik Dzhim’, vol. 12, p. 189.

⁴⁴ Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 15.

⁴⁵ Caldwell, *Dzhenni*, p. 77. [All the same she was a licentious woman, from his point of view.]

rest of novel makes this clear), and the understatement achieved through the substitution of standard language for a marked term loses the bawdy tone of the English. A similar use of euphemism can be observed in *The Northern Light* (Russian publication: 1959), where the exclamation ‘What crap!’⁴⁶ is translated as ‘ну и убожество!’ [what squalor!].⁴⁷ *Убожество* means literally poverty or mediocrity. The force of this exclamation is lessened by a non-literal translation that does not have the same rhetorical strength as the English.

Euphemism can also be demonstrated in *The Quiet American* (published in the journal in 1956). One character called Pyle is quoted, “‘I’ve never had a girl,” he said, “not properly. Not what you’d call a real *experience*””.⁴⁸ This is translated ‘У меня никогда не было женщины — сказал он, — так вот, по настоящему. То, что вы бы назвали настоящим *романом*’.⁴⁹ The idea of a sexual experience is replaced by that of a relationship. The following, from the same novel, is typical of the translators’ censorial intervention:

I had experience to match his virginity, age was as good a card to play in the sexual game as youth.⁵⁰

Его *нетронутости* я мог противопоставить свою опытность.
В игре, где ставкой- *любовь*, зрелость такая же хорошая карта,
как молодость.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Archibald J. Cronin, *The Northern Light* (London: The Companion Book Club, 1958), p. 166.

⁴⁷ Archibald J. Cronin, ‘Severnyi svet’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by I. Gurova and Tat’iana Kudriavtseva, 1-2 (1959), 64-137; 103-180 (vol. 2, p. 142).

⁴⁸ Graham Greene, *The Quiet American* (London: Heinemann, 1955), p. 129.

⁴⁹ Graham Greene, ‘Tikhii amerikanets’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva and S. Mitina, 6-7 (1956), 4-41; 90-164, (vol. 7, p. 110) [I have never had a woman — he said — you know, properly. What you would call a real *romance*.]

⁵⁰ Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 81.

⁵¹ Greene, ‘Tikhii amerikanets’, vol. 6, p. 41. [I could counter his virginity with my experience. In the game, where love is the bet, maturity is as good a card as youth.] Emphasis added.

As well as the replacement of ‘sexual game’ by ‘love’, the Russian translation of ‘virginity’ is itself a euphemism connoting *untouchedness*; the usual Russian word for virginity is *девственность*. The typescript shows that this phrase is also altered by the editor, who perhaps felt that the translator’s alteration went too far, since the translator’s original choice was the even more clearly moralising ‘чистота’ [purity]. This is scored out and replaced in the edited typescript by ‘нетронутость’ [untouchedness].⁵²

Where *love* replaces *sex*, it follows that the act of sexual intercourse is replaced by *embraces*. One of Greene’s characters in *The Quiet American* notes of two others, ‘It was impossible to conceive either of them a prey to untidy passion: they did not belong to rumpled sheets and the sweat of sex’,⁵³ and this is translated as ‘Невозможно было себе представить, что их могут терзать нечистые страсти: с ними не вязалось представление о смятых простынях, о потных объятиях’.⁵⁴ In addition to the moralising tone added by нечистые (‘untidy’ is not marked in this way) and ‘терзать’ [torment], the reference to sex is neutralised by the typical use of the generalised ‘embraces’. The style of the passage, and the novel overall, is altered by these changes, losing its directness and matter-of-fact tone. Similarly, in Alan Sillitoe’s *Key to the Door*, the translators, N. Dekhtereva, B. Rostokin and V. Smirnov, substitute ‘объятия’ [embraces]⁵⁵ for ‘love-making’. In addition, the phrase ‘shuddering at the orgasm’⁵⁶ is translated ‘в охватившей его страсти’ [In the

⁵²RGALI, f. 1573, op. 2, d. 72, l. 40. Graham Greene, *Tikhii amerikanets*. Translators’ typescript with editorial corrections.

⁵³Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 209.

⁵⁴Greene, ‘Tikhii amerikanets’, vol. 7, p. 147-148. [It was impossible to imagine, that they could be tormented by unclean passions: they didn’t suit imaginings of crumpled sheets, of sweaty embraces.]

⁵⁵Sillitoe, ‘Kliuch ot dveri’, vol. 6, p. 149.

⁵⁶Sillitoe, *Key to the Door*, p. 373.

passion engulfing him].⁵⁷ Like *сексуальный* and *половой* [sexual], the Russian word *оргазм* did exist in Russian — it is included in Ushakov's dictionary of the 1930s: 'the sensuous sensation at the end of the sexual act [*пологово акта*]',⁵⁸

The earliest example of censorship through euphemism is seen in John Dos Passos' play *Airways Inc.*; this is the only censorial change observed in the translation of this orthodox communist tale. In a romantic scene between two main characters, the phrase 'We're like people trying to make love on a battlefield',⁵⁹ — arguably already a euphemism — is rendered 'Мы с тобой точно на поле битвы встретились' [It is as if you and I met on the battlefield].⁶⁰ In Erskine Caldwell's *Some American People* (published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* in 1937), a travelogue and exposé of the extreme hardships of the great depression, a reference to incest is replaced: 'Incest is as prevalent as marriage in these tenant regions',⁶¹ becomes: 'Браки между близкими родственниками процветают в этой местности' [Marriages between close relatives flourish in this locality].⁶² In both these examples, metonymy — substitution of the more general term 'incest' — is used to avoid reference to sex.

It was not only references to sex, but also graphic reference to the body that were subject to censorship. In a description of childbirth in *The Grapes of Wrath* (1940), the naturalistic details are euphemised, rendering the description not only less explicit, but also less vivid and evocative.

⁵⁷ Sillitoe, 'Kliuch ot dveri', vol. 6, p. 150.

⁵⁸ 'Orgazm', *Tolkovyi slovar' russkogo iazyka*, ed. by Dmitrii Nikolaevich Ushakov and Grigorii Osipovich Vinokur (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei, 1935) <<http://ushdict.narod.ru/112/w33778.htm>> [accessed 4 September 2011].

⁵⁹ John Dos Passos, *Airways, Inc.*, (New York, The Macaulay Company, 1928), p. 82.

⁶⁰ John Dos Passos, 'Aktsionernoe obshchestvo "vozdukh-put"', *Internatsional'naia Literatura*, 1 (1933), 19-47 (p. 34).

⁶¹ Erskine Caldwell, *Some American People* (New York: R.M. McBride & Co., 1935), p. 262.

⁶² Erskine Caldwell, 'Amerikanskii liudi', *Internatsional'naia Literatura*, trans. by G. Prokunina, 8-9 (1936), 92-95; 105-109 (vol. 9, p. 108).

For on the night when Noah was born, Pa, frightened at the spreading thighs, alone in the house, and horrified at the screaming wretch his wife had become, went mad with apprehension.⁶³

Потому что в ту ночь, когда Ноа появился на свет, отец, оставшийся один-на-один с роженицей — с этим жалким исходившим криком существом, в котором он не мог признать свою жену, — обезумел от страха.⁶⁴

Following the pattern of metonymic substitution, the censor here substitutes the blandly descriptive ‘роженицей’ [mother in labour] for the parts of the body.

Another theme that was subject to censorship in keeping with Soviet puritanical norms was homosexuality. Male homosexuality was illegal in the Soviet Union, and both male and female homosexuality were largely invisible phenomena.⁶⁵ Homosexual themes were suppressed in literature, even in translations of Greek and Roman classics, where references were changed to heterosexual ones or erased.⁶⁶ The approach to homosexuality in the foreign texts studied here was marginally more open; this example of censorship via euphemism is taken from Ernest Hemingway’s 1935 novel *Fiesta*.

That was what the Civil War was about. Abraham Lincoln was a faggot. He was in love with General Grant. So was Jefferson Davis. Lincoln just freed the slaves on a bet. The Dred Scott case was framed by the Anti-Saloon League. Sex explains it all. The Colonel’s Lady and Judy O’Grady are Lesbians under their skin.⁶⁷

⁶³ John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (New York: Modern Library, 1939), p. 106.

⁶⁴ John Steinbeck, ‘Grozd’ia gneva’, *Internatsional’naia literatura*, trans. by Natal’ia Al’bertovna Volzhina, 1940, 5-85; 26-140 (vol. 1, p. 46). [Because on the night when Noa appeared in the world, father, left face to face with the mother in labour—with that screaming creature, in which he could not recognise his wife, went mad with fear.]

⁶⁵ Baer, 21-40 (p. 25).

⁶⁶ Baer, 21-40 (p. 26); Friedberg, *Literary Translation*, p. 33.

⁶⁷ Ernest Hemingway, *Fiesta* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1927), p. 134.

The offensive term ‘faggot’ is replaced and the reference to lesbianism is entirely removed; the end of the paragraph is cut in the Russian text:

Из-за этого разыгрались Война за Освобождение. Авраам Линкольн был гомосексуалист. Он был влюблен в генерала Гранта. И Джефферсон Дэвис. Линкольн освободил рабов на пари.⁶⁸

The target text item chosen in this passage, ‘гомосексуалист’ [homosexual] does not contain the vulgar element that ‘faggot’ does; it is, however, a term with an implicit negative judgement, and it is used in a quasi-medical way. Ushakov’s Stalin-era dictionary marks it as literary language and defines it as a ‘person *suffering* from homosexuality’.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, it is interesting that the term should be retained at all, given the fact that ‘the Soviet censor’s treatment of overt same-sex content in translations was for the most part uncompromising’.⁷⁰ Since homosexuality was illegal, any association between communism and homosexuality was ‘excised as sacrilegious’,⁷¹ which, somewhat counter-intuitively, may explain why a description of the capitalist enemy retained the comparison, albeit in a form modified to meet the puritanical norms of Russian literary language. Lesbianism was not subject to a specific criminal code, although lesbians were also victims of harassment and victimisation, personally and professionally.⁷² Like male

⁶⁸ Ernest Hemingway, ‘Fiesta’, *Internatsional’naia literatura*, trans. by P. Toper, 1 (1935), 3-44 (pp. 5-6). [Out of this came the War of Independence. Abraham Lincoln was a homosexual. He was in love with General Grant. And Jefferson Davies. Lincoln freed the slaves on a bet.]

⁶⁹ ‘Гомосексуалист’, *Tolkovyi slovar’ russkogo iazyka*, ed. by Dmitrii Nikolaevich Ushakov and Grigorii Osipovich Vinokur (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo inostrannykh i natsional’nykh slovari, 1935) <<http://ushdict.narod.ru/278/w83490.htm>> [accessed 4 September 2011]. Emphasis added.

⁷⁰ Baer, 21-40 (p. 26).

⁷¹ Baer, 21-40 (p. 26).

⁷² Igor S. Kon, ‘Russia’, in *Sociolegal Control of Homosexuality* (New York: Springer Science & Business Media, 1997), pp. 221-242 (p. 225).

homosexuality, lesbianism was invisible in official Soviet discourse.⁷³ In the translation here, that invisibility is reinforced. Where the retention of homosexuality has a political edge, the reference to lesbianism is not required for this purpose and so is erased.

A later novel, *Catcher in the Rye*, crosses boundaries that Soviet literature could not in its description of Holden Caulfield's teacher, Mr Antolini, who makes a pass at him. Even in this novel there is a certain hesitancy on the part of the translator: the word Holden uses to describe his teacher, 'flit',⁷⁴ a contemporary American slang word for homosexual, is avoided in the Russian and Mr Antolini is described in the translation as 'со странностями' [with quirks/ oddities].⁷⁵ Despite this change, the fact of Mr Antolini's homosexuality is retained in the description of his approaching Holden and attempting to touch him as he sleeps. The reader immediately understands that this is an example of homosexual desire, and this understanding is in no way erased by the alteration of the single word 'flit'. Homosexuality is also treated carefully in *The Quiet American*, where the translator opts for a non-direct translation of a phrase containing an allusion to it. One character uses the insult, 'You all talk like poufs',⁷⁶ again employing a contemporary slang word to designate a gay man; this is translated 'У вас каша в пры' [you have kasha in your mouth, i.e. you mumble].⁷⁷ While descriptive, this avoids any reference to homosexuality. In this instance, practical as well as ideological factors may have been at play. Since even translators with a good academic knowledge of

⁷³ On the subversive possibilities of this invisibility, see Baer, 21-40.

⁷⁴ J. D. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye* (London: Penguin, 1994), p. 175.

⁷⁵ J. D. Salinger, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva, 11 (1960), 28-137 (p. 128).

⁷⁶ Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 241.

⁷⁷ Greene, 'Tikhii amerikanets', vol. 7, p. 162.

the English language had limited contact with foreign cultures, issues of miscomprehension and lack of cultural knowledge could arise. In this case, it is possible that the translator had not encountered the slang term ‘poufs’ and so resorted to an approximation of meaning.

Ambiguity in Puritanical Censorship

Despite the number of changes observed, these texts do demonstrate a certain (albeit rather low) level of tolerance for foreign texts with sexual or graphic content, a fact that was highlighted during the discussion of excision as a censorial technique. Particularly where the description is not very graphic, references could be retained. This is certainly the case in *The Liberals*. One of the narrative threads of this novel concerns the romance between the two main characters; references to sex here tend to be softened, but not removed, as in the following example. The phrase ‘His hand found the warm nipple of her breast under her dress’⁷⁸ is made less explicit in the Russian: ‘Его рука ощущала теплоту ее груди под платьем’ [His hand felt the warmth of her breast/chest under her dress].⁷⁹ Again, the use of general-for-specific substitution — the use of the more general *breast* or *chest* instead of *cocok* [nipple] — avoids explicit description and, I posit, is a means of avoiding cutting this section from the text.

While the most explicit sexual language tended to be removed by the editor or translator, references to sex as an abstract topic of discussion were often retained in these texts, perhaps demonstrating some freedom for foreign literature in comparison to Soviet literature which, particularly in the 1930s and 1940s, was

⁷⁸ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 195.

⁷⁹ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 12, p. 53.

mostly stripped of sexual content. The following extract illustrates the approach; the paragraph refers to the girls whom Freeman had known in his youth.

Many of them now had their own jobs, their own latchkeys and sometimes even their own apartments; they smoked, drank and petted freely.⁸⁰

Многие из них имели теперь работу, свой ключ от квартиры, а иногда и свою квартиру; они курили, пили и свободно сходились с мужчинами.⁸¹

There is also some tolerance of sexual imagery in Richard Wright's *Native Son* (1941), but once again there is a sense of some kind of imagined limit — that some depiction of sex is acceptable, but that it must be limited.

He kissed her; her lips were cold. He kept kissing her until her lips grew warm and soft. A huge warm pole of desire rose in him, insistent and demanding; he let his hand slide from her shoulder to her breasts, feeling one, then the other; he slipped his other arm beneath her head, kissing her again, hard and long.⁸²

Он поцеловал ее; губы у нее были холодные. Он целовал ее до тех пор, как они не стали мягкими и теплыми. Огромная теплая волна желания поднялись в нем, настаивая и требуя; его рука скользнула с ее плеча и ниже, нащупала одну ее грудь и потом другую.⁸³

⁸⁰ Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 236.

⁸¹ Joseph Freeman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Z. Gan, 1 (1937), 176-182 (p. 180). [Many of them now had work, their own key to the flat, and sometimes their own flat; they smoked, drank and freely got together with men.]

⁸² Richard Wright, *Native Son* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1940), p. 197.

⁸³ Richard Wright, 'Syn Ameriki', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Evgeniia Kalashnikova, 1-2 (1941), 3-42; 4-158 (vol. 2, p. 65). [He kissed her: her lips were cold. He kissed her until they became soft and warm. A huge warm wave of desire rose in him, insistent and demanding; his hands slid from her shoulder and lower, feeling first one breast, then the other.]

Here, the technique employed is one-for-one substitution. The replacement of the word ‘pole’ with ‘волна’ alters the visual metaphor entirely. In the English original, the association is clearly made with the character’s physical arousal; the word pole is a metaphorical rendering of *erection*, whereas the Russian metaphor implies a rather more general feeling. The same kind of metonymic substitution can be observed in later texts. *The Quiet American* describes the character Fowler’s encounter with a prostitute with the phrase ‘suddenly at the moment of entry’.⁸⁴ This is translated as ‘внезапно, в решительный момент’ [suddenly, at the decisive moment],⁸⁵ once again employing a euphemistic translation. Here, as with so many of these examples, the use of metonymy — the substitution of a general phrase for a particular one — erases the most explicit content, providing a commentary on the English text. This avoids any need to excise the whole section and thus allows the reader to understand the original referent.

The analysis of these texts demonstrate multiple instances of a lax approach to censorship — indeed, it can be difficult, especially in the later texts, to draw concrete conclusions about puritanical censorship. One demonstration of the ambiguity can be seen in the Russian translation of *The Winter of Our Discontent* (published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1962) in which the protagonist describes his daughter:

It seemed to me that her preoccupation with sex began very early.
Maybe fathers always feel this.⁸⁶

Я считаю, что сексуальные вопросы стали занимать ее
слишком рано. Отцы, вероятно, всегда это чувствует.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Greene, *The Quiet American*, pp. 199-200.

⁸⁵ Greene, ‘Tikhii Amerikanets’, (vol. 7, p. 143).

⁸⁶ Steinbeck, John, *The Winter of Our Discontent* (London: Pan, 1961), p. 130.

In *Key to the Door*, a reference to sexual desire among a list of biological urges is retained, presumably because of the scientific tone here:

It was hard to believe that there were feelings based on biological sorrows and satisfactions — birth, adolescence, *sexual desire*, eating, walking in the country, growing old, dying — which were devoid of social elements.⁸⁸

Нельзя было поверить, что существуют чувства, основанные на биологических радостях и горестях, — рождение, детство и отрочество, *половое влечение*, еда, прогулка, старость, смерть, — которое было бы лишены социального элемента.⁸⁹

The quasi-scientific use of the word here allowed for its presence in the target text.

This is true of earlier texts also. *The Liberals* retains the literal translation of ‘sexually vigorous’⁹⁰ as ‘сохранять сексуальную активность’ [retain sexual activeness].⁹¹

A similarly abstract use of the word *sexual* is observed in *Catcher in the Rye*.

In the Russian translation, sex remains a central preoccupation of Holden Caulfield’s, just as in the English; its treatment by the translator is relatively lax.

Much of the treatment of sex in *Catcher in the Rye* is in marked contrast to other novels published in *Inostrannaia literatura*, which, as noted above, tend to avoid such direct reference to sex. A scene where Holden is visited in his hotel room by a prostitute — she leaves after he decides he wants only to talk — is retained in its

⁸⁷ Steinbeck, John, ‘Zima trevogi nashei’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Evgeniia Kalashnikova and Nina Al’bertovna Volzhina, 1-3 (1962), 79-139; 5-51; 8-86, (vol. 2, p. 28). [I think that sexual questions began to occupy her too early. Fathers, probably, always feel this.]

⁸⁸ Sillitoe, *Key to the Door*, p. 234.

⁸⁹ Sillitoe, ‘Kliuch ot dveri’, vol. 1, p. 180. [One could not believe, that feelings existed which were based on biological joys and sorrows—birth, childhood and adolescence, sexual desire, food, walks, old age, death—which had been deprived of the social element.]

⁹⁰ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 48.

⁹¹ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 11, p. 35.

entirety. Similarly, the phrase ‘whory looking blondes’,⁹² as Holden describes the women in his hotel, is translated with the vulgar neologism ‘шлюховатых’ [whorish].⁹³ This is not to say that everything in this novel is retained in its entirety — there continues to be some use of euphemism in translating sexual content. For instance, some uses of the English phrase ‘sexual intercourse’ are translated with a euphemism, as in the following: ‘some babe he was supposed to have had sexual intercourse with the summer before’⁹⁴ is translated ‘про какую-то девчонку, с которой он путался прошлым летом’ [about some girl, with whom he had messed about last summer].⁹⁵ Similarly, the following phrase is slightly softened in the translated version:

I know you’re supposed to feel pretty sexy when somebody gets up and pulls their dress over their head, but I didn’t.⁹⁶

Знаю, если при тебе вдруг снимают платье через голову, так ты должен что-то испытывать, какое-то возбуждение или вроде того, но я ничего не испытывал.⁹⁷

However, abstract references to sex are translated literally throughout the novel. From a conversation between Holden and his friend about a Chinese girlfriend, Holden’s question ‘Wuddya mean, “philosophy”? Ya mean sex and all?’⁹⁸ retains a direct translation: ‘Какая философия? Сексуальная?’ [What kind of philosophy? Sexual?].⁹⁹ Holden’s philosophizing also retains the word:

⁹² Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, p. 62.

⁹³ Salinger, ‘Nad propast’iu vo rzhi’, p. 63.

⁹⁴ Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, p. 32.

⁹⁵ Salinger, ‘Nad propast’iu vo rzhi’, p. 47.

⁹⁶ Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, p. 76.

⁹⁷ Salinger, ‘Nad propast’iu vo rzhi’, p. 84-85. [I know that when someone suddenly pulls their dress over their head, then you should experience something, some kind of excitement or something like that, but I didn’t experience anything.]

⁹⁸ Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, p. 132.

⁹⁹ Salinger, ‘Nad propast’iu vo rzhi’, p. 60.

Sex is something I really don't understand too hot. You never know *where* the hell you are. [...] Sex is something I just don't understand.¹⁰⁰

Вообще в этих сексуальных делах плохо разбираюсь. Никогда не знаешь, что к чему. [...] Нет, не понимаю я толком про всякий секс.¹⁰¹

This retention of the biology textbook style highlights another issue in the censorship of sexual language: that of the linguistic repertoire. Much of the inconsistency in these cases actually results from the deficiencies of the acceptable Soviet language of sex; there are certain cases where changes have to be made, because of the cultural and lexical asymmetries between Russian and English when it comes to the language of sex.

Structural Censorship: Deficiencies of the Soviet Language

The censorship of sexual and vulgar language can lie in the complicated and blurry boundary between conscious and unconscious censorship, a matter that is highlighted by linguistic differences in such language. Translation of swear words is a complex task for any translator: it is often very difficult, if not impossible, to find literal equivalents for swear words in another language, let alone equivalents which preserve the evocative force of the original word or phrase.¹⁰² Additionally, the puritanism of official Soviet discourse made it difficult to introduce swearing or sex in published texts. These challenges are well demonstrated by examples from later texts published in *Inostrannaia literatura*. This difficulty in creating an exact

¹⁰⁰Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, p. 56. Emphasis in original.

¹⁰¹Salinger, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', p. 60. [In general, I don't understand these sexual matters very well. You never know what's what. [...] No, I don't really understand sex at all.]

¹⁰²Ana María Fernández Dobao, 'Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of the Translation of Swearing: The Spanish Version of Pulp Fiction', *Babel*, 52 (2006), 222-242.

equivalent of a foreign vulgar term can be demonstrated by a change made several times in *The Northern Light*. The word ‘tart’¹⁰³ is translated by the Russian ‘проститутка’ [prostitute].¹⁰⁴ This word, although still somewhat offensive in the Russian text, is less marked than ‘tart’. But clearly, offensiveness is relative, since ‘проститутка’ was censored out of *Jenny by Nature* in favour of the neutral *женщина* [woman]. However, one must also consider the linguistic problems faced by the translator here: it is difficult to find an equivalent Russian slang word in this case. A word such as *шлюха* [whore] is considered to be extremely vulgar, and so could not accurately capture the tone of the English ‘tart’ which is relatively mild, even slightly humorous. This difficulty is acknowledged by Russian translators: a recent discussion among translators in *Inostrannaia literatura* highlights the fact that in Russian ‘either you write the medical word, or the swear-word— there is no middle ground’.¹⁰⁵ The examples cited here which do retain *sex* as *сексуальный* or *половой* are those in which the term is originally used in a scientific or abstract way. The changes tend to come when the English is describing the act of sex.

The lack of a middle ground is a crucial aspect in puritanical censorship and in the translation of sexual language from English into Russian more broadly. Where English has a large number of inoffensive and informal terms for sex and parts of the body, there is a huge gulf in Russian between the medical term and extremely vulgar swear words. Words like *сексуальный* were strongly associated with the medical sphere, and *секс* was a late addition to the Soviet lexicon. There were few (if any) alternatives that could reasonably capture the strength and connotations of the English language of sex in Russian. Hence, Russian tends to be less explicit and

¹⁰³ Cronin, *The Northern Light*, p. 147.

¹⁰⁴ Cronin, ‘Sernyi svet’, vol. 2, p. 135.

¹⁰⁵ Volevich and others.

shows a preference for terms based around the word *любовь* [love]. In Russian, the language of sex *is* the language of love, and therefore it is no surprise that the translators opted more often than not to translate *sex* in this way. Therefore, there is some difficulty in examining this mode of censorship, which can lie at the fuzzy boundary between censorship and non-censorship or, to put it another way, between censorial act and linguistic norm. This comes close to Bourdieu's 'structural censorship' as well as Butler's description of the implicit form of censorship which inhibits speech or which defines what can be said, thus producing subjects. For Butler, implicit censorship is connected to 'prior foreclosures and operative principles of selectivity that form the field of linguistic intelligibility'.¹⁰⁶

It seems clear that despite the linguistic difficulties faced in translating many of these terms — and the clash between cultural norms in the West and in the Soviet Union, there is a clear preference to desexualise the texts, even where alternatives are available, whether that be through excision or euphemism, and in many cases this preference appears to result from the ideological norms rather than only the linguistic norm. As noted earlier, there can be some overlap in the political and puritanical modes of censorship. For this reason, although I separate them for the purposes of analysis, it must be pointed out that censorship of any given text should be recognised as a process that employs different modes of operation and techniques at one and the same time. One example that demonstrates the close relationship between politics and sex is taken from *An American Testament*. Here, a section that combines political and sexual discourses is cut short in the Russian. The revolution as sacred symbol cannot be combined with sex in the Stalin period and later.

¹⁰⁶ Butler, pp. 247-260 (p. 248).

The people I admire are like the 25-year-old leader of the Passaic strike who has harnessed his brains and his feelings to the revolutionary movement, who is living in the real world, who knows what is going on three feet away from his “heart” and testicles; who is doing something with all his might.¹⁰⁷

Кем я восхищаюсь, так это людьми, вроде двадцатипятилетнего руководителя забастовки в Пассаике, который вошел всей волей и всеми чувствами в революционное движение, который живет в реальном мире; который что-то делает из всех своих сил.¹⁰⁸

This example shows how the reference to ‘testicles’, presumably judged inappropriate in combination with images of revolution and striking, has been cut from the Russian. The image of the striker and political activist is neutralised.

In *The Grapes of Wrath* by John Steinbeck (*Internatsional’naia literatura*: 1940), the euphemistic translation is seemingly nonsensical: the word ‘nigger’¹⁰⁹ is censored through the substitution of an unrelated term; in the Russian it is transformed into ‘голландец’ [Dutch person],¹¹⁰ a term that alters the denotative meaning of the original completely and erases the racist meaning of the original. As well as the offensive term *черномазый*, Russian did have a neutral word *негр* [negro], but the translator or editor opted instead to remodel the original item completely. Once again, there is a possible ideological explanation, which requires us to take into account the ideological stance of the speaker, the novel’s main character Tom Joad. Tom is portrayed sympathetically as a young representative of

¹⁰⁷ Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 376. The reference is to the Passaic textile strike of 1926, when many thousands of woolen mill workers in New Jersey went on strike for months over wages.

¹⁰⁸ Freeman, ‘Zavet amerikantsa’, vol. 3, p. 171. [The people I admire are people like the 25-year old leader of the strike in Passaic, who has put all his will and all his emotions into the revolutionary movement; who lives in the real world; who does something with all his might.]

¹⁰⁹ Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*, p. 23.

¹¹⁰ Steinbeck ‘Grozd’ia gneva’, vol. 1, p. 13.

the working class. Given the normative Soviet image of the positive hero, Tom's use of the word *nigger* would be surprising. In addition, the term *nigger* was part of the discourse of racism and the oppression of African American people; this was an important theme in Soviet discourse on the West, serving as another weapon in the arsenal of anti-American rhetoric.¹¹¹

A change made to *The Grapes of Wrath* combines the puritanical and political. All references to sex in this novel are subject to censorship, including this extract:

Preacher an' his wife stayed at our place one time. Jehovahites they was. Slep' upstairs. Held meetin's in our barnyard. Us kids would listen. That preacher's missus took a godawful poundin' after ever' night meetin'.

У нас жили один проповедник с женой. Иеговиты. Спали наверху. На моления народ к нам в сарай сходил. Мы, ребята по ночам подслушали, какую они возню у себя подымали после каждого моления!

Here, the over-clarification in translation of the English word 'meetin'' makes even clearer the religious aspect of the event, thus heightening the irony in the portrait of the preacher and his wife. Although the reference to sex is euphemised by the substitution of a word with a different referent, the Russian is even more disparaging of the preacher.

In some cases, strategies of puritanical censorship actually serve to render the target text meaningless, both literally and ideologically. The following extract, taken

¹¹¹ Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), p. 38.

¹¹² Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*, p. 31.

¹¹³ Steinbeck, 'Grozd'ia gneva', vol. 1, p. 16. [At ours stayed a preacher with his wife. Jehovahites. They slept upstairs. People came to them in the yard for prayers. We children heard at night what a racket they created at their place after every prayer meeting!]

from *Jenny by Nature*, exposes the hypocrisy of Preacher Clough, a character who victimises Jenny and tries to bully her into handing over her house to his church.

The closest Preacher Clough had ever come to being married was the time when he took one of the younger singers home one night after choir practice. They had stayed in his car in front of her house for such a long time that her father went out and found them making love on the back seat. [...]. They were still making love, and that time he shouted and turned his flashlight on them until Preacher Clough finally stopped.¹¹⁴

Они так долго сидели в машине перед ее домом, что отец девушки вышел на улицу и застал их любезничающими на заднем сиденье. [...] Они все еще любезничали, и на этот раз отец прикрикнул на них и светил в машину фонариком до тех пор, пока проповедник Клу не пришел в себя.¹¹⁵

Here the use of the verb любезничать, which can be translated as *compliment*, and has its root in *любезный* (pleasant or courteous) erases the English meaning of ‘making love’, a neutral translation of which might be *заниматься любовью*. The image here then is completely altered and the father’s reaction rendered meaningless in the Russian text. This manipulative translation, while avoiding a direct reference to sexual intercourse (which is hardly strong in the source text), also significantly weakens the intent of the passage: the fact of the character’s taking advantage of a young girl is glossed over, lessening the impact and the anti-church meaning that is present in the source text.

¹¹⁴ Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 59.

¹¹⁵ Caldwell, ‘Dzhenni’, p. 94. [They sat so long in the car outside her house, that the girl’s father came out onto the street and caught them flirting on the back seat [...] They were still flirting, and this time the father shouted and then shone his torch into the car until Preacher Clough came to his senses.]

Greene's *The Quiet American* contains a change in the first draft typescript made by the translators, Rita Rait-Kovaleva and Sulamif' Mitina, of the following phrase: 'A man's sexual capacity might be injured by smoking'.¹¹⁶ The translators choose to translate this as 'Курение может подорвать мужскую силу' [Smoking can damage a man's strength].¹¹⁷ The choice of the euphemistic 'мужскую' [masculine] for 'sexual' is interesting, given the use of *половой* and *сексуальный* in the texts of the 1930s and 1940s in neutral, abstract references to sex like that here — this text displays a relatively heightened level of prudishness. In this case, it is necessary to remain alert to the stylistic aspect of the textual changes. Here, it may be the case that the cliché *мужская сила* [masculine strength] was simply preferred for aesthetic reasons. The removal of the word 'sexual' is repeated in this novel, where one character asks another, 'If somebody asked you what your deepest sexual experience had been, what would you say?'¹¹⁸ and the Russian text has 'Если бы вас спросили, какое вы испытали в жизни самое острое физическое наслаждение, что бы вы сказали?' [If you were asked, what was the strongest physical pleasure of your life, what would you have said?].¹¹⁹ A description of a dice game also omits the word 'sexual'; indeed, the translators here include a moral judgement on the very language they omit, calling it '*малопристойный*' [indecent]. This insertion has the result of making the passage align more closely to the standards of Soviet discourse, which displayed a negative attitude to sex and sexuality.

¹¹⁶ Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 6.

¹¹⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op 2, d. 72, l. 6. Graham Greene, *Tikhii amerikanets*. Translators' typescript with editorial corrections, approved for printing.

¹¹⁸ Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 131.

¹¹⁹ Greene, 'Tikhii amerikanets', vol. 7, p. 111.

“Sans Vaseline,” Vigot said, throwing a four-two-one. He pushed the last match towards me. The sexual jargon of the game was common to all the Sureté.¹²⁰

-Sans vaseline, - сказал Виго и бросил кости; выпали четверка, двойка и единица. Он пододвинул мне последнюю фишку. При игре в кости все агенты Сюртэ употребляли свой особый, малопрстойный жаргон.¹²¹

These examples highlight the ambiguity of censorial action. In fact, an important feature of puritanical censorship in these texts is the fact that it is often incomplete, in so far as the censors allowed some sexual language to be retained, and, in other instances removed it, or censored it through a manipulative translation. This recalls my earlier comments on the relatively privileged position of foreign literature in the Soviet context: even in the 1930s, foreign literature was allowed relative freedom in comparison to Soviet literature. The same can be said for the texts in *Internatsional'naia literatura*: to a great extent they are surprising in their openness, even despite the many examples of censorship. Thus, it is difficult to describe hard and fast rules for puritanical censorship; sometimes, it even appears to be random. Censorial practices often appear rather confused; it is hard to draw a clear line between the Stalin and post-Stalin eras. In some respects, the censorship of the post-Stalin era appears to impose puritanical norms even more strongly than in previous years, while in certain texts there is a startling lack of restrictions on what is included. The lack of clarity and a strict normative structure regarding puritanical censorship — Glavlit did not provide detailed information on moral questions as it

¹²⁰ Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 177.

¹²¹ Greene, ‘Tikhii amerikanets’, vol. 7, p. 133. [-Sans vaseline, - said Vigot, and threw the dice- they fell a four, a two and a one. He pushed the last counter to me. In the game of dice all the agents of the Sureté used their own indecent jargon.]

did for political topics — create instances where the reader can infer the existence of censorship. This prompts consideration of the creation of a relationship between the censors and the reader; the presence of obvious traces of censorship in these texts raise the intriguing question that the censor sought to involve the reader in a two-way exchange, prompting them to *reconstruct* the original intent of the English texts.

Signalling Censorial Intervention

J. D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*, although it pushed the boundaries of acceptable content in terms of sex and the body, was still subject to censorship of 'bad' language. Translated by the famous and highly regarded Rita Rait-Kovaleva, this novel became a sensation among Soviet readers, appreciated for its portrayal of the internal life of a typical young Western man and its innovative use of youth slang, which had a strong influence on the young writers of the time. Jekaterina Young notes that 'Holden Caulfield became the idol of the younger generation. It has been said that Rait-Kovaleva did not so much translate the slang of American teenagers as invent the Russian equivalent single-handed'.¹²² Mild swearing survives in the text, and is a mark of the youth language that Rait-Kovaleva is credited with capturing so well in her translation. The translation of Caulfield's language maintains most of the atmosphere of the English version. 'Goddam' is translated variously as 'чертовы' [damned/ bloody] and 'дурацкое' [foolish/ idiotic], retaining some of the original strength of the word, and, in the first instance, a mild swearword. 'Sunovabitch', one of Holden's favourite words, is translated as 'сволочь' [swine] and 'дурак' [idiot], which, again, retains some of the force of the evocative original. However, *Catcher*

¹²²Jekaterina Young, 'Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 36 (2000), 412-425 (p. 414).

in the Rye's use of very strong language — an important stylistic choice of the original— is neutered in the translation. Near the end of the novel, Holden sees two pieces of graffiti, both of which read 'fuck you', which prompt some musing on his part. This phrase, used three times in total, is each time translated as 'похабщина' [an obscenity]. What is most interesting about this translation choice is the use of *похабщина*, a metalinguistic device that draws the reader's attention to the absence. It could be posited that the censorial act is also a perlocutionary act: the censor seeks to draw the reader's attention to the act of censorship and hint at what has been removed. The reader can then attempt to reconstruct the original.

This technique is also applied to earlier texts. In *The Grapes of Wrath*, the phrase 'What's gnawin' you? Is it the screwin'?',¹²³ is translated metonymically as 'И что ты мучаешься? Похоть тебе покоя не дает?' [What are you suffering from? Is lust not giving you peace?],¹²⁴ An insult uttered by one character is altered to cleverly hint at the original force of the English text; thus, 'He always said you got too long a pecker for a preacher',¹²⁵ becomes 'Он всегда говорил: куда такому ернику проповедовать!' [He always said: where could such a john preach!].¹²⁶ Where *хуй* was regarded as extremely vulgar, the alternative, *ерник*, captured both the colloquial tone and the negative connotation; it could also be read subversively. The reader could mentally substitute a *б* for the letter *п*, reading *ебник*, an extremely vulgar term that contains the root *еб* [from the verb *ебать* — *to fuck*]. We might regard this as an example of the foregrounding of censorship, or the recruiting of the reader into an act of collusion with the censor to reconstruct the censored text.

¹²³ Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*, p. 31.

¹²⁴ Steinbeck, 'Grozd'ia gneva', vol. 1, p. 16.

¹²⁵ Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*, p. 36.

¹²⁶ Steinbeck, 'Grozd'ia gneva', vol. 1, p. 18.

Georgii Andreevich Andzhaparidze, who was head of the *Khudozhestvennaia literatura* publishing house during perestroika, relates a telling encounter with the authorities regarding the publication of the French writer Marguerite Yourcenar's 1951 novel *Mémoires d'Hadrien*. Andzhaparidze is discussing the need to avoid the theme of homosexuality in the Russian translation of the novel:

I said, 'Well, let's take out a little bit. Those who know will get it, and let the rest think that Anthony remains a symbol of male beauty'. I don't want to justify myself. I did it, and I'm not ashamed of it. Otherwise, the book would not have come out.¹²⁷

Andzhaparidze's comments foreground the complex negotiations that characterise censorship practices. Significantly, he does not see a need to remove the entire theme, or every example of unacceptable language — he displays a clear understanding of the boundaries of official tolerance, and to what extent he could push those boundaries. His sophisticated understanding is also demonstrated by the translators of the texts cited here; they are aware of the likely interpretation of their text on the part of the reader. This is why Lev Loseff, in his insightful work on Aesopian language in Soviet literature, emphasises the importance of the reader's participation in decoding censorship and refers to the Soviet reader as 'the shrewd Aesopian reader'.¹²⁸ Loseff highlights the complicity between the reader and the censor, and this is reflected by the signalling of censorship in these texts.

This aspect of censorship, where the censored text seems to speak for itself, is touched upon by Judith Butler, who states that explicit forms of censorship are

¹²⁷ Cited in Gromova, p. 35.

¹²⁸ Loseff, p. 21.

‘exposed to a certain vulnerability precisely through being more readily legible’.¹²⁹ Butler is referring specifically to explicit prohibitions, but her conclusion can also apply in situations where the act of censorship is rendered obvious through other means, such as the subtle ways of attracting the reader’s attention to the intervention that I have discussed above. Referring to explicit acts of censorship, Mikhail Iampolski made reference to their visibility in the Soviet Union, where ‘prohibitions instituted against films, books, and live performances were ordinarily accompanied by an astounding song and dance’ that ‘inevitably attracted much attention to the prohibited work’.¹³⁰ In cases like these, where the existence of censorship was common knowledge among readers, the subtle indications that something had been removed enabled the reader to read ‘around’ the censorial interventions. This is well appreciated by Freshwater:

These instances of censorious incompleteness become most apparent upon consideration of the reception of censored material. If overt censorship heightens awareness of excluded material, it may also generate sophisticated and complicit audiences who are aware of the dual structure of the censored text. For these spectators, comprehension of the simultaneous existence of manifest and latent levels of meaning opens the censored text to an entirely new mode of reception: they become accustomed to listening for the hidden significances which lurk between the lines.¹³¹

It is possible to interpret these actions as an oblique kind of resistance to censorial authority. Dwyer and Uricaru, in a discussion of film subtitling in Romania, characterise this kind of evasion as ‘not about getting the message across but about

¹²⁹ Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 130.

¹³⁰ Mikhail Iampolski, ‘Censorship as the Triumph of Life’, in *Socialist Realism Without Shores*, ed. by Thomas Lahusen and Evgeny Aleksandrovich Dobrenko (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 165–177 (p. 165).

¹³¹ Freshwater, pp. 225–245 (p. 223).

getting the message around'.¹³² By indicating where the text is altered through the insertion of an ellipsis or other marker, or by removing the most obviously explicit terms while allowing the reader to understand what is being described from the surrounding context, the translator enlists the reader in a process of reconstruction.

Conclusion: The Role(s) of the Censor

Scholarship on discourses of puritanism in the Soviet Union assert that these discourses became established and rigidly applied in the Stalin era and began to weaken in the Thaw era. These case studies point towards a more complex, or even confused, picture in foreign literature. Although literary works were subject to puritanical censorship, the examples here nonetheless point to the relatively privileged position of these foreign texts in terms of the puritanical norm imposed on the autochthonous cultural production, even in the years of Stalinism. The Stalin-era texts occasionally display an openness towards sexual or vulgar content, and in some cases in the 1950s, there appears to be a heightened sense of censorial propriety, most clearly observed in the reticence towards excessively graphic descriptions and their consistent replacement by euphemistic alternatives. In the post-Stalin period, Russian literature was treated with 'relative permissiveness',¹³³ although the changes were unstable and sometimes 'puzzling', demonstrating a 'hypocritical priggishness';¹³⁴ the examples presented here demonstrate that much the same can be said of the censorship of foreign literature, the censor's role is also particularly complex here, where the position of the agent in question is unstable. It has been

¹³² Tessa Dwyer and Ionna Uricaru, 'Slashings and Subtitles: Romanian Media Piracy, Censorship, and Translation', *The Velvet Light Trap*, 63 (2009), 45- 57 (p. 56).

¹³³ Ermolaev, p. 173.

¹³⁴ Ermolaev, pp. 174-176.

stated that the translator occupied a particular space ‘between a dissenting and anticipating voice of the censored, and the repressive and permissive power of the censor’,¹³⁵ and I would argue that this applies equally to the editor. Thus, censorial actions are defined by this in-between status:

The act of translation introduces ‘liberating impulses’ into the target culture. [...] At the same time though, the translator perpetuates the discourse created by the censorial institution [...] Additionally, and perhaps surprisingly, (self)-censorship through the combination of the act of anticipation and the choices made by the translator allows the introduction of voices of dissent and the confirmation of the censorial status quo to occur simultaneously.¹³⁶

Sites of censorship are (potentially) sites of resistance, and the translators and editors of foreign literature, perhaps better than other agents, given their particularly complex status, tended to combine both activities. That these agents knew how to ‘pick their battles and chose their areas of resistance in the face of censorship’,¹³⁷ is well demonstrated in the fact that they were often able to remove enough of the text that it could pass through the higher level(s) of censorship and ultimately find a place in the published journal. Of course, these agents wished to see their work published; they were, therefore, often willing to compromise in order to see at least some version of their text published. Because of their relatively marginalised place in the cultural field they could not openly resist censorship, attempting instead to include as much as they could through accommodation and alteration.

The attempt to maximise what could be included in the journals relates to the interesting question of what is *not* censored, which I have touched upon above. In the

¹³⁵ Krebs, pp. 167-186 (p. 183).

¹³⁶ Krebs, pp. 167-186 (p. 183).

¹³⁷ Tymoczko, pp. 24-45 (p. 40).

Stalin-era texts, sexual content and vulgar language are softened, but not always removed. It would have been perfectly possible for censors to remove the offending passages completely, as was often done with politically sensitive content, but instead the censors choose to retain certain references to sex, and editors did not reverse the decisions of the translators. While the retention of sexual material is less marked in some of these texts, the fact that the original authors were referring to sex is still obvious. There appears to be a maximum limit in terms of quantity and rhetorical strength of extreme material; the translators and editors appeared to understand this limit and, either consciously or unconsciously, adhered to it in order to allow a text to be published in as full a version as they could manage. This point might be considered through an examination of the censorship of a particularly violent section of Erskine Caldwell's *Close to Home* (*Inostrannaia literatura* publication: 1963). This paragraph is shortened in the Russian version.

Reaching into his pocket, Clyde took out his knife and ripped open Harvey's shirt and pants with quick slashes of the sharp blade. He stuck the tip of the blade into Harvey's bare chest, but there was only a slight twitch of his body. After that, with savage slashes of the knife, Clyde severed the balls of his body and then crammed them into Harvey's mouth. With a grinding twist of his heel as though crunching a nest of bird eggs under foot, he forced them down into Harvey's throat as far as he could.¹³⁸

Сунув руку в карман, Клайд достал нож и, быстро орудуя наточенным лезвием, распорол Харви, но тело только слегка свело судорогой. После этого, кромсая ножом, Клайд отсек

¹³⁸ Erskine Caldwell, *Close to Home* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962), p. 139.

ему половые органы. С хрустом повернув каблук, он вбил их
глубоко в горло Харви.¹³⁹

What is significant here is that arguably the most graphic part is retained, hinting at the existence of an unofficial, perhaps even unconscious, understanding of the limit of what is sayable. By censoring ‘just enough’ the editors and translators ensured as much of their message got through as possible. Take also an earlier example in Wright’s *Native Son*. One description of violence is curtailed in a section that describes the main character murdering his girlfriend.

He lifted the brick again and again, until in falling it struck a sodden mass that gave softly but stoutly to each landing blow. Soon he seemed to be striking a wet wad of cotton, of some damp substance whose only life was the jarring of the brick’s impact. He stopped, hearing his own breath heaving in and out of his chest.¹⁴⁰

Ее еще раз взмахнул кирпичом, потом еще и еще. Он
остановился, прислушался к шуму собственного дыхания.¹⁴¹

While this excision lessens the evocative force of the English text, an earlier section containing a much more graphic description of another killing where the main character decapitates the body and stuffs it into a furnace is kept whole.

The examples discussed here point towards censorial agents, if not openly resisting, then at least attempting to circumvent external censorship through a sophisticated understanding of the rules of the game, or the limits of the field, and through an appeal to the interpretative ability of the reader. Thus, puritanical

¹³⁹ Erskine Caldwell, ‘U nas doma’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 10-11, 67-111; 152-192 (vol. 11, p. 162). [Putting his hand into his pocket, Clyde took out the knife and, quickly wielding the pointed blade, slashed Harvey but the body only spasmed slightly. After that, hacking with his knife, Clyde cut off his sexual organs. Turning his heel with a crunch, he forced them deep into Harvey’s throat.]

¹⁴⁰ Wright, *Native Son*, p. 210.

¹⁴¹ Wright, ‘Syn Ameriki’, vol. 2, p. 67. [He swung at her again with the brick, then again and again. He stopped, listened to the sound of his own breathing.]

censorship in the Soviet Union which is, at first glance, a rather uncomplicated mode of censorship, actually reveals itself to be a complicated set of practices with multiple aims and results; in several cases excisions of unsuitable material were made; in the majority of cases translators and editors employed various euphemistic practices in order to make the texts acceptable in Russian. This mode of censorship demonstrates the close interaction of explicit and structural censorship; there was a clear expectation on the part of institutions such as Glavlit and the Central Committee that translators would act as censors, and instructions issued to such an effect. Simultaneously, translators came to understand what was and was not acceptable — or what could and could not be passed by their editors and Glavlit — and internalised these norms; the internalisation of norms even where there were no explicit instructions issued resulted in internalised censorship. The ambiguity of translators' actions mirrors the blurred lines on the continuum of censorial actions. While there is undoubtedly an element of conscious pre-empting of the external censor, it is particularly clear that there is an overlap in actions of censorship.

In addition, I have touched here upon cases where censorship might be seen to arise from the cultural and linguistic asymmetries between English and Russian in the area of sex and vulgar language. Thus, the puritanical changes made to these texts clearly illustrate the continuum of censorship, which has outright oppression at one end and unconscious adherence to norms — structural censorship — at the other. The fact that the censors in these cases worked, in some senses, both to allow and to repress information highlights once again the complexity of censorship and the tensions which existed between 'centripetal' and 'centrifugal' forces in discourse.¹⁴²

¹⁴²The terms "centrifugal" and "centripetal" are used by Bakhtin in his 'Discourse in the Novel'. They characterise the centralizing, homogenizing force and the forces of stratification and heteroglossia; for

It is this doubling of responsibility towards the authorities and the reader that means that the censorial agents enlisted the reader in a sort of partnership, encouraging them, in some cases, to reconstruct what had been removed from the text.

Bakhtin 'every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where the centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear': Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), p. 272.

Chapter 5: Political Censorship

In this chapter, I will assess the texts in terms of what Ermolaev calls ‘political’ censorship, which concerns issues of internal and external policy. Political censorship was ‘determined less by ideological motivations than by the changing policy of the Party, whose professed ideology has been frequently subordinated to its practical goals’.¹ I follow him in using this term, rather than the descriptive term ‘ideological’ used by Soviet censorial authorities (usually in the phrase ‘ideological control’, which is commonly encountered in internal Glavlit documents), and will examine ‘ideological’ censorship as a separate phenomenon in the following chapter. Political censorship is concerned with concrete Soviet policies and the political capital of texts. In this chapter, censorship practices are examined in terms of the topic or theme. Political censorship was governed largely by the existence of certain taboo subjects, and I will trace the patterns of censorship of these taboo topics in the Stalin and post-Stalin period.

Political Censorship in the Stalin Period

In the Stalin era, as I described earlier, Glavlit occupied a central role in the formal censorship process. All material to be published was submitted to Glavlit, where censors based at the editing house or journal read the manuscripts and ordered changes before issuing a ‘passport’ for printing of the galley proofs; works were judged against the *perechen’*. Translated foreign literature, to a certain extent at

¹ Ermolaev, p. xiii.

least, escaped the harsh control of Russian literature from the early 1930s until the early 1940s. Close textual comparison nonetheless demonstrates extensive political censorship of the *Internatsional'naia literatura* texts: any material that portrayed the Soviet Union in a negative light or contradicted Soviet political dogma was subject to censorship. While, unfortunately, the archive does not contain the large number of typescripts that are held in *Inostrannaia literatura*'s archive and a definitive understanding of the censorial roles of the different literary agents eludes us, a picture of censorship functions can be pieced together from various indirect sources. For instance, the annual review of Glavlit's activities for 1939 notes, in a list of typical examples of censors' work, the removal of a 'politically ambiguous text' from a work, *Conqueror of the Seas: The Story of Magellan*, by the Austrian author Stefan Zweig; the report states that this part was removed by the Glavlit censor.² Many more examples can be found in the works published in *Internatsional'naia literatura*.

Attacks against the Soviet Union and Soviet Ideology

In the 1930s and 1940s, Glavlit forbade the publication of insults or attacks [*vypady*] against the Soviet Union.³ This ruling affected many of the texts published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* — all the more so since the official understanding of what constituted an insult was both vague and changeable. Insults against the Soviet Union resulted in the removal of an impassioned speech made by a liberal character in Joseph Freeman's *An American Testament*: the following section was removed from the text prior to publication:

² GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 5, l. 55- 63. Annual report on Glavlit's work for 1939. 3 March 1940.

³ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41, l. 3. Reports of Glavlit foreign censorship 1942-3.

At this time Baldwin was opposed ‘in principle’ to the dictatorship of the proletariat. For him it was ‘no better than’ the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The classless society, after the state had ‘withered away’ was very fine. But the transition period with its ‘force and violence’, its absence of civil rights, its punishment of people who had committed no ‘overt act’, was, so far as he was concerned, no better in Soviet Russia than in capitalist America. He was ready to fight both social systems on that specific issue. Freedom — *for everyone — everywhere* — now was his imagined aim, though he was ready enough to admit that without the economic and social reorganization of the world freedom was a dream.⁴

Even passing references to the Soviet Union that are negative in tone are excised. In the Russian translation of *The Liberals*, this conversation between Will, an avowed capitalist and Philip, one of the liberals of the novel is neutralised. Although Will can be expected to have a negative view of the Soviet Union, the exchange still invokes censorial intervention:

‘These guys who get all panting about Russia give me a pain in the ass. Don’t they you?’

‘I liked the fellow’, Philip said.

‘Oh he’s an alright enough fellow, but what he said burned me up. You’d think that lousy country was Paradise or something.’ ‘Well, what do you care?’⁵

-Терпеть не могу таких субъектов, которые захлебываются, когда говорят о России. А вы?

-Да он вообще приличный человек, но его рассуждения меня из себя вывели. *Подумаешь какой рай нашли в России!*

-Ну и пусть, вам-то что?⁶

⁴ Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 328. Emphasis in original.

⁵ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 70.

By removing the extremely negative informal adjective ‘lousy’ and altering the modality from negative to positive, the thrust of the statement is shifted completely. The reader may still understand that Will dislikes the Soviet Union — this fact is clear from the context of the conversation — but the negative statement itself is altered. The reluctance to ascribe insults even to negative characters well demonstrates the censorial paranoia of the 1930s.

Glavlit’s use of the term ‘attacks’ also covered satire and mockery as well as serious political statements, as a further extract from Preston’s novel demonstrates. This extract concerns the reading of letters to the main character, Philip:

A few [letters] began ‘Dear Comrade’, were violently eloquent and talked about ‘the cause of all progressive humanity’ — the same phrase occurred in three different letters; Ann said it was a phrase of Stalin’s — and it made him laugh.⁷

The final phrase is omitted in the Russian translation, for the obvious reason that mocking Stalin was completely taboo. The use of the adverb ‘violently’ in ‘violently eloquent’ is also rather sarcastic, and is translated by the neutral ‘очень’ [very]. The Russian version implies approval of these letters.

Некоторые из них начались с словами ‘Дорогой Товарищ’, были очень красноречивы и говорили о ‘деле всего передового человечества’; эта фраза встретила́сь ему в трех письмах: Анна сказала, что это слова Сталина.⁸

⁶ Preston, ‘Liberally’, vol. 11, p. 46. [-Yes, he’s generally a decent person, but his judgements drove me mad. Just think what heaven he found in Russia! -So, is it something to you?] Emphasis added.

⁷ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 225.

⁸ Preston, ‘Liberally’, vol. 12, p. 63. [Several of them began with the words ‘Dear Comrade’, were very eloquent and spoke about ‘the cause of all progressive humanity’; he encountered this phrase in three letters. Anna said that they were Stalin’s words.]

Another example that demonstrates the censor's treatment of humour can be observed in the removal of the following joke from Upton Sinclair's novel *Dragon's Teeth* (published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* in 1942). The joke is a pointedly sarcastic reference to Soviet propaganda:

One [...] story had to do with two German business men, one of whom was going to make a trip to the proletarian paradise and promised his friend to write a full account of what he found there. 'But', objected the friend, 'you won't dare to write the truth if it's unfavourable.' The other replied, 'We'll fix it this way. I'll write you everything is fine, and if I write it in black ink it's true, and if in red ink the opposite is true.' So he went, and in due course his friend received a letter in black ink, detailing the wonders of the proletarian paradise. 'Everybody is happy, everybody is free, the markets are full of food, the shops well stocked with goods — in fact there is only one thing I cannot find, and that is red ink.'⁹

Important figures of revolutionary and Soviet history were also guarded by Stalinist censorship. For example, in *The Liberals*, a discussion in which one character claims that the great historians had always held conservative views, there is a reference to Lenin:

Changes are always urged and brought about by men who had never truly absorbed history. Certainly that was being shown with tragic consequences today. He looked at Will and smiled. 'That's right', Will said. 'Did you hear that, father?' He and Fitzpatrick laughed heartily. 'I might remind you of Lenin', Marston said. He was making an effort to tease.

⁹ Upton Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth* (New York: Viking Press, 1942), p. 388.

‘Oh well, if you must speak of a fanatic. Yes, he read history, but he distorted all of it to fit his own destructive purposes. I am not talking of fanatics’.¹⁰

-Сторонниками и проводниками всяческих новшеств всегда были те люди, которые не умели должным образом осмыслить ход истории.

-Правильно, - сказал Уилл. Они с Фицпатриком весело рассмеялись.¹¹

The character’s assessment of Lenin is clearly hostile, resulting in its removal by the censor. The censors appear sensitive to any mention of Lenin in the foreign work, and, in a description of Vladimir Maiakovskii’s visit to New York in Freeman’s *An American Testament*, the whole of the following passage was removed from the Russian text:

We all drank too much. Mayakovsky, twice my size, lifted me to the ceiling to show his strength. I made fun of his booming voice by reciting the first two lines of his poem in mangled form without knowing their meaning.

‘Take the potatoes out of your mouth’, he said.

‘The revolution doesn’t need a megaphone voice’, I said. ‘Look at Lenin.’

‘Lenin’s voice did not matter. He talked with cannon. I have no cannon, but I have my voice.’¹²

The combination of a rather unflattering image of Maiakovskii — this portrait does not correspond to the official, flattering image of this canonical poet — and a potential insult against Lenin in the speaker’s hint at violence over eloquence must

¹⁰Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 101.

¹¹Preston, ‘Liberalism’, vol. 11, p. 61. [-The supporters and leaders of all kinds of new things were always those people who did not conceive of the march of history in the correct way.]

¹²Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 367.

have made censors nervous. It is worth noting that this, from a modern Western point of view, cannot be understood as an unambiguous insult against either Lenin or Maiakovskii, but in the Stalin period, ambiguity was enough to prompt censorial action.¹³ This example demonstrates that censorship could be preemptive, seeking to control the interpretation of the texts; even where a political statement was not openly anti-Soviet, or referred to another context — as with many of the statements relating to revolution — the censors acted to remove the potential for the reader to make the same interpretative leap as the censor, and interpret the text as an insult, guarding against meaning-creation on the part of the reader. This censorial paranoia is a significant aspect of Stalinist censorship. In removing unacceptable material, this instance of censorship seeks to create a text that is suitable for consumption by the Soviet reader. The text is interpreted *on behalf of* the reader, and the censor replaces ambiguity with concrete meaning, thus negating the ability of the reader to interpret the text otherwise.

Occasionally, the attempt to control the interpretation of the text is achieved through the manipulation of political perspective. This can be observed in *Some American People*, a politically engaged collection of sketches of American life. The politically manipulative translation of this text can be demonstrated in a passage calling for a reformation of American farming and an end to sharecropping, the system whereby tenants used land in return for a share of the crop produced:

A far greater step would be the discarding of the landowner, and the cultivation of the large farm on a collective basis, or else the

¹³ On Stalinist attempts to control ambiguity through censorship, see Plamper, 526-544.

breaking up of large fertile units of land into small parcels of intensive cultivation by one or two persons.¹⁴

Большим шагом *назад* была бы разбивка больших плодородных участков для интенсивной обработки двумя или тремя лицами; а еще лучше — отстранить крупных землевладельцев и обрабатывать землю на коллективных началах.¹⁵

The idea that one might break up a large farm and work it in small, independent units runs counter to the Soviet policy of collectivization: for this reason, the translation is manipulated through the insertion of the word ‘назад’ [backwards] as well as the swapping of two clauses in the English sentence. The result is that the politically incorrect position put forward in the English text is entirely altered, and the translated text in fact supports Soviet policies. In essence, the text is interpreted — or reinterpreted — by the censor. The reader is prevented from comparing the two proposals (which are put forward as equally suitable alternatives in the English text) since the Russian text imposes a negative judgement on the small-scale cultivation of land, in keeping with propaganda programs promoting collectivisation.

Non-persons

A dominant tendency observed in the Stalin-era censorship of foreign literature is the focus on actual real events. One example of this is a reference to world revolution which had been a prominent concept in early Soviet ideology and which was abandoned in the 1920s. This is mirrored in the censorship of a reference to world

¹⁴ Caldwell, *Some American People*, p. 266.

¹⁵ Caldwell, ‘Amerikanskii liudi’, vol. 9, p. 109. Emphasis added. [A big step back would be the breaking up of large plots for intensive cultivation by two or three persons; it would be even better to get rid of large-scale landowners and work the land on collective principles.]

socialism in *The Liberals*: '[He] then picked up a *History of World Socialism* which Greg had left [...] He could not concentrate on World Socialism and was annoyed by the author's doubtfree enthusiasm for the future of the race of man'.¹⁶ The translation is significantly shortened, with two main results: 'Потом взялся за "Историю Социализма", которую Грег оставил ему' [Then he started the *History of Socialism* that Greg had left for him].¹⁷ Firstly, the negative attitude towards socialism is erased, the act of reading is rendered neutral; secondly there is the erasure of *world* socialism from the novel, since it had by then been rejected. The omission of international socialism is doubly significant since this was a policy supported by Trotskii, who had, by that point, been exiled for many years and had become a *persona non grata*, what Arlen Blum calls a *nelitso*.¹⁸ The official censorship apparatus was particularly sensitive to Trotskyism, and 'Trotskyist propaganda' was outlawed.¹⁹ This kind of censorship, aimed at people who had, for one reason or another, become unacceptable subjects in Soviet discourse, was widespread in the Stalin era. In native Russian texts of all kinds, these subjects were usually figures who had fallen victim to Stalinist repression; in foreign literature censorship mostly concerned people who had been friends to the Soviet Union and subsequently renounced or altered their politics.

The instances of this kind of censorship, which aims at erasing all mention of a *nelitso*, in these case studies, often relate to Western writers or cultural agents who had renounced the Soviet Union or the Soviet system, or who had been judged to be

¹⁶ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 92.

¹⁷ Preston, 'Liberal', vol. 11, p. 56.

¹⁸ Arlen Viktorovich Blum, *Zapreshchennye knigi russkikh pisatelei i literaturovedov 1917- 1991: Indeks sovetskoi tsenzury s kommentarii* (Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet kul'tury i iskusstv, 2003), p. 13.

¹⁹ GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41.

associated with Trotskyism. Joseph Freeman's autobiographical *An American Testament* refers frequently to his association with the left-wing political and literary periodical *The Liberator*, which was founded in 1918 and, in 1922, became an organ of the American Communist Party. Eastman, who was editor from 1918 to 1922, travelled to the Soviet Union in the thirties and afterwards wrote critically about the Soviet system, thus ensuring he was renounced in the Soviet Union. In the 1920s and 1930s, he was a committed Trotskyist, heavily involved in the dissemination of Trotskii's ideas in America. As a result of his engagement with Trotskyism, Eastman became a non-person in the Soviet Union. In *An American Testament*, his name was erased from a list of authors for Freeman's literary journal *New Masses*, and he is erased from a description of his own journal:

I visited the editorial offices of *The Liberator* at the invitation of Max Eastman, who had just accepted some of my verses for publication.²⁰

Я явился в редакцию 'Либерэйтора', которая приняла для печатания несколько моих стихотворений.²¹

These meetings [of the Liberator] were very informal, more like studio parties than business conferences. *Max Eastman, when he wasn't occupied elsewhere, usually presided with the nonchalance of a gracious hostess pouring tea.* The atmosphere was strictly intellectual, however. Nothing was poured out for us except words.²²

Эти собрания проходили весьма неофициально и больше напоминали вечеринки в чьей-нибудь студии, чем деловые

²⁰Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 242.

²¹Freeman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 2, p. 142-3 [I went to the editorial office of *The Liberator*, which had accepted some of my poems for publication.]

²²Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 245. Emphasis added.

совещания. Впрочем, все было очень серьезно. Кроме речей,
здесь ничего не разливалось.²³

Here, the removal of Eastman's name distorts the text's meaning: without the reference to Eastman pouring tea the following metaphor of pouring words is destroyed. Other names are also removed from a list of members of the American Civil Liberties Union in this novel. They are Oswald Garrison Villard, a civil rights activist and editor of the liberal magazine *Nation*, who refused to approve of American intervention in the Second World War, and Frederick C. Howe, a member of the Ohio Senate. In *The Liberals* a passing mention of three authors, Aldous Huxley,²⁴ Henry David Thoreau (a nineteenth century philosopher and advocate of civil disobedience who was seen by some as an anarchist) and Ralph Bates (a communist who broke with the Soviet Union after the signing of the 1939 Nazi-Soviet pact) is removed.²⁵

The Spanish Civil War

Given the short time lag between publication in English and Russian, and the politicised choice of texts, it is unsurprising that current political themes arise, as the German and Jewish themes amply demonstrate; the topicality of the texts increases the likelihood of censorship. The Spanish Civil War was another of those topics. A subject close to the hearts of the Western authors, it was subject to harsh censorship in the journal. The Soviet Union supported the Republican side in the war,

²³Freeman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 2, p. 144. [These meetings went on very informally, and reminded one more of parties in someone's studio than business meetings. However, everything was very serious. Apart from speeches, nothing was poured out here.]

²⁴On Huxley's varied reception in the Soviet Union, see: Diakonova, 161-167.

²⁵Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Were You On? The American Communist Party During the Second World War* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1993), p. 37.

intervening to assist and 'fight fascism'.²⁶ The depiction of the war was potentially problematic, owing to the Soviet involvement and their use of it for propaganda purposes. The topic was a source of anxiety for the editors, and was subject to censorship; *Internatsional'naia literatura*'s editors referred correspondence with George Orwell to the NKVD in 1937, concerned by his participation in the POUM's actions on the front.²⁷ The POUM (*Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista, Workers' Party of Marxist Unification*) was formed by the fusion of a Trotskyist group and the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc (*Bloque Obrero y Campesino*). His association with POUM was part of the reason for his works being banned in the USSR.

John Hyde Preston's *The Liberals* mentions the Civil War in the context of discussions between the left-wing principal characters, and the following excerpt shows how the Civil War was a potentially dangerous subject in the 1930s Soviet Union. In this extract, Philip, the main character, is staying with his family. The tensions on the world stage mirror the tensions among the relations as they bicker constantly about politics, among other things, and mock Philip's left-wing views. The quoted passage is immediately preceded by a description of a family dispute.

Tonight world affairs took on an importance they had not had for weeks. *If the Loyalists won in Spain would it be democracy as we knew it or a new and truer form?* Even in an agrarian country, Marston said, it had probably gone beyond the stage where it could be developed along the agrarian lines which Jefferson envisioned.²⁸

²⁶ Stanley G. Payne, *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 295.

²⁷ Blum, 'Internatsional'naia literatura' <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/bl21.html>>.

²⁸ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 191.

К международному положению в этот вечер был проявлен интерес, который не наблюдался уже много недель. Даже в земледельческих странах, говорил Марстон, демократия, очевидно, миновала ту стадию развития, на которой прогресс еще может совершаться в направлении, предугаданном Джефферсоном.²⁹

This alteration destroys the sense of this episode — the discussion, which has been political, appears to suddenly veer into comment on general issues of development. The link between the ‘international affairs’ referred to and the following paragraph is destroyed. The effect of this and similar changes over the course of the novel is to remove the overarching concern of many characters. The war occupies a threatening position in their psyches, giving them a sense of foreboding and worry; the removal of references to the Spanish situation removes this, thus destroying one of the thematic lines of the novel. The seeming lack of concern with the sense of the text points towards external interference, possibly by Glavlit. The censor(s) of *The Liberals* replaces the word *fascist* in the target text with a generic alternative, diffusing the reference to the war; a reference to Federico García Lorca, ‘the Spanish poet who had been murdered by the Fascists’³⁰ is translated as ‘испанского поэта, убитого мятежниками’ [the Spanish poet killed by rebels].³¹

Numerous mentions of Spain are removed from this text, whether they refer directly to the war or not; for example, Philip, reads and thinks about Spain:

²⁹ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 12, p. 52. [That evening, an interest was being shown in the international situation that had not been observed for many weeks. Even in the agricultural countries, Marston said, democracy had obviously bypassed the stage of development at which progress could still proceed in the direction envisioned by Jefferson.]

³⁰ Preston, *Liberals*, p. 371.

³¹ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 12, p. 111.

It was a travel book about Spain with many photographs and had all the vulgar innocence of praise before a tragedy. It had an atmosphere of death about it and thin and rotten dying. Spain now was not a traveller's country. They would not write for a long time about the architecture of Granada and men who made photographs would make them of other things. Now Spain's grandeur was the grandeur of men fighting for those things which did not photograph well and were unfit for travel books.³²

Because of this oblique reference, the whole passage is cut, showing again that the censors were extremely anxious about the potential for readers' understanding of the text. The following argument among the main character's family is also removed from the published text:

'He wants Franco to take Madrid so the Spaniards can cultivate white beets.'

'I didn't say that. But I get sick of your bloody talk. I said I wished the whole damn mess was over.'

'No he wants Franco to win the war. He's really a damned Phalangist at heart. He sent a gold collar button to the defence of the Alcazar. He wasn't using it any more.' 'Come on,' Ann said.

'You might lay off.'

'If you think the world's going to end in Spain, why in hell don't you go over there and do something about it?' Will asked.³³

These examples demonstrate that censorship in the 1930s and the period of the Second World War altered texts dramatically, often resulting in the wholesale distortion of the source texts' political message and theme. While similar censorship

³² Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 12.

³³ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 27-28.

techniques are observed in the post-Stalin period, the changes tend to be much less marked, and the resulting texts less extensively altered.

Germany and the Second World War

Since the political mode of censorship dealt by its nature with contemporary events and policies, it was subject to change as events developed and policies were altered for political expediency, and the effects of these changing policies are particularly well demonstrated in those texts that deal with the topic of Nazi Germany and its participation in the Second World War. This topic is subject to harsh political censorship in Robert Briffault's political tract *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in December 1939). Heavily abridged, like many texts published in the 1930s, it was published at a particularly politically charged time, shortly after the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. According to that pact, any negative statements about Germany were removed by the censor.³⁴ This has a significant effect on the text; one of the principal themes of the original is the British appeasement of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. The author's thesis is that British imperialism and Nazism share defining characteristics, but each mention of this proposition is removed from the Russian text. For instance, a three page-long section on the British negotiation with fascism containing the following extract is not included in the Russian text:

Mr. Winston Churchill was the first to set aside publicly the formal pretence of horror at the repudiation of 'English' liberties, by paying a friendly visit to Signor Mussolini and declaring that, were he an Italian, he would be a Fascist. [...] Democratic support was

³⁴ Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epoku total'nogo terrora: 1929-1953*, p. 109.

even more prompt and assiduous as regards Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. His accession to power was at once hailed with enthusiasm by *The Times* and English opinion.³⁵

As well as a large number of long abridgements, there are several smaller alterations on the sentence level that serve to erase references to Nazism, such as the following:

The late pretended revival of English prosperity was effected by certain bookkeeping manipulations *together with the Nazi method of manufacturing cannons to offset an insufficiency of Danish butter*.³⁶

Недавнее мнимое возвращение Англии к благоденствию было произведено посредством кой-каких банковско-бухгалтерских махинаций.³⁷

And the following example demonstrates the same motivation:

The superiority of the English race is, of course, a form of the racial theories so refulgently upheld in countries suffering under Fascist rule.³⁸

Превосходство английской расы, представляет собой, конечно, вариацию расовых теорий.³⁹

Censorial paranoia goes further in this case; while all negative statements about Germany were omitted during the period of the pact, so were many neutral references. No discussion of fascism is permitted at all — perhaps it was thought that

³⁵ Briffault, Robert, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1938).

³⁶ Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 230. Emphasis added

³⁷ Briffault, Robert, 'Upadok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by L. Vorovoi, 12 (1939), 152-202 (p. 196). [The recent supposed revival of the English to prosperity was effected by means of certain bank and bookkeeping machinations.]

³⁸ Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 234.

³⁹ Briffault, 'Updok i razhrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', p. 197. [The superiority of the English race is, of course, a variation of racial theories.]

any mention might arouse in the Soviet reader's mind the recent anti-fascist campaign and highlight the change of policy.

The erasure of the German subject is also demonstrated in *The Liberals*. All references to the American Patriots Association, which is frequently referred to in the English text as a fascist organisation, have any link with fascism removed from the Russian text. In this example, the words of one of the communist characters are altered to remove any reference to fascism:

‘But if we don’t have trade unions, *then maybe fascism comes* — and then we are licked. Maybe dead’. He shrugged his shoulders. ‘*If trade unions can help beat fascism*, then maybe we have socialistic state some day. I don’t know. But we work and plan for it’.⁴⁰

Но если у нас не будет профсоюзов, *нас побьют*. А может быть, и убьют. — Он пожал плечами. — Когда-нибудь у нас будет социалистическое государство. Может быть, я не знаю наверно. Но мы работаем для этого, строим планы.⁴¹

As with *The Decline and Fall*, the presence of fascism is removed from the text. On top of this, the changes obfuscate the sense of urgency of this passage, rendering the threat vague and distant. The following passage in *The Liberals* about Germany removes the specifics of Nazi persecution through the excision of the end of the sentence:

Wilder had recently been in Germany and was depressed and angry. There, in what was once the novelist seat of science, a man with a severe case of paranoid dementia held sixty-five million

⁴⁰ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 308. Emphasis added.

⁴¹ Preston, ‘Liberality’, vol. 12, p. 90. Emphasis added. [But if we don’t have trade unions, *they will beat us*. And perhaps kill us. – He shrugged his shoulders. – Sometime we will have a socialist state. Maybe, I don’t know for sure. But we work for it, we make plans.]

people in serfdom and tuberculosis had become a Jewish virus and if you were in a concentration camp and had pneumonia they “cured” you by putting you outdoors naked and turning a cold hose on you.⁴²

The translated text reads:

Уайлдер побывал недавно в Германии и вспоминал о своей поездке с горечью.⁴³

In the Russian version, the author’s political target is erased. As far as the Soviet reader is concerned, Wilder could be sad about his time in Germany for any number of reasons.

The policy of censoring negative references to Germany were dramatically reversed in 1941, when Germany invaded the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union entered into the war; a huge propaganda campaign against Germany was immediately launched that was paralleled in the approach to translations.

Jewishness and the Second World War

The anti-German propaganda programme during the Second World War did not extend to an acknowledgement of the targeting of the Jewish people by the Nazi regime. This blind spot is a result of official anti-Semitic attitudes during the Stalin period. The censorship of Jewishness began with Glavlit’s erasure of evidence of anti-Semitism and pogroms,⁴⁴ and culminated in the 1940s with an ‘ethnic

⁴² Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 68.

⁴³ Preston, ‘Liberaly’, vol. 11, p. 45. [Wilder had recently been in Germany and remembered his trip with sadness.]

⁴⁴ Arlen Viktorovich Blium, ‘Evreiskaia tema glazami sovetskogo tsenzora (po sekretnym dokumentam Glavlita epokhi bol’shogo terrora)’, in *Evrei v Rossii: istoriia i kul’tura. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. by D. A. El’iashevich (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1995), pp. 186-196 (pp. 190–191).

cleansing’⁴⁵ of Jewish themes and characters from Soviet literature. A striking example of this censorship policy is to be found in Upton Sinclair’s Pulitzer-winning novel *Dragon’s Teeth*. The novel tells the story of a family of Dutch Jews in the early years of Nazi rule, centering on the fate of a rich Jewish businessman, Johannes, who is kidnapped by the Nazis and, after several long years of imprisonment in the camps, finally rescued by the American hero, Lanny Budd. The novel was published in *Internatsional’naia literatura* in heavily abridged form (cut from over three hundred pages in the English to only fifty-four in the Russian). Sinclair’s novel fits the new propaganda model of portraying the Nazis as dangerous beasts, however the internal policy of anti-Semitism means that it is subject to extensive censorship aimed at removing the theme of Jewish persecution. This is manifested mainly in the erasure of any Jewish attributes of all the main characters. For instance, when Johannes is first arrested, it is clear from the English text that he is persecuted because of his religion, a point of concern for his family. The final sentence of this extract is removed from the Russian text:

‘But think what they may be doing to him, Lanny’.

‘I’ve been thinking about it a lot, and I doubt if they’ll do him serious harm. It must be the money they’re after, and the job will be one of bargaining’.

‘He’s a Jew, Lanny’.⁴⁶

A long description of Johannes’ arrest, during which he is called ‘Jew-pig’ by German officers,⁴⁷ is also excised from the Russian version, creating the impression

⁴⁵ Arlen Viktorovich Blium, *Evreiskii vopros pod sovetsskoi tsenzuroi, 1917-1991* (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1996), p. 89.

⁴⁶ Sinclair, *Dragon’s Teeth*, p. 343.

⁴⁷ Sinclair, *Dragon’s Teeth*, p. 349.

that Johannes' treatment happened for no reason. This stripping away of Jewishness is also applied to the family's friend, Freddi:

'You don't know anyone who would shelter you?'

'Plenty of people — but I might get them into trouble as well as myself. *The fact that a Jew appears in a new place may suggest that he's wanted* — and you can't imagine the way it is, there are spies everywhere — servants, house-wardens, all sorts of people seeking to curry favour with the Nazis. I couldn't afford to let them catch me before I had a talk with you'.⁴⁸

-Неужели у тебя нет знакомых, которые могли бы тебя приютить?

-Сколько угодно, но я не хочу подвергать и себя и их опасности. Вы и представить себе не можете, всюду шишки — прислуга, дворники, всевозможные личности, которые, стараются выслужиться перед нацистами.⁴⁹

As well as altering the main characters' identities, the systematic nature of the Nazi persecution of the Jews is also entirely erased from this novel. The main character, Lanny, meets with Joseph Goebbels to plead for his freedom, although his pleas are, of course, rejected. In this passage Goebbels' description of the German hatred for the Jews is not preserved in the translated text: the result is that Johannes' arrest is no longer an example of religious persecution, but of socially and politically motivated revenge upon a rich capitalist.

I suppose he saw a *rich Jew* getting out of the country in a private yacht, obtained by methods which have made the Jews so hated in

⁴⁸ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 349. Emphasis added.

⁴⁹ Sinclair, Upton, 'Zuby drakona', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by D. Gorbov and V. Kurella, 11 (1942), 12-65 (p. 16). [-Do you not have acquaintances that could shelter you? -So many, but I do not want to risk myself and their safety. You cannot imagine, there are spies everywhere—the servant, the wardens, all kinds of people who are trying to get advantage with the Nazis.]

our country; and perhaps it occurred to him that he would like to have that yacht for the hospitalization of National Socialist party workers who have been beaten and shot by Communist gangsters.⁵⁰

The reference to Jews is entirely absent in the published text, and the emphasis here becomes one of relative wealth instead of racial persecution:

Увидев, что *миллионер* покидает страну в собственном яхте, он, вероятно, решил, что недурно бы захватить эту яхту и устроить там санатории для национал социалистов, получивших увечья в драке с коммунистами.⁵¹

It is also worth noting that in this extract the censor neutralises the negative reference to communists through the removal of the word ‘gangsters’; this is in keeping with the erasure of insults against communism that I examined earlier. As in all these examples, it does not appear to be important to the censor that the insult is voiced by a negative character, and clearly does not represent the views of the author or narrator, and is, in fact, part of his negative characterisation. The simple reproduction of taboo opinions or statements, no matter the purpose in the context of the novel, is enough to prompt censorship. Once again here we observe censorship being used to guard against the possibility of the readers’ unorthodox interpretation.

The erasure of systematic persecution is also demonstrated in the following extract, where the Russian text ends on the word ‘trickle’, omitting any mention of the Jewish people:

Tourist traffic, so vital to the German economy, had fallen off to a mere trickle as the result of the Jew-baiting, and the insulting of

⁵⁰ Sinclair, *Dragon’s Teeth*, p. 363. Emphasis added.

⁵¹ Sinclair, ‘Zuby drakona’, p. 21 Emphasis added. [Seeing that a millionaire was getting out of the country on a private yacht, he probably decided that it would be fine to seize this yacht and found a sanatorium there for national socialists who have been injured in fights with communists.]

foreigners who had failed to give the Nazi salute on proper occasions.⁵²

Поток туристов, столь жизненно необходимый для германской экономики, за последнее время превратился в жалкий ручеек.⁵³

The overall effect of these changes, which are applied to every mention of Jewish subjugation by the Nazi regime in the published version, is to entirely alter the author's political message; the racial policies clearly despised by the author are entirely removed. For instance, Hermann Göring is quoted as saying 'The *Jew* who has fattened himself upon our blood is going to disgorge';⁵⁴ this is translated: 'Вашему разжиревшему на нашей крови *ростовщику* придется раскошелиться'.⁵⁵ References to Jewishness are often manipulated in translation to refer to speculators instead:

I could never understand why our magnetos so often failed at the critical moment, but now I know that they were sold to us by *filthy Jewish swine*.⁵⁶

Я всегда удивился, почему так часто в самую критическую минуту наши магнето сдавали; теперь понятно: нам их продавали *подлый спекулянт*.⁵⁷

Another pattern of censorship displayed in the translation of this novel is the erasure of any equation between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, such as in the following passage describing the hero Lanny's wife:

⁵² Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 346.

⁵³ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 15.

⁵⁴ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 378. Emphasis added.

⁵⁵ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 26. [Your usurer, who has fattened himself upon our blood will have to cough up.] Emphasis added.

⁵⁶ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 379. Emphasis added.

⁵⁷ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 27. Emphasis added. [I was always surprised that our magnetos so suddenly and at the most critical moment gave out, now I understand: a vile speculator sold them to us.]

Lanny had to keep reminding himself that these young men [Germans] had been reared on *Mein Kampf*, but he had to keep reminding his wife, who had never read that book, but instead had heard Lord Wickthorpe cite passages from Lenin proclaiming doctrines of political cynicism which sounded embarrassingly like Hitler's.⁵⁸

Given the censorial pre-empting of interpretation that I have touched upon in this chapter, it is unsurprising that this passage is removed, since it explicitly and, from the Soviet official's point of view, offensively compares Lenin and Hitler, something that was particularly unacceptable at a time when Germany was being portrayed as the great enemy. Additionally, more tenuous comparisons were censored and moments with just the potential for comparison were all removed. For instance, the following extract was subject to censorship: 'So here was a new Hitler. Such a convenient thing to be able to be something new whenever you wished, unhampered by anything you had been hitherto!'⁵⁹ This section — which may have referred to Stalin's opportunism — was replaced with the much reduced 'Гитлера словно подменили' [It was as though Hitler had been replaced].⁶⁰ The censorial intervention sought to avoid any mental linking of Stalin and Hitler, possibly showing a paranoia that this negative association between Hitler and reinvention or revolution could be read as a denunciation of reinvention in itself, and therefore the Soviet revolution. This idea of the new — vital to any revolutionary movement — was a major part of the Bolshevik and Soviet discourse. Since revolution was such a prime concept in the Soviet discourse, the reader's mental linking of any reference to

⁵⁸ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 402.

⁵⁹ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 352.

⁶⁰ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 17.

revolution and the Bolshevik Revolution, or the new Soviet person (*homo Sovieticus*) would have been automatically assumed by the censor.

Direct references to revolution were also invariably removed from *Dragon's Teeth*. For instance, Lanny is told by a Nazi officer: 'Well, you know what happens in revolutions. People take things into their own hands, and regrettable incidents occur. The Führer can't know everything that's going on';⁶¹ this sentence was omitted from the Russian text. Similarly, a reference to revolution was removed from the following conversation between Lanny and a German woman at a social event:

'I agree with you', said the woman, promptly. 'It is one of those irrational things which happen. You must admit, Mr. Budd, that our revolution has been accomplished with less violence than any in previous history; but there have been cases of needless hardship which my husband has learned about, and he has used his influence to correct him. He is, of course a very hard-pressed man just now'.⁶²

-Я с вами совершенно согласна, быстро ответила фрау Магда.
-Такие нелепости-не редкость. Правда, мой муж – человек
очень занятой.⁶³

This extract is particularly interesting because the reference to 'any [revolutions] in previous history' refers implicitly to the Russian Revolution, and there is a subtle association of revolutionary Russia with 'needless hardship' and violence, an inference which ran contrary to official Soviet rhetoric. A particularly objectionable statement made by a Nazi officer is, because of the linking of Lenin and Nazism, removed from the final Russian version:

⁶¹ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 356.

⁶² Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p.362.

⁶³ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 20. ['I completely agree with you', Frau Magda answered quickly. 'Such absurdities are no rarity. It is true, my husband is very busy'.]

The Reichsminister Doktor perceived that this was indeed an intelligent young man in spite of his well-tailored clothes and rich wife. 'We have learned where we could', he admitted.

'Even from Lenin', smiled the other.⁶⁴

The final section of *Dragon's Teeth* culminates in an emotional scene where Lanny weeps for his own fate and that of his family, and also for the fate of all those oppressed by the Nazi system:

Tears because he hasn't been able to accomplish more; because what he had done might be too late. Tears not only for his wrecked and tormented friend, not only for that unhappy family, *but for all the Jews in Europe, and for their tormentors just as much to be pitied. Tears for the unhappy people of Germany, who were being lured into such a deadly trap, and would pay for it with frightful sufferings.* Tears for this unhappy continent on which he had been born and had lived most of his life.⁶⁵

This is cut drastically in the target text:

Он плакал о том, что не сумел сделать большего; о том, что то, что он сделал, быть может, сделано слишком поздно. Он плакал о несчастном континенте, на котором родился и прожил большую часть своей жизни.⁶⁶

Here, the Jewish people are again removed; the continent's unhappiness is vaguer than in the English — from the readers' point of view, it can be attributed to the war in a very general sense, but the facts of the German action remain somewhat at a distance. Germany itself is removed from the Russian text. The final lines of the

⁶⁴ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 367.

⁶⁵ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 631.

⁶⁶ Sinclair, 'Zuby drakona', p. 65. [He cried because he could not manage to do more; because what he had done, perhaps, had been done too late. He cried for the unhappy continent, on which he had been born and lived most of his life.]

novel, steeped with religious language, are also removed. Throughout Sinclair's novel, the erasure of Jewish characters generalises and thus weakens the political theme envisioned by the author.

He wept, despairing, as another man of gentleness and mercy had wept, in another time of oppression and misery, crying: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate'.⁶⁷

This act of censorship serves to remove the specificity of the Jewish experience, to generalise the violence perpetrated by the Nazi system, and to remove Jewish victimhood from the historical record. This also entirely alters the author's intention in publishing the novel, which clearly is to portray the Jewish experience; this is destroyed by the alterations made to the Russian text. The novel becomes a generalised denunciation of Nazi Germany, a description of only the political rather than the ethnic aspect of the system.

There are also several cases of excision of Jewishness from the target text in Ernest Hemingway's *Fiesta*. A reference to a character called Cohn has the word 'Jew' removed from the target text: 'What do you think it's meant to have *that damned Jew* about, and Mike the way he's acted?'⁶⁸ is translated as 'Как ты думаешь, каково мне с *этим проклятым Коном* и Майкл, который так ужасно ведет себя?'.⁶⁹ This is not an entirely consistent approach: there is only one sentence

⁶⁷ Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 631.

⁶⁸ Hemingway, *Fiesta*, p. 211. Emphasis added.

⁶⁹ Hemingway, 'Fiesta', p. 29. [What do you think it's like for me *with that damned Cohn* and Michael, who behaves so terribly?] Emphasis added.

in the novel where Cohn's Jewishness is retained: 'I gave Brett what for, you know. I said if she would go about with *Jews* and bull-fighters and such people she must expect trouble',⁷⁰ is translated 'Я сказал Бретт свое мнение, знаете ли. Я сказал ей, что если она будет путаться с *евреями* и матадорами и тому подобной публикой, то это добром не кончится'.⁷¹ Given the removal of all other references to Jews, it may be that this was an oversight on the part of the censor. This example highlights again the fact that censorship was not always complete or all-controlling — the censor may have been lax here for a number of reasons, none of which are recorded.

Political Censorship in the Khrushchev Period

Insults against Communism and the Soviet Union

In the Khrushchev period, censors remained alert to attacks against the Soviet Union, and editorial interference is frequently demonstrated in those extracts expressing negative opinions of the Soviet Union or the communist political system, or extracts that have the potential to be interpreted as such. In the post-Stalin period, political censorship follows similar patterns to the preceding era, although, as I will show, the alterations to the texts are less extensive. This is demonstrated in Jay Deiss' *The Blue Chips* (published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1960), a novel about the corruption of a scientist by his involvement in big business:

⁷⁰Hemingway, *Fiesta*, p. 233. Emphasis added.

⁷¹Hemingway, 'Fiesta', p. 37-38. [I told Brett my opinion, you know. I told her that if she was going to get involved with Jews and matadors and those kind of folk, then it would end badly.] Emphasis added.

‘Dr. Klemenko recently was invited to broadcast, by international short wave, an attack on the Soviet scientific method,’ Abby Parker was saying. ‘He refused — on the ground that scientists shouldn’t permit themselves to be used for purposes of political propaganda. Said that scientists who did so — *in any country* — were debased’.⁷²

Недавно доктору Клеменко предложили выступить по радио для заграницы с осуждением советского научного метода, — говорила Эбби Паркер. — Он отказался- на том основании, что ученые не должны использоваться в целях политической пропанды. Сказал, что ученые, которые позволяют себя таким образом использовать, предают науку.⁷³

This reference to ‘any country’ may be read as implying criticism of the Soviet Union, given the cold war background and the fact that the character Dr Klemenko is a Russian émigré. The potential for the reader to interpret it in this way is heightened by the separation of the phrase from the rest of the sentence, thus emphasising it and bringing it to greater prominence. The Soviet Union did, of course, rely on scientific propaganda. The censorship here seems aimed at preventing a possible negative reading.

This attention to implicature and the readers’ potential for interpreting the texts in the ‘wrong’ way is demonstrated in a small alteration to Graham Greene’s *Our Man in Havana*. A character in this novel who is deported from Cuba for being involved in espionage, is discussed in the following way:

⁷²Jay Deiss, *The Blue Chips: A Novel* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957), p. 118. Emphasis added.

⁷³Jay Deiss, ‘Krupnaia igra’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by I. Gurova and R. Bobrova, 1-3 (1960), 82-130; 110-172; 123-204 (vol. 2, p. 132). [Recently, Doctor Klemenko was asked to appear on foreign radio with a condemnation of the Soviet scientific method- said Abby Parker- He refused, on the grounds that scientists should not be used for the aims of political propaganda. He said that scientists who let themselves be used in this way betray science.]

‘He finds it necessary to return to Switzerland on a matter to do with his precision-instruments.’

‘With a passage booked on to Moscow?’⁷⁴

The second sentence, which contains the reference to Moscow is retained in the translator’s typescript,⁷⁵ but removed from the published issue, demonstrating the sensitivity to links between the Soviet Union and spying. However, it is important to note that, as with other material examined, the link is only implied. The censor is, as ever, alert to the potential for a negative interpretation on the part of the reader, and seeks to pre-empt this through censorship, in effect taking on the task of interpretation and then imposing a particular meaning upon the text. A passage that refers to the oppression of writers is cut from Hemingway’s *Green Hills of Africa*.

A revolution is much the best if you do not become bigoted because everyone speaks the same language. Dostoevsky was made by being sent to Siberia. Writers are forces in injustice as a sword is forged.⁷⁶

А революция — это еще лучше, если не становишься
догматиком...⁷⁷

The excision may be signposted here by the use of ellipsis, hinting at the presence of censorship in this text. The reference to writers is clearly a contentious statement in the Soviet context, given its allusion to oppression of writers.

At a time when the USSR’s place on the international stage was a matter of intense scrutiny and internal anxiety, it is unsurprising that censorship should be

⁷⁴ Graham Greene, *Our Man in Havana* (London: Heinemann, 1958), p. 232.

⁷⁵ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 2, d. 260, l. 120. Graham Greene, *Nash chelovek v Gavane*. Translator’s typescript with editorial markings.

⁷⁶ Ernest Hemingway, *Green Hills of Africa* (London: Arrow, 1994), p. 52.

⁷⁷ Ernest Hemingway, ‘Zelenye kholmy Afriki’, *Inostrannaia Literatura*, trans. by Natal’ia Al’bertovna Volzhina, 7 (1959), 164-180 (p. 173). [and a revolution—it is even better, if you do not become a dogmatic...]

concerned with the subject of Soviet foreign policies. Hinting at the Soviet Union's weakness on the international stage was taboo; this can explain the removal of material from the translation of Mackenzie's *Rockets Galore* (Russian publication 1958), including the following statement, which foreshadows future domination of the Soviet Union: 'And by the time they're [the Russians] ruling what's left of the world, the Chinese will step in and rule them.'⁷⁸ This allusion to potential Chinese rule over the USSR is particularly unacceptable in the context of increasing tension between China and the Soviet Union in the 1950s,⁷⁹ and so it is unsurprising that it was removed. Similarly, the implication that the West was, or could be, more powerful than the Soviet Union ran counter to the Soviet self-image and was subject to censorial intervention as in *The Northern Light*. Although this paragraph may appear innocuous to a Western reader, it is cut nonetheless:

England would rise again. Her history proved that she had survived even more devastating disasters, when the country was spent and bloodless, when the outlook seemed clouded beyond hope. Somehow, because she was herself, she had generated fresh life, renewed the cycle of her great tradition and refusing steadfastly to sink into obscurity had emerged exultant in the end.⁸⁰

In the Russian text, everything after 'England would rise again' is removed. It is difficult to account for this change without further information, but it might be that such a bold expression of English patriotism was unacceptable, and could not circulate in the Soviet context. The implication of English resurrection and

⁷⁸ Compton Mackenzie, *Rockets Galore* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), p. 135.

⁷⁹ On this subject, see, for example, Lorenz M. Lüthi, *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

⁸⁰ Cronin, *The Northern Light*, p. 17.

(potential) superiority is connected to the anxieties of the cold war, similar to the anxieties over Chinese superiority.

Material disparaging the communist system as a whole is censored again in Graham Greene's *Our Man in Havana*:

One reason why the West hates the great Communist states is that they don't recognise class-distinctions. Sometimes they torture the wrong people. So too of course did Hitler and shocked the world. Nobody cares what goes on in our prisons, or the prisons of Lisbon or Caracas, but Hitler was too promiscuous. It was rather as though in your country a chauffeur had slept with a peeress.⁸¹

The archival documents held for this text indicate that censorship was not a simple unambiguous process — this specific alteration was made late in the editorial process. The translator's first and second typescript contain the literally translated, uncensored version, with no editorial intervention recorded, indicating that discussion and negotiation must have taken place at some point prior to publication; unfortunately, the archival holdings available contain no evidence about when these decisions were taken.

Given *Inostrannaia literatura*'s preference for contemporary authors, and its focus on authors with political themes, it is unsurprising that this theme of the external affairs and policies of the Soviet Union should dominate its pages. An important instance of Soviet policies governing the treatment of the text occurs in the translation of *The Story of Lola Gregg* (published in Russian in 1956) by the communist novelist Howard Fast; references to a Croatian who murders the main character's husband are altered. The victim is a union worker arrested by the FBI.

⁸¹ Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 165.

The reference to the murderer's fascism is strengthened in translation, so reinforcing the negative allusion. Two references to him insert the word fascist in the Russian, where it is not present in the English:

This man, the murderer, said Feldberger, would be sent home to die.⁸²

Этого фашиста, говорил Фельдбергер, должны были отослать в родину, где его ожидала смерть.⁸³

The change of 'murderer' into 'fascist' makes the Croatian into an ideological enemy, rather than a common criminal, emphasising the political aspect of Gregg's treatment. There is also a change of modality in this extract, where 'would' becomes 'должны' [should], strengthening the wish of Feldberger for the Croatian's execution, arising from the strengthening of the negative language.

[Had those in power] used the insane Croatian as their weapon?⁸⁴ использовали хорватского фашиста?⁸⁵

The repetition of the word fascist, which is used only once in the English text, reinforces the link between fascism and the murder. The second example also politicises the reference to the murderer. By removing the word 'insane', the translator/editor creates the implication that he acted out of ideological conviction rather than madness, thus making the act a political one; the Russian text strengthens the polemical character of the English original. The repetition of the word 'fascist' also stems from the official Soviet policy of anti-fascism; the censored text supports Soviet discourse, and portrays Gregg within the confines of that discourse.

⁸² Howard Fast, *The Story of Lola Gregg* (London: Bodley Head, 1957).

⁸³ Howard Fast, 'Istoriia Loly Gregg', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva, 11 (1956), 3-90 (p. 85). [This fascist, said Feldberger, would be sent to his homeland, where death awaited him.]

⁸⁴ Fast, *The Story of Lola Gregg*, p. 184.

⁸⁵ Fast, 'Istoriia Loly Gregg', p. 85. [Had they used the Croatian fascist?]

Peaceful Coexistence

So far, I have highlighted political censorship based on Soviet external politics. Another important political theme in the texts published in *Inostrannaia literatura* was that of peaceful coexistence, stemming from the move away from the antagonism between the Soviet Union and the West, and the associated political rhetoric. The journal had a specific task to represent modern writing that was ideologically sympathetic, and its particular position in the cultural field, acting as a link between the Soviet Union and the West, meant that the problem of coexistence was a pressing one. The intercultural nature of these texts, and the necessary task of representing the ‘other side’ in its own words, provoked censorial anxiety. Most of the instances of censorship were aimed at pronouncements or implications of Western superiority and/ or Soviet inferiority. This anxiety was not confined to the editorial board — concerns with the foreign perception and portrayal of the USSR were subject to consultation with representatives of authority.

The translation of Mitchell Wilson’s novel *Meeting at a Far Meridian* (Russian publication: 1961) is particularly enlightening in this regard, since it contains numerous examples of censorship aimed at protecting the Soviet reputation and minimising Soviet culpability in the cold war. The novel tells the story of Nick, a highly regarded physicist who meets with a similarly admired Soviet physicist, Goncharov.⁸⁶ Nick travels to the USSR where he and Goncharov work together on a seemingly intractable scientific problem while engaging in professional and romantic rivalry. The treatment of the political material in this text is significant also because

⁸⁶The author’s typescript submitted to *Inostrannaia literatura* calls the Russian scientists “Tarchakoff” throughout. This is changed by the editor of the Russian typescript to “Gorchakov” and appears in the published English text as “Goncharov”.

of the close personal contact between the author and the journal, which likely resulted in negotiation on this level also. Several prominent authors made visits to the Soviet Union as guests of the journal, and many maintained close relations with the journal's staff. Wilson's novel was published from a manuscript sent to *Inostrannaia literatura* by the author, and is based on a series of visits he made to the Soviet Union; there was therefore a working relationship between the author, the journal and other cultural bodies such as the Writers' Union, and one would expect the author to be sympathetic to the Soviet Union. This is broadly the case, but there were still several areas that were censored by the editors. There are two typescript versions of this novel (unfortunately only chapters one to four are lodged in the journal's archive): a first, edited version, and a second version to which is attached a confirmation that the typescript had been fact-checked by an external editor. On this second typescript ten sections or sentences needing to be checked are noted in an editor's hand, along with a note indicating the decision reached. These items are clearly considered to be politically problematic — most of them refer to details of contemporary American-Soviet relations that may cast the Soviet Union in a bad light. These archival holdings are valuable as a record of internal and external negotiation during the censorship processes. The following section is highlighted by the editor:

Миллионы людей боятся. Может быть, дни расследований и истерии действительно прошли, но никто особенно не рвется встречаться с русскими или приглашать их к себе, если на то нет какой-нибудь причины. Люди запуганны. Такие времена, только и всего. И чем эти люди отличаются от русских,

которые все еще боятся встречаться с нами, когда мы едем
туда?⁸⁷

The final sentences are altered by the editor in the typescript for printing and the section is therefore marked ‘попр’ [corrected]; it is altered to read:

Такие времена, только и всего. И чем эти люди отличаются от
русских, которые все еще *предпочитают не* встречаться с
нами, когда мы едем туда?⁸⁸

The translator’s original choice, ‘боятся’ [they are scared], is replaced by a less emotive phrase. The editor subsequently scored through *предпочитают не* [they prefer not to], completely reversing the meaning of the original. The final version printed in the journal makes a compromise, and the offending phrase becomes ‘все еще *настороженно* встречающихся с нами, когда мы бываем там’ [all the same, are *wary* of meeting with us, when we are there].⁸⁹ The author’s implication that the pre-Khrushchev fear of foreigners, and, by extension, the whole Stalinist system, still prevails is significantly weakened, replaced by a relatively positive image which fits into the discourse of progressive liberalisation and increased contact, or peaceful coexistence with the West which had gained ground at that time.

Also marked as ‘corrected’ is a section that describes the relative poverty of the Soviet people, as Nick watches them upon his arrival in Moscow. The English reads as follows:

⁸⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 504, l. 53. Mitchell Wilson, *Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane*. Translators’ typescript with editorial corrections. [Millions of people are scared. Perhaps, the days of investigations and hysteria have really passed, but nobody is rushing to meet with Russians, or invite them home, without any reason. People are scared. The times are thus, that is all. And how do these people differ from Russians who are, all the same, scared to meet with us when we go there?]

⁸⁸ RGALI, f. 1473, op. 3, d. 305. Mitchell Wilson, *Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane*. Second typescript with editorial corrections. [Such are the times, that is all. And how do these people differ from Russians, who all the same, prefer not to meet with us, when we go there?]

⁸⁹ Mitchell Wilson, ‘Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by N. Dekhtereva and N. Treneva, 1-3 (1961), 37-94; 85-47; 74-162 (vol. 1, p. 61). Emphasis added.

Nick realized suddenly that he hadn't the vaguest idea of what he should have expected since the only pictures of Russians he had ever seen were drab photographs of masses of workers wearing shapeless caps and either boots or wide-bottomed trousers of obviously poor material.⁹⁰

The translators' typescript preserves this more-or-less literally, although the 'drab' photographs become neutral black and white photographs:

русских ему приходилось видеть только на *серых* фотографиях, изображавших рабочих в *форменных* кепках, и либо в сапогах, либо в широких брюках из *явно скверной* материи.⁹¹

The corrections made by the editor lessen this negative perception, implying simplicity rather than poverty. This is the version that survives in the final published text.

русских ему приходилось видеть только на *плохих* фотографиях, изображавших рабочих в *кепках*, и либо в сапогах, либо в широких брюках из *недорогого* материала.⁹²

The picture of rows of indistinguishable figures in poor clothing — an image that loomed large in the Western imagination of communist countries during the cold war — reflects badly on the Soviet Union, as much for the implication of a lack of personality and individuality in the word 'форменных' [uniform] as for the reference to the poor quality of consumer goods. The foreign representation of the

⁹⁰ Mitchell Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1961), p. 47.

⁹¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 504, l. 62. Mitchell Wilson *Vstrecha na dalekom meridian*. Translator's typescript with editorial corrections. [He had seen Russians only in *black and white* photographs which depicted workers in *uniform* caps, and either in boots or in wide trousers made from *clearly poor* material.] Emphasis added.

⁹² Wilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', vol. 1, p. 65. [He had seen Russians only in *bad* photographs which depicted workers in caps and either in boots or in wide trousers made from *inexpensive* material.] Emphasis added.

Soviet Union was a matter of pride, and in the discourse of peaceful coexistence issues of consumption and living standards had great significance as a ‘stick with which the West beat its Cold War adversary’.⁹³ The editor’s changes instead portray the Soviet people as modest rather than poor, a self-image that was common in Soviet self-description; a positive self-image was created from their spirit of making do and putting up with minor problems (cheap clothes) while building towards something better.

Another political change made to this text concerns a discussion between the physicist Nick and his colleague about their relationship with Soviet scientists:

You know as well as I do that these closed areas were picked on an arbitrary and meaningless basis in retaliation for the Soviet areas that are restricted to us.⁹⁴

Вы не хуже меня знаете, что эти закрытые районы выбирались совершенно произвольно в ответ на закрытие отдельных советских районов для нас.⁹⁵

The omission of the word ‘meaningless’ in the translation diffuses the criticism of the Soviet system of restricting access to foreign visitors. The archival documents demonstrate that this change was made by the translators themselves, showing a tendency for the translator to manipulate the text, substituting rather than excising material. This section is also flagged by the editors, although it survived into the published section without further editorial alteration.⁹⁶ One section that remains

⁹³ Susan E. Reid, ‘Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union Under Khrushchev’, *Slavic Review*, 61 (2002), 211-252 (p. 213).

⁹⁴ Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, p. 32.

⁹⁵ Wilson, ‘Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane’, vol. 1, p. 54. [You know no worse than me, that these closed areas were chosen completely arbitrarily in answer to the closing of particular Soviet areas for us.]

⁹⁶ RGALI, f. 1537, op. 3, d. 504, l. 40. Mitchell Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*. Second translators’ typescript with editorial corrections.

almost whole in the published text is highlighted in the editor's hand on the typescript: the editors were alert even to oblique references to political problems of the cold war. This extract is taken from a description of the troubled relationship between Nick and his Soviet counterpart:

Ему стало явно, что политическая обстановка сводит на нет его личное любопытство, каким бы оно ни было, и до боли бесполезно надеяться, что Горчаков поймает его истинные побуждения. Ник грустно улыбнулся, и стараясь окончательно прикрыть свое отступление, добавил: - Возможно, наука развивалась бы гораздо быстрее, если бы мы думали, что просто заново открываем утерянных истин, человечество ведь забыло же на целую тысячу лет, что земля круглая.⁹⁷

Editorial alertness and, potentially, consultation with other agents are also demonstrated in the typescript version of Graham Greene's *Our Man in Havana*:

That evening hour was real, but not Hawthorne, mysterious and absurd, not the cruelties of police-stations and governments, the scientists who tested the new H-bomb on Christmas Island, *Khrushchev who wrote notes: these seemed less real to him than the inefficient tortures of a school-dormitory.*⁹⁸

The sentence about Khrushchev is retained by the translator and highlighted by the editor in the second draft typescript.⁹⁹ Having been marked as requiring further

⁹⁷ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 504, l. 68. Mitchell Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*. Second translators' typescript with editorial corrections. [It became clear to him that the political situation would not be reduced to his personal curiosity, however intense it was, and it was completely pointless to hope that Gorchakov would understand his secret motive. Nick smiled sadly and, trying to completely hide his retreat, added, 'Perhaps, science would develop much more quickly if we thought that we were simply uncovering lost secrets for humanity as though we had forgotten for a thousand long years that the earth was round'.]

⁹⁸ Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 30. Emphasis added.

⁹⁹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 2, d. 234, l. 34-5. Graham Greene, *Nash chelovek v Gavane*. Second typescript with editorial corrections, signed off by editors for proof printing.

action or consideration, this sentence does not survive in the final published version, which reads as follows:

Вот эти вечерные минуты — они реальность. Они, а не загадочный, нелепый Готорн, не жестокости полицейских застенков и правительств. Все это казалось ему значительно менее реальным чем незамысловатые пытки в школьном дортуаре.¹⁰⁰

Non-censorship

Some material that one might expect to be unacceptable is sometimes retained in the 1950s and 1960s texts. In *Rockets Galore*, for instance, the majority of politically marked material — references to the cold war and development of nuclear weapons on both sides — is retained, even when these references are oriented negatively towards the Soviet Union. It is not that this material has escaped editorial attention — eleven such moments are highlighted by the editors on the typescript, but all are ultimately retained in the text, suggesting that these moments are negotiated and approved;¹⁰¹ negotiation was a defining factor in Soviet censorship — the input of several actors, each with personal ideologies, agendas and positions in the hierarchy of the field was a crucial element of discursive production. The relative permissiveness in the post-Stalin texts is a development from the texts published in *Internatsional'naia literatura*, in which there is very little leeway in terms of political content, control being, as other accounts of censorship in this period support, much stricter in the Stalin era. The increased cultural and political contact of

¹⁰⁰ Greene, 'Nash chelovek v Gavane', vol. 3, p. 21. [These evening minutes— they are reality. They, and not the mysterious, stupid Hawthorne, not the cruelties of police stations and governments. They all seemed much less real to him, and the simple tortures in the school dormitory.]

¹⁰¹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d.342, 343. Compton Mackenzie, *Raketnaia goriachka*. Translator's typescript with editorial markings.

the Thaw era undoubtedly impacted on the treatment and censorship of foreign literature in the Soviet Union. While, relatively speaking, political censorship was slightly more lax and the atmosphere in this regard a little more permissive — as is seen by the inclusion of some negative material in *Rockets Galore* — there remained strong pressure for the journal to keep within the political limits set by the Party and other agents of power.

Conclusion: Rewriting or Showcasing Foreign Discourses?

Arlen Blium describes political censorship of the Khrushchev era as a direct continuation of Stalin-era practices, as repressive in this period as they were before Stalin's death.¹⁰² These case studies demonstrate that, despite some similarities, there were significant differences between the censorship of the two eras. Stalinist censorship, dominated by Glavlit's involvement, is applied most often through textual excisions, sometimes very large ones. The censorship of the Thaw era, when responsibility for the texts shifted in large part towards the editorial staff, tends to be characterised by smaller changes, with increased use of replacement and softening of unacceptable lexical items rather than simply removing words or larger sections of the texts, as was demonstrated in the analysis of texts from *Internatsional'naia literatura*. The most important result of this differing approach is that in the Stalin era there was a very much stronger tendency to use censorial practices to significantly alter the political message or themes of the texts. Themes that provoked sensitivity at given points in Soviet history were erased, totally altering the content

¹⁰² Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 45.

of the texts and, essentially, producing a completely different text for Soviet consumption to the one read by the source culture audience. This is seen very clearly in the erasure of themes such as Jewishness in *Dragon's Teeth*: the removal of references to the main characters' Jewishness in response to official Soviet anti-Semitism removes the specificity of Jewish victimhood. The end result is a novel that bears no political relation to the original English text. Similarly, the wider political context dictated the erasure of negative references to Nazism in Briffault's tract, once again distorting the ideological core of the book: the principal threat in the Soviet version is only British capitalism and imperialism. The links with Nazi Germany and sympathy with Nazi ideology, which the author contends are a vital reason for his condemnation of British politics, are erased, changing the author's argument and, crucially, rewriting the text in line with Soviet political norms.

Political censorship of the Stalinist era was linked to two important strands of wider politics. The first was the internal politics of the Soviet Union — institutionalised anti-Semitism and the official reverence of Marxism-Leninism, for example, defined the political capital held by the texts in circulation. Secondly, censorship of translated texts was governed by Soviet external politics, and was closely related to the Stalinist ambivalence to the West. Censorial practices coincided with the xenophobia of that period, exhibiting a mistrust of the foreign and a desire to neutralise any political view that potentially clashed with the Soviet one. There was a great deal of anxiety about the presence of the West in Soviet culture, a conflicting feeling of inferiority and superiority, which defined much of the cultural interaction between the Soviet Union and the West at this time, termed by Michael

David-Fox as a ‘blend of instrumentalism and anxiety’.¹⁰³ It is this anxiety that lies at the root of the political censorship of foreign texts. The attempt to co-opt foreign texts into a Soviet ideological discourse is a defining aspect of Stalinist censorship. The aim was to produce a text that met the requirements of Soviet discourse, which functioned *as a Soviet text* in the Soviet literary field. This was achieved, as has been shown in the current analysis, by the extensive rewriting of the text and the removal of all aspects that did not adhere to Soviet political norms (of course, the treatment of the theme of Nazism exposes the extent to which the political line is variable).

This is the most important distinction between the Stalinist censorship and censorship of the Thaw period. In the post-Stalin era one is inclined to characterise censorship less as a process of meaning-imposition, but, rather, of making suitable a text for circulation in the Soviet context; that is, avoiding any particularly major errors. This is apparent in those texts which deal with the theme of Soviet-Western relations — some minor criticism of the Soviet Union, or at least an ambivalent attitude towards it, could be expressed on the part of Western characters, but there was a limit to this freedom: sections which were judged to be too offensive were removed. In terms of politics, the texts are presented as *foreign* texts,¹⁰⁴ acknowledged as sometimes containing material which, while not adhering to Soviet ideology, was still an important feature of the foreign writers’ world and therefore worthy of study. This acceptance of foreignness, possibly a result of the lessening of official xenophobia, the policy of peaceful coexistence, and increased cultural contact between the Soviet Union and the West, meant that expression of opinions

¹⁰³David-Fox, 300-335 (p. 323).

¹⁰⁴This is perhaps anticipated in the renaming of the journal in 1955. *Internatsional’naia literatura* [International literature] is inclusive, whilst *Inostrannaia literatura* [Foreign literature] alerts the reader straight away to the status of the texts included as Other.

falling outwith officially sanctioned Soviet policy was permitted, with certain limits. As a result, these foreign texts were treated more like exemplars or representatives of the foreign culture, rather than as native cultural products, at least in terms of their political aspects. As with many aspects of censorship, this is also ambiguous. As I demonstrate in chapter 6, it is possible to draw somewhat different conclusions about the ideological aspect of censorship at the level of the text: ideologically-marked language was often manipulated to create intertextuality between the Soviet and Western contexts in an attempt to incorporate that aspect of the English-language texts into the Soviet discursive canon. This may reflect a broader ambiguity of the cultural change of the Thaw.

The practices of political censorship demonstrated in these case studies centre on censorial anxiety over the position of foreign political discourse in Soviet culture. In both cases, a concern for meeting the discursive standards of the receiving culture defines the actions taken; in the Stalin period, only items fully in keeping with political norms could circulate. After Stalin's death, as broader cultural changes took root, literary discourse began to undergo some liberalisation, and the official rhetoric of peaceful coexistence took root, a change occurred. Foreign texts began to be treated a little more leniently, and the censorial role changed: the censor's responsibility was to make a text suitable for circulation by correcting the worst errors, rather than to rewrite the text for Soviet consumption.

Chapter 6: Ideological Censorship

In this chapter, I seek to build upon Herman Ermolaev's model of puritanical and political censorship, shifting the focus away from more concrete questions of politics towards issues of ideology. The ideological aspect of censorship has strong links, and perhaps even overlap, with the censorship of political content; indeed, Glavlit itself used the descriptive term *politiko-ideologicheskii kontrol'* [political-ideological control] in its internal documents to refer broadly to a category of pre-emptive censorship concerning questions of current policy and the portrayal of the USSR, as well as issues of politically inappropriate language and content, as opposed to censorship of state secrets based on the *perechen'*.¹ This category is, of course, extremely broad, and unhelpful for the researcher attempting to systematically understand processes of censorship. I propose in this chapter to split Glavlit's categorisation and analyse 'ideological' censorship in its own right, separately from 'political' censorship. This means that, in addition to Ermolaev's political and puritanical categories, I propose another: ideological censorship. The texts from *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* show evidence of censorial action relating to the linguistic potential of a text — its ability to produce a particular meaning in the context of its publication. The use of the term 'ideological' here corresponds to Hodge and Kress's definition: 'a systematic body of ideas organized from a particular point of view'.² My analysis acknowledges that censorship was ideologically motivated at its root — ideology was the overarching

¹ GARF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 935, l. 142. Annual report of Mosoblgorlit for 1956.

² Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress, *Language as Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 6.

stimulus for censorial interference — but I aim in this chapter to particularly highlight the close link between ideology and language. Ideological censorship encompasses censorial interference in the text-production processes that is concerned not with concrete political issues, but rather with the meaning-making potential of language, and the differences between the prestige of the material in the source and target languages respectively. This discrepancy is particularly marked in translated texts, since the act of translation itself exposes the difference between the meanings of lexical items in the source and target contexts. The study of translated literature is, therefore, a rather fruitful source for examining this kind of censorship; the very act of translation unleashes new meanings in the target culture.

Context is crucial in the understanding of a text: parts of a text which have particular meanings or resonances in the source culture may mean little or nothing to the target culture, since the target audience is not acquainted with the cultural referents of the source culture; on the other hand, the meaning conferred on a text by the target audience may be entirely different to that understood in the source culture and intended by the author, owing to social and cultural differences between the source and target contexts. The impossibility of seamlessly transferring a text from one culture into another has, therefore, become a truism in the literature: there is always some kind of loss in the translation process. This is acknowledged by José Ortega y Gasset, for whom the ‘misery’ of translation is its impossibility, which arises from linguistic and other differences that separate one culture from others.³

A Bakhtinian view also acknowledges that discourse cannot be separated from its context; all speech acts must be considered alongside the extra-linguistic

³ José Ortega y Gasset, ‘The Misery and the Splendor of Translation’, in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, ed. by Rainer Schulte, trans. by Elizabeth Gamble Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 93-112 (p. 107).

reality.⁴ Because the transfer of texts into new cultural, linguistic and political contexts can produce meanings in the target culture that do not exist for source text readers, the translated text is, in effect, a new text; to cite Derrida, 'translation is neither an image nor a copy'.⁵ Translations are outgrowths of the original text, functioning differently in the target culture; translation is an interpretative process 'capable of qualitative jumps in knowledge and perception, of amplifying the semantic polyvalency of discourse, of opening new ideological horizons'.⁶ Translated texts have an inherent polysemy, which is produced by the 'in-between' status of the text, as it simultaneously looks back to the source and forward to the target culture. Translations are polysemic as a result of their intertextual nature; they embody the 'long chains of multiple meanings and the pluralities of language that lie behind any textual construct' in a dynamic act,⁷ 'bringing texts together in a play of multiple meanings and the pluralities of language'.⁸ Since the word, as 'minimal textual unit', is important in its intertextuality, 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another'.⁹ It is precisely this play of multiple meanings that is the location of ideological censorship, and this chapter will examine the idea that this kind of censorship arises from the conflict between centripetal and centrifugal forces in society. Norman Fairclough also touches upon this idea, proposing that free intertextual play is not available to text

⁴ Valentin Nikoalevich Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), p. 95.

⁵ Jacques Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, trans. by Gil Anidjar (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 115.

⁶ Susan Petrilli, 'Translation, Semiotics and Ideology', *TTR. Etudes sur le texte et ses transformations*, 5 (1992), 233–64 (p. 239).

⁷ Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko, 'Introduction', in *Translation and Power*, ed. by Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008), p. xi-xxviii (p. xiv).

⁸ Susan Bassnett, 'The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator', in *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal, pp. 10-24 (p. 11).

⁹ Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. by Toril Moi (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 37.

producers but is rather controlled by social forces and relations of power. For Fairclough, intertextuality is closely associated with ‘a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped by) social structure and practices’.¹⁰ Voloshinov, in a discussion of dialogism in discourse states that the ‘ruling class strives to impart a supraclass, eternal character to the ideological sign, to extinguish or drive inward the struggle between social value judgements which occurs in it, to make the sign uniaccental’.¹¹

The Ideologeme

One important concept in the understanding of ideology and meaning is the *ideologeme* as a linguistic unit with reference to ideology. The term (sometimes ‘ideologem’) has been used with several different meanings in studies of language and discourse, but always contains a reference to ideology. Bakhtin acknowledges the ideological nature of language in the novel thus:

The speaking person in the novel is always, to one degree or another, an *ideologue*, and his [sic] words are always *ideologemes*. A particular language in a novel is always a particular way of viewing the world, one that strives for a social significance. It is precisely as ideologemes that discourse becomes the object of representation in the novel, and it is for the same reason novels are never in danger of becoming a mere aimless verbal play.¹²

The Marxist critic Frederic Jameson defines the ideologeme as ‘the smallest intelligible unit of the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social

¹⁰ Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), p. 103.

¹¹ Voloshinov, p. 23.

¹² Bakhtin, p. 333.

classes',¹³ seeing the ideologeme as a unit of ideologies themselves, the link between the abstract concepts and their manifestation in discourse. Expanding upon this definition, he calls the ideologeme 'those narrative unities of a socially symbolic type which we have designated as ideologemes'.¹⁴ Other critics, particularly those focused more narrowly on language, employ a definition having some commonalities with Jameson's understanding, albeit more narrowly defined. Gasan Gusejnov, for example, defines the ideologeme as

the smallest part of a text or flow of discourse, subject or symbol, which is perceived by the author, the listener, the reader as a reference — direct or indirect — to metalanguage or to an imaginary code of philosophical norms and fundamental ideological constructions, which control society [...] It is possible to define the ideologeme as the simplest switch from the natural-personal to the official-public regime of linguistic behaviour and vice versa.¹⁵

In this description, the ideologeme is an item — a letter, word or other item — which contains a reference to ideology or cultural norms. Ideologemes are taken to be semantically stable and, crucially, unquestioned: their meaning is understood by language users as commonsensical. The ideologeme can also direct speakers towards meanings that are correct in the eyes of those in authority; they can act as key markers of ideological discourse, functioning as authorised terms within that discourse.

¹³ Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (London: Methuen, 1981), p. 76.

¹⁴ Jameson, p. 185.

¹⁵ Gasan Chingizovich Gusejnov, *D.S.P.: Sovetskie ideologemy v russkom diskurse 1990-kh* (Moscow: Tri kvadrata, 2004), p. 27.

Ideologemes are strongly linked to the performative, ritualistic nature of Soviet discourse,¹⁶ and the study of these key symbolic items of Soviet culture is well established. In recent years, a number of studies have examined the existence of important, highly charged and significant cultural items in Soviet culture, calling them variously tropes, symbols, icons, or ‘hieroglyphics’.¹⁷ To take just one example, Orlando Figes and Boris Kolonitskii examine how the language of revolution was used to create identity and meaning in post-revolutionary Russia. In the early years of Soviet rule, linguistic and visual symbols were established in a cultural code, which became a powerful political tool and a means of establishing Bolshevik authority.¹⁸ In her groundbreaking study of the Soviet socialist realist novel, Katerina Clark also discusses the importance of the key symbols and tropes that were reproduced in the manner of an icon painter copying gestures or symbols. However, she adds a caveat:

The constancy with which the same signs recur in Soviet novels is in part deceptive. Continuity in the use of symbols need not be an accurate index to continuity of values. If, as most linguists now agree, the relationship between sign and meaning in ordinary language is not fixed but dynamic, then, surely, when language is used symbolically, this potential for change is increased.¹⁹

In the periods and examples under investigation here, censors, either ignorant or suspicious of the readers’ abilities to create new meanings, attempted to reduce and fix meaning, by erasing ‘foreign’ uses of these ideologically important lexemes and

¹⁶ On this topic, see Konstantin Bogdanov, ‘The Rhetoric of Ritual: The Soviet Sociolect in Ethnolinguistic Perspective’, *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 5 (2009), 179-216 (p. 182).

¹⁷ Nancy Condee, *Soviet Hieroglyphics: Visual Culture in Late Twentieth-Century Russia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

¹⁸ Orlando Figes and Boris Kolonitskii, *Interpreting the Russian Revolution: The Language and Symbols of 1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 70.

¹⁹ Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, p. 11.

attempting to establish a single, universal, meaning. The success of these attempts is, however, another question entirely.

The fixing of meaning can be brought about by authorities who, through reproduction and repetition of discourse, enable ideologemes to become semantically stable and emphasise given meanings while cutting off other meanings and co-occurrences, thus establishing and embedding the authoritative meaning(s) in the discourse.²⁰ Malte Rolf notes this tendency to make certain terms sacred as a part of the process of ‘inner Sovietization’ of discourse:

[Stalinist culture] fostered a canon of untouchable symbols and vocabularies. Extra-canonical references were likely to become targets of harsh criticism. By contrast, labels like “revolutionary”, “proletarian”, and “Soviet” and seemingly core symbols like the Red star and Red flag could not possibly be criticized.²¹

The ways in which ideologemes were treated by censorial agents is, thus, an important line of enquiry in understanding how censorship functioned. This is particularly the case in translated texts where, as previously noted, lexical items could function differently in different cultural contexts. As the chapter on political censorship has demonstrated, censorial agents were concerned with controlling the potential for meaning making on the part of the reader. Censorship was not simply concerned with erasing or destroying meaning, but rather with the act of meaning creation; in this case Soviet censors aimed to interpret a text on behalf of the reader and impose an authoritative reading of that text upon the reader.

²⁰ Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, ‘How Upright Is the Vertical? Ideological Norm Negotiation in Russian Media Discourse’, in *From Poets to Padonki: Linguistic Authority and Norm Negotiation in Modern Russian Culture*, ed. by Ingunn Lunde and Martin Paulsen, 2009 (Bergen: Slavica Bergensia, 2009), pp. 288-314 (p. 300).

²¹ Malte Rolf, ‘A Hall of Mirrors: Sovietizing Culture Under Stalinism’, *Slavic Review*, 68 (2009), 601-631 (p. 619).

In her memoir, Nora Gal' recounts an event at *Internatsional'naia literatura* which serves as an illuminating introduction to these case studies.

It was here that I first saw Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina.²² At *Interlit*, we had previously been engrossed in her translation of *The Grapes of Wrath*. Now we had another of Steinbeck's novels, *The Moon is Down*, about the fascist invasion and the proud resistance of the small, peaceful but freedom-loving people. Everyone who was sitting in or came into the room was discussing *The Moon is Down*: the 'prose-writers', the 'poets', the 'critics' and, I remember, the technical editors as well. There was a stumbling block — a character called *The Leader*. Today, with no hesitation or care for the Russian language, we see all kinds of *lenchy*, *brifingy*, *ofisy*, and *presentatsii*. But at that time, no one wanted to introduce the foreign word *lider* into literary prose. The whole room considered it and made suggestions. *Vozhd'*, especially with a capital, could not even be considered. *Vozhak?* *Vozhatyi?* Not with that semantic overlay. And suddenly, from behind my desk I shyly squeaked 'Could we not use *Predvoditel'*?' Vera Maksimonva looked over her glasses at me. I will never forget that kind and humorous look. [...] *The Moon*... never appeared in *Interlit*. When we were preparing the spring issues, we did not yet know that from 1943 the journal would no longer exist.²³

Gal''s recounting of this event touches upon a couple of important points. The first is that the fate of the texts published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* was a communal concern: all of the staff was involved in discussions as to the suitability of a given text, and of the text itself. The second, which is most relevant to the case studies presented in this chapter, is that certain terms provoked a specific anxiety among the

²² Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina, 1930-1981: Translator from English who worked for *Internatsional'naia literatura*, and translated works by Jack London etc. Member of the Kashkin 'school' of translation.

²³ Gal'. Emphasis in original.

text-producers because of their status in the Soviet context. Here, the word *лидер* [*leader* – often used in the sense of a pace-setter] is problematic because of its close association with Stalin, who was both omnipresent leader and untouchable symbol; Stalin was the ultimate representation of Soviet ideology, standing metonymically for the entire Soviet Union. Here, the editors faced two related problems, both of which were connected to contemporary linguistic norms: the impossibility of creating a neologism in the form of the word *лидер*, and the lack of a suitable semantically equivalent term that was not linked to the ideologeme *вождь* (*vozhd'*). *Вождь* is a term with a particular, ideologically determined connotative meaning. Both *вожак* and *вожатый*, which can also mean *leader*, contain the same root and are therefore too close to the taboo term to be acceptable. Gal's proposal, *предводитель* (*predvoditel'*), although arguably a clumsy choice for a character's name, manages to capture the meaning of *leader* while avoiding the ideologically loaded association with Stalin. It is clear, then, that editors were aware of the need to respect the particularly Soviet meaning of these terms. This awareness — or even paranoia — which can be demonstrated in a number of the texts published in *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura*, provoked censorial intervention on the part of the text producers, as the following case illustrates.

Semantic Shifts of The Ideologeme in *Internatsional'naia literatura*

The texts from the earlier journal exhibit fewer instances of ideological censorship than might be expected, given the highly ideologised nature of Soviet society at this time; there are twenty-four such alterations in total. The reasons for this lie in the

layered nature of Soviet censorship practices. Firstly, the choice of texts immediately limited the presence of unacceptable material. Secondly, the tendency of *Internatsional'naia literatura*, at least until around 1938, to publish works mostly in very short abridged versions, meant that most politically and ideologically unsuitable content would have been removed as part of the abridgement process, leaving a 'cleaner' text to begin with. Several of the texts (ten in total) subjected to comparative study contain no instances of ideological censorship.

The earliest instance of the censorship of the ideologeme in the Stalin-era texts is seen in the sixth issue for 1934 in William Rollins Jr.'s novel, *The Shadow Before*. This text includes a reference to the trial of the Italian-American radicals Sacco and Vanzetti, which was a cause célèbre in the Soviet Union.²⁴ In the scene examined here, a journalist is reporting the speech of the judge in the case: 'No snarling Thayer, after "those anarchist bastards"'.²⁵ The published text has: 'Это вам не циник Тэйер' [This is not your cynic, Thayer].²⁶ In addition to the substitution of 'cynic' for the more evocative adjective 'snarling', the rest of this sentence is removed, cutting the word 'anarchist'. *Anarchist* is an ideologeme, with a particularly Soviet ideological resonance and set of connotative meanings. The word contained extremely negative connotations and was incompatible with communism. Dmitrii Ushakov's major dictionary of the Russian language (published from 1934-1940) defines anarchism as a 'petty-bourgeois political movement, opposed to Marxist-Leninist teachings about the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of

²⁴See also my previous article, which examined the censorship of this theme in Howard Fast's 1955 novel *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti*: Samantha Sherry, 'Censorship in Translation in the Soviet Union: The Manipulative Rewriting of Howard Fast's Novel *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti*', *Slavonica*, 16 (2010), 1-14.

²⁵William Rollins, *The Shadow Before* (New York, R.M. McBride & Co., 1934), p. 307.

²⁶Rollins, William, 'Ten' vpered', *Internatsional'naia Literatura*, trans. by E. Romanova, 6 (1934), 5-24 (p. 14).

the proletariat [...] a counter-revolutionary force fighting against the Soviet Union and betraying the revolutionary struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries'.²⁷ The meaning of the word in the Soviet context is, as the dictionary definition demonstrates, conditioned by the particular historical and social conditions of that culture. The censorial impulse here, therefore, lies in the gap between the different connotative meanings of this ideologeme in the Soviet and Western cultures; while commonly used in Western discourse to refer to Sacco and Vanzetti,²⁸ the word *anarchist* simply could not be used in reference to two characters who were, in Soviet discourse, considered to be and portrayed as communists. A similar gap between the dominant ideologies of the respective contexts lies at the root of many of the examples of ideological censorship shown in this chapter.

In order to erase any understanding of ideology that did not adhere to Soviet sanctioned ideology, certain items were altered. For instance, a link between Marxism and the political theories of the capitalist countries was taboo, since it set up a false comparison, and so was altered in the Russian version of *An American Testament*. This of course applied to Freudianism, which was officially considered incompatible with Marxism; Freud was, from the 1930s, treated as an ideological enemy.²⁹ In the words of Solodin, 'no Freud was possible'.³⁰

But to pose a problem does not mean to solve it. We were unable to find a synthesis between conflicting ideals except abstractly.

²⁷ 'Anarkhizm', *Tolkovy Slovar' Russkogo Iazyka*, ed. by Dmitrii Nikolaevich Ushakov and Grigorii Osipovich Vinokur (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei, 1935) <<http://ushdict.narod.ru/032/w09759.htm>> [accessed 4 September 2011].

²⁸ On Sacco and Vanzetti as anarchist-communists, see Paul Avrich, *Sacco and Vanzetti: The Anarchist Background* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

²⁹ Martin Alan Miller, *Freud and the Bolsheviks: Psychoanalysis in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 107.

³⁰ Richmond and Solodin, 581-590 (p. 584).

Still less could we reconcile the doctrines of Marx with the teachings of Freud, *both of which appeared equally true*.³¹

Мы не умели найти синтез противоречивых мировоззрений, разве только отвлеченно. Еще менее нам удалось “примирить” теории Маркса и Фрейда.³²

The following section, although ultimately critical of Freudianism, is also removed because of the comparison of Freudianism and Marxism in structural terms:

Psychoanalysis had a materialist base and an idealist superstructure. It sought to explain mental illness in terms of such material things as sex, money, physical deficiencies; but it atomized the human personality into such idealistic abstractions as the Unconscious, the Id, the Libido.³³

Since ‘base’ and ‘superstructure’ were extremely important defining terms of Marxist theory, this statement clearly links the guiding philosophy of the Soviet state with the theories of an enemy of Marxism, something that is completely taboo in the Soviet context. It is this misinterpretation of Marxism through implicit comparison with Freudianism that results in censorial intervention.

At times, the ideological and political modes of censorship come very close, and possibly even overlap slightly. This means that this mode of censorship can be linked to conclusions made in the chapter on political censorship about the censors’ attempt to constrain and direct the readers’ interpretation of the texts. This close relation between the two modes of censorship is demonstrated in an example taken from John Hyde Preston’s novel *The Liberals*. This sentence, uttered by the

³¹Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 272. Emphasis added.

³²Freeman, ‘Zavet amerikantsa’, vol. 2, p. 150. [We did not manage to find a synthesis of the opposing world-views, except abstractly. Even less could we manage to ‘reconcile’ the theories of Marx and Freud.]

³³Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 272. Emphasis added.

reactionary character, Will, is altered in the translated text to remove the use of the ideologeme *red*:

It was all that damned Obilitch and Greg. They were a couple of
red shits.³⁴

Это все Грег и эта *скотина* Обилич.³⁵

The second sentence of the English extract does not survive in the final Russian text. Here, although there clearly is a political motive — avoiding criticism of communism — the ideological aspect of this act of censorship is rooted in the key significance of the word *red* in Soviet culture: an analogous use as an insult in Soviet discourse was impossible. There is a further nuance in this novel in the use of *red* in the English, in that in American English the word signifies *republican* as well as *communist*. This is demonstrated in a description of the Republican character, Fitzpatrick as ‘a bloated red in tweeds’;³⁶ the translation avoids this negative use in Russian, instead employing a word with no political connotations: ‘индюк’ [turkey].³⁷ Here the culturally specific element disappears and the imagery is entirely altered. This approach demonstrates again the difference in connotative meaning between the terms as used in English and in Russian, and, on the censors’ part, a desire to avoid an unauthorised use or open up an alternative meaning of this ideologeme. The Russian choice is more striking in its visual imagery, painting an extremely negative image of the Republican, even subtly conveying the visual image of the colour *red* in the turkey’s own colouring.

³⁴ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 166. Emphasis added.

³⁵ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 11, p. 40. Emphasis added. [It was all Greg, and that swine Obilitch.]

³⁶ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 82.

³⁷ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 11, p. 52.

A similar, though less drastic, example of the censorship of *red* is observed in Joseph Freeman's *An American Testament*. Here, the author sarcastically quotes popular opinion on the economic development of the USA after the First World War. Since this is reported speech, it is clear that the statement is not the real opinion of the author. Nonetheless, despite the clearly indicated negative opinion of the author towards this viewpoint — emphasised by the use of quotation marks — the censor of the Russian text minimises the negative use of the word *red*.

Yet even when the Golden Age was most golden, a lot of 'dirty Reds' were 'disgruntled'.³⁸

Но даже в самую золотую пору золотого века масса 'красных' имела большие 'неприятности'.³⁹

Here, although *red* is retained as a means of referring to communists, an acceptable use according to the standards of Soviet discourse, the negative marker is removed.

A further example is taken from Jim Phelan's novel *Green Volcano* (published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in 1940). This novel tells the story of a group of Irish revolutionaries on the run from the authorities. The Soviet attitude to Irish Republicanism was broadly positive, particularly in the early years of its existence: the Soviet government was the only one to recognise the first Dáil Éireann, the first parliament, which was founded in 1919. Between 1917 and 1922, there were substantial contacts between the two governments; these tailed off in the 1930s as a result of the isolationist policies pursued by both Ireland and the Soviet Union, and afterwards, as a result of the war. This political sympathy for the Irish republicans most likely was a reason for the choice of this text in particular. The use

³⁸Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 340.

³⁹Freeman, 'Zavet amerikantsy', vol. 3, p. 164-165. [But even in the most golden age of the golden century, a mass of 'reds' had big 'hardships'.]

of censorship to protect the Soviet meaning of the ideologeme is demonstrated in the manipulation of a line of a song sung by the rebels:

For though they sleep in dungeons deep,
Or flee an outlaw band,
We love them yet,
we can't forget,
The *felons* of our land.⁴⁰

This censorship technique, the substitution of one word by another, rather than the excision is a technique typically employed in the censorship of ideologemes. Although the original text of the song is clearly sarcastic, relying upon the target reader's understanding of the discrepancy between the official perception of these 'felons', and the opinions of their supporters, the censor seeks to avoid this complexity.

пускай иных уж нет в живых,
Иные скитаться должны
Мы любим вас и помним вас,
Ирландии *сыны*.⁴¹

The censorial intervention here consists of the replacement of the source text's negatively oriented term with one that has positive connotations in the target culture. Ushakov's dictionary offers the following slogans to illustrate its definition of 'сын' [son]: 'I, the son of the working people', and 'Long live the Soviet pilots, courageous sons of our great motherland!'.⁴² Defined as a 'socially dangerous act (or

⁴⁰James Leo Phelan, *Green Volcano* (London: P. Davies, 1938), p. 110. Emphasis added.

⁴¹Phelan, James Leo, 'Zelenyi vulkan', *Internatsional'naia Literatura*, trans. by P. Toper, 1940, 3-133 (p. 35). Emphasis added. [Although the others are no longer alive | Others must wander | We love you, and remember you | *Sons of Ireland*.]

⁴²'Syn', *Tolkovy slovar' russkogo iazyka*, ed. by Dmitrii Nikolaevich Ushakov and Grigorii

failure to act)', the meaning of the word *преступник*, the usual translation of *felon*, does not allow for an association with revolutionaries or revolution. The focus of the censorship practices here is on the gap between the authoritative meanings present in the target discourse and those of the source discourse. The action of the censor here guards against meaning creation on the part of the reader, ensuring that the reader does not interpret these revolutionaries literally as felons. Instead, the censor interprets the text on the reader's behalf, imposing a reading of that text that avoids the double meaning of the source text and erases the sense of irony present in the original. This avoidance of unwanted meanings, and the imposition of an already mediated meaning is a prime motivation behind ideological censorship. The above examples foreground one of the most significant aspects of the ideological mode of censorship, which is the alteration of the ideological connotations of the texts. In the *Green Volcano*, this entails, for example, a substitution of a negative term with a positive one.

Censorship may also involve the replacing of an ideologically marked item with a neutral one. This can be seen in John Hyde Preston's *The Liberals*. In this novel, one character describes Greg, the main character, a socialist, as follows: 'That sleepy communist, he wants the revolution tomorrow. He can't wait'.⁴³ In the Russian text 'communist' is replaced by the more neutrally connoted *герой* [hero]: 'Вот этот сонный герой хочет, чтоб революция была завтра. Он не может ждать'. [That sleepy hero wants the revolution tomorrow. He cannot wait].⁴⁴ Here, the word *communist* cannot be used ironically, as it is in the English version. The

Osipovich Vinokur (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarей, 1935) <<http://ushdict.narod.ru/224/w67406.htm>> [accessed 4 September 2011].

⁴³ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 308.

⁴⁴ Preston, 'Liberal', vol. 12, p. 90.

replacement *зепой* thus allows for the preservation of the irony, by deideologising the translated term.

As noted earlier, an ideologeme is not necessarily a single word, but may also be a larger unit, such as a metaphorical construction or slogan; these constructions are also subject to ideological censorship. Just such an example can be observed in Hemingway's *Fiesta*. Interestingly, Nora Gal' wrote in her memoirs that, in Vera Maksimovna Toper's translation 'nothing was simplified, there were no insertions of her own words [*otsebiatiny*]; the real Hemingway was truly recreated in Russian'.⁴⁵ The following passage describes a local parade in Spain, where the protagonists are staying; it is described, rather satirically, from the point of view of the American onlookers. This passage is severely curtailed in the translated text.

Down the street came dancers. The street was solid with dancers, all men. They were all dancing in time behind their own fifers and drummers. They were a club of some sort, and all wore workmen's blue smocks, and red handkerchiefs around their necks, and carried a great banner on two poles. The banner danced up and down with them as they came down surrounded by the crowd.

"Hurray for Wine! Hurray for the Foreigners!" was painted on the banner.

"Where are the foreigners?" Robert Cohn asked.

"We're the foreigners," Bill said.⁴⁶

Вся улица сплошь была запружена танцовали — одни мужчины. Они все танцовали под своей собственный оркестр из дудок и барабанов.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Gal'.

⁴⁶ Hemingway, *Fiesta*, p. 177.

⁴⁷ Hemingway, 'Fiesta', p. 17. [The whole street was completely full of dancers—all men. They all danced behind their own orchestra of pipes and drums.]

Hemingway's image here is clear: the picture of a group of workers of some kind is clearly established by the worker's smock and red kerchiefs. An implication of political engagement or activism is created in the image of the banner on two poles. The image, then, is a tongue-in-cheek depiction of the working class protest march, a comical inversion of mass demonstrations. This humorous image contains two symbols that were sacred in Soviet culture: *The Worker* and *Revolution*. Once again, the motivation for censorship lies in the differing ideological status of the English and Soviet discursive items; while it was acceptable to play with these items in a humorous fashion in the American context, this was impossible in the Soviet one because of their highly ideologised status, indeed these ideologemes were treated almost as religious images in Soviet culture. The worker had 'exceptional status' in Soviet culture,⁴⁸ and in the 1930s, the image of the worker functioned as a projection of an ideal type. The revolution was the central founding myth of the Soviet state, and so its treatment is similar to that of the ideologeme *worker*. The canonical position of this image is evident from the vast spectacle of the anniversary parade and the proliferation of streets, factories etc. named *Oktiabr'skii* — October and the revolution were constantly present in Soviet society. These images were ideologically marked symbols, embodying a particular message and set of meanings, set down in authoritative discourse and embedded in Soviet consciousness; as noted above, the canonisation of particular terms is fostered by constant repetition and consolidation.⁴⁹ As symbols, they are central ones in Soviet discourse and, as such, may not be satirised (at least in the official sphere of cultural production).

⁴⁸Victoria E. Bonnell, *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters Under Lenin and Stalin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), p. 28.

⁴⁹Rolf, 601-631 (p. 613).

A further example of the manipulation of the key term *worker* is taken from *An American Testament*, from a report in a communist newspaper on the plight of American workers.

There will be another fierce, dreadful wave of unemployment, another American famine. I am no divinely-informed prophet who says that; *any American workingman* will give you the same information.⁵⁰

Мы увидим новую гигантскую волну безработицы, новый американский голод. Не думайте, что это вещает пророк. *Наш великий американский рабочий* скажет вам то же самое.⁵¹

The change here involves a strengthening of the term ‘workingman’, with the result that the text is made to more closely align with Soviet discursive norms, and therefore serves to incorporate the text into the Soviet discursive canon. The addition of the adjective ‘великий’ [great] creates a collocation that is strongly reminiscent of Soviet ideological language, calling to mind proclamatory slogans and headlines.

In narratives sympathetic to the communist cause (that is, almost all the texts published in *Internatsional’naia literatura*), there is an insertion of Soviet ideology through the adoption of the key terms of Soviet discourse, as in Robert Briffault’s *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*. The following passage, on the cotton industry in Lancashire, displays this tendency, again in relation to the word *worker*.

Thousands of *operatives* are out of work with no prospect of ever being able to return to the mill.⁵²

⁵⁰Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 238. Emphasis added.

⁵¹Freeman, ‘Zavet amerikantsa’, p. 182. Emphasis added. [We will see a new, giant, wave of unemployment, a new American famine. Do not think it is a prophet who tells you this. Our great American worker will tell you the same thing.]

⁵²Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 17. Emphasis added.

Тысячи *рабочих* выбрасываются на улицу без всякой надежды
когда-либо вновь вернуться на фабрики...⁵³

The Russian phrase ‘выбрасываются на улицу’ is a newspaper cliché ; it serves to confirm the Soviet criticism of the West, which often focused on the poor treatment of workers and on economic problems, to create a contrast with the Soviet Union.⁵⁴

The use of an instantly recognisable phrase serves to insert Briffault’s text into the already existing Soviet mode of discourse of the West. Another subtle manipulation of Briffault’s text substitutes a term associated with Soviet political discourse. Where Briffault states, ‘For in no instance is a whole nation so effectually and uniformly conditioned in subservience to ruling interests as is the mind of England’,⁵⁵ the Russian translation replaced this with ‘Ибо ни в одном случае весь народ не показал себя в такой степени подчиненным правящим классам, как в Англии’ [Because in no case has the whole nation proved itself subordinate to the ruling classes to such an extent as in England].⁵⁶ This formulation draws upon the vocabulary of Marxism, thus aligning Briffault’s text more explicitly with Soviet discourse than the original. In *The Liberals*, insertion of Soviet ideologemes into the text also occurs in the translation of the name of a building development as ‘рабочий городок’ [workers’ town],⁵⁷ when the English is the neutral ‘River Settlement’.⁵⁸

⁵³ Briffault, ‘Updaok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii’, p. 158. Emphasis added. [Thousands of *workers* are being thrown out onto the street without any hope of ever again returning to the factory.]

⁵⁴ On this theme in Soviet official discourse see, for example: Alexander Dallin, ‘America Through Soviet Eyes’, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 11 (1947), 26–39 (pp. 31–32); Vladimir Shlapentokh, ‘The Changeable Soviet Image of America’, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 497 (1988), 157–171 (pp. 162–163).

⁵⁵ Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 254.

⁵⁶ Briffault, ‘Upadok i razhrushenie Britanskoi Imperii’, p. 202.

⁵⁷ Preston, ‘Liberal’, vol. 12, p. 88.

⁵⁸ Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 302.

Another example suggests that censorship was intended to align the foreign texts with the Soviet discursive canon; this is an extract from *An American Testament*.

We live once; let us not live like rats burrowing in some little hole,
but like wise and courageous men and women who *conquer some
part of nature in their own generation.*⁵⁹

Мы живем только раз, давайте же жить не как крысы,
зарывшиеся в нору, а как мудрые и мужественные люди,
которые выбрали себе какой-то вид *борьбы.*⁶⁰

In this extract the final part of the sentence is shortened and replaced by the word *борьба* [struggle] that had a strong resonance in Soviet culture and was associated with revolutionary activities and the building of the Soviet state. The metaphor of struggle was a central one in Soviet discourse, and its associated term *bor'ba* was used to designate central defining discourses of Soviet socialism like the class struggle (*классовая борьба*), the struggle against the enemies of the people (*борьба с врагами народа*) and the concept of the task, central to Stalinist projects.⁶¹

These examples demonstrate that words and symbols strongly associated with the state ideology were highly susceptible to censorship. Acting to control new potential connotative meanings being released in the target discourse, censors have demonstrated concern for the canonised items of Soviet discourse, those items having great cultural and ideological significance in the target context, but, crucially, not in the source culture. The censorship of ideological language treated certain parts

⁵⁹Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 377. Emphasis added.

⁶⁰Freeman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 3, p. 171. Emphasis added. [We live only once, let us live not like rats, burrowing in a hole, but like wise and courageous people, who chose for themselves some kind of struggle.]

⁶¹Jeffrey Brooks, *Thank You Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 296.

of discourse as valuable and sacred, which could only be employed in particular, limited ways; all these examples of censorial intervention share a concern with adhering to the norms of Soviet discourse, whether that means erasing heretical meanings, or inserting authorised meanings. That Stalinist censorship tried to guard against multiple meanings and ‘reduce semantic ambiguity’⁶² is borne out by examination of these translated texts; the censorial attempt to limit and control the readers’ interpretation of the text is clearly present. Plamper’s conclusions are drawn from an examination of 1930s texts, but I will demonstrate that this mode of censorship survived in the years following Stalin’s death, and continued to function in a similar manner.

Semantic Shifts of the Ideologeme in *Inostrannaia literatura*

Despite some political relaxation and a slight increase in cultural freedom in comparison to the years of Stalinism, the linguistic emphasis of Soviet censorship remained significant. This was due to the continued protected status of ideologically marked language in Soviet discourse. Cultural tropes and symbols of the Stalinist era continued to be present in Soviet culture into the post-Stalin era.⁶³ There is also a continuation of certain uses of Stalinist discourse in the post-Stalin era; Katerina Clark asserts that Thaw fiction, although often understood as a reaction against socialist realist literature, ‘grew out of, rather than away from, the traditions that preceded it. [...] Even when writers advocate values they believe to be opposed to

⁶²Plamper, 526-544 (p. 540).

⁶³Alexander Prokhorov, ‘Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, School of Arts and Sciences, 2002), pp. 106–107.

Stalinist values, they often articulate them against the old patterns'.⁶⁴ Therefore, the status of ideological language continued to be an important consideration, even as the transfer of censorial authority away from Glavlit and the institutions of state towards the editor and internal publishing processes took place.

In comparison to the case studies taken from *Internatsional'naia literatura*, slightly fewer examples of censorship of the ideologeme were found in *Inostrannaia literatura* (fourteen in total). Once again, the initial layer of censorial intervention — the ideologised choice of texts — played a role in the censorship that was subsequently applied on the textual level. As has been demonstrated in the study of censorship in the selection of texts, the Thaw era saw a relative loosening of control over the choice of texts for translation, particularly in comparison to the restrictive atmosphere of the late thirties — and so a broader range of voices and themes is to be expected. However, the censorship of the texts of the 1950s and 1960s was more complex than this fact would suggest, because authoritative public discourse actually became 'increasingly normalized, ubiquitous, and predictable [...] the form of the ideological representations became fixed and replicated'.⁶⁵ Since public discourse became less variable, we might well expect that the censorship of the ideologeme would survive and perhaps even come to be consolidated in the post-Stalin era.

The continued existence of certain Stalinist patterns of linguistic control can be demonstrated in the ideological censorship of *Inostrannaia literatura*. Censorship in the post-Stalin era concerns the same kind of ideologically loaded terms as in previous years, but the results are more ambiguous: controls appear less rigidly applied, and it becomes more difficult to ascribe clear, conscious motives. For

⁶⁴ Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, p. 236.

⁶⁵ Yurchak, p. 14.

instance, where I have shown how a word such as *worker* was used within strict boundaries of meaning, and was even inserted into texts, aligning them with Soviet norms in the Stalin era, in the post-Stalin era, this aspect of censorship was rather different. In this example from Cronin's novel *The Northern Light* (published in the journal in 1959), the opposite tendency can be observed: *worker* has been removed and replaced with an unmarked word. This appears surprising since the novel is a critique of big business in the newspaper industry, and its callous treatment of its workers. From a discussion between two of the main characters, Nye and Smith, the following extract is altered in translation:

Hundreds of workers, including more than a hundred journalists,
were flung on the scrap heap.⁶⁶

Сотни людей — в том числе около ста журналистов — были
вышвырнуты на свалку.⁶⁷

The substitution of 'people' for 'workers' here is significant, given the importance of the worker imagery in Soviet discourse. Here, the ambiguity and subtlety of approaches to the ideologeme are demonstrated. While the translator could have opted for the term *работники* [non-manual workers] rather than *рабочий* [manual workers], the replacement by the neutral *people* has the effect of slightly blunting the political thrust of the novel, which, after all, has a social theme: it tells the story of a small, dignified, moral newspaper owner being threatened by a larger, trashy tabloid rival. Here the translator could have chosen to ideologise the text, but has not.

Nonetheless, some instances of ideological censorship continued to function as before. The ideologeme *red* is an excellent example. Maurice Friedberg notes the

⁶⁶ Cronin, *The Northern Light*, p. 43.

⁶⁷ Cronin, 'Sernnyi svet'. vol. 1, p. 84. [Hundreds of people—including around one hundred journalists—were kicked out onto the scrap heap.]

omission of ‘the Red Baron and also [...] Red label Whiskey’ in a translation of Neil Simon’s *The Prisoner of Second Avenue*, ‘because these sounded like slurs on the communist movement’,⁶⁸ and a similar manipulative translation can be observed in the *Inostrannaia literatura* texts. The term ‘red vulture’,⁶⁹ used to refer to a corrupt and violent police chief in Graham Greene’s *Our Man in Havana*, was rendered in the Russian text only as ‘стервятник’ [vulture],⁷⁰ omitting the word *red*. *Red* carries very important positive connotations in Soviet discourse; as I noted earlier, the word was closely associated with official activities, the triumph of communism, and featured heavily in parades, posters, and other officially produced symbolic products. It was not appropriate, therefore, to use the term in a negative sense, such as applying it to a negative character, and so the phrase was neutralised. Examination of the archival documents held in RGALI demonstrates that this change was instigated by the translator,⁷¹ possibly demonstrating an internalisation of the norms of Soviet discourse. Mikhail Epstein terms this aspect of censorship the ‘evaluative conversion, changing the connotative meaning while retaining the denotative meaning’.⁷²

One example of manipulative censorship carried out by the translator is shown in Mackenzie’s *Rockets Galore*.⁷³ A negative reference to communists in the English text is rendered positive in the Russian, with the insult removed. The

⁶⁸ Friedberg, pp. 21-28 (p. 27).

⁶⁹ Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 34.

⁷⁰ Greene, ‘Nash chelovek v Gavane’, vol. 3, p. 24.

⁷¹ RGALI, f. 1537, op. 1, d. 260. Graham Greene, *Nash chelovek v Gavane*. Translator’s typescript with editorial corrections.

⁷² Mikhail Epstein, *Relativistic Patterns in Totalitarian Thinking: An Inquiry into the Language of Soviet Ideology* (Washington: The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1991), p. 23.

⁷³ It should be pointed out that in this novel most political material is retained, including one or two negative references to the Soviet Union (e.g. a passage about the Soviet Union aiming rockets at the West (p. 122; vol. 7 p. 100).

passage quoted here is a conversation between two of the principal characters, who are drinking in the pub on the island of Little Toddy.

‘Another dram, Eachann, and you’ll be as *full of wind* as a Communist’.⁷⁴

‘Еще одна рюмка, Эхан, и ты начнешь рассуждать, как *заправский коммунист*’.⁷⁵

Like many other manipulative changes, this example of censorial intervention involves the replacement of a lexical item with negative connotative meaning with another that has positive connotations, thus defusing the criticism in the source text. However, the change from ‘be full of wind’, to ‘рассуждать’ [to talk], which has associations of reason and wisdom, since it contains the root *суд* [judgement] and the expansion of ‘a Communist’ to ‘заправский коммунист’ [real/ true communist] strangely implies that Eachann’s drunkenness and his irritating behaviour are qualities to be found — and admired — in a ‘true communist’: this change renders the statement nonsensical. Although the immediately negative words have been removed, the overall sense of the passage remains rather negative, and even sarcastic. We might, then approach this change as an attempt by the translator to ironise the passage and subvert the canonical translation of *communist*. Removing the most awkward association — *full of wind* and *communist* — may mean that the censor overlooked the more subtle negative description.

As I discussed in the previous section, it was not just individual words that were subject to ideological censorship, but also larger constructions such as metaphors or slogans. Slogans, as canonical items of Soviet discourse, were

⁷⁴ Mackenzie, *Rockets Galore*, p. 60. Emphasis added.

⁷⁵ Compton Mackenzie, ‘Raketaia goriachka’, *Inostrannaia Literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva and B. Gribanov, 6-7 (1958), 99-173; 95-173 (vol. 6, p. 127). Emphasis added. [One more glass, Eachann, and you’ll start to talk like a true Communist.]

particularly susceptible to censorship. One important example from *Rockets Galore* is the translation of a Soviet slogan, written on a banner by a group of Scottish campaigners on the island of Toddy, who had tricked the British authorities into cancelling the construction of a new nuclear base by dyeing the island's seagulls pink and claiming that they had discovered a new species requiring conservation.⁷⁶ This example demonstrates once again the vast discrepancy in the status of ideologically marked language between the transmitting and receiving culture: the English phrase is a satirical use of the communist slogan 'Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь!' [Workers of the world unite]. This slogan, possibly the most famous quotation from Marx and Engels' *The Communist Manifesto*, was the Soviet Union's official state motto and, consequently, was extremely significant in Soviet ideological discourse and functioned as a key term with deep resonance and clear ideological significance. Included in songs and printed material as a matter of course, the phrase was reproduced constantly, becoming a key marker of Soviet official ideology. The phrase was obviously problematic for the editors, and it passed through several versions in the typescripts. The fact that it was a subject of censorial attention is highlighted by the cover page of the typescript, on which the page number is highlighted and circled emphatically in red pencil. The text producers were, therefore, clearly aware of the significance of this key term of discourse and were particularly alert about its treatment in translation; it also highlights the ideological nature of the editing process. The original English text contains the slogan in the following form:

⁷⁶The fact that such a ridiculous comic story was included in *Inostrannaia literatura* in the first place demonstrates the increasing liberalisation of foreign literature, compared to the 1930s and 1940s.

BIRD-WATCHERS OF THE WORLD UNITE⁷⁷

The translators, doubtless aware of the significance of this particular linguistic item, employed a slightly altered version in their first version, avoiding an exact rendering of the loaded *соединяйтесь* [unite] by substituting the prefix *об-* for the expected *со-*.

Любители птиц всех стран, объединяйтесь!⁷⁸

However, the typescript was altered by the editor, and a handwritten change restored the slogan to the *canonical* version; as a result, the ideological resonance was actually strengthened in comparison to the translator's initial word-choice:

Птицеловы всех стран, соединяйтесь!⁷⁹

For this novel, a second typescript was produced, incorporating the first editor's changes. The second draft was edited once more, and this version was signed off by the responsible editors. In the second version, the editor radically altered the slogan, replacing it with one that was less marked. This is the version of the slogan that survives in the published text:

Сомкните ряды, птицеловцы мира!⁸⁰

The original slogan did not carry the same status in the Western context and so it was possible there to subvert the slogan by removing it from its source context and altering it in a humorous way, just as happens in the English text. In the Soviet context, however, the use of this slogan in a humorous, sarcastic manner was

⁷⁷ Mackenzie, *Rockets Galore*, p. 237.

⁷⁸ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 342, l. 144. Mackenzie, *Raketnaia goriachka*, Translator's typescript with editorial corrections. [Lovers of birds of all countries, come together!]

⁷⁹ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 342, l. 144. Mackenzie, *Raketnaia goriachka*, Translator's typescript with editorial corrections. [Bird-catchers of the world, unite!]

⁸⁰ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 343, l. 144. Mackenzie, *Raketnaia goriachka*. Translator's typescript with editorial corrections. [Close ranks, bird-catchers of the world!]

unacceptable, precisely because of its canonised status in that context. The final Russian version, ‘Сомкните ряды’ [close ranks] is less ideologically marked than the original slogan; it is a standard military command, so retains the denotative meaning and some of the connotative meaning of the English source text, but erases the ideological reference. Once again, Epstein’s ‘evaluative conversion’ is demonstrated in these post-Stalinist texts.

It must be noted though, that the treatment of this slogan is not uniform in the texts of the Thaw era. Another similarly satirical use of the very same slogan occurs in the translation of Jay Deiss’ *The Blue Chips* published two years after *Rockets Galore*. On this occasion, the translation, which relays a discussion between two of the characters about the use of scientists to spread political propaganda, retains the first half of the slogan, but slightly alters the rest. The translator’s typescript for this section of the novel was not retained by RGALI:

‘Scientists of the world, unite’, chirped Miss Goldstein, ‘you have nothing to save but your brains!’⁸¹

-Ученые всех стран, соединяйтесь, - чирикнула мисс
Гольдштейн – Вам нечего терять, кроме ваших голов!⁸²

Firstly, it appears strange, in the light of the censorship applied to *Rockets Galore*, that such a key phrase of Soviet discourse was retained at all. The change significantly alters the imagery of the original text: the English text implies that by refusing to be involved in propaganda, scientists will retain their academic standing (i.e. their brains). In changing the orientation of the sentence from positive to negative, the Russian version implies that if they are not used in propaganda, they

⁸¹ Deiss, *The Blue Chips*, p. 118.

⁸² Deiss, ‘Kрупnaia igra’, vol. 2, p. 132. [Scientists of the world, unite!- chirped Miss Goldstein – You have nothing to lose, except your heads!]

risk violence or oppression. Indeed, the change made to the second half of this phrase is a corruption of a phrase from Marx and Engels in its Russian translation — ‘Пусть господствующие классы содрогаются перед Коммунистической Революцией. Пролетариям нечего терять кроме своих цепей’.⁸³ The translation employed here actually brings the target text closer in form to the canonical version. The differing treatment of this slogan demonstrates clearly the ambiguity of Soviet censorship in the 1950s and 1960s. In this example, the choice of the verb *chirped* to describe Miss Goldstein’s speech is rather disparaging, standing out between the two halves of the manipulated slogan, and lending the statement an ironical tone.

The slogan is also retained in the translation of Sillitoe’s *Key to the Door*, uttered during a slightly ironic and heated conversation between soldiers about the merits of communism before they are sent home from Malaya. The passage describes Brian, the main character and his soldier friends, trying to get onto the train to Singapore. They are stopped briefly by an officious Sergeant who tries to block their passage, as they have no rifles. The characters curse and talk about the higher ranks of the army with disdain.

‘Workers of the world unite!’ Jack shouted. ‘Let’s get on that bloody train.’⁸⁴

This is retained in the target text:

⁸³ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Manifest kommunisticheskoi partii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1948), p. 82. [Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.] Benedikt Sarnov, writing about Soviet ‘newspeak’, remembers how this cliché was subverted in private speech when, for example in a game of cards, players would mutter ‘Эх, была—не была! Пролетариату ведь нечего терпеть кроме своих цепей...’ [What will be will be! The proletariat has nothing to lose but their chains!] Benedikt M. Sarnov, *Nash sovetskii novoiaz: Malen'kaia entsiklopediia real'nogo sotsializma* (Moscow: Materik, 2002), p. 332. ⁸⁴ Sillitoe, *Key to the Door*, p. 443.

-Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь! - крикнул Джек. -
садиться в поезд!⁸⁵

While the use of the phrase here is less satirical than, for example, in *Rockets Galore* — the phrase itself is not altered or subverted in an obvious way — it is still surprising that a phrase that was so important in the Soviet context should be retained unchanged, particularly by a character who is not portrayed as a loyal communist. While the main character Brian is very sympathetic to the Malayan communists, his friends are uninterested. In contrast to the editorial attention paid to the use of this key phrase in *Rockets Galore*, there are no editorial markings to indicate that its use here caused any problems. No editorial changes were made to the original version produced by the translator and so the published version does not differ from the translator's initial version.⁸⁶ In addition, the Russian text makes Jack more of a leader: he is ordering, rather than suggesting that he and his comrades get onto the train. The favourable depiction is strengthened by the erasure of the swear word 'bloody' in the Russian. This slight alteration in Jack's character does not strongly affect the rest of his characterisation. Throughout the Russian version of the novel, he is depicted as just as unwilling a soldier as his comrades. When aligned with this key phrase, however, the description shifts slightly. It might be suggested that these changes demonstrate an increased liberalisation in Soviet culture, of an alteration of the importance of these key terms; *Key to the Door* was published five years after *Rockets Galore*. Of course, as my examination of the texts has shown, this increasing openness of discourse was partial and somewhat ambiguous.

⁸⁵ Sillitoe, 'Kliuch ot dveri', vol. 6, p. 196. [Workers of the work, unite!- shouted Jack- get on the train!]

⁸⁶ RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 1173. Alan Sillitoe, *Kliuch ot dveri*. Translator's typescript with editorial corrections.

Additionally, the slogan may have been retained because, unlike in *Rockets Galore*, it is not altered — it is retained whole.

In comparison to the texts of the 1930s and 1940s, techniques of ideological censorship in the post-Stalin era became subtler. Rather than simple excision or substitution, more complex linguistic techniques came to be employed. This is best observed in Mitchell Wilson's *Meeting at a Far Meridian* (published in the journal in 1961). The section in question describes the main character observing preparations for the parade marking the anniversary of the October Revolution on Red Square. Unfortunately, no information as to the implementation of the following alteration is present in the archival documents held in RGALI:

Every night, the rehearsal became *less ragged and more complete*, with longer lines of military vehicles extending further up Gorki Street waiting for their dash into and across the Square past the silent Mausoleum.⁸⁷

И каждую ночь репетиция становилась *все богаче и полнее*, и длинная колонна орудий, танков и транспортеров выстраивалась уже и на улице Горького, чтобы потом стремительно ринуться на Красную площадь и пройти мимо тихого мавзолея.⁸⁸

This text presents an interesting case: the strategy adopted by the translator or editor is a shift from a negative viewpoint in the English, to a positive one in the Russian. So, instead of moving from a negative state (being ragged) to a positive (becoming complete), the parade in the translation strengthens its already positive state (becoming even richer and fuller *than it was already*). This change avoids using any

⁸⁷ Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, p. 239. Emphasis added.

⁸⁸ Wilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', vol. 3, p. 155. Emphasis added. [And every night the rehearsals became much richer and fuller, and the long column of weapons, tanks and transporters lined up on Gor'kii Street so as to quickly rush onto Red Square and pass the quiet mausoleum.]

negative term alongside the ideologeme *revolution*. The censor has conformed to the dominant ideology of the discourse of revolution in the production of the target text, repositioning the discourse from negative to positive since a negative portrayal of this key event was not acceptable in Soviet discourse. There is also a subtle repositioning in terms of socialist realist teleology: the Soviet Union can only grow better.

The addition of new material is also used to distort the ideological positioning of *The Blue Chips*. In a paragraph depicting a casual, flirtatious conversation about literature between the two main characters, Abby Parker and Caleb Herbert, the addition of a reference to Tolstoi not present in the English text is demonstrated:

‘But Chekhov sees people in context’, Abby Parker replied, ‘in relation to time and place, in a true social sense’ — ⁸⁹

-Зато Чехов видит людей во взаимосвязи с обществом, - возразила Эбби Паркер, - не берет их вне времени и пространства. Вспомните взгляды Толстого на историю. ⁹⁰

This example demonstrates the importance of ideologically marked language in Soviet discourse, and how censorship may have an additional role of creating links with the existing discourse. The expansive translation of ‘social’ as ‘во взаимосвязи с обществом’ [in relation to society] uses a term with a more ideologised connotative meaning in Russian, one which makes explicit links with ‘society’ and is strongly associated with political discourse; it is reminiscent of a political textbook. The word *social* in English does not have the same meaning as the Russian word,

⁸⁹ Deiss, *The Blue Chips*, p. 153. Emphasis added.

⁹⁰ Deiss, ‘Krupnaia igra’, vol. 2, p. 154. Emphasis added. [-But Chekhov sees people in relation to society,- answered Abby Parker- he doesn’t take them outside time and space. Remember the views of Tolstoi on history.]

and so the term was altered in the Russian translation. This might be seen as another example of Bourdieu's 'structural censorship',⁹¹ where the structure of the field and the habitus limit what can be said.

At the other end of the censorship continuum is the second change in this passage; the addition of the phrase 'Вспомните взгляды Толстого' [remember the views of Tolstoi] is ideologically significant, in that it creates a clear link with Soviet discourse. This phrase is inserted at the end of a scene, finishing the conversation between the two characters. There is no further comment made upon it, either by the characters or by the narrator. Lenin wrote approvingly about Tolstoi's view of history, as expressing the contradictions of capitalism and as a literature of protest against capitalism.⁹² These writings were, of course, cited regularly in discussions of Tolstoi, as befitted the canonical status of Lenin's writing. The addition of this sentence is not random, although it might appear so at first. The phrase has a clear function, and that is to create intertextuality between this text, Soviet critical discourse, and Lenin's writing, which was part of the Soviet discursive canon. This phrase, which would be read by the (ideologically) educated Soviet audience as an allusion to Lenin's work, acts as a marker of official Soviet ideology. This addition, therefore, appears to be an example of censorship aimed at erasing the difference between the foreign text and native texts, and inserting these texts into the Soviet discursive canon, and is an example of 'manifest intertextuality',⁹³ whereby blocks of discourse are repeated also exactly from one text to another, linking them;

⁹¹ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.

⁹² Vladimir Il'ich Lenin, 'Lev Tolstoi kak zerkalo russkoi revoliutsii', in *V. I. Lenin o Tolstom*, ed. by K. N. Lomunov (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1978), pp. 48-54 (pp. 49-50).

⁹³ Fairclough, p. 117.

Yurchak describes manifest intertextuality as one of the ways in which Soviet authoritative discourse became static and formulaic.⁹⁴

These examples show the importance of the censorial creation of manifest intertextuality for making texts function as part of the authoritative discourse, inserting Soviet discursive values.

Paratextual Elements as a Means of Governing Interpretation

The creation of manifest intertextuality, ensuring the continued circulation of canonical items, contributes to the static nature of Soviet discourse by limiting readers' potential for unorthodox interpretations. In addition to the creation of manifest intertextuality in the texts themselves, another important way in which the potential for readers' interpretation was managed was through paratextual devices, including forewords and afterwords. Most of the texts published in these journals are not accompanied by a preface or afterword, being left to speak for themselves. I will examine a representative sample of the interpretative statements that accompany texts in *Inostrannaia literatura*. These paratexts are attached to works that might be considered to be potentially problematic or ambiguous, that is those that might produce unacceptable interpretations in the mind of the reader. Hence, Compton Mackenzie's comic tale of the cold war, *Rockets Galore* is accompanied by an afterword and the rebellious protagonist of *Catcher in the Rye* requires an explanatory note from Raisa Orlova.

⁹⁴Yurchak, p. 63.

Brian Kassof notes, in relation to the early editions of the *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, that 'the Bolsheviks were intense readers of signs of all types, including paratextual cues',⁹⁵ and the use of paratexts in the post-Stalin era indicates that this continued to be the case, and the importance of forewords for framing a text is emphasised.⁹⁶ Paratextual elements, in addition to containing factual information, may also have a pragmatic function and 'may impart an authorial and/or editorial intention or interpretation',⁹⁷ and this is certainly how they are used in this context. Paratexts act as a 'threshold',⁹⁸ to frame the readers' experiences and understanding of a work: 'paratextual cues, ranging from footnotes to layout, are meant to act as guides to the reader, suggesting specific interpretations or understandings of a text'.⁹⁹

Typical in its attempt to guide interpretation is the afterword to Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim*, which is written by P. V. Palievskii. Beginning with an overview of the group of writers considered 'Angry Young Men', of which Amis was one of the leading members, the novel is described as a favourite novel of this movement, a manifesto whose principal character Jim has become well-known.¹⁰⁰ Palievskii describes Jim as a modest character, who is more concerned with reality and personal character than grand ideas or theories. While he views the novel broadly in a positive light, he criticises the end, where Jim, after sabotaging his academic career, is offered a better paying job by the rich uncle of his girlfriend. Palievskii

⁹⁵ Brian Kassof, 'A Book of Socialism: Stalinist Culture and the First Edition of the Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 6 (2009), 55-95 (p. 59).

⁹⁶ Gromova, p. 35.

⁹⁷ Gérard Genette and Marie MacLean, 'Introduction to the Paratext', *New Literary History*, 22 (1991), 261 (p. 268).

⁹⁸ Genette and MacLean, 261 (p. 261).

⁹⁹ Kassof, 55-95 (p. 60).

¹⁰⁰ P. V. Palievskii, "'Schastlivchik Dzhim" Kingsli Emisa', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 12 (1958), 226-229 (p. 227).

views it as unfortunate that Amis, ‘having created a satirical novel [...] added on a touching and serene ending’;¹⁰¹ he seems most irritated that Amis appears himself to believe in this ending, portraying the rich benefactor as a good and wise man. This lack of a coherent ideology is seen by Palievskii as a sign of the failings of all the Angry Young Men: they ‘do not adhere to any one defined social group, and express a general anger and a lack of perspective which, from time to time penetrates the soul of all inhabitants of the “prosperous” states’. He views this anger and lack of perspective as characteristics of ‘this new Western illness’.¹⁰² Thus, although Palievskii acknowledges that Amis’ satire in particular, and that of the movement in general, do have a political aspect, he implicitly casts it in opposition to the positive aspects of Soviet literature by emphasising the Britishness of its negative qualities. Nonetheless, the foreword concludes that the movement is valuable and gaining ground for its critique of the social system.

Vera Panova, the ‘(on the whole) ideologically sound’¹⁰³ novelist and three-time winner of the Stalin prize for literature, is the author of the afterword to Rita Rait-Kovaleva’s 1960 translation of *Catcher in the Rye*. Panova, whose own work focused on personal stories — albeit within the confines of socialist realist orthodoxy — and family life, seems a good match for this story of a young man. Panova opens her assessment by acknowledging the force of the novel for the reader and asking ‘why do these chaotic wanderings of the infantile youth Holden Caulfield have such an effect?’¹⁰⁴ She goes on to make disparaging comparisons between

¹⁰¹ Palievskii, 226-229 (p. 228).

¹⁰² Palievskii, 226-229 (p. 228).

¹⁰³ *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*, ed. by Neil Cornwell and Nicole Christian (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), p. 613.

¹⁰⁴ Vera Panova, ‘O romane Dzh. D. Selindzhera’, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 11 (1960), 138-141 (p. 138).

Holden's experiences and those of Charles Dickens' and John Steinbeck's more typically political characters, noting that, unlike them he comes from a 'wealthy intelligentsia family'.¹⁰⁵ Panova directs the interpretation of the novel through indirect means. By referring to a general 'reader', as she does numerous times, she creates a sense of identification on the part of the actual reader. Thus, 'the reader has no reason at all to worry about [Holden]' and 'the reader is indignant'.¹⁰⁶ Panova also creates identification by drawing the reader into a group through the use of the personal pronoun: 'we have become used to sixteen-year old lads having self-respect and not showing off',¹⁰⁷ and 'we blamed him'.¹⁰⁸ By assuming that 'we' are used to something, Panova suggests that it is self-evidently true, making an implicit contrast between Soviet youth and American youth.

Panova calls Holden variously a 'барчук' (an eighteenth-century term for a landowner, which, in the Soviet period, gathered negative connotations of the bourgeoisie and a negatively charged contrast with the upstanding Soviet youth), an idler ('бездельник'/ 'лодырь'), a liar ('лгун'/ 'лгунишка'), a scatterbrain ('раззява') and a 'стиляга' [*stiliaga*]. *Stiliaga* was a particularly current insult in the Thaw period. The word referred to a young person who dressed in a fashionable, Western-inspired way. In the official discourse, *stiliagi* were associated with laziness, fecklessness and, perhaps worst of all, an amoral attachment to capitalist culture; they were subject to widespread abuse in the official press.¹⁰⁹ However, despite her harsh negative language, Panova acknowledges that the novel is a great

¹⁰⁵ Panova, 138-141 (p. 138).

¹⁰⁶ Panova, 138-141 (p. 138).

¹⁰⁷ Panova, 138-141 (p. 138). Emphasis added.

¹⁰⁸ Panova, 138-141 (p. 139). Emphasis added.

¹⁰⁹ Juliane Fürst, *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-war Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 346.

work. It is, nonetheless, a great work of *American* fiction, based entirely in the *American* world. Panova seems to be at pains to avoid any connection between the Soviet Union and America in terms of the political or ideological qualities of the novel. Her repeated use of ‘we’ separates the Soviet reader from the American work, and she refers carefully to the West, firmly establishing the novel’s foreignness. Despite the initial criticism, the final summing up is approving and she praises the novel’s attention to psychological detail.

What is interesting here is that, in addition to framing this work, the afterword itself is subject to an internal framing. The judgement of the novel — and the overall impression is positive — is achieved by bracketing positive statements between negative ones and by framing positive qualities alongside politically correct facts. Indeed, Panova makes liberal use of Soviet ideologemes to insert a judgement on the novel, using terms from Soviet literary criticism. She notes, for instance, ‘Salinger often resorts to *decadence*’.¹¹⁰ Hence, the novel’s greatness must be associated with other sanctioned works: ‘and it is not by chance that Salinger’s novel, along with Hemingway’s *Fiesta* and Saroyan’s *The Human Comedy* has been removed from the library of a middle school in the Californian city of San Jose’.¹¹¹ Hemingway’s *Fiesta* was, of course, published in *Internatsional’naia literatura* and William Saroyan, the Armenian-American writer, was also published in the journal and was ‘generally described as a writer who depicts America’s little people’.¹¹² This is why the more nuanced and reflective middle section, which lacks the loaded terminology present in the first third, was prefaced with several negative terms. Panova uses ideologically correct language, passing the ideologically correct

¹¹⁰ Panova, 138-141 (p. 138). Emphasis added.

¹¹¹ Panova, 138-141 (p. 139).

¹¹² Friedberg, 519-583 (p. 567).

judgement on the novel, and drawing the reader into that judgement, thus framing it in an appropriate way.

The critic Boris Leont'ev wrote an afterword for Compton Mackenzie's *Rockets Galore*. The novel's subject was rather close to the bone politically, since it touched upon a point of tension in the Soviet Union's international relations with the West, in a context of increasing unease over nuclear capabilities. The afterword was required to ensure that this difficult topic would be understood correctly by the readers. Leon'tev also frames the afterword in Soviet terms, unusually, as the novel is set entirely in the UK; he introduces the novel's publication in terms of the Soviet historical and contemporary context. He states:

The year 1957 will undoubtedly enter history as a year of great changes and important shifts in the development of human society. It was the year when the Soviet Union celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the great October socialist revolution [...] At the end of this year leading members of communist and workers' parties worked out their historical declaration.¹¹³

Only after this introduction does Leont'ev make any reference to the West, framing it negatively through the use of ideologically loaded terms, as in references to 'bloody imperialistic provocation' in Hungary in 1956 and the 'shameful collapse of the Suez escapade'.¹¹⁴ In this way, Leont'ev immediately places the novel in a context where the virtuous Soviet bloc is contrasted with the unstable and war-mongering Western sphere. Leont'ev then focuses on British society and the immediate setting for the novel; it is, of course heavily politicised: 'At the end of

¹¹³ B. Leont'ev, 'Posleslovie k romanu Makkenzi', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1958), 169-173 (p. 169). This is a reference to the international conference of 12 communist and workers' parties from Socialist countries that took place in Moscow on 14 to 16 November 1957, and adopted the declaration referred to here.

¹¹⁴ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 170).

1957, British social opinion was shaken as never before'. The growing anti-nuclear movement is described as follows:

England had never seen such mass 'marches for peace' as took place all around the country. And they continue even now. Time and time again, columns of demonstrators descend on parliament, on the well-guarded locations of the atomic labs, on the American military bases located on English soil... All this comes to mind when reading the novel by the famous English author of the older generation.¹¹⁵

A great deal of energy is devoted to the novel's political contextualisation: a quarter of the four-page review is devoted to a description of the political and historical setting of the work.

For Leont'ev, the novel's main advantage is its polemical approach to the policies of the Conservative Party. Perhaps alluding to the novel's divergence from Soviet literature, he notes that 'at first glance, it might seem that the events described are unimportant and incidental'.¹¹⁶ The novel's main characters are minor government functionaries, based far from the centre and more or less indifferent to politics. But, states Leont'ev, 'the real plot of Mackenzie's novel is wider and deeper'; it is relevant to the entire nation, which has been forced to 'submit to the vulgar demands of American warmongers, abandon freedom and independence, abandon priceless cultural values, habits, traditions. All this should be sacrificed to the monster of the "cold war"'.¹¹⁷ Most of the attention is focused on the novel's subject rather than the literary merits of the novel itself. There are repeated references to the novel as being 'ironic' and a satire of the British political scene,

¹¹⁵ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 170).

¹¹⁶ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 170).

¹¹⁷ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 170).

emphasising the correspondence between Mackenzie's fictional world and the real one. The novel, in the 'soft, joking manner so characteristic of English literature makes fun of pacifists and those for whom personal peace is more important than all the most important problems of our time'.¹¹⁸ This focus on the novel's relationship with the real world also allows criticism of Mackenzie's approach, with a comment that, although Mackenzie accurately uncovers the faults in British politics, he 'sometimes does it from a position of bourgeois liberalism; as a result he does not always completely understand the essence of the Soviet Union's peaceful politics, its basis and driving forces'.¹¹⁹

Leont'ev's further comments appear to highlight the difference between Soviet and Western literature, and he draws upon the tropes of socialist realism. Since Mackenzie's work does not adhere to these tropes, this provokes the negative comment: 'Mackenzie's novel does not show a clear way out, does not directly call for opposition. Even the resolution of the conflict on the two small islands leads the reader into a kind of dead-end: the tragedy has not happened, everything is calm. [...] This, of course, lessens the social impact of the novel on the English reader.'¹²⁰

Leont'ev's use of ideologemes is rather interesting here: the word *mynuk* [dead end] is related to the metaphor of path or journey, which 'occupied a special place in the Soviet totalitarian discourse'.¹²¹ Lars Lih notes that the 'heart of the governing ideology of the Soviet Union was an image of itself as a traveller on the road to

¹¹⁸ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 170).

¹¹⁹ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 172).

¹²⁰ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 172).

¹²¹ Nelya Koteyko and Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, 'The Path and Building Metaphors in the Speeches of Vladimir Putin: Back to the Future?', *Slavonica*, 15 (2009), 112-127 (p. 113).

communism'.¹²² Thus, as history was conceived of in terms of a journey, or a path, the 'dead-end' was ideologically significant, and to judge something as ending in a *tupik* highlights its deviation. This coincides with his criticism of the author for not adhering to the prototypical socialist realist plot: in socialist realism a clear conclusion is important — the conflict present in the novel should be resolved;¹²³ Mackenzie's novel, though excellent in its ideological sympathy, does not adhere to this master plot — it simply ends without resolving the central conflict.

Nonetheless, Leont'ev concludes that in the British context, and in the bourgeois society, Mackenzie's work 'plays a large and important role thanks, in the first instance, to its political sharpness'.¹²⁴ Thus, although imperfect, it serves a useful purpose in its particular context. Calling the novel an 'interesting literary-political phenomenon',¹²⁵ Leont'ev highlights its significance: 'the reader understands that it was not the stunt with the painted seagulls that saved the island of Toddy — it was saved by the resistance of the people'.¹²⁶ Like Panova, Leont'ev presents his interpretation as the correct, natural interpretation by presuming the consent of the reader and highlighting the main achievement of the novel as political, rather than literary. The Soviet framing of the work is reinforced in the afterword's concluding paragraph, when it is claimed that the novel shows that 'even in the most capitalistic society, great forces are maturing which are able —together with the

¹²² Lars Lih, 'The Soviet Union and the Road to Communism', in *The Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. by Ronald G. Suny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), III, 706-731 (p. 706).

¹²³ Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, p. 259.

¹²⁴ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 173).

¹²⁵ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 173).

¹²⁶ Leont'ev, 169-173 (p. 173).

mighty camp of socialism and peace — to stop war and destroy the plans of aggressors’.¹²⁷

The next of these paratexts is not an afterword in the strictest sense, but a long essay on the work of John Steinbeck, published in the same issue as the final part of his *The Winter of Our Discontent* (number 3 for 1962), not directly after the novel, but included in the *Criticism* section: this is an overview of his oeuvre, with a focus on his latest novel. Unlike the previous paratexts I have described, Orlova’s essay begins by discussing the *American* context surrounding the publication of the novel, citing Western critics’ opinions of it. The rest of the overview also relies less on the tropes of Soviet literature than the two afterwords I have examined here, though these do occur a number of times. When discussing *The Grapes of Wrath*, which was published in *Internatsional’naia literatura*, she notes that it was an anti-capitalist novel that focused not on personal scarcities, but on the structure of the system itself.¹²⁸ Orlova introduces Steinbeck as a ‘contradictory author’, describing him as a ‘thoughtful social critic and the author of light-weight “rosy” ephemera’.¹²⁹

When discussing *The Winter of Our Discontent*, she focuses on its political aspects, highlighting those that are most positive — these are described, as in Panova’s and Leont’ev’s articles, using Soviet ideologemes. ‘A typical character in typical circumstances is described. Steinbeck unmasks [облущает] the capitalist system, uncovers the link between the social structure and human behaviour.’ The concept of *unmasking*, which was a common term, especially in early Soviet discourse,¹³⁰ links

¹²⁷ Leont’ev, 169-173 (p. 173).

¹²⁸ Raisa Orlova, ‘Den’gi protiv chelovechnosti (zametki o tvorchestve Dzhona Steinbeka)’.

¹²⁹ Orlova, 197-208 (p. 197).

¹³⁰ Sheila Fitzpatrick, ‘Making a Self for the Times: Impersonation and Imposture in 20th-Century Russia’, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2 (2001), 469-487 (p. 471).

Orlova's review to wider discourses of ideological correctness and exposure of enemies.¹³¹

The shortest foreword is, strictly speaking, only a footnote, and is appended to the beginning of Mitchell Wilson's novel *Meeting at a Far Meridian*. The novel is described as being formed by Wilson's personal experience and observations, gained during his three visits to the Soviet Union. This paratext makes heavy use of ideologemes to describe the novel, implicitly framing it in Soviet terms and imposing the 'correct' interpretation. Thus, the novel 'confirms the idea of mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence of states, despite differences in their social structure. The author and his hero support the development of international scientific collaboration in the name of the strengthening of peace, in the name of the real progress of humanity.'¹³² Like the other paratexts, this short note also points out the potential failings of the novel. The anonymous author claims that despite his positive opinion and flattering description of the Soviet Union, Wilson makes some mistakes: some scenes and descriptions betray the 'author's insufficient acquaintance with Soviet reality, and sometimes his insufficient understanding of it'. This short introductory paratext describes the text in terms of Soviet discourse, and also alerts the reader to the novel's shortcomings in advance.

The structure and vocabulary of all of these paratexts bear striking resemblances to the editorial reviews examined earlier: they make oblique references to the tropes of socialist realism, and they present the work in relation to Soviet literary practice. The novels are explicitly framed in terms of the Soviet experience: Panova judged the main problem with Salinger's character to be his American

¹³¹ On masks and unmasking as a political phenomenon, see Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off the Masks! Identity and Imposture in Twentieth-Century Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

¹³² 'Note', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 1 (1961), 37 (p. 37).

attitude, which she contrasts to the upstanding behaviour of Soviet youths. Mackenzie, although on the right track, does not sufficiently understand the Soviet experience.

The authors of these forewords generally express positive attitudes to the novels — the texts could not be regarded as completely unsuitable or they would not be published at all — but make sure that the difference between these texts and Soviet literature is stressed. This is achieved by the structure of the paratext: the beginning of the review focuses on the Soviet context, thus stressing the interpretation from a Soviet point of view; ideologemes are used which allude to Soviet ideological norms. Negative traits are highlighted not as literary faults, but as political ones. The reader is thus reminded that any differences that arise are due to the foreign status of the works under discussion; these reviews set out the acceptable interpretation. Of course, given the earlier discussion of internal editorial reviews' privileging of the performative dimension of discourse, and the generic similarity between those reviews and these paratexts, we might consider the performative dimension of these texts also. These paratexts might be seen as another example of the ways in which censorial actions could serve as a means to allow texts through, by framing them within the terms of Soviet authoritative discourse.

Conclusion: Controlling Readers' Interpretation

The overriding concern on the part of the censor(s) in these extracts is for the readers' understanding of the text, the potential for meaning making in the text. The examples, though numerically small, are still informative and raise questions for further study. There are three main aspects to the control of meaning here. The first

encompasses the neutralisation of ideologically marked language — the replacement of ideologemes by a non-marked item — guarding against a potentially heterodox interpretation of the text. This aspect of the intervention is aimed at retaining the denotative meaning of a particular English word while either imposing a single connotative meaning or narrowing the range of connotations in the Russian translation, in order to erase potentially heterodox connotative meanings present in the English texts. Censorship also arises precisely from the ideologically charged nature of the ideologeme: the discrepancy between the prestige held by the words in question in the Western and Soviet contexts was unacceptable in a context where words and symbols were treated in a quasi-religious manner and held to have great symbolic power. The interventions in the text have the result of erasing difference in the status of a particular word in the two cultures. This is well demonstrated in the censorship of such key terms of Soviet discourse as *red*, *revolution* and *worker*. The special role played by these symbolic terms in Soviet culture meant that any satirical or otherwise subversive use was problematic. Censorship of translated literature, then, sought to protect the ‘sacred’ symbols of Soviet authoritative discourse, those items strongly associated with that discourse and used ritualistically. Since these ideologemes functioned differently in the Western context than the Soviet one, they had to undergo transformation in order to mitigate the discrepancy in connotative meanings in the source and target cultures.

The censorial interventions had at their core an urge to impose norms of Soviet discursive production onto Western cultural products, controlling the new meanings that arose in the translation process. However, this kind of censorship does not simply result in the erasing of difference, but in the imposition of sameness,

particularly marked in the example of the insertion of Tolstoi into *The Blue Chips*. This is, in effect, the other side of the coin: the creation of intertextuality with Soviet discourse can serve, at least partially, to artificially align these texts with the Soviet discursive canon. Censorship is a constructive act, and the counterpart of the erasure of heretical uses of Soviet ideologemes is the imposition of a normative Soviet meaning upon the text. The reproduction of Soviet discourse, through circulation of a limited range of symbols,¹³³ is protected by the erasure or neutralisation of symbols that do not adhere to the canonical norm. The censorship practices examined here attempted to counteract an insertion of foreign discourse and ideology into the Soviet context, by the imposition of the authoritative Soviet discourse.

Bourdieu's concept of the unification of the linguistic field goes some way in accounting for all these practices.¹³⁴ Jan Plamper writes, in relation to the Stalin period, that censorship was applied to cultural products not only in order to enforce 'the positive canon by cutting the cultural products listed in the *Perechen*', but also to abolish heterodox interpretations of cultural texts.¹³⁵ The unification of the linguistic field, like other fields of cultural production, is brought about by 'a whole set of specific institutions and mechanisms',¹³⁶ that exert control over the actors involved, producing changes in the habitus, thereby generating a new standard that provides linguistic capital.¹³⁷ Plamper demonstrates that the increasing homogeneity of society in the Stalinist era brought disparate fields together. The Soviet response to this was to produce a unification of the linguistic field, that is, 'to create a single

¹³³ Rolf, 601-631 (p. 613).

¹³⁴ Bourdieu uses the term 'unification of the linguistic market'. The more widely used and well-known term 'field' is used for consistency.

¹³⁵ Plamper, 526-544 (p. 532).

¹³⁶ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 50.

¹³⁷ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 50.

discursive space to be shared by all'.¹³⁸ In these circumstances, the multiplicity of meaning present in cultural products became more evident and was, as a result, repressed by the censorship apparatus. This mode of Stalinist censorship therefore attempted to regulate the use of language by controlling the interpretations of the products circulating in society, by engaging in what is termed the 'purging of polyseme'.¹³⁹ The multiplicity of meanings could be erased and heterodoxy of the text eliminated through censorship; the result was that otherness was erased and translated texts were incorporated into the target discourse. The 'single discursive space' that Plamper refers to relates to the idea of a 'canonical formation', which I have examined earlier in this thesis, where a single legitimised language could be imposed.¹⁴⁰ It is unsurprising then that the polysemy arising out of the fact of translation was suppressed. The creation of a canon of foreign literature seems to inevitably require this form of censorship. These examples of the imposition of a Soviet 'legitimate language',¹⁴¹ expose one of the discursive mechanisms by which the standardisation of language in the Soviet Union was achieved. Whereas in the early years after the October Revolution there was a linguistic plurality and a sense that linguistic codes were still being established, this plurality began to disappear in the 1930s and public discourse began to be standardised; in essence, there was an 'evolution from expressiveness to ritualization',¹⁴² and a 'party-state voice' was canonised.¹⁴³

¹³⁸ Plamper, 526-544 (p. 542).

¹³⁹ Plamper, 526-544 (p. 543).

¹⁴⁰ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, pp. 45–46.

¹⁴¹ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 39.

¹⁴² Ludmila Pöppel, *The Rhetoric of Pravda Editorials: A Diachronic Study of a Political Genre*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, 33 (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2007), p. 257.

¹⁴³ Michael S. Gorham, *Speaking in Soviet Tongues: Language Culture and the Politics of Voice in Revolutionary Russia* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009), p. 128. Significantly,

In accordance with the continuation of other cultural elements, patterns of authoritative language continued to be imposed into the post-Stalin era. This is, perhaps, similar to the continued existence and operation of Stalinist tropes in other cultural areas that survived in the post-Stalin era: Stalinist discursive models continued to define Soviet cultural production. Despite this, linguistic control tended to falter in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Items that would have been subject to censorship in the Stalin era were left unaltered in the Thaw era, and there are many discrepancies between the applications of censorship in this era; these are particularly well demonstrated in the differing treatments of the slogan ‘Workers of the World Unite!’ observed in *Rockets Galore*, *The Blue Chips* and *Key to the Door*. The Thaw, then, saw at least some liberalisation, albeit rather confused and certainly incomplete, of literary discourse in the Soviet Union. Thus, alongside political and puritanical censorship — which form the core of Ermolaev’s analysis, and which are the principal aspects of censorship examined in scholarship to date — there is a clear need to stay alert to the presence of subtler practices of linguistic control.

Michael Gorham notes that this voice ‘achieves the full status of “canon” only when aestheticized by the authoritative domain of prose fiction’.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Strategies of Censorship

The presentation of the empirical data here is an attempt to produce an in-depth analysis of censorship practices in the Soviet Union. Although I have separated out types of censorship, it is important to note that censorship comprised a set of practices that operated simultaneously. While the impetus for the various censorial interventions on the textual level varied widely, the mode of operation was, broadly, the same. It is useful, therefore, to provide an overview of the strategies of censorship employed. These strategies can be divided into two broad categories: excision and manipulation. The first strategy operates on both the textual and extra-textual levels; on the extra-textual level, exclusion concerns the choice of texts for publication in the journals, as I discussed at length in chapter 3. At this level, the principal censorial agents were the editors — who produced the reviews and discussed the works and authors at their meetings, as editorial documents show — and the relevant figures from the Party or the Writers' Union. The exclusion of particular texts is related to political taboos, and aims to exclude taboo subjects from the canon of foreign literature, while simultaneously creating a canon portraying an 'approved' image of the West.

A comparison of the textual level censorship strategies in each of the journals reveals a number of striking differences. Firstly, the Stalin-era texts are censored significantly more often through excision — of individual words or paragraphs rather than manipulative rewriting: there are 103 instances as opposed to forty-eight

instances of the latter (longer abridged passages are not counted since many texts were published in abridged form for reasons of space). Although no typescripts for the texts studied here survive in *Internatsional'naia literatura*'s archival holdings, the use of excision might indicate a greater reliance on editorial and external censorship than on self-censorship by translators, since the documents which are available for the later journal indicate that excisions were more often — though not always — made by the editor. The fact that some of the changes confuse or destroy the meaning of the text may also indicate that at least some changes were ordered by Glavlit, since editors had an investment in the literary values of their text and sought to mitigate the impact of the changes. In *Inostrannaia literatura* the situation is reversed: instances of manipulative censorship far outnumber excisions (eighty-three to thirty-two), although the available typescripts point to editorial rather than translators' involvement in the majority of these changes. There is also a significant difference in the presence of the different modes of censorship in each era. In the Stalin period, political changes predominate; ninety-eight examples of political censorship were noted in *Internatsional'naia literatura*, alongside only twenty-five puritanical changes. By contrast, the post-Stalin censorship is much more concerned with sex and violence than political content; there are eighty-one puritanical alterations and only twenty-one political alterations. While the difference may, to some extent, be accounted for by the types of texts published in each journal, which is a consequence of censorial intervention above text-level, I believe that these figures clearly indicate a lessening of the intense politicisation of literature from the Stalin period to the Thaw. Whereas the texts of the 1930s and 1940s often contained dozens of changes in each text, the combined result of which was to completely

distort the political themes of these works, the *Inostrannaia literatura* texts were simply tweaked in order to eradicate the most unacceptable material. In terms of the ideological mode of censorship, the difference is less marked, but still significant. For this mode, twenty-four instances were recorded for the Stalin-era texts and eleven recorded in the later texts.

Exclusion on the textual level is a strategy not just of the external censor but also of the editor and — more rarely — the translator. On this level, excision is associated strongly with taboo. This is seen most strikingly in the exclusion of entire themes from novels, such as the removal of Jewishness from the Russian translation of *Dragon's Teeth*. Taboos were moral as well as political; thus, in chapter 4 I have demonstrated how the taboo subject of sex was cut — albeit partially — from the translated texts. Exclusionary strategies were the responsibility of the editor more often than the translator, although translators did sometimes excise small parts of the texts, rarely more than a word or two, from the transcripts that are available for study. It can be assumed that at least some of the excisions were made above editorial level, but unfortunately evidence for this has not survived, due to Glavlit's reluctance to make and keep records of this type.

Manipulation of the texts is the other principal censorship strategy. This, again, is a strategy of both editors and translators. This category can be subdivided further to expose in more detail how the strategies operate. In order to categorise the manipulative strategies of censorship, it is helpful to borrow from the terminology of translation studies (with the caveat that not all the changes are made during the actual translation process: the terminology is still helpful since the comparison is being made between source and target texts). The censorship strategies were used by

both editors and translators, and were employed across all modes of censorship. The majority of the censorial translation techniques are types of lexical substitution, the most prominent of which is the replacement of an unmarked for a marked item. This is particularly obvious in political censorship, where words referring to politically taboo subjects are erased by the substitution of a neutral item. Thus, as I noted earlier, fascists become ‘мятежниками’ [rebels]. This kind of unmarked for marked substitution was used to de-ideologise the texts, avoiding the use of Soviet ideological language in foreign texts; this was demonstrated in the replacement of ‘герой’ [hero] for ‘communist’ in John Hyde Preston’s novel *The Liberals*, for example. The opposite strategy, the substitution of a marked for unmarked item, is also observed. It was, as I noted in the chapter on the ideological mode of censorship, used, in many cases, to insert Soviet ideological discourse into the foreign texts and create intertextuality. One of the clearest examples is the substitution of ‘рабочий городок’ [Workers’ Town] for ‘River Settlement’. A third strategy, less common than one-to-one substitution, is expansive translation. This is the strategy employed in *Catcher in the Rye*, for example, where ‘homosexual’ becomes ‘со странностями’ [with eccentricities/ strange aspects]: this is a strategy to neutralise unacceptable content. These strategies depend on the substitution of a different referent, but this is not the only resource available to the censors on the textual level. Another common technique is metonymy, which is predominant in the puritanical mode of censorship: multiple examples were discussed in which general-for-specific substitutions serve to erase the most explicitly sexual parts of a sentence while retaining the denotative meaning.

Altering the semantic orientation of the text is one censorship strategy that serves to alter its ideological standpoint. Once again, two opposing techniques are observed: the alteration from a negative to a positive standpoint — ‘full of wind’ becomes ‘заправский’ [true/ real] — and from positive to negative. I have commented on some ways in which puritanical censorship combines a euphemistic substitution with an alteration in orientation that creates an implied criticism of the original text. These kinds of change are perlocutionary in that they serve to produce an appropriate reaction in the reader, imposing an appropriately ‘Soviet’ reading. The use of a meta-linguistic device, such as ‘похабщина’ [an obscenity], which was highlighted in the translation of *The Catcher in the Rye*, can also have a similar effect. This censorial attempt to produce a politically correct interpretation is even more obvious in the more extensive manipulations of the texts — the changes that are applied above the level of individual words. These include altering an entire clause or sentence — as observed in the translation of political slogans subject to ideological censorship. This kind of change is closely intertwined with the reproduction of canonical Soviet discourse; ideologemes are made to fit in with the established connotative meaning, avoiding a non-canonical meaning. This is perhaps the most obviously perlocutionary strategy, but all the strategies employed at the textual level and extra-textual level were strongly concerned with the readers’ reaction to and interpretation of the texts.

All the examples of censorial intervention in the source texts examined here have as a uniting factor this anxiety over interpretation, or the potential for interpretation, on the part of the reader. The importance of the correct interpretation

was a key concern for ‘Soviet aesthetics’,¹ and the censorial anxiety observed in this study arises from the potential for the reader to interpret the text contrary to the Soviet canon. The correct interpretation was, of course, the ideologically and politically correct one, one that corresponded to the ideological canon. Since these texts were both linguistically and ideologically foreign, they presented a challenge to the censorial authorities. While their producers saw them as a window into another world, they represented a potential destabilising force to the Soviet discursive canon via unsuitable, non-canonical influences. Thus, the censorial action served to guard against unacceptable readings, to guide the reader’s understanding of the text. Censorship of translated texts sought to control the stability of the discursive canon by enforcing Soviet discursive standards upon these texts. This imposition of Soviet standards can be interpreted as more than just adhering to the standards of Soviet discourse, but making the foreign texts into a part of that discourse — this is particularly marked in the Stalin-era texts. Through the exclusion of themes, people and events judged to be taboo, the neutering of sexual or vulgar content to meet Soviet standards of propriety and through the modification of language to match the contours of Soviet authoritative discourse and the creation of intertextuality with that discourse, the censorial interventions here attempt to create a quasi-Soviet text. This observation leads to another important discussion. I have emphasised in the introductory chapters and the case studies that censorship is not (only) a destructive act, but that it is also formative. That is, censorship produces discourse through establishing the limits of what is sayable. It also produces discursive objects in the target culture that are different from those in the source culture.

¹ Evgeny Aleksandrovich Dobrenko, *The Making of the State Reader: Social and Aesthetic Contexts of the Reception of Soviet Literature* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 16.

The Formative Aspect of Censorship

My extensive examination of the empirical data has outlined the wide variety of censorial interventions, both in terms of agent and technique. An overarching feature of all these case studies, and one of the main arguments I have made in this thesis, is that censorship is productive in nature, and is one of the means of cultural regulation that produces (official) discourse. In this vein, Judith Butler comments:

Censorship is a productive form of power. It is not merely privative, but formative as well. I want to distinguish this position from the one that would claim that speech is incidental to the aims of censorship. Censorship seeks to produce subjects according to explicit and implicit norms, and this production of the subject has everything to do with the regulation of speech. By the latter I do not mean to imply that the subject's production is narrowly linked to the regulation of that subject's speech, but rather to the regulation of the social domain of speakable discourse.²

This aspect of censorship can be observed in many of the examples of censorial intervention analysed in this thesis, both at and above the level of the text. What Butler terms the 'formative' aspect of censorship is certainly as significant as its privative side, and processes of exclusion can be formative as well as destructive. Exclusion, which manifests itself as the blockage of texts from the pages of the journal and also of words and parts of the text, can serve to delineate the acceptable, to demarcate limits and, therefore, define the discursive object. By excluding the unacceptable, censorship can create a model of the acceptable.

There are a number of ways in which censorship of these texts functions in a formative way. Firstly, the choice of texts was politically motivated; this is

² Butler, pp. 247-260 (p. 252).

particularly clearly demonstrated in the choice of texts in the Stalin era. Political considerations figured highly in the inclusion of appropriate texts, and I have shown how editors took pains to ensure that the texts were suitable for Soviet consumption. This led to the foreign canon corresponding to a great extent, though with some exceptions, to the dominant Soviet discourse. Thus, the model of the West present in Soviet culture was at least partially created through censorship. This close interaction between the Soviet and Western canons was somewhat lessened in the post-Stalin era when political considerations became less significant, and the choice was less significantly shaped by Soviet political discourse.

The formative nature of censorship is not only evident at the level of text choice, but can also be demonstrated in the manipulation of the texts themselves. I have demonstrated that a large number of manipulative alterations were not intended simply to remove politically unacceptable topics, but to (re)create these parts of the texts in the mould of Soviet authoritative discourse, frequently utilising socialist realist vocabulary. Intertextuality between the Soviet and Western discourses was created in order to create texts that adhered to Soviet norms of discourse, which acted, in a linguistic sense, as Soviet texts. This is most clearly demonstrated in the censorship of ideological language. Ideological censorship, as I have noted, displays the ‘obsession with reducing signs to a single meaning’ that Jan Plamper refers to in his study of Stalinist censorship practices.³ This attempt to erase polysemy in the language of ideology through the censorship of the key ideologemes, thus imposing an approved meaning on them, is an attempt to regulate the speakable discourse, and produce a Soviet authoritative language.

³ Plamper, 526-544 (p. 526).

The formative aspect of censorship, therefore, is an attempt to produce the Western discourse as an object of Soviet discourse, in keeping with the ideological norms of that field. The attempt to create the texts in a *Soviet* mould is one of the most striking aspects of Soviet censorship practices. Thus, we can analyse the formative aspect of censorship in terms of the creation of an authoritative language: censorship clearly aims to rewriting the foreign texts according to the authoritative language; this can be seen to be contributing to the reinforcement of that language. The counterpart of the formative power of censorship to shape and create discourses is the extent to which the agents involved in the text creation process contributed to or resisted that power: this side of censorial practice also deserves careful consideration.

Censorship and Resistance

It is widely acknowledged that censorship was resisted in the Soviet Union, and it has become a truism that the very act of translation was a means of avoiding the censorship of their original work for authors such as Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova and others. While it was impossible to openly declare anti-Soviet feelings, or to openly challenge the censorship apparatus — at least within the bounds of state publishing — there were various ways in which writers and editors could insert material that was not ideologically correct; this has been called ‘silent resistance’.⁴

⁴ See Epp Lauk and Tiiu Kreegipuu, ‘Was It All Pure Propaganda? Practices of “Silent Resistance” in Soviet Estonian Journalism’, *Acta Historica Tallinnensia*, 15 (2010), 167-190.

A useful way to examine issues of resistance is through dialogue with James C. Scott's ideas on public and hidden transcripts.⁵ Broadly, Scott argues that subordinate groups develop hidden transcripts of discourse, which take place “‘offstage”, beyond direct observation by powerholders’.⁶ Scott's extensive use of the theatrical metaphor is telling — he characterises the public transcript of subordinate groups as a performance put on for the benefit of the ruling élite, and masking the true feelings of these groups. Scott also argues against a Gramscian model of hegemony, stating that ‘the seductiveness of theories of hegemony and false consciousness [...] depends in large part on the strategic appearances that elites and subordinates alike ordinarily insert into the public transcript’,⁷ essentially claiming that any appearance of acquiescence to the dominant ideology is only an act. Scott's theorisation of dominance and resistance is problematic, not only because his work overly generalises from vastly differing situations, from George Orwell's account of British colonialism in Burma to the nineteenth-century Russian Empire — but also because he does not accept that there can be intermediary levels between complete acceptance and outright rejection of a given ideology. In Scott's model there are only two groups: the oppressors and the oppressed; he rejects any notion that a subordinate group can be complicit in the aims of the dominant group on any level. Scott appears to insist that there is no grey area between the actions of the oppressors and the oppressed and, contrary to Gramsci's writing, that the oppressed cannot ever be complicit in their own impression: ‘subordinates are not

⁵ See James C Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

⁶ Scott, p. 4.

⁷ Scott, p. 89.

much deceived by their own performance'.⁸ However, my examination of these texts, and of the practice of self-censorship by the translator and of censorship of the editor, seem to indicate that there is, in fact, a level in between where agents, without the constant prompting and oversight of those in power (such as Glavlit) seem to act in a way that would seem contrary to their own interests. Indeed, one of the main focuses of this thesis has been on the ways in which those agents who can be considered to occupy an area in the middle: they are 'in-between' in the sense that they have responsibilities to the top of the hierarchy (the Party, Glavlit) and the bottom (the readers). Scott ignores the fact that an agent may participate in one or more fields and that his or her position is not the same in each one. Here, I have discussed how translators mediated between the Soviet and Western cultures; how editors were, in some ways, members of the field of power, but also of the literary field with the responsibilities they felt as literary agents. These agents were neither wholly submissive — I have already outlined numerous ways in which they attempt to circumvent censorial instructions — nor wholly resistant: my study of the ways in which the language of ideology was censored in order to comply with dominant norms demonstrates an adherence to ideological norms. Scott's model would claim that in each case the agents were simply performing the 'public transcript', while continuing to adhere to their beliefs in private, out of sight of the authorities. This, to me, seems to be an overly simplistic way of viewing the power relations at play, both generally in the Soviet cultural field, and specifically in the area of censorial actions, as I have demonstrated at length that censorial action is complicated and often contradictory.

⁸ Scott, p. 90.

We must treat terms like ‘domination’ and ‘resistance’ as complex and potentially problematic. Traditionally, accounts of Soviet agents have employed a binary model where resistance is the opposite of compliance. In the last decade or so, this ‘totalitarian model’ of Soviet culture has come under attack from scholars who view the Soviet subject as not simply oppressed by ideology, but as participants in it.⁹ Igal Halfin is one scholar who has specialised in what has become known as ‘Soviet subjectivity’ and has argued against the ‘totalitarian thesis [which] locates the subject in opposition to Communist ideology’.¹⁰ Since it seems clear that one cannot cleanly separate the Soviet self into the real, internal person and inauthentic, external acts, it follows that we cannot conceive of the reaction to (and implementation of) censorship simply as the reaction of a true self to an imposed external force. As Susan Gal notes, ‘contrasting stances cannot be classified as posed versus genuine: they are evidence of deeply felt yet contested discourses’.¹¹ Jochen Hellbeck has also critiqued these approaches, arguing against the notion that ‘at their core, members of Soviet society resided externally to state policies and Bolshevik ideology’.¹² He has sought to describe the relationship of Soviet agents to the state, showing how Soviet citizens, rather than being passive recipients of Soviet power, created themselves *through* it, often holding sincerely to Soviet values. Thus any discussion of resistance must take note of the appeal to see ‘the experience of

⁹ One of the pioneering works in this approach is Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

¹⁰ Igal Halfin, *Terror in My Soul: Communist Autobiographies on Trial* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), p. 4.

¹¹ Susan Gal, ‘Review: Language and the “Arts of Resistance”’, *Cultural Anthropology*, 10 (1995), 407-424 (p. 413).

¹² Jochen Hellbeck, ‘Working, Struggling, Becoming: Stalin-Era Autobiographical Texts’, *The Russian Review*, 60 (2001), 340–359 (p. 340).

individual dissent not in distinction toward the ruling order, but within the framework of the Soviet Revolution'.¹³

Despite this boom in recent scholarship re-evaluating the totalitarian model, much scholarship on censorship in authoritarian contexts continues to adopt a rather black-and-white view of the phenomenon, tellingly in references to 'cheating' or opposing' censorship.¹⁴ The texts and archival documents from *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* demonstrate that in the case of censorship, it is not useful to simply conceive of an imposed force, to which one is either wholly subject or wholly resistant. In the examples evaluated in the preceding chapters the censorial agents do not simply act as arms of the state: the wishes of the authorities are not just unthinkingly applied. Indeed, the archival records suggest that negotiation was one of the defining features of the censorship/ publication process in the later journal: editors negotiated with the Party and its ministries; translators negotiated with editors and authors. Censorial actions were often, but not always, premeditated and conscious. In this sense, I agree with Alexander Etkind's belief that there is 'a lot of exaggeration' in Hellbeck and Igal Halfin's assertions that 'in the early Soviet period the language of power was fully assimilated by the average citizen, who had no other language to formulate his or her individuality',¹⁵ particularly Halfin's claim that 'while resistance was everywhere, it coexisted with

¹³Jochen Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1 (2008), 71–96 (p. 76).

¹⁴Dennis Deletant, 'Cheating the Censor: Romanian Writers Under Communism', *Central Europe*, 6 (2008), 122–171 (p. 161).

¹⁵Aleksandr Etkind, 'Soviet Subjectivity: Torture for the Sake of Salvation?', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 6 (2005), 171–186 (p. 178). The assumption of full assimilation of Soviet authoritative discourse is often applied to the post-Stalin period, especially in studies of censorship.

discursive incorporation, as different aspects of the dominant discourse cut across each other'.¹⁶

Certainly, norms of authoritative discourse were internalised by the censorial agents, as I have outlined at length. There are several striking examples of this in the study of puritanical censorship: structural censorship was at play, defining the limits of sexual and vulgar language. In this case, the translators were constrained by the limits of language. Most closely associated with ideology is the question of ideologemes. In my study of this aspect of censorship, I have demonstrated how the norms of authoritative discourse was internalised by the censors and the texts rewritten to conform to its standards, erasing heterodox ideological meanings. The censors' habitus acts here to impose the authoritative discourse where there is ideological ambiguity in the transfer from the English source text. Mikhail Epstein, in his analysis of Soviet ideological language, concludes that this language was 'totalitarian' in its providing only one potential form of expression, which was completely governed by authority. Language could not be challenged or verified, and so became unverifiable and hegemonic. Totalitarian language, in essence, completely defined the Soviet experience, according to Epstein.¹⁷ This complete acceptance of authoritative discourse would seem to be the logical, if extreme, conclusion of Hellbeck and Halfin's assertion that Soviet subjects worked always within the Soviet discourse. It is true that, as V. D. Stel'makh has stated, 'the reading public [...] was forcibly inscribed within a specific set of coordinates, and was forced to live and

¹⁶ Igal Halfin, *Stalinist Confessions: Messianism and Terror at the Leningrad Communist University* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009), p. 186.

¹⁷ Epstein, p. 72.

survive within that system of coordinates. And it seems to me, we mustn't forget about that'.¹⁸

However, my study appears to show that censors resolutely did *not* unquestioningly and completely absorb the meanings that created the authoritative discourse. There are a number of instances where material not adhering to the Soviet discursive canon is retained — this is particularly marked in the 1960s texts, but is also observed in some cases before the post-Stalin era. Thus, it is clear that authoritative discourse, while dominant, was not all-encompassing.¹⁹ A study of the phenomenon of censorship must be alert to the areas in which authoritative discourse did not apply, or was applied with less rigour. Once again, Alexei Yurchak's work is useful in understanding the complexity of censorship. Yurchak disputes Epstein's conclusions on the totalising nature of Soviet language, stating:

Although Epstein's point about the hegemonic and unitary nature of authoritative discourse is correct, his assumption that the Soviet people read authoritative language exclusively as a set of constative statements is not. In fact, precisely because authoritative language was hegemonic, unavoidable, and hypernormalized, it was no longer read by its audiences literally, at the level of constative meanings. Therefore, which statements represented 'facts' and which did not was relatively unimportant. Instead, Soviet people engaged with authoritative language at the level of the performative dimension, which Epstein ignores.²⁰

The idea of engagement at the performative level leads to a more nuanced understanding of how readers accepted or resisted censorship in censored texts. The

¹⁸Quoted in Gromova, p. 49.

¹⁹It could be argued that the fact of these texts being foreign makes the deviation from the authoritative norm more likely and more obvious.

²⁰Yurchak, p. 76.

performative aspect of discourse, which Yurchak highlights, advances issues of resistance and raises questions of the extent to which censorship is, or ever can be, all-encompassing.

The case studies and archival documents presented here demonstrate definitively that censorial agents, and censorship, are not simply repressive. Indeed, it is particularly true that when an agent is not an external censor — that is, when censorship is internalised — the situation becomes more complicated than simple resistance or ‘acquiescence’.²¹ The particular position of the censorial agents under investigation here — mediating between the foreign culture and the Soviet one, and in a subordinate position to the authorities — is one in which ‘domination and subordination could [...] be experienced simultaneously, depending on whether one looked up or down on various levels of various hierarchies’.²² The position of these censorial agents is an important part of understanding their application of censorship — and their adherence to authoritative discourse. Both translators and editors might be considered to stand somewhere in the middle of the hierarchy of power: they were not completely members of the political elite nor were they at the same place in the hierarchy as most of their readers. As Derrida notes in relation to religion, ‘the same individual can belong to two authorities’.²³ They acted, therefore, in ways that supported authoritarian power, but also simultaneously in ways that undermined it. This double action was demonstrated most strongly in the examples of puritanical censorship, where censorial practices attempted to make texts adhere to Soviet standards of propriety in some sections while, simultaneously, other parts of the

²¹ Deletant, 122-171 (p. 126).

²² Michael David-Fox, ‘Whither Resistance?’, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1, 161-165 (p. 161).

²³ Jacques Derrida, *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2*, trans. by Jan Plug (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004), p. 45.

same texts retained vulgar or explicit material: the censorship of the texts was only partial. The inconsistent position of agents in the middle of the hierarchy has been highlighted by Caroline Humphrey in a study of the discourse of the Party bureaucracy. Humphrey discusses the ways in which ‘conflict and argument over propositional substantive meanings were crucial’,²⁴ emphasising the agency of Party bureaucrats to produce discourse through negotiation; she expands upon Yurchak’s idea that Soviet people could undermine authoritative language through performance, arguing that — at least in the milieu on which she focuses her attention: ‘decisions to take and express an ideological position had great – perhaps greater – political impact’.²⁵ The concept of bureaucratic creativity, which forms the main principle of her article, is a useful term for understanding the actions of these agents outwith a simplistic oppression/ resistance dichotomy. Creativity allows a more subtle understanding of the ways in which agents negotiate a space (sometimes an expanded space) within the Soviet context, without necessarily requiring that they are dissidents. In fact, Humphrey’s choice of agent for examination — a relatively senior and loyal bureaucrat, Georgii Lukich Smirnov, emphatically makes the case for a more nuanced understanding of political agency. Like Humphrey, I would extend Yurchak’s work by positing that conscious actions — here, the conscious resistance of authoritative discourse by censorial agents — can play an equally, or more, important role than the performative acts, which Yurchak characterises as

²⁴ Caroline Humphrey, ‘The “Creative Bureaucrat”: Conflicts in the Production of Soviet Communist Party Discourse’, *Inner Asia*, 10 (2008), 5–35 (p. 7).

²⁵ Humphrey, 5–35 (p. 6).

broadly unconscious, or at least unreflective. The conflicting practices of these censorial agents imply that we should ‘speak of *acts* of resistance or resistances’.²⁶

If we assume that censorial agents can act with creativity — as creative workers in the literary field this is certainly true for both translators and editors — then the ambiguity of censorship is put in a new light. Both translators and editors, with their dual habitus, sought to expand the discursive space available to them. This meant that they were able to find subtle ways to ‘get around’ the censorial standards and alert their readers to what had been removed. They were able to take advantage of their privileged position in relation to other journals or publishers and use their foreign cachet in order to increase the freedom available to them, and thus, the range of material available to their readers. This creativity is also alluded to by Francesca Billiani: drawing upon Foucault, she notes, ‘if we establish a *sine qua non* affiliation between censorship and social and cultural transformations, we can argue for the importance of looking at censorship simultaneously as a repressive and ‘creative’ power, one which lies both in the hands of the translator and the censorial body’.²⁷ A focus on the censorial agents, which has been a principal approach of this thesis, highlights the inherent instability of censorship. One of the effects of censorship is counter-intuitive from the point of view of the censorial authorities: self-censorship can aid in the inclusion of heterodox discourses in the receiving culture: this has been termed ‘productive censorship’²⁸ by Brian James Baer, building upon Billiani’s statement, presenting studies of the ways in which censorship, by eliciting the

²⁶Lynne Viola, ‘Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s: Soliloquy of a Devil’s Advocate’, in *Contending with Stalinism: Soviet Power and Popular Resistance in the 1930s*, ed. by Lynne Viola (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 17-43 (p. 43). Emphasis in original.

²⁷Billiani, pp. 1-25 (p. 10).

²⁸Baer’s term ‘productive’ here should be distinguished from the term ‘formative’, used by Butler. Although the two are closely related, inasmuch as they both invoke the productive potential for censorship to create discourses, Baer’s focus is *specifically* on the ability of censorial practices to produce discourses that are heterogeneous, in opposition to the official ones.

involvement of the reader ‘produces encoded texts, generates alternative interpretive communities, to some degree at odds with the government’s ideal of a homogenous national or party audience’.²⁹ I have drawn attention to the ways in which censors sought to draw their readers into a relationship, making them into ‘shrewd Aesopian reader[s]’.³⁰ Censorship can engage the reader in a kind of conversation with the translator/ censor: ‘by enabling the text to pass through the censors’ net, the translators’ self-censorship also allows for the articulation of a multiplicity of possible interpretations’.³¹ While, unlike Baer’s texts, the texts forming the object of study here do not appear to advance a particular, unified agenda, there are numerous examples of the reader being made subtly aware of the censorship applied to the texts. It is particularly clear in puritanical censorship where metalinguistic devices, the use of marked textual substitutions and strategically placed gaps alert the reader to the fact of censorship. These cases demonstrate more generally the ability of translators to insert heterodox material into the translated texts.

In addition to the subtle, reader-oriented inclusion of this heterodox material, there are more marked instances of departure from the officially standard discourse. For instance, in the area of text choice, there are a number of works that clearly do not fit the socialist realist mould, and which depart radically from the official canon. These texts are more dominant in the 1960s but, as I have shown, inclusion of non-orthodox items also occurs in the 1930s. I have also touched upon what I term ‘non-censorship’ to highlight parts of the texts that one might expect to be subject to censorship but were, in fact, left intact. These areas that have been ignored or missed

²⁹ Baer, 21-40 (p. 24). See also his Baer, pp. 213-238.

³⁰ Loseff, p. 21.

³¹ Sergi Mainier, ‘Translation and Censorship: Robert Burns in Post-Civil War Spain’, *Translation Studies*, 4 (2011), 72-86 (p. 84).

by the censor are one way in which alternative discourses can enter Soviet culture. It seems that the Soviet censorship of foreign texts was not all-encompassing; the very fact that Soviet readers so treasured their encounters with foreign literature demonstrates that alternative, heterodox messages were penetrating the censorial shield.³²

The Ambiguity of Censorship

One of the most striking conclusions of this close study of censorship practices is the way in which censorship could work to both ends simultaneously: censorial agents acted in ways that benefited authoritarian power, by limiting discourse and imposing the authoritative discourse upon the foreign texts. However, they also act in ways that undermine the censorial authority. This is achieved through a creative challenging of censorship norms, and by the privileging of the performative aspect of discourse. This performative aspect is particularly clearly demonstrated in the internal reviews, which purport to assess and present criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of texts from the pages of the journal. These reviews used the vocabulary of socialist realism in a performative way: they were the formal dimension of the process, their presence and the presence of authoritative phrases made it possible for new texts and new meanings to be included in the journal.

³²Safiullina's edition of readers' letters to *Internatsional'naia literatura* shows how these readers considered the foreign works a 'window onto the West': Safiullina, 128-161. The same term is used by Birgit Menzel to refer to *Inostrannaia literatura*: Menzel, pp. 143-176 (p. 150). Robert English examines the importance of Western culture for intellectuals in the Thaw, and, perhaps too optimistically, concludes that contact with the West in the post-Stalin era produced a strand of Westernism that helped to erode official Soviet models and so hastened the coming of Glasnost and the end of the USSR: Robert English, *Russia and the Idea of the West: Gorbachev, Intellectuals, and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

It is instructive to consider the censorial agents in terms of their subjectivity. The agents I am describing, to some degree, embody the debate in Soviet studies of the late 1990s and 2000s over the extent to which agents internalised or resisted Soviet power. Stephen Kotkin's influential *Magnetic Mountain* portrayed Soviet citizens as able to cynically 'play the game' and switch when necessary between speaking Bolshevik and speaking their own, distinct language.³³ This has been critiqued by Anna Krylova as an attempt to 'banish the possibility of the return of the believing subject'.³⁴ Kotkin's characterisation of Soviet subjects as able to withdraw from the ideologised social sphere at will and to maintain their own subjectivity raises an intriguing question in relation to censors. I have shown here how the censors often worked to opposing ends simultaneously — is this a case where agents could switch at will between the official discourse (and a pretence of belief) and non-official discourse? I would argue that the reality was more complicated, and that one cannot simply posit a clean break between compliant and non-compliant identities. These censorial agents were created through and by their immersion in the Soviet milieu, and any understanding of their apparent acts of resistance must take that into account. I therefore heed Krylova's warning that one should study 'the individual as a process constituted over time by different social milieus all in motion'.³⁵

The adoption of authoritative discourse by the censorial agents under investigation here might point towards what Serguei Oushakine, following Foucault, terms 'mimetic resistance'.³⁶ The relationship between the authoritative and the

³³ Kotkin, p. 71.

³⁴ A. Krylova, 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1 (2008), 119–146 (p. 144).

³⁵ Krylova, 119–146 (p. 145).

³⁶ Serguei Oushakine, 'The Terrifying Mimicry of Samizdat', *Public Culture*, 13 (2001), 191–214 (p. 203).

heterodox (or dissident) discourses is not one of simple opposition, and Oushakine's appropriation of the Bakhtinian notion of the 'hybrid construction' can illuminate this paradox.³⁷ On the topic of samizdat texts, Oushakine notes the 'mixture of intentions caused by being constituted by the authoritative discourse as well as by being constituted at a location different from that of the authorities'. It is the mixture of intentions that produces the mimicry of the hybrid text. This description can also be applied rather neatly to the translated text: the translated text is constituted by the authoritative discourse and also produced outside that discourse. Thus, the translated text could incorporate that discourse, as I demonstrated in the preceding chapters, while also undermining it. By mimicking the authoritative discourse, the translated text can mock it. Oushakine's development of the concept of mimetic resistance allows us to conceive of 'the dominant and subordinate as belonging to the same discursive field, as relating to each other intradiscursively rather than interdiscursively'.³⁸ The status of a translation as a hybrid text can explain how censorial agents could simultaneously use the language of authority, while undermining it and creating new meanings for the readers, since 'the vibrant hybrid speech of the subordinate is pregnant with potential subversion'.³⁹

The censors in these case studies, therefore, embody the paradox that is at the heart of censorship as a practice. Once embedded in the actions of agents outwith the formal governmental apparatus, censorship as a practice becomes unstable. Thus, the censorial agents below the level of government or party combine both censorial action and resistance against this very action. This paradox is usefully illuminated by Judith Butler.

³⁷ Bakhtin, p. 304.

³⁸ Oushakine, 191-214 (p. 207).

³⁹ Oushakine, 191-214 (p. 208).

Never fully separable from that which it seeks to censor, censorship is implicated in its own repudiated material in ways that produce paradoxical consequences. If censoring a text is always in some sense incomplete, that may be partly because the text in question takes on new life as part of the very discourse produced by the mechanism of censorship.⁴⁰

My study of translated literature has demonstrated the instability of censorship as a means of creating an authoritative discourse. I have shown how both the choice of texts for publication and the imposition of authorised language upon these texts attempted to create foreign literature as part of a single unitary discourse — this is particularly marked in the assessment of ideological language. The end result, however, was *not* a unitary, single discourse, but a very varied, complex meeting of different discursive structures and traditions, which, despite the best efforts on the parts of the censor, release unplanned-for and heterodox meanings in the receiving sphere. This is highlighted by Susanna Witt, who states, ‘the status of the translated text, by way of its very ontology, challenges the common view of Stalinist language and culture as monolithic and largely monologic’.⁴¹ I would argue that the challenge presented by the translated text is even stronger in the post-Stalin era, where we see a wider range of topics and a more heterodox language, and this judgement is supported by Humphrey, who states that ‘the official discourse [...] could not overcome the polysemic character of signification, nor control the responses to it’.⁴²

The principal paradox of censorship in translation is that censorship seeks to achieve monologism, but is almost always undermined because translation is by its very nature multivocal. While there is a tendency for censorial agents to try and impose

⁴⁰ Butler, p. 130.

⁴¹ Witt, pp. 149-170 (p. 151).

⁴² Humphrey, 5-35 (p. 12).

monosemy, translation can undermine this. In addition to the inherent polysemy of translation which, it seems, cannot be entirely destroyed, censorship can also be subverted through the actions — whether deliberate or not — of the censorial agents themselves, as is demonstrated in the study of the censorship practices of translators and editors in these two journals. At its heart, censorship in translation is a clash between the force of polysemy and monosemy, between centripetal and centrifugal forces, in which, even in the most repressive phases of Soviet rule, monosemy seems unable to completely gain the upper hand.

Appendix 1: Authors Translated from English in Internatsional'naia literatura, 1933-1942

Author	Number of items
Aldington, Richard	2
Asch, Nathan	1
Bertram, J.	1
Bierce, Ambrose	1
Briffault, Joseph	1
Britton, Lionel	1
Buck, Pearl S.	3
Burnshaw, Stanley	1
Caldwell, Erskine	7
Caldwell Dobie, Charles	1
Croy, Homer	1
De la Mora, Constansia	1
De Kruif, Paul	1
Dreiser, Theodore	2
Engstrand, Stuart D.	1
Field, Ben	1
Frank, Waldo	1
Freeman, Joseph	1
Galsworthy, John	1
Greenwood, Robert	1
Haller, Albert	2
Hemingway, Ernest	5
Herbst, Josephine	1
Hughes, Langston	4
Huxley, Aldous	2
Joyce, James	1
Lardner, Ring	1
Lewis, Sinclair	1
MacLeod, Norman	1
MacDonnell, A.	1
Millburn, J.	1
O'Casey, Sean	1

Phelan, Jim	1
Preston, John Hyde	1
Pynchon, E.	1
Rollins, William Jr.	1
Saroyan, William	1
Shaw, George Bernard	4
Sinclair, Upton	2
Smedley, Agnessa	1
Steinbeck, John	3
Sterne, Laurence	1
Twain, Mark	3
Wallace, Irving	1
Wells, H. G.	2
Wetjen, Albert Richard	1
Wright, Richard	3

Appendix 2: Authors Translated from English in Inostrannaia literatura, 1955-1965

Author	Number of items
Amis, Kingsley	1
Bowen, Robert	1
Bradbury, Ray	1
Buchwald, Arthur	1
Caldwell, Erskine	4
Carter, Dyson	1
Coppard, Alfred	1
Cronin, Archibald	1
Deiss, Jay	1
Fast, Howard	2
Faulkner, William	4
Greene, Graham	5
Hemingway, Ernest	7
Hughes, Langston	2
James Alridge	2
Kerouac, Jack	1
Killens, John, Oliver	1
Lee, Harper	1
Lennon, Albert	1
Lessing, Doris	1
Mackenzie, Compton	1
Maltz, Albert	1
Marshall, Alan	3
Masters, Dexter	1
O'Hara, John	1
Prichard, Katarina Susanna	1
Priestley, J. B.	2
Purdy, James	1
Salinger, J. D.	1
Shaw, George Bernard	1

Sillitoe, Alan	2
Steinbeck, John	4

Appendix 3: Texts Used in Close Comparison Case Studies

Internatsional'naia literatura

Author	Title	Translator	Published in English	Published in <i>Intlit</i>
Lionel Britton	Hunger and Love	O. Kholmskaia	1931	1933
John Dos Passos	Airways Inc.	None named	1928	1933
William Rollins	The Darkness Before	Elizaveta Romanova	1934	1934
Ernest Hemingway	Fiesta	Pavel Topor	1927	1935
Erskine Caldwell	Some American People	G. Prokunina	1935	1937
Joseph Freeman	An American Testament: A Narrative of Rebels and Romantics	Z. Gan	1936	1937
John Hyde Preston	The Liberals	Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina	1938	1938
Robert Briffault	The Decline and Fall of the British Empire	L. Vorovoi	1938	1939
Erskine Caldwell	Trouble in July	Nina Leonidovna Daruzes	1940	1940
Jim Phelan	Green Volcano	Pavel Topor	1938	1940
John Steinbeck	The Grapes of Wrath	Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina	1939	1940
Richard Wright	Native Son	E. Kalazhnikov	1940	1940
Upton Sinclair	Dragon's Teeth	D. Gorbov, V. Kurella	1942	1942

Inostrannaia literatura

Author	English Title	Translator	Published in English	Published in <i>Inolit</i>
Doris Lessing	The Antheap	D. Dezint, I. Manenok	1953	1955
Ernest Hemingway	The Old Man and the Sea	E. Golysheva, Boris Izakov	1952	1955
Dyson Carter	Fatherless Sons	I.M. Bernshtein	1955	1956
John Steinbeck	The Pearl	Nina Volzhina	1947	1956
Graham Greene	The Quiet American	Rita Rait-Kovaleva, Sulamif' Mitina	1955	1956
Howard Fast	The Story of Lola Gregg	Rita Rait-Kovaleva	1956	1956
James Aldridge	I wish he would not die	E. Golysheva	1957	1957
Compton Mackenzie	Rockets Galore	Rita Rait-Kovaleva, B. Gribanov	1957	1958
Kingsley Amis	Lucky Jim	T. Ozerskaia, N. Treneva	1954	1958
Graham Greene	Our Man in Havana	Nina Volzhina	1958	1959
Archibald Cronin	The Northern Light	I. Gurova, T. Kudriavtseva	1958	1959
Ernest Hemingway	The Green Hills of Africa	N. Volzhina	1935	1959
Joseph Jay Deiss	The Blue Chips	I. Gurova, P. Bobrova	1957	1960
J.D. Salinger	Catcher in the Rye	Rita Rait-Kovaleva	1951	1960
Mitchell Wilson	Meeting at a far Meridian	I. Gurova	1961	1961
Erskine Caldwell	Jenny by Nature	Nina Leonidovna Daruzes	1961	1962
J. B. Priestley	The Thirty-First of June	F. Protasov, V. Khinkis	1961	1962
John Steinbeck	The Winter of our Discontent	Nina Volzhina, Evgeniia Kalashnikova	1961	1962

Erskine Caldwell	Close to Home	Nina Leonidovna Daruzes	1962	1963
Harper Lee	To Kill a Mockingbird	Nora Gal', P. Oblonskaia	1960	1963
Alan Sillitoe	Key to the Door	N. Dekhterova, B. Rostokin, V. Smirnov	1961	1963

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Sources Consulted Directly

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i isskustva (RGALI), fond 1397. *Internatsional'naia literatura*.

RGALI. Fond 1573. *Inostrannaia literatura*.

Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi federatsii (GA RF). Fond 9425. Glavnoe upravlenie po okhrane gosudarstvennykh tain v pechati pri sovete ministrov SSSR (Glavlit).

Sources Cited in Published Collections

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (RGANI). Fond 5. Apparat TsK KPSS.

Primary Sources

Internatsional'naia literatura

Briffault, Robert, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1938).

---, 'Upadok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by L. Vorovoi, 12 (1939), 152-202.

Britton, Lionel, 'Golod i liubov', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by O. Kholmskaia, 6 (1933), 10-33.

---, *Hunger and Love* (London: Putnam, 1931).

Caldwell, Erskine, 'Sluchai v iule', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 7/8 (1941), 4-64.

---, *Trouble in July* (London: Falcon Press, 1948).

---, *Some American People*. (New York, McBride, 1935).

---, 'Amerikanskii liudi', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by G. Prokunina, 8-9 (1936), 92-95; 105-109.

Dos Passos, John, *Airways, Inc.*, (New York, The Macaulay Company, 1928).

---, 'Aktsionernoe obshchestvo "Vozdukh-put"'', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, 1 (1933), 19-47. [No translator named]

Freeman, Joseph, *An American Testament; a Narrative of Rebels and Romantics*, (New York, Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1936).

---, 'Zavet amerikantsa', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Z. Gan, 1-3 (1937), 176-182; 140-152; 156-174.

Hemingway, Ernest, *Fiesta* (London: Cape, 1927).

---, 'Fiesta', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by P. Toper, 1 (1935), 3-44.

Lewis, Sinclair, *It Can't Happen Here: A Novel* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1935).

---, 'U nas eto nevozmozhno', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Z. S. Vygodskaya, 2-3 (1937), 29-127.

Phelan, James Leo, *Green Volcano* (London: Davies, 1938).

---, 'Zelenyi vulkan', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by P. Toper, 1940, 3-133.

Preston, John Hyde, *The Liberals: A Novel*. (New York: John Day, 1938).

---, 'Liberal', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina and Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 11-12 (1938), 14-78; 23-119.

Rollins, William, *The Shadow Before* (New York, McBride, 1934).

---, 'Ten' vpered', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by E. Romanova, 6 (1934), 5-24.

Sinclair, Upton, *Dragon's Teeth* (New York/ Pasadena, 1942).

---, 'Zuby drakona', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by D. Gorbov and V. Kurella, 11 (1942), 12-65.

Steinbeck, John, *The Grapes of Wrath* (New York: Modern Library, 1939).

---, 'Grozd'ia gneva', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina, 1940, 5-85; 26-140.

Wright, Richard, *Native Son* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1940).

---, 'Syn Ameriki', *Internatsional'naia literatura*, trans. by Evgeniia Kalashnikova, 1-2 (1941), 3-42; 4-158.

Inostrannaia literatura

Aldridge, James, *I wish that he would not die* (London: The Bodley Head, 1957).

---, 'Ne khochu, chtoby on umiral', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by E. Golysheva, 11 (1957), 109-222.

Amis, Kingsley, *Lucky Jim* (London: Penguin, 1954).

---, 'Schastlivchik Dzhim', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by T. Ozerskaia and N. Treneva, 10-12 (1958), 7-68; 163-212; 145-199.

Caldwell, Erskine, *Close to Home* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962).

---, 'Dzhenni', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 12 (1962), 71-162.

---, *Jenny by Nature* (London: Heinemann, 1961).

---, 'U nas doma', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, 10-11, 67-111; 152-192.

Carter, Dyson, *Fatherless Sons* (Toronto: Progress Books, 1955).

---, 'Synov'ia bez otsov (otryvki iz romana)', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by E. M. Bernshtein, 12 (1956), 119-154.

Cronin, Archibald J., *The Northern Light* (London: The Companion Book Club, 1958).

---, 'Severnyi svet', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by I. Gurova and Tat'iana Kudriavtseva, 1-2 (1959), 64-137; 103-180.

Deiss, Jay, *The Blue Chips: A Novel* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957).

---, 'Krupnaia igra', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by I. Gurova and R. Bobrova, 1-3 (1960), 82-130; 110-172; 123-204.

Fast, Howard, 'Istoriia Loly Gregg', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva, 11 (1956), 3-90.

---, *The story of Lola Gregg* (London: Bodley Head, 1957).

Greene, Graham, 'Nash chelovek v Gavane', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nina Al'bertovna Volzhina, 3-4 (1959), 5-72; 43-107.

---, *Our Man in Havana* (London: Heinemann, 1958).

---, *The Quiet American* (London: Heinemann, 1955).

---, 'Tikhii Amerikanets', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva and S. Mitina, 6-7 (1956), 4-41; 90-164.

Hemingway, Ernest, *Green Hills of Africa* (London: Arrow, 1994).

---, *The Old Man and the Sea* (London: Cape, 1952).

---, 'Starik i more', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by E. Golysheva and Boris Izakov, 3 (1955), 95-136.

---, 'Zelenye kholmy Afriki', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina, 7 (1959), 164-180.

Lee, Harper, *To Kill a Mockingbird* (London: Random House, 1960).

---, 'Ubit' peresmeshnika', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Nora Gal' and P. Oblonskaia, 3-4 (1963), 61-169; 105-180.

Lessing, Doris, 'The Antheap', in *African Stories* (London: Joseph, 1964), pp. 335-383.

---, 'Muraveinik', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by D. Dezint and I. Manenok, 6 (1955), 110-151.

Mackenzie, Compton, 'Raketnaia goriachka', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva and B. Gribanov, 6 (1958), 99-173.

---, *Rockets Galore* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957).

Priestley, J. B., *The Thirty-First of June* (London: Heinemann, 1961).

---, '31 iunia', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by F. Protasov and V. Khinkis, 9 (1962), 53-127.

Salinger, J. D., *The Catcher in the Rye* (London: Penguin, 1994).

---, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaleva, 11 (1960), 28-137.

Sillitoe, Alan, *Key to the Door* (London: W.H. Allen, 1961).

---, 'Kliuch ot dveri', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by N. Dekhtereva, B. Rostokin and V. Smirnov, 5-7 (1963), 6-78; 50-107; 122-198.

Steinbeck, John, *The Pearl* (London: Heinemann, 1948).

---, *The Winter of Our Discontent* (London: Pan, 1961).

---, 'Zhemchuzhina', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina, 12.

---, 'Zima trevogi nashei', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans by Evgeniia Kalashnikova and Nina Al'bertovna Volzhina, 1-3 (1962), 79-139; 5-51; 8-86.

Wilson, Mitchell, *Meeting at a Far Meridian* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1961).

—, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', *Inostrannaia literatura*, trans. by N. Dekhtereva and N. Treneva, 1-3 (1961), 37-94; 85-47; 74-162.

Secondary Sources

'Note', *Inostrannaia Literatura*, 1 (1961), 37.

'Ot redaktsii', *Inostrannaia Literatura*, 1 (1955), 3-4.

Aimermakher, K., B. Yu. Afiani, D. Bairau, B. Bonvech, and N. G. Tomilina, eds., *Apparat TsK KPSS i kul'tura 1953-1957: Dokumenty* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2001).

Allan, Keith, and Kate Burridge, *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used As Shield and Weapon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

---, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Álvarez, Román, and M. Carmen-África Vidal, 'Translating: A Political Act', in *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008).

Assmann, Aleida, and Jan Assmann, eds., *Kanon und Zensur* (Munich: Fink, 1987).

Association des écrivains et artistes révolutionnaires, 'A.E.A.R.- Historique' <<http://www.aear.net/Textes/HistoriqueAEAR.html>> [accessed 7 December 2010].

Austin, John Langston, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Avrich, Paul, *Sacco and Vanzetti: The Anarchist Background* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

- Baer, Brian James, 'Introduction: Cultures of Translation', in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), pp. 1-18.
- , 'Literary Translation in the Age of the Decembrists: The Birth of Productive Censorship in Russia', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer and Michaela Wolf (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010), pp. 213-238.
- , 'Russia', *Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature* (London: Routledge, 2006), 1141-1145.
- , 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia: A Case Study in Productive Censorship', *Translation Studies*, 4 (2011), 21-40.
- Baer, Brian James, ed., *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982).
- Ballard, Michel, ed., *Censure et traduction* (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011)
- Barghoorn, Frederick C., *The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- Bassnett, Susan, 'The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator', in *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), pp. 10-24.
- Billiani, Francesca, 'Assessing Boundaries: Censorship and Translation, an Introduction', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007), pp. 1-25.
- Billiani, Francesca, ed., *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007).
- Blum, Arlen Viktorovich, *A Self-administered Poison: The System and Functions of Soviet Censorship* (Oxford: Legenda European Humanities Research Centre, 2003).
- , 'Evreiskaia Tema glazami sovetskogo tsenzora (po sekretnym dokumentam Glavlita epokhi bol'shogo terrora)', in *Evrei v Rossii: istoriia i kul'tura. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. by D. A. El'iashevich (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1995), pp. 186-196.

- , *Evreiskii vopros pod sovetskoi tsenzuroi, 1917-1991* (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1996).
- , 'George Orwell in the Soviet Union: A Documentary Chronicle on the Centenary of His Birth', *The Library*, 4 (2003), 402-416.
- , "'Internatsional'naia literatura": Podtsenzurnoe proshloe', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/bl21.html>> [accessed 18 April 2011].
- , *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade: Tsenzura v gody Ottepeli, Zastoia i Perestroiki 1953-1991* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2008).
- , *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epoku total'nogo terrora: 1929-1953* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000).
- , *Za Kulisami "ministerstva pravdy": Tainaia istoriia sovetskoi tsenzury, 1917-1929* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1994).
- , *Zapreshchennye knigi russkikh pisatelei i literaturovedov 1917- 1991: Indeks sovetskoi tsenzury s kommentariiami* (Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet kul'tury i iskusstv, 2003).
- Bogdanov, Konstantin, 'The Rhetoric of Ritual: The Soviet Sociolect in Ethnolinguistic Perspective', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 5 (2009), 179-216.
- Bonnell, Victoria E., *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters Under Lenin and Stalin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. by John Thompson, trans. by Matthew Adamson and Gino Raymond (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- , *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- , *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993).
- , *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).
- Bradley, Laura, 'GDR Theatre Censorship: A System in Denial.', *German Life & Letters*, 59 (2006), 151-162.
- Brooks, Jeffrey, *Thank You Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Brown, Deming, *Soviet Attitudes Towards American Writing* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962).

- Brownlie, Siobhan, 'Examining Self-Censorship: Zola's *Nana* in English Translation', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007), pp. 205-234.
- Brzyski, Anna, 'Introduction: Canon and Art History', in *Partisan Canons* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), pp. 1-26.
- Burt, Richard, '(Un)Censoring in Detail: The Fetish of Censorship in the Early Modern Past and the Postmodern Present', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 17-41.
- Butler, Judith, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- , 'Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 247-260.
- Cherfas, Teresa, 'Waugh and Peace Revisited: Russian Readers, Western Writers', *Encounter*, 64 (1986), 64-68.
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, *A Fence Around the Empire: Russian Censorship of Western Ideas Under the Tsars* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1985).
- , 'Access to Foreign Publications in Soviet Libraries', *Libraries and Culture*, 26 (1991), 135-150.
- , 'Censorship via Translation: Soviet Treatment of Western Political Writing', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 21-52.
- , 'Good Business, Bad Business, No Business: Selling Western Books to the Soviets', in *Books, Libraries and Information in Slavic and East European Studies: Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Slavic Librarians and Information Specialists*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin (New York: Russica, 1986), pp. 254-271.
- , 'The New Censorship: Censorship by Translation in the Soviet Union', *Journal of Library History*, 21 (2008), 334-349.
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, and Maurice Friedberg, *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, ed., *Tsenzura inostrannykh knig v Rossiiskoi Imperii i Sovetskom Soiuze: Katalog vystavki* (Moscow: Rudomino, 1993).

- Clark, Katerina, 'Germanophone Contributions to Stalinist Literary Theory: The Case of Georgy Lukacs and Michail Lifšic, and Their Roles in Literaturnyj Kritik and IFLI', *Russian Literature*, 63 (2008), 513–532.
- , 'Germanophone Intellectuals in Stalin's Russia: Diaspora and Cultural Identity in the 1930s', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2 (2001), 529–551.
- , 'M. M. Bakhtin and "World Literature"', *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 32 (2002), 266–292.
- , *Moscow, the Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931–1941* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).
- , 'The Role of Translation in the Formation of National Culture', in *Kultur und/als Übersetzung. Russisch-deutsche Beziehungen im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Christine Engel and Birgit Menzel (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2011), pp. 121–142.
- , *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 2nd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).
- Condee, Nancy, *Soviet Hieroglyphics: Visual Culture in Late Twentieth-Century Russia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).
- Cornwell, Neil, and Nicole Christian, eds., *Reference Guide to Russian Literature* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998).
- Dallin, Alexander, 'America Through Soviet Eyes', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 11 (1947), 26–39.
- David-Fox, Michael, 'The Fellow Travelers Revisited: The "Cultured West" Through Soviet Eyes', *The Journal of Modern History*, 75 (2003), 300–335.
- , 'The "Heroic Life" of a Friend of Stalinism: Romain Rolland and Soviet Culture', *Slavonica*, 11 (2005), 4–29.
- , 'Whither Resistance?', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1, 161–165.
- Deletant, Dennis, 'Cheating the Censor: Romanian Writers Under Communism', *Central Europe*, 6 (2008), 122–171.
- Derrida, Jacques, *Acts of Religion*, trans. by Gil Anidjar (London: Routledge, 2002).
- , *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2*, trans. by Jan Plug (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004).

- Dewhirst, Martin, and Robert Farrell, *The Soviet Censorship* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1973).
- Diakonova, Nina, 'Aldous Huxley in Russia', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 21 (1997), 161-167.
- Dobao, Ana María Fernández, 'Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of the Translation of Swearing: The Spanish Version of Pulp Fiction', *Babel*, 52 (2006), 222-242.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny Aleksandrovich, *The Making of the State Reader: Social and Aesthetic Contexts of the Reception of Soviet Literature* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997).
- Dudziak, Mary L., *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
- Dunnet, Jane, 'Foreign Literature in Fascist Italy: Circulation and Censorship', *TTR*, 15 (2008), 97-123.
- Dwyer, Tessa, and Ionna Uricaru, 'Slashings and Subtitles: Romanian Media Piracy, Censorship, and Translation', *The Velvet Light Trap*, 63 (2009), 45- 57.
- Eaton, Katherine Bliss, ed., *Enemies of the People: The Destruction of Soviet Literary, Theater, and Film Arts in the 1930s* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2002).
- English, Robert, *Russia and the Idea of the West: Gorbachev, Intellectuals, and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
- Epstein, Mikhail, *Relativistic Patterns in Totalitarian Thinking: An Inquiry into the Language of Soviet Ideology* (Washington: The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1991).
- Ermolaev, Herman, *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917-1991* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997).
- , 'Zapad glazami sovetskoi tsenzury 1946-1953 godov', *Studia Rossica Posnaniensia*, 25 (1993), 75-81.
- Erzikova, Elina, 'Subversion of Censorship in Soviet Journalism: Komsomolskaya Pravda's Contribution in Preparation for Gorbachev's Perestroika and Its Implications for the Contemporary Russian Media' (presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, 2008) <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/3/2/0/0/p232005_index.html> [accessed 23 June 2010].
- Etkind, Aleksandr, 'Soviet Subjectivity: Torture for the Sake of Salvation?', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 6 (2005), 171-186.
- Ezhegodnik knigi SSSR* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia knizhnaia palata, 1955).

- Fairclough, Norman, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008).
- Figes, Orlando, and Boris Kolonitskii, *Interpreting the Russian Revolution: The Language and Symbols of 1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
- Fish, Stanley, *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech: And It's a Good Thing Too* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila, 'Making a Self for the Times: Impersonation and Imposture in 20th-Century Russia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2 (2001), 469-487.
- , *Tear Off the Masks!: Identity and Imposture in Twentieth-Century Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979).
- , *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Routledge, 1989).
- , 'The Subject and Power', *Critical Inquiry*, 8 (1982), 777-795.
- Freshwater, Helen, 'Towards a Redefinition of Censorship', in *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*, ed. by Beate Müller, Critical Studies (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 225-245.
- Friedberg, Maurice, *A Decade of Euphoria: Western Literature in Post-Stalin Russia, 1954-64* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977).
- , *Literary Translation in Russia: A Cultural History* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).
- , 'Soviet Censorship: A View from Outside', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 21-28.
- , 'The U.S. in the U.S.S.R.: American Literature Through the Filter of Recent Soviet Publishing and Criticism', *Critical Inquiry*, 3 (1976), 519-583.
- Fürst, Juliane, *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-war Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Gachechiladze, Givi Razhdenovich, 'Realism and Dialectics in the Art of Translation', *Babel*, 13 (1970), 87-91.
- , *Vvedenie v teoriiu khudozhestvennogo perevoda* (Tbilisi: Izdatelstvo Tbilisskogo universiteta, 1970).

- Gal, Susan, 'Review: Language and the "Arts of Resistance"', *Cultural Anthropology*, 10 (1995), 407-424.
- Gal', Nora, *Vospominaniia, stat'i, stikhi, pis'ma, bibliografiia*, ed. by Dmitrii Kuz'min and Edvarda Kuz'mina, 5th edn (Moscow: ARGO-RISK, 1997) <<http://www.vavilon.ru/noragal/memoir.html>> [accessed 10 August 2011].
- Gallagher, Aoife, 'Pasternak's Hamlet: Translation, Censorship and Indirect Communication', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 119-131.
- Garbovskiy, Nikolay, 'Les inderdits dans la traduction sous le régime soviétique', in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit, 2011), pp. 283-294.
- Garrard, John and Carol Garrard, *Inside the Soviet Writers' Union* (London: Tauris, 1990).
- Genette, Gérard, and Marie MacLean, 'Introduction to the Paratext', *New Literary History*, 22 (1991), 261.
- Genieva, Ekaterina Iur'evna, 'Iz-za Dzhioisa', *Vestnik Evropy*, 15 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/vestnik/2005/15/ge41.html>> [accessed 29 December 2010].
- Gentzler, Edwin, and Maria Tymoczko, 'Introduction', in *Translation and Power*, ed. by Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008), p. xi-xxviii.
- Gibbels, Elisabeth, 'Translators, the Tacit Censors', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 57-75.
- Gibian, George, *Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature During the Thaw, 1954-1957* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960).
- Gomez, Miguel Casas, 'Towards a New Approach to the Linguistic Definition of Euphemism', *Language Sciences*, 31 (2009), 725-729.
- Gorham, Michael S., *Speaking in Soviet Tongues: Language Culture and the Politics of Voice in Revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009).
- Goriaeva, T. M., 'Nesvobodnoe radio dlia nesvobodnykh liudei', in *Iskliuchit' vsiakiye upominaniia*, ed. by T. M. Goriaeva (Moscow: vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 78-106.

- , *Politicheskaia tsenzura v SSSR. 1917-1991 gg.*, Kul'tura i vlast' ot Stalina do Gorbacheva. Issledovaniia (Moscow: Rosspen, 2002).
- , 'Sovetskaia politicheskaia tsenzura: (Istoriia, deiatel'nost', struktura)', in *Iskliuchit' vsiakiie upominaniia: Ocherki istorii sovetskoi tsenzury*, ed. by T. M. Goriaeva (Moscow: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 13-64.
- Gorokhoff, Boris Ivanovitch, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959).
- Gromova, T. V., ed., *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuze: Materialy konferentsii 24-27 Maia 1993 g.: Moskva* (Moscow: Rudomino, 1995).
- Guillory, John, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- Günther, Hans, 'Soviet Literary Criticism and the Formulation of the Aesthetics of Socialist Realism, 1932 - 1940', in *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 90–108.
- Gusejnov, Gasan Chingizovich, *D.S.P.: Sovetskie ideologemy v russkom diskurse 1990-kh* (Moscow: Tri kvadrata, 2004).
- Gvosdev, Yuri, 'Publishing and Book Distribution in the U.S.S.R.', *Library Quarterly*, 28 (1958), 269-276.
- Halfin, Igal, *Stalinist Confessions: Messianism and Terror at the Leningrad Communist University* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009).
- , *Terror in My Soul: Communist Autobiographies on Trial* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Hellbeck, Jochen, 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1 (2008), 71–96.
- , 'Working, Struggling, Becoming: Stalin-Era Autobiographical Texts', *The Russian Review*, 60 (2001), 340–359.
- Heller, Kevin John, 'Power, Subjectification and Resistance in Foucault', *SubStance*, 25 (1996), 78-110.
- Hodge, Robert, and Gunther Kress, *Language as Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- Hoffmann, David L., *Stalinist Values: The Cultural Norms of Soviet Modernity, 1917-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

- Hollander, Paul, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba 1928-1978* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).
- Holquist, Michael, 'Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship', *Pmla*, 109 (1994), 14-25.
- Humphrey, Caroline, 'The "Creative Bureaucrat": Conflicts in the Production of Soviet Communist Party Discourse', *Inner Asia*, 10 (2008), 5-35.
- Hutchings, Stephen C., *Russian Literary Culture in the Camera Age* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Iampolski, Mikhail, 'Censorship as the Triumph of Life', in *Socialist Realism Without Shores*, ed. by Thomas Lahusen and Evgeny Aleksandrovich Dobrenko (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 165-177.
- Inggs, Judith A., 'Censorship and Translated Childrens Literature in the Soviet Union: The Example of the Wizards Oz and Goodwin', *Target*, 23 (2011), 77-91.
- Isserman, Maurice, *Which Side Were You on?: The American Communist Party During the Second World War* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1993).
- Jameson, Fredric, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (London: Methuen, 1981).
- Jansen, Sue Curry, *Censorship: The Knot That Binds Power and Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- Kalashnikova, Elena, *Po-russki s liubov'iu: Besedy s perevodchikami* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2008).
- Kashkin, Ivan, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel, 1968).
- Kassof, Brian, 'A Book of Socialism: Stalinist Culture and the First Edition of the Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 6 (2009), 55-95.
- Kelly, Catriona, 'Review (Lauren G. Leighton, Two Worlds One Art)', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 70 (1992), 535-537.
- Komaromi, Ann, 'The Unofficial Field of Late Soviet Culture', *Slavic Review*, 66 (2007), 605-629.
- Kon, Igor, 'Sexuality and Culture', in *Sex and Russian Society*, ed. by James Riordan and Igor Kon (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), pp. 15-44.
- Kon, Igor S., 'Russia', in *Sociolegal Control of Homosexuality* (Springer Science & Business Media, 1997), pp. 221-242.

- Korda, Michael, *Making the List: A Cultural History of the American Bestseller, 1900-1999: As Seen Through the Annual Bestseller Lists of Publishers Weekly* (New York: Barnes & Noble Publishing, 2001).
- Koteyko, Nelya, and Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, 'The Path and Building Metaphors in the Speeches of Vladimir Putin: Back to the Future?', *Slavonica*, 15 (2009), 112-127.
- Kotkin, Stephen, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
- Krebs, Katja, 'Anticipating Blue Lines: Translational Choices as Sites of (Self-) Censorship: Translating for the British Stage Under the Lord Chamberlain', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007), pp. 167-186.
- Kristeva, Julia, *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. by Toril Moi (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).
- Krylova, A., 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1 (2008), 119-146.
- Kudriavtseva, Tat'iana Alekseevna, *Prevratnosti odnoi sud'by: Zapiski literatora i perevodchika* (Moscow: R. Valent, 2008).
- Kuhiwczak, Piotr, 'Censorship as a Collaborative Project: a Systemic Approach', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 46-56.
- Lamaison, Pierre, and Pierre Bourdieu, 'From Rules to Strategies: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu', *Cultural Anthropology*, 1 (1986), 110-120.
- Latynina, Alla, and Martin Dewhurst, 'Post-Soviet Russian Literature', in *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature*, ed. by Neil Cornwell (Routledge, 2001), pp. 234-250.
- Lauk, Epp, and Tiiu Kreegipuu, 'Was It All Pure Propaganda? Practices of "Silent Resistance" in Soviet Estonian Journalism', *Acta Historica Tallinnensia*, 15 (2010), 167-190.
- Leighton, Lauren G., *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois Univeristy Press, 1991).
- Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich, 'Lev Tolstoi kak zerkalo russkoi revoliutsii', in *V. I. Lenin o Tolstom*, ed. by K. N. Lomunov (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1978), pp. 48-54.
- Leont'ev, B., 'Posleslovie k romanu Makkenzi', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1958), 169-173.

- Lih, Lars, 'The Soviet Union and the Road to Communism', in *The Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. by Ronald G. Suny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), III, 706-731.
- Looby, Robert, 'Looking for the Censor in the Works of Sean O'Casey (and Others) in Polish Translation', *Translation and Literature*, 17 (2008), 47-54.
- Loseff, Lev, *On the Beneficence of Censorship: Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature* (Munich: Sagner, 1984).
- Lovell, Stephen, *The Russian Reading Revolution: Print Culture in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Eras* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).
- Lüthi, Lorenz M., *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- Mainer, Sergi, 'Translation and Censorship: Robert Burns in Post-Civil War Spain', *Translation Studies*, 4 (2011), 72-86.
- Maksimov, Leonid, *Bol'shaia tsenzura: Pisateli i zhurnalisty v strane sovetov 1917-1956* (Moscow: Materik, 2005).
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *Manifest kommunisticheskoi partii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1948).
- Menzel, Birgit, 'Die Zeitschrift "Inostrannaja literatura" als Medium kultureller Übersetzung', in *Kultur und/als Übersetzung. Russisch-deutsche Beziehungen im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Christine Engel and Birgit Menzel (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2010), pp. 143-176.
- Merino, Raquel, 'Censored Translations in Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project-Theatre and Fiction (English- Spanish)', *TTR*, 15 (2008), 125-152.
- Merkle, Denise, 'M. French Sheldon, Translator of Gustave Flaubert's *Salammbô*: Transauthorship and the Mechanics of Censorship in Late-Victorian Britain', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer and Michaela Wolf (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010).
- Merkle, Denise, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer, and Michaela Wolf, 'Exploring a Neglected Century: Translation and Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe', in *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer and Michaela Wolf (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2011), pp. 7-28.
- Merkle, Denise, Carol O'Sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer, and Michaela Wolf, eds., *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in 19th Century Europe* (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010).

- Meyer, Priscilla, *How the Russians Read the French: Lermontov, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).
- Michael David-Fox, 'The Implications of Transnationalism', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 12 (2011), 885-904.
- Mikheev, Aleksei, 'Mezhdu Dvumia "otpepeliami"', *Inostrannaia Literatura*, 10 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/mi20.html>> [accessed 18 August 2011].
- Miller, Martin Alan, *Freud and the Bolsheviks: Psychoanalysis in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- Mitrokhin, N.A., and Vladimir Solodin, "'Ubezhden, chto rabotal na stabil'nost' godudarstva" interv'iu V.A. Solodina', in *Iskliuchit' vsiakiye upominaniia: Ocherki istorii sovetskoi tsenzury*, ed. by T. M. Goriaeva (Moskva: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 315- 331.
- Müller, Beate, 'Censorship and Cultural Regulation: Mapping the Territory', in *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*, ed. by Beate Müller (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 1-32.
- Nemchinskii, Ia., 'Nebokhodima Konkretnost'', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 3 May 1959, p. 3.
- Ní Chuilleanáin, Eil an, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin, and David Parris, 'Introduction', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 9-24.
- Ní Chuilleanáin, Eiléan, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin, and David Parris, eds., *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009).
- O'Sullivan, Carol, 'Censoring These "Racy Morsels of the Veranacular": Loss and Gain in the Translation of Apuleius and Catullus', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009).
- , 'Translation Within the Margin: The "Libraries" of Henry Bohn', in *Agents of Translation*, ed. by John Milton and Paul Fadio Bandia (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009), pp. 107-130.
- Orlova, Raisa, 'Den'gi protiv chelovechnosti (zametki o tvorchestve Dzhona Steinbeka)', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 3 (1962), 197-208.
- , *Vospominaniia o neproshedshem vremeni: Moskva, 1961-1981 gg* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1983).

- Ortega y Gasset, Jos , 'The Misery and the Splendor of Translation', in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, ed. by Rainer Schulte, trans. by Elizabeth Gamble Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 93-112.
- Ostoi, O. S., 'Izdatel'stvo "Academia"', *Kniga: Issledovannii i materialy*, 18 (1969), 155-174.
- Oushakine, Serguei, 'The Terrifying Mimicry of Samizdat', *Public Culture*, 13 (2001), 191-214.
- Palievskii, P. V., "'Schastlivchik Dzhim" Kingsli Emisa', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 12 (1958), 226-229.
- Palmier, Jean Michel, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America*, trans. by David Fernbach (New York: Verso, 2006).
- Panova, Vera, 'O romane Dzh. D. Selindzhera', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 11 (1960), 138-141.
- Parker, Stephen Jan, 'Hemingway's Revival in the Soviet Union: 1955-1962', *American Literature*, 35 (1964), 485-501.
- Parker, Stephen, and Matthew Philpotts, *Sinn und Form: The Anatomy of a Literary Journal* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).
- Payne, S. G., 'Soviet Anti-Fascism: Theory and Practice, 1921-45', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 4 (2003), 1-62.
- Payne, Stanley G., *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
- Pechat' SSSR v 1955 Godu* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia knizhnaia palata, 1955)
- Petersen, Klaus, 'Censorship! Or Is It?', in *Interpreting Censorship in Canada*, ed. by Klaus Petersen and Allan C. Hutchison (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), pp. 3-18.
- Petrilli, Susan, 'Translation, Semiotics and Ideology', *TTR. Etudes sur le texte et ses transformations*, 5 (1992), 233-64
- Plamper, Jan, 'Abolishing Ambiguity: Soviet Censorship Practices in the 1930s', *Russian Review*, 60 (2001), 526-544.
- , 'Russia: Archives of Soviet Censorship', in *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. by Derek Jones (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001), pp. 2093-2095.
- Polonsky, Rachel, *English Literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

- Pöppel, Ludmila, *The Rhetoric of Pravda Editorials: A Diachronic Study of a Political Genre*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, 33 (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2007).
- Post, Robert, 'Censorship and Silencing', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post, Issues & Debates. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 1-16.
- Prokhorov, Aleksandr Mikhailovich, ed., 'Inostrannaia Literatura', *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1969).
- Prokhorov, Alexander, 'Inherited Discourse: Stalinist Tropes in Thaw Culture' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, School of Arts and Sciences, 2002).
- Reid, Susan E., 'Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union Under Khrushchev', *Slavic Review*, 61 (2002), 211-252.
- Reinelt, Janelle, 'The Limits of Censorship', *Theatre Research International*, 32 (2007), 3-15.
- Richmond, Steven, and Vladimir Solodin, "'The Eye of the State": An Interview with Soviet Chief Censor Vladimir Solodin', *Russian Review*, 56 (1997), 581-590.
- Rogatchevski, Andrei, 'Homo Sovieticus in the Library', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 54 (2002), 975-988.
- Rolf, Malte, 'A Hall of Mirrors: Sovietizing Culture Under Stalinism', *Slavic Review*, 68 (2009), 601-631.
- Romanova, Elena, 'What American Novels Do Russians Read?', *Soviet Literature*, 7 (1961), 178-182.
- Ross, Trevor Thornton, *The Making of the English Literary Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).
- Ruggles, Melville J., 'American Books in Soviet Publishing', *Slavic Review*, 20 (1961), 419-435.
- Rundle, Christopher, *Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010).
- , 'The Censorship of Translation in Fascist Italy', *The Translator*, 6 (2000), 67-86.
- Ryazanova-Clarke, Lara, 'How Upright Is the Vertical? Ideological Norm Negotiation in Russian Media Discourse', in *From Poets to Padonki*:

Linguistic Authority and Norm Negotiation in Modern Russian Culture, ed. by Ingunn Lunde and Martin Paulsen, 2009 (Bergen: Slavica Bergensia, 2009), pp. 288-314.

Safiullina, Nailya, 'The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture Under Stalin' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Manchester: University of Manchester, 2009).

---, 'Window to the West: From the Collection of Readers' Letters to the Journal *Internatsional'naiia Literatura*', *Slavonica*, 15 (2009), 128-161.

Sarnov, Benedikt M., *Nash Sovetskii Novoiaz: Malen'kaia Entsiklopediia Real'nogo Sotsializma* (Moscow: Materik, 2002).

Schauer, Frederick, 'The Ontology of Censorship', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. by Robert Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 147-168.

Scott, James C., *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

Seruya, Teresa, and Maria Lin Moniz, eds., *Translation and Censorship in Different Times and Landscapes* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008).

Shakhova, Erna, 'Rol' redaktora v izdanii knigi', in *Översättning som kulturöverföring: Rysk-svenska och Svensk-ryska översättningsproblem*, ed. by Barbara Lönnqvist (Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag, 1993), pp. 131-145.

Sherry, Samantha, 'Censorship in Translation in the Soviet Union: The Manipulative Rewriting of Howard Fast's Novel *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti*', *Slavonica*, 16 (2010), 1-14.

Shlapentokh, Vladimir, 'The Changeable Soviet Image of America', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 497 (1988), 157-171.

Shomrakova, I., 'Knigoizdatel'stvo "Vsemirnaia literatura" 1918-24', *Kniga: issledovaniia i materialy*, 14 (1967), 175-193.

Sikorskii, N. M., *Teoriia i praktika redaktirovaniia* (Moscow: Vysshaia shkola, 1971).

Sinclair, Upton, *I, Candidate for Governor: And How I Got Licked* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935).

Sinityna, Olga, 'Censorship in the Soviet Union and Its Cultural and Professional Results for Arts and Art Libraries', *Inspel*, 33 (1999), 35-42.

Slonim, Marc, 'Dostoevsky Under the Soviets', *Russian Review*, 10 (1951), 118-130.

- Smith, S. A., 'The Social Meanings of Swearing: Workers and Bad Language in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia', *Past and Present*, 1998, 167-202.
- Soiuz Pisatelei SSSR, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934: Stenograficheskii otchet* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1934).
- Stelmakh, V. D., 'Reading in the Context of Censorship in the Soviet Union', *Libraries and Culture*, 36 (2001), 143-150.
- Stephenson, Chloë, 'Seeing Red: Soviet Films in Fascist Italy', in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, ed. by Francesca Billiani (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007), pp. 235-256.
- Stern, Ludmilla, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union, 1920-40: From Red Square to the Left Bank* (London: Routledge, 2007).
- Sturge, Kate, "'A Danger and a Veiled Attack': Translating in Nazi Germany", in *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*, ed. by Jean Boase-Beier and Michael Holman (Manchester: St. Jerome, 1999).
- , 'Censorship of Translated Fiction in Nazi Germany', *TTR*, 15 (2002), 153-169.
- , *'The Alien Within': Translation into German During the Nazi Regime* (Munich: Iudicium, 2004).
- Telesin, Julius, 'For Whom the Scissors Cut: How to Improve Hemingway (Moscow Style)', *Encounter*, 46 (1976), 81-86.
- Teplova, Natalia, 'Prol gomènes à une tude historiographique de la censure et de la traduction en Russie', in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011), pp. 295-304.
- Tihanov, Galin, 'Viktor Shklovskii and Georg Lukács in the 1930s', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 78 (2000), 44-65.
- Tomaszkiewicz, Teresa, 'Le traducteur entre la censure politique imposée et l'autocensure pratiqu e', in *Censure et traduction*, ed. by Michel Ballard (Arras: Artois presses universit , 2011), pp. 341-354.
- Trauberg, Natal'ia, 'Vsegda li pobezhdaet pobezhdennyi? Natal'ia Trauberg o khristianskom samizdate', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 2000
<<http://dlib.eastview.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/sources/article.jsp?id=1481>>
[accessed 12 July 2011].
- Tymoczko, Maria, 'Censorship and Self-censorship in Translation: Ethics and Ideology, Resistance and Collusion', in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, ed. by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 24-45.

- Ventslova, Tomas, 'Igra s tsenzorom', *Staroe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 1 (2001) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/slo/2001/1/tomvench-pr.html>> [accessed 15 April 2011].
- Vinograd, Ann C., 'A Soviet Translation of Slaughterhouse-Five', *Russian Language Journal*, 93 (2008), 14-18.
- Viola, Lynne, 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s: Soliloquy of a Devil's Advocate', in *Contending with Stalinism: Soviet Power and Popular Resistance in the 1930s*, ed. by Lynne Viola (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 17-43.
- Volevich, Irina, Viktor Golyshev, Grigorii Dashevskii, and Sergei Gandlevskii, "'Vsekh etikh slov po-russki net..." (kruglyi stol "IL", posviashchennyi perevodu nenormativnoi leksiki)', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1999) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/1999/7/krugl.html>> [accessed 7 March 2011].
- Voloshinov, Valentin Nikoalevich, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
- Vonnegut, Kurt, *Fates Worse Than Death: An Autobiographical Collage* (New York: Berkley Books, 1992).
- Walker, Gregory P.M., *Soviet Book Publishing Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Witt, Susanna, 'Between the Lines: Totalitarianism and Translation in the USSR', in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), pp. 149-170.
- Wolf, Michaela, 'Censorship as Cultural Blockage: Banned Literature in the Late Habsburg Monarchy', *TTR*, 15 (2002), 45-62.
- Wolf, Michaela, and Alexandra Fukari, eds., *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007).
- Wolf, Michaela, ed., *Übersetzen - Translating - Traduire: Towards a "Social Turn"?* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2006).
- Yaram-Agaev, Yuri, 'Soviet Censorship: Discussion', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 53-67.
- Young, Jekaterina, 'Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 36 (2000), 412-425.
- Yurchak, Alexei, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

- Zaks, Boris, 'Censorship at the Editorial Desk', in *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*, ed. by Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 155-161.
- Zalambani, Maria, 'Literary Policies and Institutions', in *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Marina Balina (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 251-268.
- Zamiatin, E. I., 'Kratkaia istoriia vseмирnoi literatury ot osnovaniia i do sego dnia', *Pamiat'*: *Istoricheskii sbornik*, 5 (1981), 237-314.
- Zaretskaïa-Balsente, Ioulia, *Les Intellectuels et la censure en URSS (1965-1985): De la vérité allégorique à l'érosion du système*, Collection logiques politiques (Paris: Harmattan, 2000).
- Zhirkov, G. V., 'Ot tsenzorov-professionalov k tainym tsenzoram', in *U mysli stoia na chasakh... tsenzory Rossii i tsenzura*, ed. by G. V. Zhirkov (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Petersburgskogo universiteta, 2000), pp. 3-23.
- Zhuk, Sergei I., *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dnepropetrovsk, 1960--1985* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).