

# Discourses of Regulation and Resistance

## Russian Language and Society Series

**Series Editor: Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, University of Edinburgh**

This series of academic monographs and edited volumes consists of important scholarly accounts of interrelationships between Russian language and society, and aims to foster an opinion-shaping 'linguistic turn' in the international scholarly debate within Russian Studies, and to develop new sociolinguistic and linguo-cultural perspectives on Russian. The series embraces a broad scope of approaches including those advanced in sociolinguistics, rhetoric, critical linguistics, (critical) discourse analysis, linguistic anthropology, politics of language, language policy and related and interdisciplinary areas.

### Series Editor

Dr Lara Ryazanova-Clarke is Senior Lecturer in Russian, and the Academic Director of the Princess Dashkova Russian Centre, at the University of Edinburgh.

### Editorial Board

Professor David Andrews (Georgetown University)

Professor Lenore Grenoble (University of Chicago)

Professor John Joseph (University of Edinburgh)

Professor Vladimir Plungian (Institute of Russian Language/Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)

Professor Patrick Seriot (Université de Lausanne)

Dr Alexei Yurchak (University of California, Berkeley)

### Titles available in the series:

*The Russian Language Outside the Nation*, ed. Lara Ryazanova-Clarke

*Discourses of Regulation and Resistance: Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era Soviet Union*, Samantha Sherry

*French and Russian in Imperial Russia: Language Use among the Russian Elite*, ed. Derek Offord, Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, Vladislav Rjéoutski and Gesine Argent

*French and Russian in Imperial Russia: Language Attitudes and Identity*, ed. Derek Offord, Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, Vladislav Rjéoutski and Gesine Argent

Visit the Russian Language and Society website at

<http://www.euppublishing.com/series/rilas>

# Discourses of Regulation and Resistance

## Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era Soviet Union

---

Samantha Sherry

EDINBURGH  
University Press

© Samantha Sherry, 2015

Edinburgh University Press Ltd  
The Tun – Holyrood Road, 12(2f) Jackson's Entry, Edinburgh EH8 8PJ

[www.euppublishing.com](http://www.euppublishing.com)

Typeset in 11/13 Monotype Ehrhardt by  
Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire,  
and printed and bound in Great Britain by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 0 7486 9802 8 (hardback)  
ISBN 978 0 7486 9803 5 (webready PDF)  
ISBN 978 1 4744 0365 8 (epub)

The right of Samantha Sherry to be identified as the author of this work  
has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and  
Patents Act 1988, and the Copyright and Related Rights Regulations  
2003 (SI No. 2498).

# Contents

---

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vi
<i>Note on Transliteration</i>	vii
Introduction	I
<b>Part I: Context</b>	
1. Translation and Translators in the Soviet Union	17
2. The Soviet Censorship System	45
<b>Part II: Case Studies</b>	
3. Censorship in the Stalin Period: <i>Internatsional'naiia literatura</i>	67
4. Censorship in the Khrushchev Era: <i>Inostrannaia literatura</i>	102
5. Resisting Censorship	141
Conclusion	171
<i>Bibliography</i>	179
<i>Index</i>	196

# Acknowledgements

---

I owe a debt of gratitude to many people who have helped me bring this book to completion. Firstly, I must thank Lara Ryazanova-Clarke and Andrei Rogatchevski, who supervised the PhD thesis on which the book is based. My colleagues at the University of Oxford have provided me with a stimulating and supportive environment in which to finish writing, and Polly Jones has been a generous mentor and friend. I have presented parts of this research at numerous conferences and conventions, and would like to thank all who gave comments and advice. I also warmly thank the staff of the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, the State Archive of the Russian Federation, the archive of the Memorial Society in Moscow, the M. I. Rudomino all-Russian Library of Foreign Literature and the Archive of the East European Research Centre at the University of Bremen.

Research for this project was made possible by an ESRC PhD scholarship awarded by the Centre for Russian, Central and East European Studies. I am grateful for further funding for fieldwork from the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies and the Institute of Historical Research.

I am particularly grateful to Victoria Irvine and Lucy Weir, who have provided me with endless inspiration, advice and coffee breaks, for which I am deeply grateful; and to my brother, Colin, whose encouragement and humour have been much appreciated. My husband, Ashley Good, has supported me unfailingly and uncomplainingly throughout. The greatest debt I owe is to my parents, Anne and Colin Sherry, who have helped me in more ways than I could ever have hoped for. This book is dedicated to the memory of my much-missed grandparents, Jean Sherry, Frank Malone and Jenny Malone.

# Note on Transliteration

---

Transliteration of Cyrillic is carried out according to the Library of Congress system (without diacritics) throughout, except in those cases where Russian authors writing in English have opted for alternative renditions and where Russian authors (such as Gorky) are known by standard forms.



# Introduction

In a memoir written jointly with his wife, Raisa Orlova, the author and, later, dissident Lev Kopelev recalled their attempts to publish Western literature in the Soviet Union before their emigration, romantically portraying the struggle between the intelligentsia and the state that defined the translation and publication of foreign works:

Officials were scared to ‘open the floodgates’ to harmful Western influences, but we wanted the cracks in the iron curtain to turn into breaks and for there to be a flow of new words, new colours, new sounds and, with them, new thoughts, feelings and ideas about life. That is what we worked for. And we hoped that these flows would wash away all the external and internal barriers that held back the development of our literature, our art and prepare the soil for the flowering of all spiritual life.<sup>1</sup>

Foreign literature in translation was eagerly consumed by Soviet readers;<sup>2</sup> from the earliest days of the Soviet regime, it not only represented an ‘escape’ from ideologically correct socialist realism, but was also a desirable object of cultural consumption and a marker of the reader’s highly-educated, cultured status. Among the educated youth especially, foreign literature represented the idealised world culture of which they wished to be a part, and was treated as high culture rather than entertainment.<sup>3</sup> Translation also occupied an important place in Russian culture in terms of its significant influence on the development of Russian literary culture.<sup>4</sup> The publication of translated works of Western authors was closely linked to the broader intercultural relationship 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 comparisons shaped new and consequential calculations of superiority and inferiority between Russia and the West'.<sup>5</sup>

The relationship between Russia and the world outside its borders, of which the status of translation is both a component and a reflection, has a long history and acquired new resonances and meanings in the twentieth century. For several centuries, the West has been a preoccupation of both Russian rulers and the intelligentsia; it has formed a vital component in the definition and construction of Russian and later Soviet identity. Representing a historical and geographical 'Other', the West has been a category against which one can measure what it means to be Russian. As a 'constructed category',<sup>6</sup> the West has been, at various points in history, a model for emulation and a political or technological rival; it is a mark of the complexity of the Russian/ Soviet relationship with the West that these impulses could coexist simultaneously.

Cultural exchange with the West acquired new features after the 1917 revolution, when it became strictly formalised and incorporated into state structures. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, a steady stream of foreign sympathisers, including such figures as George Bernard Shaw, Theodore Dreiser and Paul Robeson, visited the Soviet Union under the auspices of Party organisations such as the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (VOKS), which was established in 1925 to enable – and control – cultural contact with foreign countries. Although it painted itself as an independent organisation, VOKS answered to the Department of Culture and Propaganda of the Party;<sup>7</sup> intercultural activities were closely monitored by the security organs.<sup>8</sup> Some Western intellectuals were received in the Soviet Union as great friends of the country; a few, including H. G. Wells and Henri Barbusse, met and conversed with Stalin personally. In 1935, for example, Romain Rolland observed a parade from atop the Lenin mausoleum alongside Stalin; in 1936 the country extravagantly celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday.<sup>9</sup> VOKS was disbanded in 1958 and replaced by the Union of Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (SSOD), which implemented the cultural agreements made by its associated institution, the State Committee for Cultural Ties (GKKS),<sup>10</sup> organising scientific, cultural and artistic exchanges with their counterparts abroad. Among the most important moments of cultural interaction was the 1957 sixth World Festival of Youth and Students. This mass event marked the first time that Soviet citizens could meet 'real' foreigners, and young people seized upon the popular culture presented to them. Although the festival represented an unprecedented openness compared to previous undertakings, participants still had to be 'prepared' in their reactions, and were warned about the potentially harmful influences of the foreign

guests;<sup>11</sup> the activities of both foreign and Soviet delegates were continually monitored by the authorities.<sup>12</sup> The comparative receptibility of the Soviet Union to foreign culture during the Thaw was striking and highly significant for Soviet citizens; nonetheless, as before, the state was ambivalent about arenas of transnational cultural interaction and sought constantly to monitor, control and even curtail them.<sup>13</sup>

Translation, closely related to other forms of cultural relations, but engaging the individual reader in a particularly intimate way with the West and its cultural products, was, as Kopelev's statement suggests, also incorporated into a state cultural programme driven by several different, sometimes conflicting imperatives. One the one hand, translation was an important weapon in the early Soviet campaign against illiteracy.<sup>14</sup> On the other, the authorities, seeking to play a leading role in 'world culture', sought to co-opt translation, so that the publication of foreign literature became a means by which the Soviet Union could demonstrate its dedication to that cause; partly this was a signal to the West – much in the vein of the official magazines like *Amerika*, distributed abroad to demonstrate the openness and progressiveness of Soviet culture to sceptical foreigners. In essence, translation was of great importance not only for its literary merits, but also in terms of state agendas. Foreign literature was considered by the authorities to have a strong impact on the 'ideological lives' of the population,<sup>15</sup> and so throughout the Soviet period the popular enthusiasm for foreign literature and the desire to learn from the West was tempered by official anxiety about the potentially 'dangerous influences' that foreign works might have on their readers.<sup>16</sup> In 1958, for instance, the Party warned that 'serious errors' in foreign literature and criticism 'threaten[ed] the ideological education and cultural growth of the Soviet people'.<sup>17</sup> The light, entertaining literature favoured by publishers, which communicated no serious ideological or artistic values,<sup>18</sup> could not educate Soviet readers about the dangers of capitalism, colonialism or the other deficiencies of the bourgeois capitalist nations. The authorities' anxiety about the potential for contamination and miseducation of readers manifested itself in the censorship of translation, which sought to neutralise the negative power of foreign items by minimising the impact of bourgeois ideology and Western vulgarity, bringing only what was thought to be useful and valuable to the reader.

*Discourses of Regulation and Resistance* explores the ways in which the state sought to mitigate the danger of foreign influences in literary translation from English into Russian in two important literary journals through the 1930s and early war period, and then during the post-Stalin 'Thaw'. It seeks to understand not only how Western culture was received and reworked in the Soviet context, but also to examine how

ensorship was implemented, exposing the complex layers of interventions that affected all texts published in the Soviet Union. In doing so, it will analyse the conflicts between the censorship apparatus and those agents charged with fulfilling its orders, discussing the tension inherent in the work of translators and editors, who sought to fulfil their literary responsibilities even as they worked to censor the texts for which they were responsible. In this introductory chapter, I will offer a reading of the theoretical literature on censorship, discussing the ‘traditional’ understanding of Soviet censorship in the light of new Western approaches before outlining the structure of the rest of the book.

### THEORISING CENSORSHIP: RUSSIAN AND WESTERN APPROACHES

---

To date, accounts of Soviet censorship, whether in English or Russian,<sup>19</sup> have often described the phenomenon as a part of the totalitarian machine, the repressive application of state power against a downtrodden artist. Arlen Blium, author of several important histories of the censorship system, passionately denounced censorship as ‘an absolute evil’,<sup>20</sup> defining it as

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.<sup>21</sup>

Censorship in Russia and the Soviet Union is most often viewed in terms of control and destruction. It is usually conceived of as a moral issue, and as such implicitly assumes the existence of a ‘free’ cultural agent who would, were it not for the malign action of censorship, produce a ‘pure’, unmarred text. Scholars of Soviet censorship have also emphasised the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon, which bled out beyond the boundaries of party-state institutions to be implemented by authors, artists and editors as well as the official censorship body itself,<sup>22</sup> a fact reflected in the creation by Marianna Tax Choldin of the term ‘omni-censorship’ (usually translated into Russian as *всецензура*), to describe a state where censorship permeated all levels of society, affecting each individual.<sup>23</sup> Blium considered ‘omnicensorship’, the complicity of all cultural agents in the violence of censorship, a uniquely Soviet phenomenon, describing the system as pyramidal, with the Party general secretary at the top and the individual author at the bottom.<sup>24</sup> T. M. Goriaeva

similarly described Soviet political censorship as a ‘multifold, dichotomous and polymorphous phenomenon’,<sup>25</sup> whereby the state used various technologies and strategies to control and limit, but also positively shape cultural and social life; censorship was an ‘all-encompassing systemic mechanism’.<sup>26</sup>

Where studies of the Soviet Union continually emphasise the role of the state as the originator and controller of all censorial activity, Western scholars, inspired by Michel Foucault’s theorisations of power, have in the last two decades significantly reconfigured definitions of censorship,<sup>27</sup> decentring the phenomenon and emphasising the actions of alternative non-state forms of cultural regulation and control. Studies of what has been called by some critics the ‘new censorship’ have sought to liberate the phenomenon from a freedom/repression dichotomy, and move beyond a conceptualisation in terms of ‘sovereign agency’ and ‘deliberate policy’<sup>28</sup> in order to recast censorship as an extremely wide range of practices present at all levels in society, which govern behaviour and discourse in multiple, often unconscious ways.<sup>29</sup> What distinguishes such understandings from ‘traditional’ models is the understanding of censorship as the primary regulative force in society, which is so pervasive that it is internalised by all involved in the creation of discourse, becoming ‘the norm rather than the exception’.<sup>30</sup> Such definitions also emphasise censorship’s productive nature in setting norms, instituting practices and producing linguistic expression.<sup>31</sup> For these post-modern theorists, censorship is incorporated into a set of forces that limit speech as a necessary precondition of discourse and are thus constitutive of all discursive production.<sup>32</sup> Consequently, in such a framework censorship can never be entirely absent and, as Michael Holquist states, ‘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’.<sup>33</sup> Pierre Bourdieu also points to a similar notion of censorship as a largely unconscious precondition of expression in his essay ‘Censorship and the Imposition of Form’, in which he argues that the hierarchy and structure of the cultural field itself ‘governs expression by governing both access to expression and the form of expression’.<sup>34</sup> Such limitation is an unconscious and necessary condition of all discursive production, rendering alternatives ‘literally unthinkable outside of the known forms and recognized norms’.<sup>35</sup> For Bourdieu, regulatory censorship, in the form of explicit prohibitions, eventually becomes unnecessary as norms and standards are internalised by agents and put to work in their own discursive production. Judith Butler prefers to term such embedded forms of controls ‘foreclosure’, in order to emphasise the difference between explicit and implicit operations of power. She notes, however, that the

two are not necessarily diametrically opposed, but that they might be thought of as existing on a continuum.<sup>36</sup> Butler's statement draws attention to a potential danger of the 'new censorship', which is that it risks conflating all forms of social regulation under a single umbrella term, thus blurring boundaries between qualitatively different phenomena. This is a particular risk when considering the operation of censorship in authoritarian countries, where the cultural sphere was centrally controlled and extremely hierarchical, and the danger faced by writers often very real; to 'flatten distinctions among kinds of power' risks trivialising acts of violence and oppression.<sup>37</sup>

Despite such concerns, the new theories of censorship can bring a valuable new perspective to bear on the study of Soviet censorship in action, if we consider the warning articulated by Helen Freshwater that 'censorious events should be analysed with critical emphasis on their socio-historical specificity'.<sup>38</sup> Studies of Soviet censorship must continue therefore to acknowledge the importance of state censorship and other forms of coercion and control. Nonetheless, borrowing where useful from Western approaches should allow for consideration of factors that may otherwise disappear from view. We might be increasingly attentive to the role played by 'structural' censorship or 'foreclosure' and the interaction between internalised and overt forms of regulation, since the internalisation of censorship often depended on the agents learning the 'rules' and applying them unconsciously; indeed, this was a major aim of the censorship institution at certain points in its history. Additionally, the lacunae and ambiguities of censorship may be brought to the fore, prompting consideration of the ways in which censorship might be 'incomplete',<sup>39</sup> and so susceptible to resistance or undermining. Perhaps most importantly, drawing upon contemporary theories of censorship allows one to better understand the 'scope and complexity of censorship, in which relations between censors and victims appear dynamic and multidirectional'.<sup>40</sup>

---

## CENSORSHIP MODES AND PRACTICES

---

*Discourses of Regulation and Resistance* will employ a relatively broad definition of Soviet censorship as a heterogeneous, dispersed set of practices that varied historically and geographically and were carried out by different 'censorial agents'.<sup>41</sup> While the role and influence of party and state institutions was of course of primary importance in this context, I will also focus on the position of the various agents who made up the system, from the Party organs down to editors and translators, as responsibility

for carrying out censorship was dispersed throughout the cultural hierarchy, discussing the struggles and tensions between censorial agents. As such, I am informed by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, who describes the relations between cultural agents as being produced in the dynamic space of the 'cultural field', a space that adheres to an internally coherent set of rules and is structured by the relative position of its agents.<sup>42</sup> Fields are not hermetically sealed: they can be affected by external conditions through 'refraction', and fields with a lower 'refraction coefficient' are less autonomous and more susceptible to being altered by external determinants.<sup>43</sup> The practices of agents within each field is governed by their struggle for cultural and symbolic capital; they are additionally governed by the action of the habitus, the internalised system of socially determined norms and unconsciously applied dispositions, described by Bourdieu as 'principles which generate and organise practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them'.<sup>44</sup> In the Soviet literary field, a 'complex socio-political institution completely governed by the field of power',<sup>45</sup> censorial practices were governed both by the relation between representatives of power and literary actors and by the action of the habitus, as censorial norms were internalised and functioned unconsciously.<sup>46</sup> The impact on the translated text of these various forces will be the focus of this book, which will explore the relationship between different censorial agents and their often overlapping practices; by illuminating the interplay between particular dispositions and the strategies of different agents, a fuller picture of censorship on both the macro and micro levels can be formed. The complexity of the actions of these censorial agents, who combined their censorial role with other identities, is foregrounded throughout.

The actions of censorial agents in implementing censorship are 'manifold' and 'interwoven'.<sup>47</sup> Censorship technique can be divided broadly into two categories: manipulation and exclusion (either of a text from publication or of parts within the text). In practice, the censorship of translated texts occurred at four principal stages in the lengthy process of import, translation and publication: the first stage occurred when foreign items arrived in the country and were examined by the censors at the post office, who decided whether to destroy, release or secretly store them. At the second stage, editors, guided by institutions such as the Central Committee and the writers' union, decided what should be published. Examination of processes and debates surrounding the exclusion (and, complementarily, the inclusion) of foreign texts will allow us to trace developments in ideological attitudes to the West

and the highly instrumental use of foreign literature within the Soviet cultural context.

The third and fourth stages of censorship occurred during the translating and subsequent editing of texts. In my analysis of censorship practices on the level of the text itself, I will build upon the framework elucidated by Herman Ermolaev in his seminal study of the censorship of domestic Soviet literature, in which he delineates two principal categories of censorship. The first category is ‘puritanical’ censorship, which concerned ‘sex, gore, foul language, offensive odours, unpleasant appearance, bad manners, uncleanness and certain parts and functions of the human body’.<sup>48</sup> The second category, political censorship, concerned issues of policy and the Party line, encompassing such topics as external relations, Party initiatives, the portrayal of particular figures or events and attitudes towards the communist regime; as such, it was subject to change according to the policy of the day. The majority of political interventions ‘purported to show the Bolsheviks and their regime in a most favourable light’.<sup>49</sup> Glavlit’s own internal documents termed this ‘ideological–political control’ (*идеолого-политический контроль*), under which title they gathered issues of policy and the portrayal of the USSR, as opposed to censorship based on the *perechen’*, the officially produced list of state and military secrets that could not be openly published.<sup>50</sup> Ermolaev eschews the term ‘ideological censorship’ so as to emphasise the ways in which was defined principally by the Party’s practical – sometimes short-term – goals rather than ideology. However, I will make use of the term to define a third type of censorial intervention, not examined as such in Ermolaev’s schema. Ideological censorship concerns the ideological significance of particular linguistic items, which have been termed ‘ideologemes’ by a number of critics.<sup>51</sup> Ideologemes are linguistic units that contain a reference to metalanguage or ‘fundamental ideological constructions’,<sup>52</sup> and can function as ritualised key markers of authoritative language. In the Soviet Union, these items included terms such as *революция* (revolution) or *партия* (party). In Soviet translations, the ideologeme aroused particular censorial attention because of the discrepancy in terms of the status of such items in the respective source and target cultures. The act of translation produces polyvalence, bringing texts and discourses together in new contexts and releasing new, often unanticipated meanings in the receiving culture.<sup>53</sup> It is precisely the ‘long chains of multiple meanings’ created through translation<sup>54</sup> that are the target of ideological censorship, which sought to resolve the ambiguity of the translated text,<sup>55</sup> reimposing authorised meanings and, as Voloshinov puts it, making ‘the sign uniaccentual’.<sup>56</sup>

The following chapters trace these various modes of censorship as they

were manifested in the translation of foreign literature, dictated from the centre and carried out by the editors and translators of two important Soviet literary journals, *Internatsional'naia literatura* (*International literature*) and *Inostrannaia literatura* (*Foreign literature*).

## STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

Part 1 establishes the historical and cultural context in which the censorship of translation occurred. Chapter 1 discusses the particularly complex and often ambiguous position of the translator and translations in Soviet society. It begins by tracing publication patterns of foreign literature from the rapid early growth of the early post-revolutionary period through the difficult Stalinist period, and then describes the renewed enthusiasm for foreign literature after Stalin's death. It goes on to discuss the ways in which the role of the translator was constituted by the state and by translators themselves. Official discourses, including sanctioned theories of translation, painted the translator as a political figure, whose role was to act as an ideological fighter and gatekeeper, providing the Soviet masses with politically appropriate material and introducing them to canonised authors. By contrasting this rhetoric with translators' own self-definitions – which were much more likely to emphasise disengagement from the state as a moral issue, trying to make of translation a 'free' zone of cultural production – the ambiguity and complexity of their position in the authoritarian culture is revealed.

Chapter 2 lays out the institutional context of the censorship of foreign literature. It examines the structure of the Soviet censorship agency, Glavlit, and describes how it intervened in the receipt and distribution of items imported from abroad, and its role in censoring the texts. It goes on to discuss the censorial roles played by editors and translators, who will come to be the main characters in this study.

Part 2 turns to case studies of regulation and resistance. Chapters 3 and 4 examine in close detail censorship practices in the Stalin and post-Stalin eras respectively. The case studies are drawn from two journals dedicated to the publication and criticism of foreign literature, *Internatsional'naia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura*; these chapters will trace the production of foreign texts from initial selection to final publication through the various stages and layers of censorship. Using archival sources where available, including, for *Inostrannaia literatura*, translators' original typescripts, these chapters expose the hitherto concealed history of translated texts, exploring the debates around which texts to publish and the interventions in the texts themselves. In the

Stalin period, despite the surprising appearance of modernist works in the first half of the 1930s, many later texts show signs of extensive mutilation, their deformations showing how censorship responded to shifting political taboos, resulting in texts that met the requirements of Soviet discourse but bore little relation to their English originals. Chapter 4 demonstrates how the often tentative cultural changes of the Thaw resulted in a greater freedom for translated literature: new themes of human relationships and sexuality began to appear in works by Erskine Caldwell and J. D. Salinger among others. Most importantly, the editors and censors were able to embrace the foreignness of foreign literature, ‘trimming’ the minimum necessary for the text to appear in print. Nonetheless, these changes were often faltering, and texts continued to be subject to manipulation and excision where vulgar and ideological content was concerned.

While Chapters 3 and 4 scrutinise the limits within which editors and translators operated and the ways in which they sought to maximise the space for their work even within censorial boundaries, Chapter 5 examines more marked demonstrations of resistance to censorial interventions, extending the scope of the investigation slightly beyond the end of the Khrushchev era. During the Stalin period, the tactic of Aesopian translation – particularly as it was used by Boris Pasternak, a poet ‘forced’ into translation when he could not publish his own work – allowed for the expression of personal, nonconformist messages behind the ‘shield’ of translation. Later expressions of resistance eschewed any pretence of working within the system, and *samizdat* translations allowed anonymous, sometimes amateur translators almost complete freedom to publish the works they found to be politically or culturally important. Even so, *samizdat* was not a ‘purer’ transmission of the foreign text than the officially published versions, and instances of textual manipulation can also be found even in these clandestine texts.

Censorship of translation is the meeting site between the contradictory forces of the state and the creative individual; translators and editors, even as they acted as censors, were keenly aware of the ways in which they could push the limits of the authorities’ control or even undermine censorship, turning it into a complicated game of wits. The conclusion to *Discourses of Regulation and Resistance* will return to the question of how the censorship of translation sought to mitigate the potentially dangerous influences of foreign culture, a culture that was simultaneously desirable and dangerous, and make it into a useful object for Soviet self-definition. It will consider how this impetus altered over time, and assess the extent to which censorship could ever be completely successful.

## NOTES

1. Kopelev and Orlova, *My zhili v Moskve*, p. 129. Kopelev's statement betrays the now much-critiqued binary thinking of dissident culture. Nonetheless, it also says much about the struggle as it was perceived by those engaged in the publication of foreign works, and about the creation of an intelligentsia identity.
2. Measuring popular enthusiasm concretely poses several methodological difficulties, particularly in the Soviet context, where centrally-set print runs and readership were not necessarily linked. Nonetheless, numerous personal statements made by Soviet citizens attest to the important role it played. Nailya Safiullina, for example, has recorded the response of sympathetic and 'creative' Soviet readers to Western literature in letters to the editorial board of *Internatsional'naiia literatura*. Safiullina, 'Window to the West', p. 130.
3. Tromly, *Making the Soviet Intelligentsia*, pp. 206–8. Sergei Zhuk also notes that the passion for foreign, especially Western, literature was such that the young people of Dnepropetrovsk in the post-Stalin period traded foreign books on the black market. Zhuk, *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City*, p. 122.
4. The tendency for foreign literature to act as a model for emulation became particularly important once again in the 1960s, when the appearance of new translations of American authors including Caldwell, Steinbeck and Hemingway contributed to the development of the 'youth prose' movement. On this topic, see Young, *Sergei Dovlatov and his Narrative Masks*, p. 5.
5. David-Fox, 'The Fellow Travelers Revisited', p. 301.
6. Tolz, *Russia*, p. 197.
7. Ludmila Stern examines its activities in her *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union, 1920–40*, especially Chapters 5–7.
8. The security organs not only policed VOKS' activities but also followed foreign visitors during their trips. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*, p. 57.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 229–44.
10. Notable works on these organisations and their political importance include Barghoorn, *The Soviet Cultural Offensive*; Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War*.
11. Koivunen, 'The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival', p. 56.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
13. This is not to argue that censorship and manipulation existed on only one side of the 'Iron Curtain'. Indeed, the Western presentation of Soviet culture was also highly ideologised, though the main mechanism at work here was market censorship. For example, Verity Clarkson has examined the Western reaction to the Soviet Union as a 'half known' place during the cold war, portrayed as inferior and underdeveloped: see her 'Sputniks and Sideboards', p. 288. Michelle Woods' comparative study of the censorship of Vaclav Havel's plays in Czechoslovakia and the West is a rare exploration of the commonalities and differences between both overt and covert forms of control in each cultural sphere: see Woods, *Censoring Translation*.
14. Brown and Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations of American Literature*, p. 7.
15. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishchei istorii (hereafter RGANI), f. 11, op. 1, d. 8, ll. 95–8. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 45.
16. Choldin, 'Censorship via Translation', p. 29.

17. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 226, ll. 6–12. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 34.
18. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 8, ll. 95–8. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 46.
19. Some of the most important histories of the Soviet censorship apparatus have been written by Arlen Blium. Blium gathered material in secret and only became able to write his major works after the fall of the Soviet Union: see his *Za kulisami 'ministerstva pravdy'; Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora; Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*. Other significant historical surveys include Dewhirst and Farrell, *The Soviet Censorship*; Choldin and Friedberg, *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR*; Babichenko, *Pisateli i tsenzory*; Gorიაeva, *Politicheskaiia tsenzura v SSSR*.
20. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 253.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 253–4.
22. Gorიაeva, *Politicheskaiia tsenzura v SSSR*, p. 11.
23. Choldin, 'Closing and Opening and Closing', p. 294.
24. The system is described in detail in Blium, *A Self-Administered Poison*.
25. Gorიაeva, *Politicheskaiia tsenzura v SSSR*, p. 4.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
27. Foucault wrote extensively on power, and modified his stance somewhat between his early and later works. Important sources include his *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality*. He illustrates the depersonalised diffusion of power as a relationship between agents as follows: '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.' Foucault, 'The Subject and Power', p. 788.
28. Müller, 'Censorship and Cultural Regulation', p. 5.
29. There have been few studies of Soviet censorship to date that draw upon Foucault's work. One exception is the work of Brian James Baer. See for example his 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia'.
30. Post, 'Censorship and Silencing', p. 2.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 2–3.
32. Fish, *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech*, p. 102.
33. Holquist, 'Corrupt Originals', p. 16. Emphasis in the original.
34. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
36. Butler, 'Ruled Out', p. 248.
37. Post, 'Censorship and Silencing', p. 4.
38. Freshwater, 'Towards a Redefinition of Censorship', p. 242. Jan Plamper also makes a similar point in relation to Soviet censorship specifically, stating that 'the historian's task becomes one of figuring out the commonalities and differences and ultimately the logic at work in each case'. Plamper, 'Abolishing Ambiguity', p. 527.
39. Butler, 'Ruled Out', p. 249.
40. Holquist, 'Corrupt Originals', p. 16.
41. In employing the designation 'censorial agents', I intend to highlight the fact that many actors who held responsibility for censorship, editors and translators in particular, did not need to be officially designated as censors or, indeed, act as censors at all times and in all contexts.

42. Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, pp. 162–3.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 182. Ann Komaromi has also stressed the possibility of ‘reading Bourdieu artistically’. Komaromi, ‘The Unofficial Field of Late Soviet Culture’, p. 629.
44. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, p. 72.
45. Zalambani, ‘Literary Policies and Institutions’, p. 251.
46. Bourdieu notes the link between structural and regulatory censorship, stating that the need for censorship to manifest itself explicitly diminished as the standards were internalised, becoming ‘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’. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138.
47. Wolf, ‘Censorship as Cultural Blockage’, p. 50.
48. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. xvii.
49. *Ibid.*, p. xvii.
50. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 935, l. 42. The *perechen*’, which was revised and reissued periodically and updated every few months, listed facts relating to, for example, industry, agriculture, transport and military information. The rules of the *perechen*’, like all Glavlit’s rules, were changeable and governed by current policies and Party actions. Jan Plamper has discussed the *perechen*’ as a tool for maintaining orthodoxy in Soviet culture and for establishing the place of certain cultural products in the collective memory. In this reading of the *perechen*’s cultural function, it was ‘the dialectical counterpart of the Soviet canon, a selection of cultural products placed closest to the centre of Soviet society’. Plamper, ‘Abolishing Ambiguity’, p. 531.
51. Bakhtin, for instance, defined ideologemes as the words of ‘the speaking person in the novel’ and the means by which ‘discourse becomes the object of representation in the novel’. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 333.
52. Guseinov, *D.S.P.: Sovetskie ideologemy v russkom diskurse 1990–kh*, p. 27.
53. Susan Bassnett, ‘The Meek or the Mighty’, p. 11.
54. Gentzler and Tymoczko, ‘Introduction’, p. xiv.
55. On broader attempts to combat discursive ambiguity through censorship during the Stalin period, see Plamper, ‘Abolishing Ambiguity’.
56. Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 23.



PART ONE

# Context



# Translation and Translators in the Soviet Union

In the opening paragraphs of his landmark study of translation, the celebrated children's writer and translator Kornei Chukovskii described translation in the early years of Soviet rule as follows:

Never before in our country has the art of literary translation blossomed as it does now. There has been no other period in the entire history of Russian literature when there existed such a *Pleiad* of talented writers using their talent for translations. There were the geniuses, Zhukovskii and Pushkin, but they were giants among Lilliputians. They rose alone above a crowd of the unskilled and weak – they were individuals who knew no equals. And now the sheer number of magnificent artists of the word who have dedicated themselves to this difficult work demonstrates that something unprecedented has happened. Yes, it has never truly happened until now that so many talents have worked shoulder to shoulder and simultaneously in the space of a single decade on translation.<sup>1</sup>

It is certainly true that literary translation, into Russian and the other languages of the national republics, was 'central to the Soviet project from the beginning'.<sup>2</sup> The extent of the Soviet translation endeavour can be demonstrated by the range of new outlets for publication – journals, books, series and dedicated publishing houses – and by the growing number of works published in translation. The official promotion of translation – critics and scholars proudly pointed to print runs in the millions as proof that it held a particularly special place in Soviet society – was mirrored by a genuine passion for foreign literature among readers. For the so-called 'best-read country in the world', the publication and

consumption of foreign literature was not only a matter of pride, but also a marker of cultural sophistication;<sup>3</sup> translated literature was a crucial part of the ‘world culture’ of which the Soviet intelligentsia felt itself to be a part. For the many readers who were unable to travel beyond their own borders or meet foreigners, translation also had an especially potent appeal as a ‘window onto a semi-forbidden world’.<sup>4</sup> For the cultural authorities, foreign literature could enrich Soviet culture and teach Soviet citizens about the world outside its borders; nonetheless, the consumption of imported cultural products could provoke a sense that Soviet cultural actors ‘looked to the West but were also repelled by it’.<sup>5</sup> Officially, translation was viewed as a ‘matter of great political importance’,<sup>6</sup> and was co-opted into the political sphere in a number of ways. Translation to and from the languages of the republics was intended to further the ‘friendship of the peoples’ and was thus used as a tool to develop the Soviet nationalities policy. From foreign (that is, non-Soviet) languages, translation could be directed towards increasing literacy and cultural awareness. Additionally, it became a means of aligning the Soviet Union with ideologically sympathetic authors abroad and a demonstration to other countries of the sophistication of Soviet culture.<sup>7</sup> In addition to its literary merits, translation was an important instrument of a subtle form of cultural diplomacy.

Translated literature was subject to contradictory impulses on the part of the intelligentsia and the state and the position of translation in Soviet culture at different historical moments was ambivalent and liable to change: the ways in which it was received and used in Soviet culture were always a reflection of the prevailing political atmosphere. This chapter will explore the tension between the official attitude to – and mobilisation of – translation and the attitudes of translators themselves. First offering an overview of the development of translated literature after the revolution, it will go on to examine the official rhetoric on translation as it was expressed in newspaper and institutional discourse and in works of translation theory, which often served as a proxy for ideological battles. The self-identification by translators, who often saw translation as a possible refuge from the intervention of the state, is examined in the light of the requirement that they also act as censors.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSLATION IN SOVIET CULTURE

---

Translation became a particularly significant political and theoretical problem in the early Soviet period. In the wake of the 1917 revolution, it

acquired an important role in the development of the new reading masses; translation was also a means of bringing the best of European culture into the Soviet sphere in order to contribute to the development of the new Soviet literary culture and way of life. As a result, official attitudes to translated literature during the turbulent post-revolutionary period and the early 1920s were generally warm and welcoming, governed by an atmosphere of fascination with the West, which was exemplified by an emerging network of cultural exchange and a prevailing conviction that it could offer useful models from which to learn. Particularly important as a means of furthering internationalist policies, translation began to flourish in the early years of Soviet rule. The number of published translations rose dramatically during the 1920s, the number of titles growing from 134 in 1918 to 782 in 1927.<sup>8</sup> Despite a sharp decline in the immediate aftermath of the revolution, which mirrored trends in the wider publishing sphere and which was due in no small part to the economic and cultural turmoil and the disruption of publishing routes, the subsequent increase in publication of foreign books during the NEP era and the simultaneous appearance of new venues for foreign literature allowed translations to reach a wider audience than had ever been possible before. The mass reader could appreciate, among other things, the 'local color in America' through translations of O. Henry, Mark Twain and Jack London, whose works were published in vast print runs.<sup>9</sup>

The appearance in the very early post-revolutionary years of a number of major officially-sanctioned translation projects is also testament to the authorities' enthusiasm for foreign culture; many became important cultural programmes and were highly influential for following generations. The earliest such undertaking was the establishment in 1918 of a Petrograd-based publishing house, *Vsemirnaia literatura* (International Literature).<sup>10</sup> Masterminded by Maksim Gorky and Anatolii Lunacharskii under the auspices of the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment (Narkompros), it sought to furnish the Soviet reader with a world heritage through the publication of an enormous number of high-quality translations from Western European, American and East Asian literature in book and pamphlet form. At a time when the upheaval of the revolution and civil war still loomed large, *Vsemirnaia literatura's* plans were staggeringly ambitious: to issue a core library of 1,500 titles and a popular library of up to 5,000 titles.<sup>11</sup> Its literary aims were fourfold: to form and enhance links between the workers of different countries; to educate the Soviet public; to 'systematise' the publication of foreign literature;<sup>12</sup> and to act as a monument to the achievements of the new Soviet state.<sup>13</sup> Although embedded in the official apparatus, the journal employed some of the great names of the Silver Age, including

Lev Gumilev and Aleksandr Blok, as translators or editors. Evgenii Zamiatin worked for a time on the editorial board;<sup>14</sup> together with Kornei Chukovskii, who was then head of the Anglo-American section at *Vsemirnaia literatura*, he also led a short-lived journal, issued by the publishing house, entitled *Sovremennyi zapad* (Contemporary West). *Vsemirnaia literatura* served as a refuge for the old cadres who worked unwillingly with Soviet power, but whose ‘erudition and knowledge of languages and world literature could and should be used in the interests of the republic’.<sup>15</sup> In essence, the publishing house was a niche of pre-revolutionary values in a hostile context. Working there allowed members of the former bourgeois intelligentsia to scrape together some kind of living, receiving payment in money or, more usefully, food;<sup>16</sup> the institution also served as ‘group living premises for homeless intellectuals’.<sup>17</sup>

One of *Vsemirnaia literatura*’s central tasks was to formalise the publication of translation, rejecting the haphazard approach of the Tsarist era; in this sense, it was also an exercise in drawing foreign literature into the socio-political institution of Soviet literature under the governance of the Party and the state. In 1919, a literary studio was established that took on a similar role; it arranged a series of seminars and lectures to facilitate the professionalisation of translation and editing, in order to turn translation into a ‘real, worthy profession’.<sup>18</sup> Lengthy discussions of practice and style promoted translation from original texts or literal interlinear translations (*подстрочники*) as opposed to already-existing translations in other languages; collective work was encouraged, and would become an important part of the working practices of translators throughout the Soviet period.<sup>19</sup> The enterprise lost momentum after Gorky left the country in 1921 and was finally disbanded in 1924. Throughout its existence its work was hindered by deep disagreements among the editorial staff, especially in the selection of works for publication, where some members of the board tried to avoid an openly political approach. Further hampered by paper shortages and disputes with the state, the enterprise never quite lived up to its own expectations; nonetheless it managed to produce a respectable 200 titles during its lifetime.<sup>20</sup>

The existence of *Vsemirnaia literatura* overlapped with the development of another important venue for foreign literature, the publisher Academia (its use of the Latin script emphasised both its classical interests and its foreign inclinations), which was established as a private concern in Petrograd in 1921. First attached to Petrograd University, it moved to Moscow in 1929 before being absorbed in 1938 into the state publisher Goslitizdat, at which point it effectively ceased to exist. In its various series Academia published fiction, general works in the

humanities, and classics of Western writing. From 1924, the year it was nationalised, it came to focus more narrowly on art and literature, including translation. Perhaps its most notable achievement was the 'Treasures of World Literature' (*Сокровища мировой литературы*) series, which included works by Swift, Cervantes, Dante and Byron among many others in Russian translation.<sup>21</sup> Academia was closely associated with the advocates of literalism in translation and promoted issues of translation theory and criticism, issuing Kornei Chukovskii's *Isskustvo perevoda* (The Art of Translation), which would become a standard text in the discipline of translation, in 1936.

The 'thick journals' also served as a vital space for the publication of foreign literature, especially for an audience, and the two major foreign literature journals had a pre-Soviet pedigree. The earliest such journal, *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* (Herald of Foreign Literature), was established in 1891 and survived until 1917. A Soviet successor journal with the same title was established in 1928, after the first conference of the International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature (MBRL), and was headed by Lunacharskii.<sup>22</sup> Like the journals that followed, it was a multi-language undertaking. Versions were published in French, German and English as well as Russian. The foreign-language editions, which published reviews and Soviet literature in translation, were created for a market of interested readers abroad; the Russian version acquainted its readers with the most important literary and cultural developments in foreign countries,<sup>23</sup> seeking to steer their interpretations of these works and to control foreign literature in the USSR.<sup>24</sup> Following the reorganisation of the MBRL, and its replacement by the International Association of Revolutionary Writers (MORP), *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* was superseded by the short-lived journal *Literatura mirovoi revoliutsii* (Literature of the World Revolution), edited by Bruno Iasenskii, a Russian-Polish futurist poet. He was arrested and died in the Gulag in 1939.<sup>25</sup> *Literatura mirovoi revoliutsii* was itself replaced by *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in 1933.<sup>26</sup>

Although venues for the publication of translation existed throughout the pre-war period, the official attitude towards foreign literature became quite variable, shifting in accordance with broader shifts in foreign policies. The end of the NEP era signalled changes that would substantially change the position of foreign culture and, as a result, translation, by the end of the following decade. The 'cultural revolution' was a period of attacks against the old 'bourgeois' culture, which caused significant problems for the many translators who had come from that class.<sup>27</sup> In 1930, the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP) temporarily monopolised the Soviet literary scene, establishing

an aggressively class-based approach to literature. RAPP created a set of combative oppositions between proletarian and bourgeois writers, and its use of labels like *свои* (our) and *чужой* (alien) proved ominous for the position of translation. At its second conference, RAPP criticised *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* for ‘passively reflecting, rather than actively promoting, the achievements of international revolutionary literature’, and ordered its reconfiguration.<sup>28</sup> The popularity of foreign writers in their home countries ceased to matter, and political allegiance (always significant) became the primary criteria for determining the selection of books for translation, at least formally speaking. RAPP was disbanded in 1932 and was replaced by the consolidated Union of Soviet Writers, which admitted both communists and non-communists on an equal basis. As a result of the changes in the broader literary scene, translators could once again attempt to cultivate a non-political professional identity in the early 1930s, and translation quickly came to occupy a very prominent position in Soviet literary culture. In 1933, almost a tenth of all authors published in book form were published in translation; in periodicals, the figure was a little under seven per cent.<sup>29</sup> Publishers worried about meeting the demand for translations among readers.<sup>30</sup> The foundation in 1933 of the journal *Literaturnyi kritik* (*Literary Critic*) also contributed towards a more pro-European orientation in Soviet culture. It published a range of critical articles on Western literature and thought, and a range of translations that included, in 1934, Hegel’s *Aesthetics*.<sup>31</sup>

Although continuing paper shortages and other practical issues meant that translation print runs in the early 1930s were small and translations often appeared with long delays after publication in their original languages,<sup>32</sup> the recurrent upheaval in the cultural sphere had indirectly positive results. Continued shortages and practical problems in, for example, recruiting institutional personnel with foreign language skills meant that there was a ‘lack of a clear, centralised programme for the handling of foreign literature’,<sup>33</sup> thus inadvertently turning translation into a space where creative agents could work with relatively little interference from the state. In addition, Glavlit had not yet produced proper guidelines for the censorship of foreign material. The ongoing inability of the state to enact strict controls in these years meant that text choice was somewhat unregulated until the mid-1930s, and was governed largely by translators’ own initiative.<sup>34</sup> The relative – and surprising – freedom that translation experienced even while socialist realism was established as the official literary method is a manifestation of what Katerina Clark has described as the cosmopolitanism that marked intelligentsia culture of the early Stalin period. Even as Soviet culture became increasingly strongly regulated, more closed and autarchic, it ‘simultaneously became

more involved with foreign trends'.<sup>35</sup> Noting that 'national ambitions in the international arena' were an important factor in the large wave of translations published during the 1930s,<sup>36</sup> Clark describes translation as a way of participating 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'.<sup>37</sup> Although a clear preference for left-wing, ideologically 'appropriate' writers can be demonstrated, readers were still able to explore in Western literature human relationships and high-quality writing. This was the period that 'established the fondness for Hemingway, Steinbeck, Caldwell and Wright. On the whole, the Soviet public was given an opportunity to read, and showed a preference for, much of the best contemporary American literature'.<sup>38</sup> The fact that this continued enthusiasm for translated literature occurred at the same time as a shrinking of the Soviet ideological space and a growing 'totalitarianism' should prompt a reconsideration of the usual narrative that frames Stalinist society as completely closed, and encourage a renewed appreciation of the continued interaction with the outside world in this decade.

In the late 1930s, the cosmopolitan tendencies of earlier years began to disappear. Processes of the institutionalisation of literature and an increasing atmosphere of xenophobia began to impact on Soviet translation culture. Many translators, now judged to display a 'suspicious interest in foreign lands and culture',<sup>39</sup> were killed in the purges.<sup>40</sup> The USSR's growing isolation made it more difficult and dangerous for translators to maintain links abroad; the flow of material for translation was sharply curbed and subject to increasing interference. The official tolerance for the West and for Western cultural products had started to run out. By the last years of the decade, the 'Stalinist superiority complex' had begun to manifest itself in 'anti-foreign isolationism',<sup>41</sup> with the result that anti-Western rhetoric markedly increased and suspicion of foreigners, or those with links abroad, grew dramatically. The most intense period of cultural exchange with the West was definitively over by the end of the 1930s. Correspondingly, the status of translation also declined in those years, in terms of both scale and status, and the number of translations decreased sharply; by 1940, the year that the outward-looking *Literaturnyi kritik* was closed, only 348 foreign titles were published in a total print run of 5.1 million copies.<sup>42</sup>

The entry of the Soviet Union into the war had a drastic impact on all areas of Soviet publishing. Publication resources were redirected in such a way that around forty per cent of all books and pamphlets concerned the war.<sup>43</sup> The effect on translation was also severe. A further drop in the number of translations published was accompanied by a

much more conservative choice of texts than had previously been the case. Experimental works mostly disappeared, replaced by consistently popular, officially-sanctioned 'safe' choices such as Theodore Dreiser or Upton Sinclair, both of whom were left-wing and pro-Soviet and were therefore regarded as 'sources of cultural stability'.<sup>44</sup> Aside from a short period in 1945–6, during which political links with the USSR's allies allowed translated literature to experience a short and limited 'renaissance',<sup>45</sup> the post-war years marked the nadir of Soviet–Western relations. It was at this time that the anti-cosmopolitanism campaigns reached their height, a fierce anti-Western campaign took place, and nationalist propaganda sought to prevent the spread of Western ideas.<sup>46</sup> This resulted in the development of a profound mistrust of foreigners, those with links abroad or specialists in foreign languages. Although the publishing system as a whole rapidly recovered,<sup>47</sup> foreign literature reached its lowest ebb during the early cold war years. As the West was reconfigured as the enemy, works that did not condemn American decadence were excluded from publication. Authors popular in the 1930s were 'officially denounced or quietly discarded',<sup>48</sup> and the West came to be represented in the literary field solely by orthodox communists like Howard Fast (at least until he rejected the Soviet cause in the 1950s) or historically remote and thus ideologically 'harmless' nineteenth-century authors.

It was only after Stalin's death that translated literature would start to recover, and eventually develop even further than it had during the Stalin period. The start of the Thaw brought about great upheaval in Soviet society, but, crucially, it also released forces of liberalisation – albeit limited and often reversible – in Soviet culture, one important aspect of which was the turning of the Soviet gaze outwards, and a renewed engagement with Western countries. The revival of cultural interaction with the West stemmed initially from the concern that isolation from the rest of the world had made Soviet culture 'backward'. Formal cultural exchanges were reinstated and expanded, and it became easier to make and maintain contacts with foreign authors. The study of foreign languages was revived, with new institutions set up to this end. The cautious reappraisal of Soviet–Western relations allowed an attempt to be made to 'rehabilitate' foreign literature,<sup>49</sup> leading to a substantial regrowth of translation in comparison to the late Stalin period. These changes quickly brought about a broader opening up of the Soviet world in cultural and political terms. The 'nervous adoption of foreign literature'<sup>50</sup> of this period developed into a much deeper engagement, so that foreign literature came once again to occupy a vital role in the Soviet literary sphere – not solely as an 'escape' from the rules and restrictions of domestic literary production, but as a model that,

through its engagement with Soviet literature, encouraged a new range of literary modes to emerge.<sup>51</sup> During the 1950s and 1960s, multi-volume sets of works by foreign authors reached a wide audience, allowing Soviet readers to become reacquainted with writers like Ernest Hemingway, who had fallen out of favour after *For Whom the Bell Tolls* had been banned, or others who were now being published for the first time.<sup>52</sup>

New publishing initiatives also began to appear: after a gap of more than a decade, a major new journal dedicated to translation, *Inostrannaia literatura*, was founded in 1955.<sup>53</sup> A few years later, a descendant of *Vsemirnaia literatura* was born in the form of a major series dedicated to the publication of translations of contemporary and classical literature as well as Russian literature. Launched to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution, the 'Library of World Literature' (*Библиотека всемирной литературы*) series sought to present the Soviet reader with 'a universal version of world culture that would fit into a Soviet flat'.<sup>54</sup> It published two hundred volumes in the 1960s and 1970s, with a print run of 303,000 copies each.<sup>55</sup>

A rise in the number of translations published had begun in the very last years of Stalin's rule,<sup>56</sup> but it increased even more markedly after his death. In 1955, 1,189 titles were translated from foreign languages into the languages of the USSR, including 818 into Russian, the largest proportion of which was translated from English.<sup>57</sup> By 1960, this had grown to 2,498 titles from foreign languages into the languages of the USSR, including 1,830 into Russian. Of these, 715 titles were translated from English. Literary translations made up almost half of the total translations into all Soviet languages.<sup>58</sup> The difference between the worst years of the Stalin period and the Thaw period are striking: between 1940 and 1960 the number of foreign titles published in a year had almost tripled and the total print run of these items increased in the same period by 1,457 per cent, to a total of 79.4 million copies. Translated literature had come to be an important and integral part of the Soviet literary culture, and the Soviet Union became the most prolific publisher of translated literature in the world, translating more than twice as many titles as France and around four times as many as the United Kingdom. This was due in no small part to the large translation efforts in relation to the languages of the Soviet republics, though foreign translations were a significant proportion of the total.<sup>59</sup> By the mid-1960s, this rise had levelled off, and a modest drop in the number of translations can be observed.<sup>60</sup> Of 1,942 titles translated from foreign languages into the languages of the various Soviet republics, 1,345 were translated into Russian. English and the Western European languages remained the dominant languages of translation.<sup>61</sup>

Improved relations with the West and the increased presence of foreign people and foreign texts in Soviet culture had important implications for the 'ideological life of the Soviet people', and so the Central Committee continued to pay close attention to the publications of works by foreign authors.<sup>62</sup> Concerned by the haphazard approach of publishers and journals to foreign literature, which allowed too many 'bourgeois' works to appear, it complained that too often 'aimlessness and chance rule. Some publishers and the Ministry of Culture display an unserious attitude to the publication of translated foreign literature with the result that ideological errors are made in this sphere of work'.<sup>63</sup> As a result, the Central Committee pushed for a politicised approach to translation, criticising publishers who prioritised commercial factors over ideological and artistic ones and who thereby neglected their responsibility to 'educate' readers.<sup>64</sup> In 1958, the Central Committee Commission on Questions of Ideology, Culture and International Party Contacts sought to further systematise the publication of foreign material by restricting the right of organisations to purchase foreign texts from abroad and lowering the amount of foreign currency that could be assigned to that task. Those organisations that were able to bring foreign items in were to be monitored more carefully.<sup>65</sup>

As Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo have pointed out, the period 'saw the return to a dialogue with foreign literature, but anxiety about the effect that it might have in the USSR persisted; censorship and proscription therefore also persisted'.<sup>66</sup> Nonetheless, the significance of foreign culture in translation could not be simply ignored, and it continued to be a vital aspect of Soviet cultural consumption throughout the post-Stalin era.

## SOVIET TRANSLATION THEORY

---

One vital factor that governed translation was the development of an officially sanctioned theory of translation that grew out of Stalinist debates in the 1930s, which were consolidated in the 1950s. Soviet translation theory was rooted in traditional arguments over 'free' versus 'literal' translation.<sup>67</sup> These issues acquired their particular ideological gloss in debates that saw the theory of translation develop not only as an 'applied science', but also as a 'part of Marxist–Leninist literary theory'.<sup>68</sup>

Until the late 1920s, a more-or-less experimental approach to translation favoured a literal approach. The most famous proponents of literalism included Mikhail Lozinskii, a translator of Shakespeare and Dante, and Evgenii Lann, best known for his translations of Dickens'

novels. Literal translation privileged the faithful reproduction of form and content in the transfer of the foreign text into the target language, muting the voice of the translator and allowing the source culture to come through. In the Soviet Union, literalist translators ‘expanded the lexicon of literary renditions’, with beneficial results for the development of the discipline.<sup>69</sup> Nonetheless, the approach fell out of favour in the 1930s; as free translation began to win the battle for dominance, its opponent was attacked as ‘useless and senseless’.<sup>70</sup> The battle between the two approaches had strongly ideological overtones: literalism came to be commonly labelled ‘formalism’, and so represented the antithesis of the new socialist realist literary method. Formalism, since it was writer-rather than reader-oriented, could not appeal to the mass reader and so could not educate or engage them;<sup>71</sup> in its focus on the word, it could not appreciate or transmit the ideological and artistic unity of the original. Lann’s literalist translations of Dickens were attacked for emasculating the idea and deadening the form<sup>72</sup> and were therefore subject to intense scrutiny and reworking.<sup>73</sup> Eventually, the ‘formalists’ found themselves forced to withdraw from literary activity.

Although used as a weapon against translators from the early part of the decade, the formalist label would not ‘acquire its full repressive potential’ until January 1936,<sup>74</sup> when, almost simultaneously, *Pravda* launched its anti-formalist campaign and the translators’ section of the Union of Writers held its first all-Union Translators’ Conference. The meeting was a key event in the development of translation theory as the last public event where literal approaches could be strongly argued for;<sup>75</sup> it was also where free translation won its decisive victory, when a resolution was issued that condemned the continuing domination of ‘aesthetic’ and ‘formalist’ theory and the absence of a suitably Marxist–Leninist theory of translation.<sup>76</sup> The conference also established the terminology of translation that would see free, ‘realist’ translation adopted as an official method, which would become more fully developed in the theoretical writings of the 1950s and thus further contribute to the ideologisation of translation. Adopting the language of anti-cosmopolitanism, the anti-formalist campaign derided literalism for failing to respect the Russian language and by extension Russian culture. Through their ‘submission to the “foreign”’,<sup>77</sup> formalist translators played into the hands of the imperial, bourgeois Western world.<sup>78</sup> By the late 1930s, ‘free’ or realist translation was thus firmly established as the only sanctioned approach. It called for a focus on the translated work as a unified whole and for ‘historical objectivity and maximum fullness in the translation of the ideological sense of the original, not literal but actual – artistic – exactness in the transmission of words and expressions’.<sup>79</sup> It was not

until the later Stalin period that realist translation would acquire a fully established body of theoretical literature. The main steps were taken in 1951, when speakers at the second all-Union Conference of Translators argued that it was necessary to develop a unified theory that would improve the culture of translation and the level of the craft;<sup>80</sup> it was here that realist translation was definitively established. Although introduced by the Ukrainian critic Aleksandr Mikhailovich Leites, it was Ivan Aleksandrovich Kashkin who would bring it to its fullest development.

Kashkin, who would become perhaps the most important translation theorist, was a well-known translator and literary critic and a specialist in English literature. He taught English at the Moscow Institute of New Languages (now the Moscow State Linguistic University) from the late 1920s, where he built up a circle of translators and began to acquire positions of authority in literary organisations, particularly the translators' section of the Writers' Union. His circle, known colloquially as the *kashkintsy* (*кашкинцы*), included many of the USSR's most prominent and prolific translators. Its activities included training seminars and the production of group translations, including important contemporary works such as their translation of Joyce.<sup>81</sup> They were also involved in the two-volume (almost) complete works of Ernest Hemingway published in 1959. The *kashkintsy* became equated almost entirely with the Soviet school of translation; they fought against the poor quality of older translations, believing that 'the translator must pursue the spirit and not the letter of the text',<sup>82</sup> a belief that neatly dovetailed with the principles of realist translation and which spurred Kashkin on in his fight against the formalists. Although many translators had a more literary inclination and were little interested in political issues, the circle, which operated under the auspices of the Writers' Union, brought translators into a state-sanctioned structure.

Unlike most of the rest of his collective, Kashkin was deeply politically engaged. He was described by several contemporaries as a vicious ideologue. Kornei Chukovskii referred to him in his diary as a 'scoundrel'<sup>83</sup> and Nikolai Liubimov, the translator of *Don Quixote*, went even further, describing him as 'mentally ill, unbalanced, suspicious, distrustful'.<sup>84</sup> According to Liubimov, Kashkin wasted his considerable talent on baseless attacks and would 'with maniacal tenacity drone on and on about the same thing'.<sup>85</sup> It is certainly true that Kashkin readily transposed literary criticism into political critique, framing his denunciations of the formalists in particular as political betrayals. Thus at a meeting of the translators' section of the Writers' Union he accused Georgii Shengeli's 1947 translation of *Don Juan* of belittling and distorting the image of Aleksandr Suvorov, the Russian Field Marshall featured

in Byron's poem. He called Evgenii Lann and his wife Aleksandra Krivtsova, who translated Dickens, 'rootless cosmopolitans', the threatening official euphemism for 'Jew'.<sup>86</sup>

In the early 1950s, Kashkin was among the first to outline systematically the theory of realist translation, and a large body of work soon emerged; objections to the model developed by him and other theorists were 'timid and ultimately ineffectual',<sup>87</sup> and realist translation remained dominant as an officially sanctioned approach throughout the rest of the Soviet period, defining the Soviet 'school' of translation. Realist translation, unlike literalism, mandated a free approach to the text that did not 'photograph the text of the original', but should instead 'creatively produce it in the Russian language',<sup>88</sup> so that the reader should be able to understand without difficulty. Translations should read as though they had been originally written in Russian; they should 'reach out to the reader',<sup>89</sup> so that they would be accessible to the broad masses. The translated work should, according to this doctrine, 'look behind' the words of the original to faithfully carry across the vision of the author.<sup>90</sup> Realist translation was, as the name suggests, more than a simple linguistic approach; rather it was conceived of as a branch of socialist realism. Realist translations were to interpret the original in the light of the target cultural and historical context and, instead of simply carrying out a straight linguistic transfer, should portray a deeper truth; crucially, that truth should be tuned to the Soviet ideological context. Through the translator, the reader should perceive 'all that is progressive, alive and relevant . . . for our times'.<sup>91</sup> So realist translation was not concerned with the depiction of surface detail, but rather a deeper reality, as Kashkin states:

Our Soviet translation is not a dead mirror image, but a creative work, since we absorb and recreate the reality of the original in the light of our world outlook, and unavoidably reflect the participation of the translator in the life of Soviet literature. In this regard, the most important thing is the understanding and true interpretation of the original based on an understanding of the link between art and life; among the most important criteria of such an understanding are ideological truth and historical concreteness, taken in their revolutionary development.<sup>92</sup>

As noble as the realist rhetoric sounded, the ideological appropriation of the foreign text was used to facilitate 'minor censorship' of translations.<sup>93</sup> The emphasis on the translator's agency and creativity and the need to interpret and recreate the foreign text also implied that realist

translations should modify the text to meet the norms of the target culture; realist theory expected the translator to understand which parts of the texts should be emphasised and which should be played down. Kashkin exhorted translators to transmit all that was important and meaningful for the Soviet, but also reminded them not to ‘burden’ the translated text with ‘unnecessary details that are exclusive to the alien linguistic structure and often should simply not be translated’.<sup>94</sup> The bland statement that the words of the foreign author should sound in Russian ‘as though he had himself written the work in the Russian language’ acquire a rather different tone in the light of such assertions: transmitting the ‘reality’ behind the original comes to mean writing what the author would have said, were he or she properly educated in Soviet ideology. The doctrine of realist translation also demanded the full ideological engagement of the translator as a ‘representative of the progressive social formation’.<sup>95</sup> To meet the standards of realist translation fully it was therefore necessary to be ideologically educated, so as to avoid the faults of ‘dogmatism, formalism, reductionism and falsification’.<sup>96</sup> As a result, realist translation was a primary contributor towards the official conception of the translator as an ideological fighter, an image that was repeatedly articulated and refined in the official discourse. In the next section, I will discuss how this model was expressed at the institutional level before examining the means by which it was accepted, repudiated or modified by translators themselves.

## THE OFFICIAL IMAGE OF TRANSLATORS

After the revolution, when translation was, like all other cultural spheres, mobilised in service of the new regime, translators were incorporated into the ‘class struggle on the literary front’.<sup>97</sup> The social and political importance of translation and translators was constantly rearticulated during the Soviet period. One such example is found in a 1935 *Pravda* editorial, which tells its readers that the work of translators was not only art, but also ‘incredibly responsible and honourable work’;<sup>98</sup> such formulations were found repeatedly in the press and were reproduced by the main institutions governing translation, principally the Writers’ Union.

For translators from foreign languages the translators’ section was an important arena for the articulation of the role of the translator and the establishment – or at least the public expression – of norms of behaviour and ideological attitudes. At the first congress of the Writers’ Union in 1934 Chukovskii, in a speech rather different from his more private reflections, announced:

I allow myself here, at this podium, to talk so much about translations because in this Soviet country the question of translation is not the monastic [*келейное*] affair of a few literary pedants; nor is it an academic topic for yet another philologist's dissertation. Rather, it is in an issue of the greatest state importance, in which millions are viscerally interested.<sup>99</sup>

Such statements set the tone for the public debate on translation of the Stalin and post-Stalin periods, much of which took place under the umbrella of the translators' section of the Writers' Union. Like other professional bodies, the translators' section acted not only as one of a set of 'institutions of consecration',<sup>100</sup> in the sense that it offered members professional prestige, but also as a control institution that governed who might work in the field and attempted to create political norms. The following year, at the first all-Union conference of translators, Chukovskii spoke of translation in very similar terms to those expressed at the recent Writers' Union congress. While translators were often looked down on as second-rate 'artists of the word', they deserved great respect, 'so huge is the political role that they play in our country'.<sup>101</sup> One of the conference's main aims was to strengthen further the idea of translation as an ideologically meaningful and socially important task. Translation could either, according to the speaker Iogann Al'tman, strengthen the Soviet Union or become part of a wrecker's toolkit.<sup>102</sup> The leadership of the translators' section – if not the rank and file members themselves – consistently asserted the translator's political responsibility, often in striking terms. Semen Grigor'evich Zaimovskii, in an address to a meeting of the section in 1935, employed a military metaphor to make his point, claiming that, 'in the USSR the translator, like every writer, is a fighter on the cultural front for the idea of socialism . . . The demands made upon the translator are political, artistic and scientific'. The translator was, he continued, 'a member of the Soviet literary family'.<sup>103</sup>

In the late Stalin period, the section sought to consolidate its ideological position: strengthening the translators' section was part of an attempt to make translation more carefully planned and better coordinated with the demands of the state hierarchy – the leadership strove for harmonisation with publishing houses and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.<sup>104</sup> Records of a meeting held to accompany the election of the section's committee indicate the direction in which the section was leaning. The leadership indicated that previous years had seen the building of a strong professional foundation for translators' work, but the coming decade should witness an expansion 'so that the committee will act as a leader and ideological educator' of translators whose 'ideological-political level,

well established before the war' had weakened.<sup>105</sup> The speech given by Ivan Kashkin, elected head of the committee at the meeting, captures the official position on translation. Kashkin began by emphasising the need for translation to be socially and politically situated:

We should not take our work in isolation from the general situation. The world is in a state of intense battle between moribund capitalism and the ever-strengthening forces of this socialist country and the neighbouring people's democracies. When acquainting the Soviet reader with the works of foreign writers, we are doing great and responsible work, and to become a conscious participant in it we must work out how our publications can fully and correctly reflect this struggle. We should actively help publishers to deepen, widen and strengthen their work on translations, not forgetting for a single minute that the general principle of *partiinost'* extends, of course, to translation.<sup>106</sup>

He went on to argue for improved education of translators, which would improve both the quality and social standing of their work; this program was closely related to and should therefore be carried out in parallel with attempts to 'raise the ideological-political and artistic level of translators',<sup>107</sup> which he envisioned being made part of formal programmes that would include systematic critique and competitions.

Kashkin's speech employed two important metaphors to describe the Soviet translator, both of which were repeatedly employed in the critical writing. The first is of translators as teachers; in this speech Kashkin cast translators as pedagogical agents, whose duty it was to lead the Soviet reader through the unfamiliar landscape of foreign literature, and so advance state agendas. 'It is not enough now to be only a mirror that passively reflects reality,' he stated, continuing,

We should not and do not wish to soil the consciousness of the Soviet reader with translations of Sartre or Henry Miller, Faulkner or André Gide, whose repulsive writing has been explained and appraised in detail in a series of articles. Translation, as far as it is able, should also actively interfere, correctly reflecting reality, and actively help the reader to understand reality.<sup>108</sup>

Instead, the translator had a duty to educate the reader in the work of contemporary writers like Sean O'Casey and Howard Fast as well as acknowledged classics of world literature. Kashkin's second metaphor,

which appeared several times in his writing on translation and which is also encountered repeatedly in the public discourse, is the translator as soldier, recalling Zaimovich's earlier formulation: if translation was a battlefield, then the translator stood on its front line. Their aim was 'success on the translation front (*на переводном фронте*)'.<sup>109</sup> For Kashkin, translation was the active and purposeful weapon of socialism, to be wielded in the ideological struggle for Soviet culture. Subsequent speakers agreed with the terms of Kashkin's speech, though their responses were rather less strident. Vera Oskarovna Stanevich, for example, agreed that translators wielded the tools for the 'construction of communism', which could be achieved only by 'strongly principled and planned work with people' which maintained a 'deep and thorough connection with the ideas of Marxism–Leninism'.<sup>110</sup> Most of the discussion among other members of the bureau was, however, focused on improving the professionalism – by which was meant attention to quality, good planning and remuneration – of translators and making the translators' section work more efficiently, rather than expressing particularly ideological views.

After Stalin's death, ideological rhetoric featured less overtly in internal debates among translators, though it did not vanish completely. Records of a 1955 meeting of the translators' section of the Moscow branch of the Writers' Union, where issues of literary quality and translation training were discussed at length, also paint a picture of translation as a practice with a principally social function. Sergei Vladimirovich Mikhalkov, the head of the Union's foreign commission – an author rather than translator by profession – emphasised the Soviet Union's strengthening international links and growing contacts between Soviet writers and those in other countries.<sup>111</sup> The translator, as a result, must consider him- or herself a 'social actor, as an important component in the operation of international relations between the Soviet Union and other countries'.<sup>112</sup> He emphasised that the translator 'should remember their political responsibility to the Soviet reader and viewer [of translated drama]'.<sup>113</sup> Part of that responsibility was to demonstrate care about what to translate, adhering to a set of 'ethical norms' in the presentation of suitable works to the reader.<sup>114</sup> Mikhalkov also encouraged translators to work closely with the foreign commission, using it as a conduit through which foreign authors could be accessed and formal cultural contacts maintained. In doing so they could contribute to the 'strengthening of international relations'.<sup>115</sup>

During the 1950s, the Culture Section of the Central Committee also emphasised the ideological nature of the translator's work. Like Kashkin and the leadership of the translators' section, the Culture Section also

cast translators in a pedagogical role, charging them with the education of Soviet readers about the dangers of capitalism, colonialism and other problems of the bourgeois countries.<sup>116</sup> The Culture Section also primarily considered translators as part of the ideological apparatus, in a similar way to Mikhalkov's description of translators as 'components', and expressed its disapproval at an insufficiently collective, planned approach. The subjective – and thus fallible – approach of the translator alone could be harmful to the development of a progressive canon of foreign literature, requiring tighter control of translators on the part of institutions such as publishing houses.<sup>117</sup> As ideological actors, translators were expected to engage in censorship as they worked, and to remain alert to the political significance of their texts; as the author of the translated text, the translator should pay attention to political factors and display a sense of responsibility towards their work.<sup>118</sup> Although they did not hold primary responsibility for ideological questions,<sup>119</sup> the authorities, including Glavlit, expected that they remain attentive to the content of their translations.<sup>120</sup> Censorship was thus seen as an integral part of the work of the translator: to translate in the realist mould meant to engage in self-censorship.

The official discourse on the cultural role of translators, supported by a theoretical approach that supported and reproduced the Party line on literature, consistently asserted translators' political status, casting them in a narrow set of ideologically defined roles. But how did translators themselves conceive of their own cultural position? Did their subjective feelings mirror the image created by the state, or challenge it?

---

## TRANSLATORS AS APOLITICAL INTELLECTUALS

---

For many writers of the Stalin period, translation was something of a refuge and allowed them to produce creative work when other avenues were closed off to them. In 1968, Efim Etkind, in the introduction to the collection *Mastera stikhotvornogo perevoda* (Masters of Verse Translation), wrote that, 'deprived of the possibilities of expressing themselves to the full in original writing', Soviet poets 'spoke to the reader in the language of Goethe, Orbeliani, Shakespeare, and Hugo'.<sup>121</sup> The retreat to translation by Soviet novelists and poets was described by Maurice Friedberg as 'literary forced labour' and 'translation under duress'.<sup>122</sup> Natal'ia Trauberg (who began translating somewhat later) remembered it somewhat differently, describing translation in positive terms as a free space for creative expression: 'translation was for us the only way to say what we wanted'.<sup>123</sup> Translation was therefore an important outlet for those

authors excluded from the domestic literary sphere, whether that was for purely financial or more literary reasons. This category of somewhat reluctant (though hardly mediocre) translators included a number of important Soviet writers, such as Marina Tsvetaeva. After her return to the Soviet Union from emigration in Paris in 1939 she was unable to publish her own work, and was eventually commissioned to translate Georgian, Polish and Yiddish poetry.<sup>124</sup> Her translation *oeuvre* was quite varied, taking in German folklore and the ballads of Robin Hood as well as contemporary poetry.<sup>125</sup> The work afforded her a very modest income; more important, however, was her insistence on its status as true creative work. She worked carefully and slowly, seeking to find the true poetic essence of the works she translated and emphasising the artistry and poetry in her practice, which remained ‘deeply grounded in the sense of freedom’.<sup>126</sup> Her focus on imaginative factors, expressed in a careful attention to issues of verse, rhyme and rhythm and a dislike of blank verse, betrayed a ‘formalist’ and thus potentially dangerous privileging of form over content, which meant that she could not enter the pantheon of ‘realist’ translators. Although she was ‘hurt’ by being reduced to a mere translator,<sup>127</sup> Tsvetaeva nonetheless rejected a purely instrumental view of translation as only a source of income, investing her considerable literary powers in her new role as an interpreter, rather than original creator of poetry and refusing to be drawn overtly in to any of the politicised literary debates of the time. Nonetheless, even though her freedom to create was much limited, Tsvetaeva did not simply churn out the kind of translations that would meet with official approval; she continued to mark out a literary space for herself, quietly asserting her literary identity and thus obliquely challenging the socialist realist norms of the literary sphere.

Boris Pasternak is perhaps the most famous Soviet poet–translator. He too came to translation as a ‘refuge’ in the 1930s and 1940s, when it was impossible for him to publish original work. He would make a considerable impact in that field, even addressing the first all-Union conference of translators in 1935. As well as his well-received translations of Georgian verse, which included odes to Stalin by Paolo Iashvili and Nikolo Mitsishvili, he was known for his translation of Shakespeare.<sup>128</sup> As Tsvetaeva also expressed, the thought that he should become ‘merely a translator’ caused Pasternak great pain.<sup>129</sup> Nonetheless, he was for a time in the 1930s considered to be a role model for translators; his reputation as an original writer allowed him to gain status as ‘more than “just a translator”’.<sup>130</sup> Crucially for Pasternak, translation, despite a subordinate status that resulted in a relative lack of prestige, was not so tainted with association with the state. After the *Doctor Zhivago* scandal, when he was once again in a perilous professional position, he again described

translation as a retreat and, according to Chukovskii's account, declared that before expressing any regret or realigning himself with the Soviet state he would 'tell them I'm only willing to be a translator, and refuse to write original verse'.<sup>131</sup>

Brian James Baer has stated that the Soviet intelligentsia saw translation as 'more or less apolitical',<sup>132</sup> believing it to occupy a separate plane to the heavily politicised arena of domestic literature. Alfred Kazin, the American writer, editor and critic, said of the *Inostrannaia literatura* translators he met on a visit to Moscow in the 1960s that they 'in public sounded like "organs of state security" and in private laughed at themselves and me for taking them seriously'.<sup>133</sup> The intelligentsia, including translators of course, tended to conceive of translation in ethical terms: translators portrayed themselves as serving the "eternal" or universal values of art in preference to the fleeing and shifting political values of the party or state'.<sup>134</sup> While the idea of a strictly binary split between public and private spheres, in which individuals publically parroted the regime's rhetoric and privately resisted, has been extensively critiqued in recent years,<sup>135</sup> translators' rhetoric tended to portray exactly such a division in the interests of creating a non-ideological self-image. Translators' memoirs function as extended exercises in subjectivisation or myth-making, creating an idealised, if not entirely accurate, identity that emphasised disengagement from ideology and the state.

In texts intended for public consumption, such as memoirs, most translators were (and remain) very reluctant to address the political aspects of their work in any detail or say much about any difficulties they may have faced in publishing work, often preferring to fix their place in literary history by recounting stories of friendships with famous literary figures, or prioritising stylistic and technical issues. Natal'ia Trauberg, whose work was political in as much as she published a number of translations in *samizdat* during the 1960s and 1970s,<sup>136</sup> seems reluctant to discuss these factors in great detail. In an interview published in 2008 she would say only that in the late Soviet period some translators could 'express their individuality' and that 'nobody did anything about it'.<sup>137</sup> A fragment of a memoir published by Rita Rait-Kovaleva, one of the most famous members of the school of Soviet translation, focused almost entirely on her relationships with literary figures such as Vladimir Mayakovsky and Boris Pasternak, making no mention of the political factors that impinged on her work.<sup>138</sup>

The identity of the translator as a 'selfless intellectual toiling at the altar of high culture'<sup>139</sup> was created in part in the more informal social spaces run by rank-and-file translators themselves. One such arena was the translation seminar established at the House of the Leningrad

Writer's Union in 1954 by the translator El'ga L'vovna Linetskaia.<sup>140</sup> The seminar, at which Efim Etkind led the German prose section, was one of a number of activities that helped to create a somewhat freer atmosphere for literary creation in Leningrad during the Thaw;<sup>141</sup> it also contributed to the creation of an important Leningrad 'school' of translation. The group eventually moved unofficially to Linetskaia's home, a fact that says much about the close social links and bonds of friendship between its members.<sup>142</sup> The participants consciously drew a line between themselves and the authorities: anyone who had excessively close attachments to power was an object of suspicion and moral judgement for these self-identified *litterateurs*; any attachment to the authorities was considered 'amoral'.<sup>143</sup> Being part of this group of translators and engaging in translation and discussion with the other members was an almost spiritual experience. Konstantin Azadovskii remembered his time as a young man at the seminars in such terms: 'What did I learn under El'ga L'vovna? The art of translation? Perhaps. Poetic ability and taste? Undoubtedly. Even more, I acquired a different ability: to live.'<sup>144</sup>

The famous Soviet translator Lilianna Zinov'evna Lungina serves as another vivid, perhaps even archetypal, example of the myth of the translator as a 'pure' intellectual figure.<sup>145</sup> Born into a Jewish family in 1920, she initially led a somewhat nomadic life: while her father worked with Lunacharskii in Narkompros, she spent much of her childhood in Germany, France and Palestine. In 1934, she and her mother returned to the Soviet Union, having become precisely the kind of well-travelled people who would soon be seen as highly suspicious, where she enrolled first in a German school, then in an elite Narkompros school. She trained as a translator at the Institute of Philosophy, Literature and History (better known by its acronym IFLI) in Moscow, which she described as being like Pushkin's *lycée*.<sup>146</sup> In her final year at IFLI she became interested in Russian–Scandinavian cultural links and went on to do postgraduate work on Scandinavian literature at the Institute of World Literature (IMLI). Like many, Lungina suffered at the hands of the state, though she managed to escape the worst excesses of state violence: she was approached several times by the KGB – and taken to the Lubyanka for questioning as a student – and at one point was forced to give up her flat so it could be used as a listening post. Her husband, Semen L'vovich Lungin, a theatre director, was fired as a drama teacher and from his post at the Stanislavski theatre in the wake of the post-war anti-cosmopolitan campaign, forcing the couple into poverty until the 1950s.<sup>147</sup>

It was during the more hopeful days of the Thaw that Lungina established her career as a translator. Unable to find other work, she turned to a friend, Boris Gribanov, who was at that time the head of the foreign

literature section at the Children's State Publishing House. Because they were able to only employ a limited number of Jewish translators, she was assigned Scandinavian texts rather than her preferred French.<sup>148</sup> Lungina's translation of the story 'Karlsson på taket' (Karlsson-on-the-roof) by the Swedish author Astrid Lindgren established her reputation in the Soviet Union.

For Lungina, translation was a powerful force for good in the world which not only created some 'breaches in the iron curtain that divided us from the rest of the world', but also had a moral significance; reading translations, 'a person looks at things differently'.<sup>149</sup> Her memoir carefully crafts a narrative that paints translation not simply as an escape from Soviet reality, but as a completely separate sphere where creativity, not politics, was of prime importance. Translation was for her a creative activity akin to the interpretation and performance of music and depicted in terms of its psychological and moral power. Describing her work as a 'great happiness',<sup>150</sup> she expressed her belief that translation could even reveal the essence of a person: 'when one translates, one feels exactly what one is'.<sup>151</sup>

Like the other memoirs, Lungina's reminiscences serve as a fascinating exercise in self-fashioning, which creates an 'authorial persona' characterised principally by an 'oppositional stance in relation to the system'.<sup>152</sup> Thus, Lungina emphasises that she 'poorly understood the mechanisms of official Soviet life',<sup>153</sup> although she became a member of the Writers' Union, which allowed her to attract literary and official recognition. Karin Sarsenov notes that Lungina's memoir is an extended exercise in subjectivisation, which functions by asserting and assuming the audience's trust even though it 'leaves much to be desired from a historical, factual point of view'.<sup>154</sup> Through her narrative, the author creates an image of herself as a witness to the twentieth century and, perhaps most importantly, as a victim of the Soviet regime.<sup>155</sup> Creative actors, and most of all Lungina herself, were at the mercy of the state, seeing to evade its grasp for as long as possible. By continually differentiating herself from the authorities, she creates an image of the intelligentsia as a resisting, independent group; her memoir falls into a genre of memoiristic writing that constructs a struggle between the subject and state, thus co-opting that heritage for herself.<sup>156</sup> It is difficult to judge the extent to which this self-created subject reflects reality, and Lungina gives little detail about her day-to-day contact with authority as it was manifested in her translation work. What can be discerned, however, is the idealised image that Lungina seeks to project to the post-Soviet reader (and the viewer of her video biography) of herself as victim of the totalitarian state; moreover, the memoir aims to retrospectively construct

Lungina's subjectivity as a translator and, more broadly, a member of the intelligentsia in opposition to the state.

Translators were frequently inclined to disengage themselves from the state, and repeatedly emphasise their repressed or 'victim' status. There is therefore a fundamental gap between the translator's view of him or herself as a free cultural agent and apolitical intelligentsia figure, and the construction of the translator in the authoritative discourse, which vacillated between co-opting translators into the cultural and ideological battle and treating them as potential (or actual) enemies. Neither position tells the entire story; both sides created an image that suited their own ends. It would be more accurate to say that the cultural space occupied by translation was defined by the pull between these two opposing forces. Translators were trapped between their desire to exist outside the state system, engaging in what they conceived of as 'pure' literary production and the demands of that system, which failed to sanction the special role that translators sought to create for themselves and tried to turn them into cogs in the ideological machine. The particularities of their position would play out in the treatment of the texts they translated.

## NOTES

1. Chukovskii, *Vysokoe Iskusstvo*, p. 5.
2. Gould, 'World Literature as a Communal Apartment', p. 405.
3. Anisimov, 'Nedochety perevodnoi literatury', p. 5.
4. Baer, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', p. 541.
5. Clark, *Petersburg, Crucible of Cultural Revolution*, p. 171.
6. Kuznetsov, 'O literaturnom perevode', p. 2.
7. On translation, especially of national languages, as 'culture planning', see Witt, 'Between the Lines', p. 154.
8. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 111.
9. Brown and Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations*, p. 12.
10. On the history of Vsemirnaia literatura see, for example, Shomrakova, 'Knigoizdatel'stvo "Vsemirnaia literatura"'; Zamiatin, 'Kratkaia istoriia Vsemirnoi literatury'.
11. Scherr, 'Notes on Literary Life in Petrograd', p. 258.
12. Lazzarin, 'N. S. Gumilev – perevodchik i redaktor', p. 165.
13. In 1919, Gorky wrote to Lenin that the publishing house should make the Western proletariat understand that 'the Russian proletariat is not a barbarian, but that they understand internationalism much more widely than they, cultured people and that in the most awful conditions one can imagine, have managed to do in a year something for a long time could only be dreamt of.' Quoted in Kuz'michev, *Russkie pisateli o perevode*, p. 587.
14. On Zamiatin's work at the publishing house, see Shane, *The Life and Works of Evgenij Zamiatin*, pp. 29–31.

15. Shomrakova, 'Knigoizdatel'stvo "Vsemirnaia literatura"', p. 177.
16. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 4.
17. Walker, 'Kruzhok Culture', p. 117.
18. Lazzarin, 'N. S. Gumilev – perevodchik i redaktor', p. 166.
19. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 192. See also the discussion of the Kashkin school, which produced a number of collective translations, in this chapter.
20. Scherr, 'Notes on Literary Life in Petrograd', p. 258.
21. Ostroi, 'Izdatel'stvo "Academia"', p. 168.
22. See Mikheev, 'Mezhdru dvumia "otpepliamy"'
23. As such, the journal, like its successors, focused mainly on the translation of new publications, especially of those writers who were openly sympathetic to the USSR; there was less emphasis on the publication of 'classics' in this journal and its later equivalents than in book publishing.
24. Stern, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union*, p. 52.
25. On Iasenskii's life and works, see Kolesnikoff, *Bruno Jasiński*.
26. On *Internatsional'naia literatura*, see Chapter 3.
27. On the period of cultural revolution more generally, see Sheila Fitzpatrick, 'Cultural Revolution in Russia'.
28. Safiullina and Platonov, 'Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s', p. 249.
29. Matsuev, '1933 Literaturnyi God', p. 232.
30. Anisimov, 'Nedochety perevodnoi literatury', p. 5.
31. On *Literaturnyi kritik* and its contribution to the literary debates of the 1930s, see Clark, 'Germanophone Contributions to Stalinist Literary Theory'; Günther, 'Soviet Literary Criticism and the Aesthetics of Socialist Realism'.
32. Knipovich, 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 4.
33. Safiullina and Platonov, 'Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s', p. 262.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
35. Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 16. On this wave of cosmopolitanism and the publication of modernist authors in *Internatsional'naia literatura*, see Chapter 3.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
38. Brown and Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations*, p. 21.
39. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 114.
40. Details of some translators purged in the 1930s can be found in Safiullina, 'The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture under Stalin', pp. 109–10.
41. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*, p. 288. David-Fox argues that both Soviet isolationism and the engagement with the West that preceded and overlapped it were two sides of the same coin.
42. *Pechat' SSSR v 1955 godu*, p. 65.
43. Gorokhoff, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.*, p. 4.
44. Brown and Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations*, p. 24.
45. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 227.
46. On these campaigns see, among others, Azadovskii and Egorov, 'From Anti-Westernism to Anti-Semitism'; Grüner, 'Russia's Battle against the Foreign'.
47. Gorokhoff, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.*, p. 4.

48. Brown and Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations*, p. 24.
49. Burnett and Lygo, 'The Art of Accommodation', p. 26.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
52. Iasnov, 'Biograficheskie zametki ob El'ge L'vovne Linetskoj', p. 16. On Hemingway's fate and his fate in the USSR, see Parker, 'Hemingway's Revival in the Soviet Union'; Orlova, *Kheminguei v Rossii*; Alexander Burak, 'The "Americanization" of Russian Life and Literature'. On the alternative existence of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in *samizdat*, see Chapter 5.
53. On this journal, see Chapter 4.
54. Lovell, *The Russian Reading Revolution*, p. 69.
55. Khotimsky, 'World Literature, Soviet Style', p. 152.
56. Sidorenko, 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 8.
57. *Pechat' SSSR v 1955 godu*, p. 58.
58. *Pechat' SSSR v 1960 godu*, p. 65.
59. Wright, *American Library and Book Trade Annual 1960*, p. 37.
60. The fall in the 1960s also occurred, though less sharply, in Russian literature and the literature of the Soviet republics. Kuz'mina, *Pechat' SSSR za 50 let*, p. 184.
61. *Pechat' SSSR v 1964 godu*, p. 29. The 1964 statistics conflate figures for books and brochures.
62. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 8, ll. 95–8. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 45.
63. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 226, ll. 6–12. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, pp. 33–8.
64. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 8, ll. 95–8. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 45.
65. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 18, ll. 116–17. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, pp. 64–5.
66. Burnett and Lygo, 'The Art of Accommodation', p. 28.
67. The literal/free translation debate has characterised much of the writing on translation, from the very first foundational statements made by Cicero and St Jerome.
68. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies*, pp. 19–20.
69. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 89.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
71. Azov, *Poverzhennye bukvalisty*, p. 125.
72. Kashkin, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika*, p. 407.
73. Azov, *Poverzhennye bukvalisty*, p. 134.
74. Witt, 'Between the Lines', p. 160.
75. Mikhail Lozinskii and Aleksandr Smirnov gave speeches in favour of literal translation, which were followed by discussions of the topic.
76. RGALI, f. 631, op. 21, d. 9, l. 1.
77. Witt, 'Arts of Accommodation', p. 177.
78. Azov, *Poverzhennye bukvalisty*, p. 125.
79. Fedorov, *O khudozhestvennom perevode*, p. 14.
80. Kashkin, 'O realizme v sovetskom khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 199.
81. The 'First Translators' Collective' produced Russian translations of *Dubliners* in 1936 and a partial translation of *Ulysses* in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in 1935–6 (see Chapter 3).

82. Burak, 'The "Americanization" of Russian Life and Literature', p. 53.
83. Chukovsky, *Diary*, p. 380.
84. Liubimov, *Neuviadaemyi tsvet*, p. 343.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 343.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 343. Lann and Krivtsova killed themselves together in 1958.
87. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 105.
88. Sidorenko, 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 8.
89. Kashkin, 'O realizme v sovetskom khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 197.
90. Kashkin, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika*, p. 479. The extent to which the realist translators were 'faithful' to their authors' intentions is a matter that will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.
91. Kashkin, 'O metode i shkole sovetskogo khudozhestvennogo perevoda', p. 151.
92. Kashkin, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika*, p. 479. The title of one essay, 'In the struggle for realist translation', reflects his combative stance in relation to other approaches to translation.
93. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 79.
94. Kashkin, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika*, p. 451.
95. *Ibid.*, p. 477.
96. RGALI, f. 631, op. 34, d. 583, l. 76. Quoted in Azov, *Poverzhennye bukvalisty*, p. 105.
97. Knipovich, 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', p. 4.
98. Anisimov, 'Nedochety perevodnoi literatury', p. 5. Expressions of an official attitude towards translators were frequently specifically concerned with those who worked with the languages of the Soviet republics, rather than from Western languages, although some translators were occupied with both tasks at different times. Translation to and from the languages of the Soviet republics played a crucial role in the advancement of the 'friendship of the people' policy, which aimed to strengthen the bonds between nations. The activities of these translators were considered to be vitally important, politically speaking. On translators and translations from the national languages, see Witt, 'Totalitarizm i perevod' and 'The Shorthand of Empire'.
99. Luppold, et al., *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934*, p. 566.
100. Zalambani, 'Literary Policies and Institutions', p. 252. The term is borrowed from Bourdieu. See Bourdieu, 'The Market of Symbolic Goods', p. 13.
101. Chukovskii's speech was reported in *Pravda*: Chukovskii, 'Iskusstvo perevoda', p. 6.
102. Witt, 'Arts of Accommodation', pp. 165–6.
103. RGALI, f. 631, op. 21, d. 9, l. 13.
104. RGALI, f. 9425, op. 14, d. 88, l. 41r.
105. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, ll. 48v–49r.
106. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, l. 13r–13v.
107. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, l. 19r.
108. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, l. 13v.
109. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, l. 13v.
110. RGALI, f. 631, op. 13, d. 88, l. 41v.
111. Mikhalkov is perhaps best known for his work for children, including *Diadia Stepa* (Uncle Stepa).
112. RGALI, f. 2464, op. 1, d. 662, l. 13.
113. RGALI, f. 2464, op. 1, d. 662, l. 14.

114. RGALI, f. 2464, op. 1, d. 662, l. 15.
115. RGALI, f. 2464, op. 1, d. 662, l. 16.
116. RGANI, f. 1, d. 226, ll.6–12. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 34.
117. RGANI, f. 1, d. 226, ll.6–12. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 38.
118. Nemchinskii, 'Ob otvetstvennosti perevodchika', p. 3.
119. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 42.
120. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 224.
121. Quoted in Etkind, *Notes of a Non-Conspirator*, p. 112. The controversy that surrounded this sentence became known as the 'affair of the sentence' (*дело предложения*). Although the work had been approved by Glavlit and the print run produced, Etkind's statement provoked fury 'higher up'. The entire print run was destroyed and the sentence cut from subsequent versions. Etkind was forced to write a statement of self-criticism and appear before the academic council of the Herzen Pedagogical Institute, where he was disciplined.
122. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 114.
123. Trauberg, *Sama zhizn'*, pp. 407–8.
124. Feiler, *Marina Tsvetaeva*, p. 245.
125. Tsvetaeva, *Neizdannoe*, p. 411.
126. Khotimsky, 'I Am – for the Free', p. 577.
127. Feiler, *Marina Tsvetaeva*, p. 252.
128. On Pasternak's translations of Shakespeare as a form of resistance, see Chapter 5.
129. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 115.
130. Zemskova, 'Translators in the Soviet Writer's Union', p. 203.
131. Chukovsky, *Diary*, p. 438.
132. Baer, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', p. 550.
133. Kazin, *New York Jew*, p. 273.
134. Baer, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', p. 551.
135. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever Until It Was No More*, p. 5.
136. On Trauberg's *samizdat* translations, see Chapter 5.
137. Kalashnikova, *Po-russki s ljubov'iu*, p. 507.
138. Rait-Kovaleva, 'Vse luchshee vospominaniia . . .'. According to the foreword, this is part of a longer memoir. However, no full version ever seems to have been published.
139. Baer, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', p. 556.
140. Linetskaia, her husband and several of their friends were arrested in 1933 after establishing an informal circle for the study of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. Although she served only a few months in prison, her husband was imprisoned for three years. They were then forced to live in exile near Kuibyshev until 1946.
141. Lygo, *Leningrad Poetry 1953–1975*, p. 37. This translation circle had a function similar to that of the literary associations (LITOs), the semi-independent writers' organisations, which provided a framework for young writers during the Thaw.
142. Azadovskii, 'Ogladyvaia's nazad', p. 123.
143. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
144. *Ibid.*, p. 126. This kind of myth-making is of course subject to the bias of hindsight.
145. Lungina's reminiscences were filmed by Oleg Dorman and became a surprise

sensation in Russia after being screened on the state-run first channel. They were published in book form in 2009.

146. Dorman and Lungina, *Podstrochnik*, p. 111.
147. *Ibid.*, pp. 198–9.
148. *Ibid.*, p. 254.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 346.
150. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
151. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
152. Sarsenov, ‘The Constitution of a Reliable Self’, p. 8.
153. Dorman and Lungina, *Podstrochnik*, p. 259.
154. Sarsenov, ‘The Constitution of a Reliable Self’, p. 8.
155. This was an important theme in intelligentsia memoirs. See on this subject Walker, ‘On Reading Soviet Memoirs’, pp. 346–51.
156. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

# The Soviet Censorship System

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn called Soviet censorship an ‘incredible mincing machine’,<sup>1</sup> vividly capturing its all-encompassing, systemic nature. The Soviet censorship apparatus, which controlled all printed output, was a vast, multi-layered system of preliminary and post-publication control that aimed to create and impose political, moral and ideological norms in all areas of public life. Embedded in Party and state structures, censorship extended its reach into almost all areas of Soviet life, like ‘a kind of monster’, according to one critic.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the easing of Tsarist censorship by the provisional government, the Bolsheviks quickly reconstructed a formal censorship apparatus after the revolution. On 27 October 1917, Lenin, as chairman of the Sovnarkom, signed a decree on the press instituting a new censorship regime. This decree established temporary extraordinary measures against the bourgeois press, which, in the Bolsheviks’ minds, posed a grave threat to the new political order. Lenin declared that ‘as soon as the new order is consolidated, all administrative measures against the press will be suspended’,<sup>3</sup> though it must be noted that freedom of the press was only ever meant to be given ‘within the limits of responsibility before the laws, in accordance with the broadest and most progressive in this respect’.<sup>4</sup> The main arm of the Soviet censorship apparatus was the Main Administration of Literature and Publishing, most often known by the shortened form of its full title, Glavlit.<sup>5</sup> Glavlit held responsibility for setting norms and implementing censorship, by which was meant the control of all printed production including literature, newspapers and other printed items such as pamphlets and forms.<sup>6</sup> The foundation of Glavlit in 1922 saw the creation of a fully-formed, centralised bureaucratic structure for the control of publication. Initially (until 1936) existing under the auspices of Narkompros and led by Pavel

Ivanovich Lebedev-Polianskii, it was tasked with overseeing the publication of printed output and controlling foreign publications imported into the country; its remit covered pre- and post-publication censorship of almost all printed periodical and non-periodical publications including photographs, drawings and maps. Theatrical and musical censorship was first overseen by Glavrepertkom, the Main Repertory Committee, set up in 1923. Glavrepertkom became part of Glavisskustvo, the Main Administration for Affairs of Literature and the Arts, which exercised ideological control over all kinds of creative endeavours including literature, fine art, cinema and circus.<sup>7</sup> Glavlit still maintained overall censorial control over literature and the arts, with Glaviskusstvo providing ideological guidance.<sup>8</sup> As the executive body of censorship Glavlit was subordinate to the highest organs of state, including the Central Committee's department of propaganda, the KGB and the council of ministers, and, despite its nominal attachment to Narkompros, acted as a 'kind of affiliate' of the state security services.<sup>9</sup> It also regularly consulted with and took instruction from the internal and foreign ministries, the Komsomol Central Committee and the ministry of defence. The central Glavlit, based in Moscow, oversaw a network of local organs at the territorial (*крайлит*), provincial (*обллит*), municipal (*горлит*) and regional (*райлит*) levels. The ideological standards of the local organs and the educational level of regional censors, especially during the Stalin period up to the mid-1950s, provoked occasional concern in the central institution. In many cases most or even all of the censors in the local organs had no higher education, being employed mainly on account of their 'unimpeachable past'.<sup>10</sup> Although censors throughout the USSR became gradually more professionalised, the process proceeded in fits and starts; in 1945, for example, the censorship of Turkmenistan employed no censors with higher education.<sup>11</sup> Censorship was a huge administrative task, carried out by several thousand censors across the whole country. In the late 1930s there were around 6,000 employees;<sup>12</sup> in 1955, Glavlit recorded the total staff as 6,708, including 305 in the central apparatus in Moscow. The head of the institution in the late Soviet period, Vladimir Solodin, claimed that at that time there were 1,500 employees. This is surely an underestimate and does not account for those plenipotentiaries attached to journals and publishers, who were not on the payroll, though they reported to Glavlit.<sup>13</sup>

After its foundation, Glavlit grew rapidly. Its functions widened to take in other areas of cultural production such as theatre and radio scripts, and it was placed under strict Party control that required its guiding documents, in particular the *perechen'*, to be approved by the Sovnarkom.<sup>14</sup> In the late 1920s and throughout the next decade

a noticeable strengthening of censorship occurred which coincided with the growing repression in other areas of society. The focus of the censorship apparatus's attention also shifted somewhat, with ideological-political censorship being strengthened significantly. In addition, many of the censors themselves were also subject to purges, and several important members of Glavrepertkom and Glavlit were removed from their posts. This included the head of Glavlit, Sergei Ingulov, who was arrested and shot in 1937.<sup>15</sup> The intensification of censorship was to continue until Stalin's death, although the organisation underwent no major structural changes.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the years between 1946 and 1953, when Glavlit was headed by Konstantin Omel'chenko, are referred to by Herman Ermolaev as 'the worst period in the history of Soviet literature and censorship';<sup>17</sup> during this time extensive campaigns were carried out against 'cosmopolitan' and otherwise un-Soviet literature.

After Stalin's death, processes of de-Stalinisation and decentralisation and wider cultural changes such as the growth of new kinds of mass communication prompted structural and functional reform of the censorship apparatus.<sup>18</sup> Among the first post-Stalin reforms were the replacement of Konstantin Omel'chenko as chief censor by Pavel Konstantinovich Romanov in 1957.<sup>19</sup> At the same time, Glavlit began to occupy a more peripheral role in the implementation of censorship, although it did not shrink appreciably in terms of the number of staff. Initially, for a short period in 1953, the organisation was placed under the direct control of the ministry of internal affairs in order to 'prevent any unrest in the wake of Stalin's death';<sup>20</sup> later in the same year, it was moved to the Committee for the Press under the Council of Ministers, representing 'a step in the direction of curtailing the functions of the security police'.<sup>21</sup> Its title was also changed to the Main Administration for the Preservation of Military and State Secrets in Print under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, illustrating its change in position and function, which was, formally at least, only to protect state secrets. Some of Glavlit's previous responsibilities began to be taken over by other bodies such as the Ministry of Culture, and so the Khrushchev period was characterised by 'Glavlit's shrinking authority',<sup>22</sup> as its 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 editorial or self-censorship. It is perhaps debatable whether the refocusing of the censorship structure was associated with increasing liberalisation in Soviet society. Arlen Blium has argued that in some respects Glavlit became less central precisely because censorship had 'won': its constant presence as a control institution had caused the ideologised norms of literary production to

be internalised. Censorship no longer needed to be strictly enforced by the Party apparatus when editors were capable of carrying it out themselves. What is clear is that Glavlit, however far removed it might have become from the operation of censorship in the Thaw period, retained an important supervisory role. Additionally, it is obvious from Glavlit's internal documentation that political questions continued to be relevant, even though Glavlit acted increasingly to guide and recommend rather than order or implement changes. Throughout the Thaw, despite the formal changes, it continued to pass judgement on the political faults of the works it examined.

### CENSORSHIP AND THE CONTROL OF FOREIGN LITERATURE

---

Only too aware of the potential danger posed by foreign literature, the Party organs worked constantly to mitigate any negative impact through multi-layered control mechanisms, with Glavlit acting as the front line. Glavlit's functions in relation to foreign literature were twofold. Firstly, it managed the import of untranslated foreign texts from outside the country; secondly, it controlled the publication of translated texts. Glavlit's work in the second respect followed the same lines as the control of artistic literature produced domestically.

The foreign section of Glavlit, known as *Inootdel*, was set up around the same time as its parent agency and was tasked with the regulating the flow of foreign printed items such as books and periodicals into the Soviet Union. Based at the main post offices,<sup>23</sup> this sub-section was staffed by 'political editors' with higher education and knowledge of two or three languages; by the 1950s its forty-seven employees handled around forty languages between them.<sup>24</sup> The foreign section was less dominated by Party members than other sections, since Glavlit was forced reluctantly to prioritise linguistic capability over class origin; the need for the censorship to deal with rarer languages especially required skills that were unlikely to be possessed by those with a proletarian background,<sup>25</sup> meaning that members of the old, discredited intelligentsia were sometimes needed to fill gaps in the censorship expertise. A 1954 report notes, for instance, that only fifty-three per cent were Party members, compared to over seventy-seven per cent for all other sections. As the least orthodox part of Glavlit the *Inootdel* was, alongside the military censorship section, the worst affected by the Stalin terror of the mid-1930s: many of its members were denounced as 'cosmopolitans' and purged.<sup>26</sup> More than half the staff was arrested, causing, in addition

to the obvious trauma and disruption to the lives of those in the section, major practical problems of short staffing.<sup>27</sup>

The *Inootdel* was responsible for maintaining control over all foreign literature entering the country from abroad and monitoring all libraries and institutions that had the right to receive foreign literature. In addition, it exercised preventative censorship over all publications in foreign languages intended for export; this included items published by the Publishing House of Foreign Literature and the foreign versions of Soviet journals, and all literature sent abroad by sale or book-exchange.<sup>28</sup> As well as removing harmful material from circulation entirely, the *Inootdel* operatives were tasked with controlling readers' access to foreign literature. The role of the censorship apparatus in this area was to ensure that only suitable texts were imported and that only those individuals and institutions permitted to take receipt of foreign items could do so.<sup>29</sup> Intercepted items were addressed to both organisations and private individuals; individuals who regularly received packages containing foreign items became the subject of internal reports.<sup>30</sup> Glavlit passed on scientific and technical publications, communist publications and classics of world literature; other items were seized and, if they had some value, passed to the Lenin Library.<sup>31</sup> Only with special permission from the Central Committee could an organisation avoid censorial attention.<sup>32</sup> In the Stalin period, Glavlit's agents had the right to remove unsuitable content from imported texts,<sup>33</sup> blacking out certain sections. So sensitive was this work and so potentially harmful the items handled by Glavlit that the censorship office at the main post office was to be kept locked, with the key only available to Glavlit's own staff.<sup>34</sup>

The strict control of foreign literature was connected to the fear that items from abroad could contaminate the reader, threatening the task of ideological education of the people.<sup>35</sup> As a result, Glavlit routinely 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,<sup>36</sup> and insults against Marxism and communism. A 1943 Glavlit circular provides an example of the kinds of material judged to be intolerable in Anglo-American literature:

1. Attacks against the USSR, the Communist Party and the Soviet government.
2. Discussions of democracy in the USSR; material supportive of democracy in the 'so-called democratic' countries.
3. Information about countries at war with the USSR.
4. Information about Soviet war losses.

5. Caricatures of the USSR, its government and the leadership of the Party.
6. Bibliographic information about anti-Soviet books.<sup>37</sup>

Accurate figures for items seized by the *Inootdel* are difficult to confirm. In the early years of its existence, it seems that a minority of items were 'arrested'.<sup>38</sup> Of 'Anglo-American' items imported, Glavlit permitted the import of 110,001 individual books, periodicals and newspapers. Only 5,043 were banned and a further 1,695 items were allowed after 'processing'.<sup>39</sup> In the post-Stalin era censorial activity was supposed to focus 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.<sup>40</sup> An internal document noted that 'all publications containing anti-Soviet material, leaflets, tabloids and items of religious propaganda are confiscated and not passed to private individuals', going on to state that 'on average, Glavlit confiscates and destroys around two thirds of all publications addressed to private individuals'.<sup>41</sup> The total proportion of items destroyed, however, was rather smaller, since many items were sent to institutions rather than individuals. Destruction was not the only option: items judged to be unsuitable for circulation were frequently placed in the *spetskhran*, a special library collection with limited access that held restricted items. Illustrating the scale of the task of controlling foreign items, Glavlit's annual report for 1957 noted that a total of 18.6 million individual items, including copies of books, journals and newspapers, were controlled. Of this number, 15.6 million items were released for general consumption and a small number – a third of a million – were judged to be entirely dangerous inasmuch as they were considered to be bourgeois, anti-Soviet or pornographic – and were destroyed. Around three million items were placed in the *spetskhran*.<sup>42</sup>

## THE *SPEKSKHRAN*

---

The closed stores of the *spetskhran* housed items judged to be potentially harmful by Glavlit, with access granted only to authorised individuals.<sup>43</sup> To keep its contents secret, they were not listed in the libraries' open catalogues. Access to these secret collections was limited to those with a particular purpose, such as specialist researchers and translators, and was on a reference-only basis.<sup>44</sup> 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. The *spetskhran* had a long history in Russia, with the

first secret library collections established in the 1740s.<sup>45</sup> They appeared in their Soviet manifestation at the start of the 1920s, storing not only material banned under the Tsarist regime, but also new 'White' and émigré literature, and other items confiscated by Glavlit.<sup>46</sup> The contents were defined by the *perechen'* and by a catalogue of books and periodicals that had already undergone censorship with notes on the censors' decision.<sup>47</sup> The censor checked this catalogue before reading a given item, and noted the previous judgement in his or her report to guide future decisions.<sup>48</sup> These sources were accompanied by a series of circulars issued by Glavlit detailing the titles that were to be excluded from public libraries and withdrawn from sale in bookshops. In addition, periodic circulars responded to changing political trends and prohibitions: as a topic fell out of favour, the *spetskhran* could remove it from the public gaze. The same can be said for people: those declared enemies of the people were physically and symbolically removed from public life, and books by authors condemned by the regime were also placed in the secret stores.<sup>49</sup> The scale of these special collections was enormous: the Lenin Library, for example, held more than one million items.<sup>50</sup> The fate of a foreign title depended on a number of factors; as well as the content of the text, the most important considerations were the author's political sympathies, especially his or her attitude towards the Soviet Union and the Communist Party.<sup>51</sup> This explains why Albert Einstein's books on physics, which coincided with the state prioritisation of science in the post-war period, were approved for general circulation, while his 1949 essay 'The World As I See It' was restricted, since it showed evidence of his 'anti-Soviet views' and, moreover, made comparisons between the Soviet Union and fascist Italy.<sup>52</sup> In 1954, Glavlit recommended that the English psychological and philosophical journal *Mind*, which treated Marxism in a 'slandering' manner, be kept in closed storage.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, material from the 5th and 6th international congresses on the history of science, published by the United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), was confined because the material was 'directed against Marxism'.<sup>54</sup> Glavlit also recorded the revision of a decision regarding the publication of Belgian scientist George Sarton's *Introduction to the History of Science* (published in the original in three volumes between 1927 and 1948). It passed censorship in March 1949, and was approved for general use with no restrictions. In May 1950 Glavlit received information about the 'undesirable' material in the book, which comprised a statement that the Bolsheviks continued quasi-Orthodox traditions in their treatment of Lenin's body. The document noted drily, 'in this way, the book's author, with obviously hostile intent . . . alleged that the Communist Party displayed Lenin's body as holy

relics. Sent to the *spetskhran*'.<sup>55</sup> However, the *spetskhran* was no black hole; texts could be returned, political climate permitting, to general circulation. The complex process of returning texts to the open collections began in the Khrushchev era;<sup>56</sup> many works – both Soviet and foreign – were rehabilitated at this time.

### GLAVLIT'S INTERVENTIONS IN THE TEXT

Glavlit's primary function in relation to foreign literature was to act something like a border guard. By limiting the import of 'anti-Soviet' and politically unorthodox items it aimed to 'forc[e] 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'.<sup>57</sup> The second, no less important and more demanding function of the censorship agency was to control the content of translated texts. As with literature written in the Soviet languages, this was a multi-layered process that followed the same processes as domestic literature. At this stage the bulk of the censorial work was transferred to the publishing house or journal, where 'political editors' paid via the publishers rather than Glavlit itself worked in close contact with editors to ensure that the content of texts was suitable for publication.

Textual interventions were also partially based on the contents of the *perechen*'. Its constantly changing content was considered by many to be somewhat ridiculous: Mikhail Sergeevich Voslensky, a member of the Academy of Sciences and, from 1965 to 1972, a member of the Academy's Presidium who later emigrated from the USSR to West Germany, claimed: 'Many of [the rules] are really foolish. Nobody can understand them. One, for example, forbids the disclosure of the total number of cattle in the Kemerovo region. Why? Nobody knows. People have no idea where these rules come from. Every day new rules are added to the "Talmud" while some old ones are deleted.'<sup>58</sup> Each text that was prepared for publication was checked (at least) twice in an examination process involving both editor and censor. After proceeding through the normal editorial process, manuscripts were checked by the 'political editor' and changes made in conjunction with the editorial staff before being approved for printing. Upon approval at this stage, a small 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. Glavlit could then authorise and stamp the text accordingly, approving it for printing. Further changes could be ordered at this stage to ensure that no violations had slipped through. Glavlit's work on the textual level was

carefully monitored; notable examples of interventions made by the central apparatus were recorded in annual reports and discussed internally on a rather more frequent basis. These reports were regularly used as teaching tools for censors, often containing sharp commentary about the need for such mistakes to be corrected before the texts reached the checking stage.<sup>59</sup> From 1936, censors checked the work early in the process. This was to allow for corrections to be made and guidance to be offered, thus hopefully avoiding the unfortunate need to ban an entire book or issue of a journal.<sup>60</sup> In later years, as censors became more peripheral to the process, they only checked the text in the late stages of preparation. Glavlit's plenipotentiaries also valued their pedagogical role, using the censorial process to educate writers and explain the faults in their texts.<sup>61</sup>

During the Thaw the question of censoring foreign literature was reconsidered. In 1960, in order to reduce the burden on its censors, Glavlit discussed the possibility of freeing translated literature from pre-printing control (*предварительный контроль*), requiring that these items – which, of course, could not contain Soviet state or military secrets – would be checked by the censors only once the galley proofs had been produced.<sup>62</sup> Interventions in the text could be extensive, even despite the very close attention paid by editors, though it was mostly applied to newspapers and similar texts as opposed to literary texts.<sup>63</sup> The local Moscow censorship agency, Mosoblgorlit, recorded in a 1955 report that of 24,456 journals, books and brochures subject to pre-publication control, the censors had made 1,084 cuts of material banned by the *perechen'* and only twenty-nine 'political-ideological' cuts.<sup>64</sup> Especially in the post-Stalin period Glavlit was more reluctant to make ideological changes, consulting with – or instructing – editors in such cases. On occasion books were returned to publishers for revision, showing that although books were regularly stopped after going to press, Glavlit displayed at least some sensitivity to the wastefulness of banning a book at the last minute and was not simply mindlessly destructive.<sup>65</sup> Indeed, there is some evidence in Glavlit's internal discussions that the censors could be well-meaning within their limited bureaucratic role; unwarranted interferences were harshly criticised and the censors strove to avoid them.<sup>66</sup> Meetings regularly noted instances where material had been cut in error, or the *perechen'* misinterpreted; exact adherence to the Glavlit's regulations was required, and going beyond the limits of one's responsibility was considered problematic.

---

## PUBLISHERS' ROLE IN THE CONTROL OF FOREIGN LITERATURE

---

Although Glavlit was the primary tool of censorship, the highly regulated and centralised publication system also ensured that censorship was embedded in the actions of publishing houses and journals. The Soviet publishing system was wholly subordinate to the state, one result of which was that Glavlit and the Party organs approved publication plans and schedules, as well as the content of texts. Established in 1919, the state publishing house Gosizdat oversaw subordinate publishers, printing facilities and distribution networks. Gosizdat's role in regulating and controlling institutions meant that it functioned in effect as 'an instrument of preventative censorship'.<sup>67</sup> The system of inter-related institutional mechanisms was run as a 'single undertaking'. The blending of institutions of education, censorship and publishing, which was characteristic of Soviet culture, functioned 'like part of an enormous Socialist Realist machine'.<sup>68</sup>

Foreign literature had its own particular publishing structure, which granted the intelligentsia some ability to set or at least influence its functioning. The Ministry of Culture had the right to coordinate publication of translations by all publishing houses.<sup>69</sup> The choice of texts was strictly 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.<sup>70</sup> The Publishing House of Foreign Literature was set up in 1946 to publish Russian translations of foreign artistic literature and books on social and scientific topics. Linked to the all-Union State Library of Foreign Literature, which was founded in 1948 and held large numbers of untranslated foreign items, it selected material from the library and purchased a large number of foreign books and journals from abroad. The specialist staff was concerned with producing high-quality, well-presented books.<sup>71</sup> Publishing houses formulated in advance publishing plans that were to be checked and approved at Party level. Agitprop could also make recommendations, usually for the exclusion of a particular title from the plan.<sup>72</sup> The Central Committee also intervened, disciplined and ordered changes to working practices relating to the publication of foreign literature.<sup>73</sup>

---

 EDITORIAL CENSORSHIP: THE LINK BETWEEN  
 STATE AND AUTHOR
 

---

According to Martin Dewhurst, 'the borderline between editing and censoring is always difficult to define' in the Soviet Union, 'where censors were often referred to as editors and real editors were supposed to relieve Glavlit plenipotentiaries of much of their work at the pre-censorship stage'.<sup>74</sup> Editors were a key link in the censorship chain. This was especially important – and frequently emphasised in Glavlit's documents – in the post-Stalin period, but it was true to varying extents throughout the Soviet period. Although Glavlit did intervene in the content of texts, much of the preventative censorship took place rather informally in the editorial offices of publishing houses and journals where editors, in addition to carrying out their normal literary duties, worked to ensure that unsuitable material did not make it through the processes of text-selection, translation and production. For translations, as for domestic literature, this required a multi-layered approach. First, the translators' typescript was checked; both stylistic and 'political' changes were made at this stage. Once this was done – sometimes multiple drafts were produced – 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 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.<sup>75</sup> Each page was initialled by the editor to confirm that the work had been read in full, and 'so that in case a mistake is found he cannot evade responsibility'.<sup>76</sup>

Editors were considered by the authorities to be a crucial line in the defence of the Soviet state; a 1936 statement made by the head of Glavlit, S. B. Ingulov, impressed upon authors their political role. Ingulov chastised editors for attempting to pass all responsibility for matters of policy to the Glavlit 'political editors' stationed in publishing houses and journals. Ingulov noted that the roles of the editor proper and the political editors overlapped to a certain extent, but that editors must always be aware of their own crucial responsibility for the content of the texts with which they worked. Each intervention required by Glavlit should be thought of as the correction of errors and oversights on the part of the editorial staff. Ingulov stated: 'the greater the sense of responsibility of each editor, the less work there will be for the employee of the censorship, and I will not bear a large grudge if all the workers in this part [of Glavlit] are made unemployed'.<sup>77</sup> Mikhail Voslensky remembered his own work as an editor as having a primarily political and censorial direction. He

noted in an interview that ‘if someone found that I had allowed a political mistake to slip by, then I’d be in trouble’. Editors had to be ‘on guard’ and always ready to catch the author or translator’s political mistakes.<sup>78</sup>

The organisational changes made to Glavlit in the post-Stalin period had the result that the administration began, formally at least, to occupy a less central role in the implementation of censorship. During the 1950s, having transferred Glavlit to the Ministry of Culture, the Central Committee repeatedly emphasised that the main burden of censorship should now fall to editors and publishers, with Glavlit checking texts only as the final proofs were printed and, strictly speaking, only holding responsibility for the protection of state and military secrets. Glavlit emphasised in its own internal discussions that censors ‘are not political editors and do not interfere in the functioning of the editors’,<sup>79</sup> with the exception of ‘obvious errors’.<sup>80</sup> In order to manage this transfer of power and outline their new advisory role, Glavlit introduced in 1962 a series of ‘conversations’ (*беседы*) with editors and representatives of publishing houses to teach them about the censorship requirements; the conversations were consciously aimed at instituting the internalisation of censorship standards and knowledge of the *perechen*.<sup>81</sup> An internal memo noted approvingly that the understanding of the ‘demands of censorship on the part of workers in the publishers and journals’ had improved and that this was leading to ‘an improvement in the quality of the control of literature’.<sup>82</sup>

As a result of these changes Glavlit required that the censors began to play, in addition to their policing duty, an advisory, even pedagogical role in relation to editors.<sup>83</sup> A 1960 circular states:

It is not only necessary for the censor to be a controller looking for the mistakes that arise as a result of editorial inattention; he or she should also be an educator, systematically explaining to editorial workers their responsibilities in relation to the publication of forbidden information.<sup>84</sup>

Glavlit’s employees thus increasingly began to conceive of themselves as partners in the censorship process rather than enforcers, and increasingly emphasised that censorship was a multi-agent process. Internal circulars also documented 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’.<sup>85</sup> Notwithstanding the continuing interference of Glavlit’s censors (despite its stated aims) in the publication process, editors were judged to have internalised the standards for publication,<sup>86</sup> reinforcing their position as the first line of censorship.<sup>87</sup>

In essence, 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 correspondence via the responsible editor.<sup>88</sup> 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. Blium claims that editors were, on the whole, 'lackeys' who simply acquiesced to Soviet power:

It must be said that among editors there were a number of talented and concerned individuals who exerted themselves to resist these political and ideological dictates . . . However, with the passage of time a new generation of Soviet editors was trained who formed a united front with the censors and waged war against authors – with the editors often in the vanguard.<sup>89</sup>

I would contend, however, that tension between the editor and censor could arise out of the discrepancy in each agent's professional task, and that editors were often deeply concerned with the literary quality of their work.<sup>90</sup> Boris Zaks, who worked as an editor at *Novyi mir* (New World) during the Khrushchev era, characterised the relationship as purely antagonistic, and believed that the journal had gained a 'victory' over Glavlit.<sup>91</sup> In a similar vein, Erna Shakhova referred bitterly to the changes she made to John Updike's novel *Rabbit, Run* as 'idiotic', referring to her attempts 'not to completely spoil the author's text'.<sup>92</sup>

The particular role of the Soviet editor recalls Bourdieu's concept of 'double personages', by which he means those agents – he refers specifically to publishers and gallery directors – who negotiate between different cultural fields and who thus embody contradictory dispositions.<sup>93</sup> Building upon Bourdieu, Stephen Parker and Matthew Philpotts in their study of *Sinn und Form*, a key literary journal in the German Democratic Republic, propose that editors also function as 'double personages' or 'double agents' who require the ability to mobilise cultural and economic capital in their role.<sup>94</sup> In an authoritarian culture, the editor's loyalty is divided between the literary and political fields, requiring editors to negotiate between producers of symbolic and political capital; in this sense, the editor is caught between the forces of autonomy and heteronomy.<sup>95</sup> Editors' in-between status requires that they 'combine the dispositions of the poet and of the (political) professional';<sup>96</sup> the editors of translated literature had an additional responsibility, strongly linked to their contacts with the West. Their privileged position in the Soviet cultural scene allowed them access to foreign writers, and sometimes trips abroad. As a result, they felt an obligation to their Western

contacts that had to be reconciled with their political responsibilities to the Soviet state and their own sense of literary quality. The editorial role was therefore contradictory by nature: at once the producer and controller of information, the editor simultaneously played a policing, censorial role while trying to realise the interests of society as they saw them, by allowing information to circulate.<sup>97</sup> Censoring the texts was a compromise required in order that a text could be published in some form: it was better to publish something, even if censored, than nothing at all.<sup>98</sup> 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 even been compared to a Western writer making changes so that their work will be acceptable in the marketplace.<sup>99</sup> Quoting a conversation with Raisa Orlova, who was 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.'<sup>100</sup> These statements indicate that editorial staff constantly negotiated between their own sense of literary worth and the requirements of the Party authorities,<sup>101</sup> whether communicated via Central Committee decree or simply understood and internalised.

## TRANSLATORS AS CENSORS

Perhaps even more so than the editorial staff, translators also occupied multiple and contradictory roles in Soviet culture. They were creative agents, though they 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;<sup>102</sup> at the same time, however, translators were Soviet citizens, exposed to Soviet propagandistic public discourse and subject to the instructions of the Party, the Union of Writers and other institutions. As cultural agents, translators therefore occupied a difficult position between the source and target cultures and between official institutions and literary production. This status as 'double personage' strongly influenced the practising of self-censorship, which was governed by both external and internal factors. 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.<sup>103</sup> As 'tacit censors', translators, having absorbed social norms, do not only consciously anticipate the desires

of censorial institutions, but also ‘tinge the tone of the texts and make them readable and acceptable’.<sup>104</sup> Of course it is necessary to examine the extent to which translators were unconsciously acting in accordance with their place in the cultural hierarchy – this is the action of the *habitus* – or were making conscious and calculated decisions.

The evidence of the archival documents and personal statements made by translators seems to show that both factors were at play. In addition to having an internalised understanding of norms learned through their working experiences, translators were often reacting to explicit instructions passed down from above. The actions of *Internatsional'naiia 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.<sup>105</sup> Glavlit's own internal documents also noted the importance of translators as a link in the censorship chain. A 1958 report, for example, rebuked translators for allowing ‘mistakes’ to survive in texts, necessitating their removal by the censor after submission to Glavlit.<sup>106</sup> A similar memo from 1959 noted with disapproval ‘insufficiently careful’ translations.<sup>107</sup> The expectation that translators should be involved in the censoring of their work before it reached Glavlit also filtered down to the translators themselves. In the rare moments when they have spoken about this aspect of their work, translators do sometimes acknowledge that they censored their translations. The translator and sociologist V. B. Dubin made light of the constraints, which he saw as a normal and unimportant, though integral, part of life under socialism. He stated, ‘although it always seemed to us (or we convinced ourselves) that censorship was a terrible thing, omnipresent, all-powerful, all-knowing and so on, it turned out that it was just funny stories not worthy of our attention.’<sup>108</sup> Others seemed to see, or at least publically portrayed, their translation choices as natural and necessary: Viktor Golyshv, a translator since the early 1960s, who has worked for *Inostrannaia literatura*, argued for the necessity of modifying erotic content and non-normative language when translating into Russian: he considered this to be a necessary consequence of the different cultural contexts, and implied that this kind of censorship is actually an *artistic* act:

They [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.<sup>109</sup>

Translators' own complex understanding of their actions as censorship demonstrates the difficulty of making a clear distinction between censorship and non-censorship –that is, between the censored text and free expression, or 'evil' censorship and the 'heroic' translator.<sup>110</sup> In examining self-censorship, it can be 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'.<sup>111</sup> 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. External and internal censorship are thus closely intertwined, existing in a complex, mutually reinforcing relationship with one another. Censorship was supported, if not always enacted, by the editorial staff of the journals, so the translators must have understood the standards expected of them. 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 Müller reminds us:

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.<sup>112</sup>

The chapters that follow will examine in detail these multi-level, multi-agent processes, examining how rather than consolidating or perfecting censorship the multiplicity of censorship practices and agents could in fact undermine state intentions, making censorship of foreign literature an ambiguous practice and allowing editors and translators to undermine state norms; the system of *vsetsenzura* proved itself vulnerable to undermining from the inside.

## NOTES

1. Solzhenitsyn, 'Interview with Two Western Correspondents', p. 63.
2. Goriaeva, *Politicheskaia tsenzura v SSSR*, p. 182.
3. Daniels, *A Documentary History of Communism in Russia*, p. 65.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
5. Glavlit's full title was changed several times between its foundation and the collapse of the censorship system in 1991, each time coinciding with a change in the agency's place in the Soviet administrative system and, accordingly, shifts in Glavlit's significance and power. The acronym Glavlit was used throughout the Soviet period. One of the most significant changes was its acquiring of responsibility for state and military secrets in 1946.
6. Martin Dewhirst notes that 'all the really important decisions on control of the media and on impeding freedom of speech were taken by the leaders and lower-ranking, often provincial, officials of the CPSU (Communist party) and organs of state security such as the OGPU and its successors.' Dewhirst, 'Censorship in Russia, 1991 and 2001', p. 22.
7. On the formation of Glaviskusstvo, see Fitzpatrick, 'The Emergence of Glaviskusstvo'.
8. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 9.
9. Blium, *A Self-Administered Poison*, p. 8.
10. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 53.
11. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 2, d. 237, l. 2.
12. Dewhirst, 'Soviet Socialist Realism and the Soviet Censorship System', p. 28.
13. Richmond and Solodin, "'The Eye of the State'", p. 582.
14. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 7.
15. Goriaeva, *Politicheskaia tsenzura v SSSR*, p. 209.
16. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 101.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
18. Golovskoy, *Is There Censorship in the Soviet Union?*, p. 7.
19. Romanov was replaced in 1963 by Aleksei Petrovich Okhotnikov, but returned to his post in 1966, serving for another twenty years. Ivkin, *Gosudarstvennaia vlast' SSSR*, pp. 496–7.
20. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 142.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 144.
23. The *Inotdel* plenipotentiaries' salaries were paid through the post office rather than directly through Glavlit. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 49.
24. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 14.
25. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, pp. 51–2. Glavlit regularly wrestled with the issue of language expertise. In the 1960s a literary journal, *Sowjetisch Heimland* (Soviet Homeland), published in Yiddish, was both edited and censored by Aron Vergelis, a Ukrainian Jewish poet, since Glavlit had no censors who read Yiddish. See Golovskoy, *Is There Censorship in the Soviet Union?*, p. 25.
26. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 57; p. 59.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 128.
28. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41.

29. This proved to be difficult to police. Glavlit reported back to the Central Committee in 1958 that many individuals and institutions, including the staff of ministries and the Academy of Sciences, were in fact breaking the party's rules on the import of foreign literature. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 29, ll. 97–101. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, p. 65.
30. For example, GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, l. 76.
31. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii (hereafter RGASPI), f. 82, op. 2, d. 990, ll. 143–4. Available at 'Baza dannyykh dokumentov', <<http://www.alexanderyakovlev.org/fond/issues-doc/69793>> (last accessed 14 January 2015).
32. RGASPI, f. 17, op. 132, d. 316, ll. 41–2. Available at 'Baza dannyykh dokumentov', <<http://www.alexanderyakovlev.org/fond/issues-doc/69454>> (last accessed 14 January 2015).
33. Choldin, *Tsenzura inostrannykh knig v Rossiiskoi Imperii i Sovetskom Soiuzе*, p. 9.
34. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, op. 33.
35. RGANI, f. 1, d. 8, ll. 95–8. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, pp. 45–7.
36. It is worth noting that the terms 'fascist' and 'Trotskyite' had specific negative meanings in Soviet discourse; Trotskyism was used as a generic insult against all positions that deviated 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"'. Payne, 'Soviet Anti-Fascism'. p. 56.
37. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41, l. 3.
38. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 125.
39. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41, l. 8. This 'processing' seemed to encompass the physical removal of certain pages or parts of pages of the items in question.
40. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, ll. 25–30.
41. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 950, ll. 96–7.
42. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1 d. 984, l. 59.
43. For a personal account of the *spetskhran*, see Rogachevskii, 'Homo Sovieticus in the Library'.
44. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1088, l. 9.
45. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 94.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
47. According to former head of Glavlit Vladimir Solodin, by the end of the 1980s this card catalogue held more than one million records; it was allegedly 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 (despite the fact that Glavlit's extensive archive is held by the State Archive of the Russian Federation). Gromova, *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuzе*, p. 19.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
49. Blium calls this kind of control of works by and about repressed persons 'total bibliocide'. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 95.
50. Gromova, *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuzе*, p. 16.
51. Sinitsyna, 'Censorship in the Soviet Union', p. 38.
52. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 2, d. 217, ll. 22–6.
53. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 2, d. 217, ll. 28–31.

54. Ibid.
55. Ibid.
56. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1113, l. 15.
57. Stelmakh, 'Reading in the Context of Censorship in the Soviet Union', p. 145.
58. Voslensky, "'Officially There Is No Censorship . . .'", p. 29.
59. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 969.
60. RGALI, f. 631, op. 15, d. 93, ll. 24–40. Included in Vodop'ianova, *Mezhdú molotom i nakoval'nei*, p. 503.
61. Plamper, 'Russia: Archives of Soviet Censorship', p. 2094.
62. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1053, l. 24.
63. Full records of these excisions have not been retained in the Glavlit archive, and in any case much work was done by telephone, but they were used contemporaneously as teaching and discussion tools at censors' meetings. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 886, l. 115.
64. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 900, l. 144.
65. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1087, l. 9.
66. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 855, l. 66.
67. Garzonio and Zalambani, 'Literary Criticism during the Revolution and Civil War', p. 15.
68. Dobrenko, 'Socialist Realism', p. 107.
69. Gorokhoff, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.*, p. 44.
70. Walker, *Soviet Book Publishing Policy*, p. 119.
71. Gorokhoff, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 156–7.
72. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 47.
73. See, for example, the 1959 resolution concerning the work of the publishing house *Inostrannaia literatura*; it noted several serious failings and made a large number of recommendations, including changing the honorariums offered to translators and instituting training programmes for staff. RGANI, f. 11, op. 1, d. 40, ll. 128–32. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS*, pp. 173–5.
74. Dewhirst, 'Censorship in Russia, 1991 and 2001', p. 29.
75. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 2, l. 1.
76. Voslensky, "'Officially There Is No Censorship . . .'", p. 29.
77. RGALI, f. 631, op. 15, d. 9, ll. 24–40. Included in Vodop'ianova, *Mezhdú molotom i nakoval'nei*, p. 500.
78. Voslensky, "'Officially There Is No Censorship . . .'", p. 29.
79. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 9696, l. 14.
80. Mitrokhin and Solodin, "'Ubezhdén, chto rabotat na stabil'nost' godudarstva'", p. 321. Whether this was the case in practice is open to debate. Several authors and editors have remembered Glavlit's interventions in the post-Stalin period as concerning political themes, and Glavlit's own documents make frequent reference to 'ideological-political' censorship.
81. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1113, l. 12.
82. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1113, l. 21.
83. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 202.
84. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1053, l. 45.
85. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 1114, l. 109.
86. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 46.
87. Zaretskaia-Balsente, *Les Intellectuels et la censure en URSS*, p. 145.
88. Zaks, 'Censorship at the Editorial Desk', p. 158.

89. Blium, *A Self-Administered Poison*, p. 5.
90. Erzikova, 'Subversion of Censorship in Soviet Journalism'.
91. Zaks, 'Censorship at the Editorial Desk', p. 156.
92. Shakhova, 'Rol' redaktora v izdanii knigi', p. 145.
93. Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, p. 216.
94. Parker and Philpotts, *Sinn und Form*, p. 172.
95. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
97. Zhirkov, 'Ot tsenzorov-professionalov k tainym tsenzoram', p. 20.
98. 'Soviet Censorship: Discussion', p. 61; See also Sherry, 'Better Something Than Nothing', p. 744.
99. Gromova, *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuze*, p. 37.
100. Friedberg, 'Soviet Censorship: A View from Outside', p. 26.
101. Orlova, *Vospominaniia*, p. 115.
102. For particularly interesting recollections of translators' relations with foreigners, see: Kudriavtseva, *Prevratnosti odnoi sud'by* and Kalashnikova, *Po-russki s liubov'iu*.
103. Gibbels, 'Translators, the Tacit Censors', p. 73.
104. *Ibid.*, pp. 74–5.
105. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 17.
106. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 42.
107. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 978, l. 442.
108. Quoted in Gromova, *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuze*, p. 33.
109. Volevich et al., "Vsekh etikh slov po-russki net . . .", emphasis in the original.
110. Tymoczko, 'Censorship and Self-Censorship in Translation', p. 30.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
112. Müller, 'Censorship and Cultural Regulation', p. 25.

PART TWO

# Case Studies



## Censorship in the Stalin Period: *Internatsional'naia literatura*

The translator Nora Gal', who worked on the editorial staff of *Internatsional'naia literatura* as a young woman, described her time at the journal in evocative and emotional terms:

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*, *Hydrocentrals*,<sup>1</sup> or poetic refrains in the style of 'the cranes rumble in the construction pit'.<sup>2</sup> 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 and 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 about the 'proletarian writers of all countries'. But it happened 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.<sup>3</sup>

*Internatsional'naia literatura* was a vital outlet for publishing major works of contemporary foreign, particularly Western, literature during the Stalin period. Like other 'thick' journals, it was not only a literary journal but also a socio-political one,<sup>4</sup> which was charged with creating

'a favourable image of the Land of the Soviets in the pinkshaded eyes of western intellectuals'.<sup>5</sup> As such, the journal focused primarily on publishing work by proletarian and revolutionary writers, although it also included a significant number of 'works of those left-bourgeois foreign writers, who portray the real actuality of the capitalist world';<sup>6</sup> meaning that the journal had some freedom to publish bourgeois authors, particularly during the first half of the 1930s, when cultural conditions were such that controls over foreign literature was still weak, allowing the journal to emerge as a 'potential cultural bridge between the Soviet Union and the West'.<sup>7</sup>

*Internatsional'naiia literatura* was an important literary institution, with a print run of 7,500 at the time of its launch, rising first to 8,000 in 1936 and to 15,000 by 1937. In terms of its content, most translations were made from English or 'American' (*американский язык*), as the journal sometimes referred to the language of the USA. German, French and Spanish were also important languages. As well as literary translations, the journal dedicated sections to 'theory and criticism', 'literary memoirs', 'reportage' and 'polemic'. Letters from famous foreign authors also occasionally featured. Until the mid-1930s, many of the prose works that were 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. The editorial staff frequently sought external advice regarding the choice of texts and the potential for abridgements, consulting with the National Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, Agitprop and the Comintern.<sup>8</sup> As happened with its earlier counterparts, versions of *Internatsional'naiia literatura* were published in German, French, English and, for a time, Chinese editions. These were standalone versions, designed to be a showcase of Soviet culture for a foreign audience, much as the monthly journal *Soviet Literature*, which published Soviet works in eight languages, would be from 1946. These foreign versions of the journal, edited in French by the author and journalist Paul Vaillant-Couturier, in German by the poet Hans Günter and in English by the Soviet literature specialist Sergei Dinamov (who had overall editorial responsibility for all versions, including the Russian), attempted to attract sympathetic foreign intellectuals to the Soviet cause, acquainting them with the achievements of the new Soviet state and, somewhat ironically, presenting the work of foreign 'revolutionaries' who were censored in their home countries.

The journal's first editors were Sergei Sergeevich Dinamov and Sergei Mikhailovich Tret'iakov. Dinamov was the author of works on George Bernard Shaw and Theodore Dreiser and editor of a collection of Shakespeare's works. Tret'iakov, a poet and playwright, had previously

been associated with *Novyi Lef* (New Left Front of the Arts). Having taken over the final issues of *Literatura mirovoi revoliutsii*, Dinamov and Tret'iakov set the journal on an initial course that displayed a keen interest in foreign literature and sought deep engagement rather than dry polemic.<sup>9</sup> Between 1937 and 1938 the journal indicated no chief editor, identifying the board as the responsible editor.<sup>10</sup> Timofei Arnol'dovich Rokotov took over after the previous editors were arrested, in 1938. He continued, despite the dangers, to attempt to establish contacts with foreign authors and cultural figures.<sup>11</sup> After the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the journal's work became almost impossible. In the last fraught year of its existence, the board was headed by the Germanist literary critic Boris Leont'evich Suchkov.<sup>12</sup>

As this chapter will discuss, *Internatsional'naia literatura* can be regarded as a rather unusual cultural space with (limited) freedom to publish, at least for part of the Stalin period. In part, this was achieved by the mobilisation of personal contacts with foreign authors and cultural figures, by which means translators and editors were able to obtain books for translation, a process that became much more dangerous and so more or less ceased during the years of Terror.<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, the journal was not immune to the terror that gripped the country in the mid-1930s, and its staff suffered greatly during the purges. Sergei Dinamov, chief editor in the first half of the 1930s, was arrested in 1938, accused of participating in counter-revolutionary activity, and shot in 1939. He was rehabilitated only after Stalin's death, in 1956.<sup>14</sup> Tret'iakov also perished during the purges. Several translators who worked for the journal were also arrested; many of them were also executed.

After the closure of MORP in 1935, responsibility for *Internatsional'naia literatura* fell to the Foreign Commission of the Soviet Writers' Union in 1936; from this point, its sense of freedom of publication began to dissipate. In the second half of the decade the journal would suffer from growing Soviet isolationism and anti-westernism, and its position would become increasingly precarious. The editorial board was publically criticised in the literary press in 1940 for producing poor-quality translations of poetry and for publishing the known reactionary Rudyard Kipling (although he was acknowledged to be an important author) without paying due attention to his presentation for the Soviet readers or clearly outlining what was harmful and reactionary in his work. The journal was reminded of its responsibility to the Soviet reader as the foremost publisher of foreign literature in the Soviet Union.<sup>15</sup> With the onset of war, the journal's position became increasingly difficult as international culture became less and less relevant for the Soviet cultural authorities.<sup>16</sup> The Politburo instructed that works by foreign writers be published

instead in book form and on the pages of the other ‘thick’ journals, *Oktiabr*’ (October), *Novyi mir* and *Znamia* (Banner).<sup>17</sup> Eventually, after struggling through the early part of the war, the journal was disbanded in 1943; its closure was initiated by the secretary of the Central Committee, Aleksandr Sergeevich Shcherbakov, who co-authored a report on the journal in which the editor Suchkov admitted his ‘obsequiousness’ (*раболепия*) before the West.<sup>18</sup> As Soviet cultural policy became more strongly isolationist *Internatsional’naia literatura* came to be seen by officials as the ‘megaphone of Anglo-American propaganda in our country’.<sup>19</sup> The journal had ‘become Anglo-American, which we did not need’.<sup>20</sup> There was to be no major journal dedicated to foreign literature until after Stalin’s death. Nonetheless, in the decade of its existence, *Internatsional’naia literatura* had a profound impact on its readers, and managed to publish some of the most significant foreign writing of the period in high-quality translations.

## A FRAGILE COSMOPOLITANISM

The journal was, in the early years of its existence, able to exercise considerable freedom in its choice of works to publish, benefitting from the lack of official attention paid to foreign literature. As Nailya Safiullina and Rachel Platonov have noted, before 1937, mainly for practical reasons, ‘the Soviet authorities did not articulate a clear programme for the import, censorship and publication of foreign literature’.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, the journal was able to operate with more freedom than other Soviet publications, and used its freedom to publish works by authors who could be seen as ‘antithetical to the themes, values and aesthetics promoted through contemporaneous Soviet literature’.<sup>22</sup> As well as being able to fly under the radar, the journal was also able to tap into the tolerance – even encouragement – of foreign culture associated with cosmopolitanism of Soviet culture in the first half of the 1930s, examined by Katerina Clark. In the first half of the 1930s, the Soviet Union became paradoxically ‘more cosmopolitan, more open to products from the West’ even as Stalinist power was being consolidated; as a result, ‘the horizon of Soviet culture widened as translation took off’.<sup>23</sup>

The consequence of these impulses was that for some years the journal was able to exist as a vital space for the publication of modernist authors whose work diverged from the emerging socialist realist canon not only by their apolitical standpoints, but also by their formal and aesthetic experimentation. This occurred despite the politicisation of literary culture, which became especially marked after the 1934 Soviet

writers' congress, and nowhere is it better exemplified than in the publication of James Joyce's modernist masterpiece *Ulysses* (originally published in 1922) from 1935, the year that marked the 'high point of Soviet internationalism'.<sup>24</sup> Episodes from Joyce's novel, translated by Ivan Kashkin's translators' collective, were published over ten issues in 1935 and early 1936. Remarkably, the novel could be published despite the denunciation of Joyce's 'decadent' work by Karl Radek at the first Writers' Congress only the year before as the petty, pointless ramblings of the bourgeoisie, and 'a heap of manure in which worms swarm, filmed with cinematographic apparatus through a microscope'.<sup>25</sup> One of Joyce's greatest failings was that he ignored the Irish Republican movement entirely in favour of the small lives of small people and 'the stagnant waters of a small pond and swamps where frogs live'.<sup>26</sup> Radek's comments were prescient. Although no significant changes were made to the texts during the editing process, publication was in fact unfinished – it ceased abruptly and without published explanation in 1936. The novel was also at some later point subjected to post-publication censorship: the entire novel was torn out of library copies of *Internatsional'naiia literatura* and even its title on the contents page inked out in some issues. One member of the translation collective, Igor' Romanovich, was arrested in 1937 and died in a labour camp. Romanovich's wife, according to a family friend, believed that the translator was arrested 'because of Joyce'.<sup>27</sup> After this abortive attempt, nothing more by Joyce could be published in Russian translation until the 1970s, with the sole exception of his *Dubliners*, judged to be suitably realist and so published in 1937.<sup>28</sup>

The inclusion of modernist authors was always tempered by political interference. Aldous Huxley's dystopian novel *Brave New World* (published in English in 1931) appeared in the journal's ninth issue for 1935, albeit published in an extremely truncated form – the selected extracts ran to only twenty-eight pages in the Russian version – and 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'.<sup>29</sup> In addition, Aleksandr Arosev, head of VOKS (the All-Union Society for Cultural Ties Abroad), considered *Brave New World* to be 'basically directed against fascism'.<sup>30</sup> Despite the initially positive reception, a critical campaign against Huxley was launched as the political climate changed, and his works could not be published until many years after Stalin's death.

The cosmopolitan impulse of the journal was therefore somewhat fragile in actuality, since it was always subject to political considerations. The attempts on the part of the editorial board to present the best

modernist literary pieces were frequently tempered by external political factors. Berthold Brecht's work represented a particularly ideologised presentation of modernism; a Marxist who was sympathetic to the Soviet Union and later a champion of the GDR, Brecht fit well into the journal's canon, allowing a plausible claim to be made for both political suitability and literary quality. His *oeuvre* appeared in Russian its more obviously pro-Soviet form; the first work published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* was *Die Mutter*, an adaptation of Gorky's *Mat'* (Mother) (published the second issue for 1933), and the journal's inaugural issue contained a poem in honour of Lenin. Modernist or formalist experimentation, though not a suitable mode for socialist realist authors, was rendered more acceptable in foreign authors when accompanied by the correct political messages. Nonetheless, the presence of modernist authors in the journal was governed by the struggle of the editorial board to privilege literary importance over nakedly political factors; this was true even into the 1940s, when the choice of texts became much more obviously politicised. A 1940 letter from the editor Rokotov to the deputy head of Agitprop, Petr Nikolaevich Pospelov, exemplifies the types of debates engaged in. Arguing for the suitability of Mann's novel *Lotte in Weimar* for inclusion in the journal,<sup>31</sup> Rokotov 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 sympathetic to the USSR before, and he could be so again.<sup>32</sup> The essence of Rokotov's argument was a challenge to the politically motivated narrowing of the journal's scope, and a call for the continued inclusion of works 'of great cultural and historical interest' to readers.<sup>33</sup> Most significantly, Rokotov resisted the instrumental inclusion of foreign texts, stating in a letter to Agitprop, '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'.<sup>34</sup>

*Internatsional'naiia literatura's* special position meant that it could take advantage of the Soviet cosmopolitanism of the 1930s. Modernist authors and those who, while not wholly orthodox, nonetheless presented their societies in appropriate terms, especially in their examination of social themes, made *Internatsional'naiia literatura* fascinating for its readers. This explains the inclusion of Ernest Hemingway (published five times in *Internatsional'naiia literatura*) and Erskine Caldwell (published seven times). For much of the 1930s, the journal's staff was able to avoid harsh censorship in its choice of texts. However, works by communist authors featured heavily, even in the early years of its existence; some of these authors were – and remain – obscure figures to the

Western reader. Authors such as Lionel Britton, a working-class author with close links to the Soviet Union, and the black American Langston Hughes represented the 'politically correct' selection of those authors with proven sympathy to the Soviet cause.<sup>35</sup> These authors represented the progressive tendencies prized by the authorities, which would come to dominate in the later 1930s.

## THE RHETORIC OF SOVIET SUPERIORITY

Around 1937, fragile cosmopolitanism gradually began to be overtaken by a foregrounding of 'proletarian' writers and, as the decade progressed, a Soviet 'superiority complex' emerged,<sup>36</sup> profoundly shaping the official attitude to foreign literature and as a result the censorial approach to the texts published in translation. Radek's speech at the first Congress of the Writers' Union in 1934, in which he vigorously denounced modernism and Joyce, urged writers to draw upon contemporary realist literature as models for socialist realism; he wished Soviet literature to integrate the best 'proletarian' writers, whom he associated closely with socialist realism.<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> He noted the value of foreign proletarian literature: 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'.<sup>39</sup> There is a strong sense of instrumentality in Radek's speech, which focused on the ideological and political properties of texts to assess their usefulness in the Soviet context; foreign works 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'.<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, writers like Romain Rolland, George Bernard Shaw and Upton Sinclair were incorporated into a canon of proletarian writers with strong links to the Soviet Union: Soviet writers should learn from the best of 'proletarian revolutionary literature abroad' and teach these writers how to 'create a picture of our country'.<sup>41</sup> In addition, Radek tasked those foreign writers present at the congress with teaching the Soviet audience about life abroad: with depicting, for a Soviet audience, rather than the authors' natural Western readership, the life of the worker in their countries. He implied that the 'proletarian' writer's natural readership was the Soviet one; he continued more explicitly 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 proletariat, in the struggle in which Soviet workers fought, in the struggle in which the best people of the working class in all the world died, you will create great literature'.<sup>42</sup>

The desire to create a single revolutionary literary canon expressed by Radek had a strong impact upon *Internatsional'naia literatura's* publication processes. The left-wing, proletarian authors who found favour among the authorities came increasingly to dominate the pages of the journal in the later 1930s and early 1940s, and 'apolitical' authors began to disappear. The journal turned to proletarian groups abroad: for example, abridged works by several members of the French Association of Revolutionary Artists and Writers (*Association des écrivains et artistes Révolutionnaires*) were published in the first year of the association's existence. Paul Vaillant-Couturier (who also edited the French edition), 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 mobilised French intellectuals in the fight against fascism and war.<sup>43</sup> A great many of the authors included in *Internatsional'naia literatura* were foreign intellectuals who were interested in and sympathetic to the Soviet Union without necessarily being communists.<sup>44</sup> Romain Rolland, for example, maintained Soviet contacts and privileged access in the country through MORP.<sup>45</sup> Lionel Britton 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 Soviet life up close and learning about the Stalinist repressions. Those who were members of their domestic communist or socialist parties were also highly favoured. The American author Josephine Herbst was a member of the communist party in her home country; the Spanish poet Rafael Alberti, who had poems dedicated to the revolution in Spain and the siege of Madrid published in 1935 and 1937, 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 was translated from Spanish, and the subject of the Spanish Civil War was a common one.<sup>46</sup> Federico García Lorca's work was published five times between 1936 and 1941, including a poem about an attack by the Spanish Civil Guards against gypsies, 'Romance de la Guardia Civil española', published in issue 9/10 in 1940.

Thus, as the 1930s progressed, the publication of foreign authors in translation was increasingly coloured by the emerging discourse of Soviet superiority, which increased tension between the desire to include representations of foreign culture and the need to assert the Soviet

Union's cultural achievements. As Michael David-Fox notes, 'the challenge became how to integrate the exemplars of contemporary western civilisation into a new Stalinist orthodoxy that by the mid-1930s asserted the outright superiority of Soviet culture'.<sup>47</sup> By the late 1930s, Soviet rhetoric proclaimed the country's leading role in economics, science and culture. The impulse to 'trumpet Soviet superiority over the rest of the world was a far-reaching phenomenon far broader than agitprop' and had become a defining feature of socialist realism and Soviet popular culture.<sup>48</sup> As the discourse of cultural supremacy gained ground, the idea of Soviet literature as world-leading became more entrenched, leading to a view of other literatures as inferior, and of Soviet literature as a model to which foreign literature should also adhere – rather than the other way round, as had previously been the case. The myth of Soviet literature 'became entrenched as dogma and as a true reflection of reality'. As a keystone of Soviet cultural policy it was turned into 'a sound basis for making decisions such as how to evaluate foreign writers and whom to translate'.<sup>49</sup>

The journal's ability to act in this changing cultural context was governed, and limited, by a number of factors. At the highest level, the establishment of a dominant rhetoric of superiority established an atmosphere that the editorial staff could not avoid being affected by, with correspondent effects on its work. Additionally, recommendations from the Party established the ever-changing limits of what represented an acceptable image of and relationship with the West. In the late 1930s and early 1940s the journal struggled to produce quality work, not only for practical reasons – it was becoming more difficult to access foreign material – but also on account of crudely political factors. As a result, the journal's view narrowed considerably to focus on the 'proletarian' authors who continued to vocally support the country; by the end of the 1930s, its period of freedom was definitely over.

Despite its decline in the second half of the 1930s, one cannot help but be struck by the freedom enjoyed – albeit temporarily – by the staff of *Internatsional'naiia literatura*. As already noted, this freedom was far from absolute and even in the earlier period the texts were mediated in a number of ways, as an examination of text-level practices will show. Close comparison of the translated texts published by *Internatsional'naiia literatura* with their English originals demonstrates that a large number of editorial changes, up to several dozen in a single text, were made before publication. Alterations ranged from the seemingly benign process of publishing a novel in abridged form (sometimes, but by no means always, acknowledged in the text as such) to the removal or manipulation of particular ideologically problematic words and sentences. Thus, if a

work escaped censorship upon import into the country, or during the text-selection process, it was certainly subjected to it during and after translation. Politically or morally unacceptable material was consistently excised or distorted; as a result, foreign literature was reshaped and moulded on the textual level to conform to Soviet norms, often emerging as a shadow of its former self. The textual changes in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* were a response to political and moral taboos, which was a powerful force at a time when certain words, phrases and subjects possessed a quasi-sacred status or 'magical power'.<sup>50</sup> The presence in Soviet society of political and ideological taboos recalls Freud's statement that behind such prohibitions there is 'a theory that they are necessary because certain persons and things are charged with a dangerous power, which can be transferred through contact with them, almost like an infection'.<sup>51</sup> Certainly there are many instances in these texts where one can observe the use of censorship to guard against an 'infectious' inclusion of taboo material – even where, in the original version, the author is explicitly critiquing or denouncing that subject or person. The very presence of a name or topic could contaminate a text. The operation of taboo in censorship had little regard for authorial intent but rather prioritised content. This is because, as Caroline Humphrey has noted, 'it was not the meaning content (signified) that was tabooed so much as the word itself (the signifier)'.<sup>52</sup> Thus the very mention of a taboo name or topic provoked anxiety, even if the author of the original was engaging in an obvious denunciation. An article by the critic I. Fradkin captures this paranoia. Coming close to accusing the editorial board of anti-Marxist tendencies, Fradkin describes the approach of critics to the work of J. B. Priestley and the French author Louis-Ferdinand Céline. The appearance in their works of certain 'problems' of capitalism was, mistakenly, taken as critique of capitalism. They were, in fact, according to Fradkin, simply allowing harmful, even pornographic, material to be published. These so-called critics of capitalism turned out to be anti-Soviet.<sup>53</sup>

The incantatory power of certain names or words was therefore all-important. As a result, the danger represented by taboo content was very real for members of the Soviet literary profession, where mistakes could have very grave consequences.<sup>54</sup> Soviet taboos, then, resulted in a paranoid avoidance, a 'cross[ing] out' of topics that established 'certain zones of silence in social communication'.<sup>55</sup> The establishment of taboo is a means of setting the limits and thereby establishing the identity of a political regime, which defines endorsed speech as well as excluding the unsayable.<sup>56</sup> Translated texts, which were of course produced outside the well-regulated, standardised Soviet discursive sphere, were not subject to the same taboos and as such contained a potential threat

to the politically sanctioned discourse, provoking censorial anxiety and paranoia. The works published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* avoided proscribed subjects in the same way as Russian literature was forced to; in these texts the avoidance of taboo often resulted in the manipulation or even reversal of the political and ideological themes of the Western works.

Although one can observe certain constants, many Soviet political taboos were not rooted in any eternal quality, but rather shifted with Party priorities and other such factors as the state of relations with other countries; constant vigilance was therefore required. The political censorship of translated texts was, to a great extent, governed by the often-changing policy of the Party, which established taboo areas of expression that required intense attention on the part of the translators and editors as well as Glavlit.

#### POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL TABOO

Joseph Freeman's autobiography *An American Testament: A Narrative of Rebels and Romantics* serves as an excellent example of the extent to which Stalinist censorship could impact upon translated texts. In this text, the ideological and political modes of censorship were mobilised to drastically alter the text, moulding its message to fit the stringent demands of the Soviet political context despite the author's fellow-traveller status. Freeman was a prominent figure in American radical circles as a founding editor of the *Partisan Review*; he was part of the circle that formed around left-wing publications like *New Masses*. Of ethnic Jewish descent, Freeman was born in Ukraine but grew up in New York, where he joined radical groups and was associated with the Communist Party. He spent several months in Moscow in the early 1930s working for the American delegation to the Comintern; it was here that he would witness both the enthusiasm of the Soviet workers and the political struggles that would cause him significant doubts.<sup>57</sup> Nonetheless, he maintained close links with the Soviet Union, working closely with RAPP, and later became the New York correspondent for TASS. During the 1930s he wrote numerous political tracts on subjects such as the Russian revolution and workers' rights. *American Testament*, a 'narrative of Marxist self-fashioning',<sup>58</sup> was published in 1936;<sup>59</sup> it describes Freeman's journey to socialism and portrays the left-wing circles in the USA. After its publication, Freeman was attacked by the Comintern for his lack of respect in depicting Stalin;<sup>60</sup> he was expelled from the American Communist Party in 1939 for making a number of errors, including, most notably,

'failing to sufficiently demonize Trotsky'.<sup>61</sup> He conclusively rejected the Soviet Union after the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and his later fictional work was much more introspective, even humanistic in its approach.<sup>62</sup>

The censorial treatment of *An American Testament* combined the political, aimed at removing taboo material, and ideological modes of censorship. The most obvious manifestation of textual interference was the removal of politically taboo material in accordance with the official prohibition of 'insults' against communism (what counted as an insult was, as the following extracts display, a rather broad category). In the following extract, Freeman recounts a 1926 meeting with Vladimir Mayakovsky during the poet's American tour.<sup>63</sup> In his recounting of the event, the following paragraph was cut 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.'<sup>64</sup>

This portrayal of Mayakovsky's poor English, his excessive drinking and Freeman's gentle mockery did not conform to the state-controlled, canonical portrayal of the poet in official Soviet discourse. Freeman's humanising image of the great poet was unacceptable; the implication of Leninist violence in the phrase 'he talked with cannon' was also suspect. As a result, the section had to be removed.

The elimination of other public figures from the published text stemmed not from their exalted position in Soviet society (and their consequent protection from criticism), but quite the opposite. A vital component of censorial practice – which was also common in domestic literature – was the striking out of the names of those people who had been judged to be anti-Soviet. These individuals, including repressed persons or foreign critics of the Soviet system, were considered to be 'non-persons' (*нелица*).<sup>65</sup> In these translations, the censorship of 'non-persons' manifested itself most often in the removal of the names of former communists who had abandoned their links with the Soviet Union or renounced their original politics. This was carried out either by cutting them from the texts during translation and editing or, after

publication, slicing or inking their names and photos from the pages on which they appeared. Perhaps the most notable such figure was Leon Trotsky, who was deported in 1929. The censorship apparatus was particularly sensitive to Trotskyism, and so-called ‘Trotskyist propaganda’ was outlawed.<sup>66</sup> *American Testament* made frequent mention of Freeman’s association with the left-wing political and literary periodical *The Liberator*, which was founded in 1918 and became an organ of the American Communist Party in 1922. Max Eastman, who was editor from 1918 to 1922, was a committed Trotskyist during the 1920s and 1930s and played a large role in the dissemination of Trotsky’s ideas in America. His engagement with Trotskyism made Eastman a non-person in the Soviet Union and, as a result, in *American Testament* his name was erased from a list of authors for Freeman’s literary journal and even from a description of his own journal, where Freeman notes: ‘I visited the editorial offices of *The Liberator* at the invitation of Max Eastman, who had just accepted some of my verses for publication’.<sup>67</sup> The Russian translation cuts Eastman’s name: ‘Я явился в редакцию ‘Либерэйтора’, которая приняла для печатания несколько моих стихотворений’ (I went to the editorial office of *The Liberator*, which had accepted some of my poems for publication).<sup>68</sup> Typically, these kinds of changes were made with little regard for literary quality and internal coherence. In this extract, the removal of Eastman’s name distorts the text’s meaning: without the reference to Eastman pouring tea, the metaphor of pouring words that follows is destroyed.

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.<sup>69</sup>

The Russian avoids any reference to Eastman:

*Эти собрания проходили весьма неофициально и больше напоминали вечеринки в чьей-нибудь студии, чем деловые совещания. Впрочем, все было очень серьезно. Кроме речей, здесь ничего не разливалось.*

(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.)<sup>70</sup>

The reader of the Russian edition might plausibly ask what *else* might be poured, since the reference to tea disappeared along with Eastman's name; they might also assume this to be bad writing on Freeman's part, or poor translation. Such clumsy censorial interventions occurred quite frequently in the *Internatsional'naiia literatura* texts. The names of other 'non-persons' were also removed from a list of members of the American Civil Liberties Union. They include Oswald Garrison Villard, a civil rights activist and editor of the liberal magazine *The Nation*, and Frederick C. Howe, a member of the Ohio senate.

The remoulding of *An American Testament* did not stop at the removal of taboo material, but also, more insidiously, manipulated Soviet ideologemes in order to maintain their status. The censor consistently erased non-canonical uses of these terms or manipulated them to conform to the Soviet use, thus ensuring they retained their sanctioned Soviet meanings. Consequently, even the presence of such marked terms proved problematic. In the following instance, the author sarcastically quotes popular opinion on the economic development of the USA after the First World War: 'Yet even when the Golden Age was most golden, a lot of "dirty Reds" were "disgruntled"'.<sup>71</sup> Since it is reported speech, it is quite clear that the statement is not the real opinion of the author. Nonetheless, despite the clearly indicated hostile opinion of the author towards the expressed viewpoint – further emphasised by the ironising use of quotation marks – the censor of the Russian text minimised the negative use of the word *red*, preserving the canonical status of this marker of Soviet ideological language. The final result is as follows: 'Но даже в самую золотую пору золотого века масса "красных" имела большие "неприятности"' (But even in the most golden time of the golden age, a mass of 'reds' experienced great 'hardships').<sup>72</sup> Although *red* was retained as a means of referring to communists, an acceptable use according to the standards of Soviet official discourse, the negative marker was removed, reinforcing the sanctioned use.

The censorial approach to the ideologeme often produced a more subtle type of intervention involving the modification and strengthening of certain items to better coincide with their particularly Soviet use. Freeman records a report in a communist newspaper on the plight of American workers in which just such a change can be observed. The English refers to the American 'workingman': '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'.<sup>73</sup> The Russian version is subjected to a very minor but crucial change, so that the end of the phrase is rendered: 'Не думайте, что это вещает пророк. Наши великий

*американский рабочий скажет вам то же самое*’ (Do not think it is a prophet who tells you this. Our great American worker will tell you the same thing).<sup>74</sup> The change here serves to more closely align the text with Soviet discursive norms, thereby making an attempt to incorporate the text into the Soviet symbolic canon, by heightening the resonance of the image of the worker. The addition of the adjective ‘великий’ (great) creates a collocation that is strongly reminiscent of the Soviet ideological language, calling to mind proclamatory slogans and headlines. The result is to create ‘manifest intertextuality’, whereby blocks of discourse are repeated exactly through several texts thus linking them in a single intertextual construction.<sup>75</sup>

A further example suggests that censorship attempted to align the foreign texts with the Soviet discursive canon through the creation of intertextual links between the Soviet and foreign contexts. The English version reads: ‘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’.<sup>76</sup> The Russian version replaces the combination of natural and military metaphors with one more strongly associated with Soviet public discourse, utilising the metaphor of struggle that was a constant feature of official language use and was used to designate central features of Soviet rhetoric in collocations such as *классовая борьба* (class struggle) and *борьба с врагами народа* (struggle against the enemies of the people). The term *борьба* (struggle) was also strongly associated with the struggle against capitalism and closely related to the metaphor of the task, which was central to Stalinist projects, containing in it the sense of the struggle to build Soviet society.<sup>77</sup> This subtle change again creates intertextuality between the Soviet context and the Western text, with the resultant translation reading as follows:

*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.*

(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.)<sup>78</sup>

These examples amply demonstrate the susceptibility of the words and symbols strongly associated with the state ideology to censorship. Acting to control new and potentially taboo 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 of discourse as valuable and sacred, which could only be employed in particular, limited ways. As a result it tried to force foreign texts to adhere to the norms of Soviet discourse, whether that meant erasing heretical meanings that appeared in the English, or inserting authorised meanings, and creating intertextuality between the foreign and Soviet literary environments. Jan Plamper describes this kind of change as an important secondary function of Soviet censorship, which sought to guard against the proliferation of multiple meanings and 'reduce semantic ambiguity', thereby preserving the canonical authoritative discourse.<sup>79</sup> The ideological censorship of foreign texts is a result of the extreme anxiety surrounding linguistic as well as political taboo, although the two are of course closely related. This feature of the censorship was quite consistent throughout the Stalin period and after, and therefore relatively easy to predict and implement. Political taboos, on the other hand, underwent dramatic shifts in accordance with Party policy and events on the international stage.

---

## FASCISM AND ANTI-FASCISM

---

Party policy and the resultant censorship shifted most drastically in relation to Soviet anti-fascist discourses, demonstrating the transformation of the taboo over a period of several years.<sup>80</sup> Anti-fascism was an extremely important factor in what was published in the Soviet Union during the 1930s: the enthusiasm for such writers was part of a broader anti-fascist discourse and a way of placing the Soviet Union at the front of an international cultural alliance.<sup>81</sup> Anti-fascism was 'a central pillar of Soviet ideology and culture'.<sup>82</sup> The public rhetoric of this period positioned the country at the forefront of world literature, world culture and the 'real' Europe, in stark contrast to barbarian Germany, portrayed as a dangerous and debauched enemy whose transgressions included anti-Semitism and anti-Communism.<sup>83</sup> At this time, the journal, in common with other literary institutions, emphasised its anti-fascist stance,<sup>84</sup> seeking out anti-fascist authors,<sup>85</sup> such as Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser and Willi Bredel, a German communist displaced by the rise of Nazism who spent time in the USSR in the 1930s. German authors associated with the Communist Party in their own country, such as Johannes Becher, and Ernst Ottwalt, who immigrated to the Soviet Union from Germany, were also frequently published in the journal.<sup>86</sup> This tendency has been referred to as an attempt to co-opt the West in the formation

of an 'anti-fascist front' and to construct literary 'Potemkin villages' that would fool Western liberals into sympathy with the Soviet movement.<sup>87</sup>

The anti-fascist line was strained after the Soviet decision to intervene in the Spanish Civil War in support of the Republicans in 1936; Spain, and anti-fascism more broadly, became the subject of substantial censorial attention and some anxiety for cultural officials. It also conditioned the approach to anti-fascism in the published texts. The different approach of *Internatsional'naiia literatura's* Western authors in understanding and describing the war provoked several interventions aimed at maintaining the correct Soviet narrative of the conflict, such as was presented at length in newspapers in 1936 and 1937,<sup>88</sup> and seeking to avoid the publication of taboo material. It could be safer – and presumably easier – to avoid the topic altogether, as in the Russian translation of a work by John Hyde Preston, a now obscure left-wing author, who wrote for a variety of socialist periodicals and produced two books on American history: *A Gentleman Rebel: Mad Anthony Wayne* (1930) and *Revolution, 1776* (1933). *The Liberals* certainly fit the late 1930s pattern of publishing works primarily by 'proletarian' writers. As a critique of American politics, albeit a mild one, it also seems likely that Preston's work fed into the discourse of Soviet superiority, and could showcase the problems and weaknesses of the liberal American model for the Soviet reader. By the time the novel was published over two issues in 1938, support for the Republicans in the form of supplies, diplomacy and propaganda had started to be scaled back in anticipation of a complete withdrawal from Spain the following year.<sup>89</sup> Whereas it featured in the original as a frequent topic of political discussion among the characters, the war in Spain was written out of this novel for the most part, and references to anti-fascist tendencies and organisations.<sup>90</sup> The following extract, for example, was altered in the Russian translation:

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.<sup>91</sup>

The second sentence was removed, erasing the subject of Spain entirely. This excision makes clear the lack of concern on the part of the censor for the reader's understanding of the novel: the text of the Russian translation lacks coherence, jumping between unrelated topics. This change and others such as the replacement of the word 'fascists'<sup>92</sup> with

‘мятежники’ (rebels) in another part of the novel,<sup>93</sup> aims to remove any mention of the war from the Russian version. The same can be said of a moment where the main character, Philip, reads about Spain and muses that the country ‘had an atmosphere of death about it and thin and rotten dying. Spain now was not a traveller’s country . . . Now Spain’s grandeur was the grandeur of men fighting for those things which did not photograph well and were unfit for travel books’.<sup>94</sup> This whole extract was cut from the Russian version.

By seeking to avoid the inclusion of potentially problematic material as the absolute priority, the censorial changes obscure a key thematic line of the novel and create numerous clumsy moments in the text where transitions within paragraphs are disturbed and characters’ line of thought disrupted. A lack of regard for the literary qualities of the resultant text and the reader’s experience is rather typical of the Stalin-era censorship of translations. It would be even more marked in material concerning the Soviet relationship with Germany during and after the period of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. The increasing anxiety around the topic of Germany would be anticipated in the Russian translation of *The Liberals*, likely in an attempt to avoid any reference to this sensitive subject. Interestingly, the translation also anticipated the anti-Semitic censorship that would find full expression in the early 1940s. The English version reads as follows:

Wilder had recently been in Germany and was depressed and angry. There, in what was once the noblest seat of science, a man with a severe case of paranoid dementia held sixty-five million 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.<sup>95</sup>

The translated version is much reduced: ‘Уайлдер побывал недавно в Германии и вспоминал о своей поездке с горечью’ (Wilder had recently been in Germany and remembered his trip with sadness).<sup>96</sup> As a result, the situation in Germany is referenced only obliquely and the character’s opinion rendered neutral. The motivation for Wilder’s sadness also vanishes, again weakening the translation’s style.

The mutability of taboo in the face of a changing political climate is especially clearly demonstrated in the years immediately before and after the Soviet entry into the Second World War. During this period the official attitude to Germany twice shifted dramatically, necessitating an appropriate censorial response each time. In August 1939, Soviet foreign

policy drastically changed course when the Soviet Union and Germany signed the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, which agreed a policy of non-aggression between the two countries and divided eastern Europe into German and Soviet spheres of influence; this cancelled at a stroke the previous anti-fascist line.<sup>97</sup> With the signing of the pact, Germany was no longer included in the category of enemy,<sup>98</sup> and the official rhetoric and identity was forced to change rapidly to keep up.<sup>99</sup> Soviet public discourse ‘professed total neutrality in international relations, whilst clearly privileging the German interpretation of events’.<sup>100</sup> Glavlit immediately banned the publication of negative statements about Germany and moved to remove them from texts.<sup>101</sup> The editorial board of *Internatsional’naia literatura* scrambled to censor texts in accordance with the new Party line: all negative statements about Germany and references to fascism and Nazism had to be removed from the texts published after the non-aggression pact was signed. *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (1938, Russian publication 1939), a long essay by Robert Briffault, was published in Russian in the last issue for 1939, shortly after the agreement of the non-aggression pact. Briffault, an anthropologist, surgeon and, later, novelist, was intensely concerned with social and political issues, although he was never associated with an organised political movement. His argument in *Decline and Fall* was directed against Britain and British imperialism and forcefully expressed his socialist views on class and capitalism;<sup>102</sup> in his vehement argument against the British appeasement of fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, Briffault repeatedly made disparaging parallels between German and British politics, arguing that British imperialism and Nazism shared crucial characteristics. The censorship of this text encompassed the deletion of almost every reference to Germany or fascism – either through the use of long abridgements or smaller excisions of single words or sentences. Thus, Briffault’s condemnation of the ‘superiority of the English race’ as ‘a form of the racial theories so refulgently upheld in countries suffering under Fascist rule’<sup>103</sup> was cut short, removing the reference to fascism in the Russian version: ‘Превосходство английской расы, представляет собой, конечно, вариацию расовых теорий’ (the superiority of the English race is, of course, a variation of race theories).<sup>104</sup> A rather less critical reference to fascism and Germany was also erased in the following extract, where the English version reads: ‘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’.<sup>105</sup> The Russian translation cuts the final sentence, avoiding any description of German militarisation: ‘Недавнее мнимое возвращение Англии к благоденствию было произведено

посредством кой-каких банковско-бухгалтерских махинаций' (The recent supposed revival of the English to prosperity was effected by means of certain bank and bookkeeping machinations).<sup>106</sup> The cumulative result of such changes was to remove a primary line in Briffault's argument, completely erasing the target of his attacks. The political taboo against Nazism at this time operated in such a way that the only acceptable response was silence: because any inclusion of the subject aroused anxiety, even neutral mentions of Germany at this time were the subject of censorial attention, with the result that fascism was entirely erased from the literary discourse, even despite the ensuing damage to the published texts.

### THE WAR: A SUDDEN REVERSAL

The anxiety and fear experienced by *Internatsional'naiia literatura's* staff could only have increased when Germany invaded the Soviet Union in June 1941, bringing about the Soviet entry into the war. In the wake of the invasion, a huge propaganda campaign against Germany was immediately launched; the journal was, as ever, at the mercy of these policy reversals and the start of the war proved to be a key turning point in its history. Where criticism of Germany was strictly avoided during the time of the non-aggression pact, the Soviet entry into the war forced the journal to turn once again towards anti-fascism. This sudden change in policy was problematic and the new chief editor Timofei Rokotov wrote in September 1941 that the journal was in 'total bedlam': the editorial board did not know what to publish and was struggling to obtain anti-fascist literature.<sup>107</sup> Around the same time, the journal consulted with the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs and Agitprop about the suitability of publishing particular items.<sup>108</sup> At this time, the journal's reportage section was filled with propagandistic essays and articles; the topic of war loomed large.

One anti-fascist novel that did manage to find its way into the journal – albeit in heavily abridged form – was Upton Sinclair's Pulitzer-winning *Dragon's Teeth* (1942, published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* the same year). This novel, the third in his *World's End* series about the socialist character Lanny Budd, describes the fate of a family of Dutch Jews during the consolidation of Nazi power in the early 1930s. *Dragon's Teeth* tells the story of the head of the family, Johannes, a rich Jewish businessman who is kidnapped by the Nazis and freed only after several years of campaigning by Lanny at the novel's climax. Sinclair, a committed socialist, was actively involved in politics in his native USA;<sup>109</sup> he was

also an enthusiastic supporter of the Soviet system in the 1930s, seeing it as the vanguard against fascism. More than three million copies of his novels were published in the country.<sup>110</sup> Even as other intellectuals began to abandon the country in the wake of the Stalinist purges, he maintained a 'noncommittal public reaction' to growing evidence of Soviet totalitarianism,<sup>111</sup> believing that to criticise the Soviet Union would undermine the broader socialist cause. Sinclair only belatedly broke with the Soviet Union; by 1940, disappointed with the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact, he began to look at the country with a more critical eye, though he maintained his support through the war. Eventually, he could no longer turn a blind eye to signs of Soviet dictatorship. Horrified by the Soviet expansionism in the post-war period, he 'declared war' on the country in 1949, cutting all ties and reversing his previous statements to argue that, in actual fact, the Soviet system was even worse than Nazism.<sup>112</sup> In the year of Stalin's death, he published the final *World's End* novel, *The Return of Lanny Budd*. Budd was by now a cold warrior; this time it was Budd who was captured and put in jail by the Soviets.

*Dragon's Teeth* featured a number of high-profile German political figures as characters and fitted the anti-German propaganda model almost perfectly. However, it was not perfectly orthodox in its presentation of the anti-Nazi theme, and so a number of interventions were aimed at removing comparisons between Germany and the Soviet Union. One passage, for example, in which Lanny describes his wife, was cut from the translated version, since it makes a heretical comparison between Lenin and Hitler: 'Lanny [. . .] had heard Lord Wickthorpe cite passages from Lenin proclaiming doctrines of political cynicism which sounded embarrassingly like Hitler's.'<sup>113</sup> Another section, in which a character claims that the Nazis learned 'even from Lenin', was also removed.<sup>114</sup>

The creation of undesirable equivalences of Lenin and the Nazi regimes could clearly not be published, but the censorship also operated in more subtle ways: implicit analogies were also subject to cuts and manipulations aimed to foreclose the reader's potentially incorrect interpretation of the text. As a result, Lanny's opinions of a speech given by Hitler on foreign affairs at the Reichstag were altered in the Russian version. Whereas in the English, Lanny thinks, '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!',<sup>115</sup> in Russian it was rendered simply as '*Гитлера словно подменили*' (It was as though Hitler had been replaced).<sup>116</sup> The censorial intervention pre-empted a possible interpretation of this passage as referring to Stalin's own foreign policy reversals and his opportunism at the beginning of the war, thus avoiding a taboo link between Stalin and the enemy.

Several of the changes to this text are ideological in nature, concerning the sacrosanct imagery and ideologemes of Soviet official discourse. As a result, references to revolution were consistently removed from the text, anticipating the reader's potential to make an interpretative link between the German and Bolshevik revolutions and so seeking to preserve the sanctified image of revolution within Soviet discourse. Hence the removal of a sentence in which a Nazi officer tells Lanny, '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'.<sup>117</sup> A later passage was also subject to a similar intervention:

'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.'<sup>118</sup>

The Russian version is much shorter, with all reference to 'revolution' cut:

– Я с вами совершенно согласна, быстро ответила фрау Магда. – Такие нелепости – не редкость. Правда, мой муж – человек очень занятой.  
(– I am completely in agreement, quickly answered Frau Magda.  
– Such absurdities are no rarity. It is true, my husband is a very busy person).<sup>119</sup>

The reference to previous revolutions made by Frau Magda in the English obliquely recalls the Bolshevik revolution, associating it, however subtly, with hardship and violence. In these 'ideological' deletions, the censorship operates rather more subtly than in passages that simply 'defame' Lenin and the Soviet order. Here, the censorial interventions were concerned not simply with the presence of the politically taboo material in the text, but also with the misuse of the quasi-sacred image of the revolution. Consequently, the censorial interventions sought to control imagery presented by these foreign texts, ensuring a 'correct' reading and avoiding any ambiguity in the terms of Soviet discourse.

By far the most striking aspect of the censorship of *Dragon's Teeth*

is the complete removal of the Jewish theme from the Russian publication, an act prompted by broader anti-Semitic policies. The war years were marked by ‘an equivocal official policy [. . .] regarding the Jewish minority’,<sup>120</sup> which developed into an official anti-Semitism from around 1942. In that year, Agitprop declared that Jews were over-represented in cultural institutions; a purge of publishing houses and newspapers followed that targeted mostly Jews.<sup>121</sup> The growing anti-Jewish atmosphere in the country was also reflected in the censorship; Glavlit began to erase evidence of anti-Semitism and pogroms,<sup>122</sup> culminating in the 1940s in an ‘ethnic cleansing’ of Jewish themes and characters of Soviet literature.<sup>123</sup> *Internatsional’naia literatura* engaged in anti-Semitic censorship in several texts and excluded an article written by the Jewish author Klara Blum in 1943. In that case, the head of Glavlit, Nikolai Sadchikov, wrote to Agitprop with a special report and a memo from the censor about his interventions in the journal, recommending the article not be published because of its incorrect statements about Jews, most particularly the statement that ‘because the Jews love peace, especially because they are deeply against violence and the spilling of blood, they stand on the front lines in the war against fascist barbarity, and to their great achievements in the fields of philosophy, poetry, music and sociology, one can add great achievements in a fifth field: the military’.<sup>124</sup> Sinclair’s novel represents an early manifestation of this shift in policy, and a rather extreme one. Despite being the central theme of the novel, Jewishness is almost entirely absent from the Russian translation. To take one example, after Johannes’s arrest the English text makes clear that his persecution has a religious basis; the Russian version, however, lost the explanatory phrase, ‘He’s a Jew, Lanny.’<sup>125</sup> The same erasure of Jewishness can be observed in relation to all the Jewish characters, as the description of one of the family’s friends, Freddi, shows. He states, ‘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.’<sup>126</sup> In the Russian translation, the first clause was lost, and the remainder was rendered as follows: ‘Вы и представить себе не можете, всюду шпишки – прислуга, дворники, всевозможные личности, которые, стараются выслужиться перед нацистами’ (You cannot imagine, there are spies everywhere, the servant, the caretaker, all kinds of people who try to get favour with the Nazis.)<sup>127</sup> In a scene where Lanny meets with Joseph Goebbels to plead (unsuccessfully) for his friend’s freedom, the Russian translation, by erasing the reference to Johannes’s Jewishness, created the impression that his arrest is actually a kind of socially and politically motivated revenge upon a rich capitalist, rather

than ethnically-based persecution (of course, it seems rather unlikely that the quasi-socialist pronouncement that results from this change was the intention of the censor):

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 our country; and perhaps it had 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.<sup>128</sup>

The censored Russian version recasts Jews as capitalists; as well as removing the reference to ‘gangsters’ and referring simply to ‘коммунисты’ (communists), the ‘rich Jew’ becomes a ‘миллионер’ (millionaire), stripped of the ethnic-religious identifier.<sup>129</sup> References to Jewish characters were reframed throughout the novel to refer to them only as speculators. Where Sinclair has Hermann Göring declare that ‘the Jew who has fattened himself upon our blood is going to disgorge’,<sup>130</sup> the translation reads instead: ‘Вашему разжиревшему на нашей крови ростовщику придется раскошелиться’ (Your usurer, who has fattened himself on our blood will have to cough up).<sup>131</sup> Göring continues, ‘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.’<sup>132</sup> The rationale of his statement was again altered, with ‘filthy Jewish swine’ becoming ‘подлый спекулянт’ (filthy speculator).<sup>133</sup>

The cumulative effect of these repeated manipulations and excisions is to expunge completely the systemic nature and ethnic bias of Nazi persecution. The final section of *Dragon’s Teeth* culminates in an emotional scene where Lanny weeps for his own fate and that of his friend. His sorrow is also for the Jewish people as a whole, but is erased from the Russian version, rendering the source of Europe’s unhappiness vague and difficult to perceive.

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.<sup>134</sup>

The censorial intervention in the text removes the specificity of the Jewish experience, generalising the violence perpetrated by the Nazi regime and removing Jewish victimhood entirely.

*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.*

(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.)<sup>135</sup>

The unintended result of the avoidance of a politically taboo subject is the complete destruction of the author's intended message: rather than a description of the ethnic violence at the heart of the Nazi state, the reader is faced with a generalised attack on the enemy that, thanks to the destruction of the novel's central theme and the extensive abridgement, barely hangs together as a coherent piece of fiction.

## PURITANICAL CENSORSHIP

Where political taboo was absolute during the period in which it had force, puritanical censorship was rather more pliable. The puritanical censorship applied to the texts published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* employed a number of tactics, although it was possible for these domestic norms relating to sex to be challenged, as examples from Preston's *The Liberals* will demonstrate. While the novel was subject to puritanical censorship to neutralise the sexual content, not all of it was bowdlerised or removed.

Although the post-revolutionary period was marked by a sense of sexual freedom and experimentation around gender norms and conceptions of the family, this was only short-lived and was sharply curtailed in the 1920s and 1930s. Sexual licence became associated with bourgeois values and 'ideological deviance'.<sup>136</sup> Sexual politics became increasingly conservative, prioritising the family unit. The sociological study of sexual life disappeared and Freud's works, widely discussed in the previous decade, were banned. The state began to institute centralised control over the life of its citizens to an unprecedented degree, resulting in a 'veritable triumph' of puritanism,<sup>137</sup> which manifested itself as the 'profound sexual phobia of Soviet society'.<sup>138</sup> The puritanism of Stalinist

culture of course impacted on literary production – depictions of love, sex and the body disappeared almost completely from Soviet literature of the 1930s, and earlier texts were censored to conform to contemporary moral norms.<sup>139</sup> Swearing and vulgar language, the subject of official campaigns for cultured speech, was also subject to strict censorship; Glavlit issued official instructions concerning the ‘fight’ against bad language.<sup>140</sup> While puritanical censorship had a firm grip on domestic literature, it was not quite so strictly applied to translations.

In the Russian translation of Preston’s novel, one can infer the existence of some kind of imagined limit governing the portrayal of sex whereby the subject could be mentioned, but only subject to certain limitations in terms of frequency and explicitness. Thus the love affair between two characters, Philip and Ann, underwent some modification in the Russian version in order to modify excessively long or explicit reference to the sexual act. Unlike the approach to political taboo, puritanical censorship displayed a concern with the tone and intent of the original text. The neutral and medicalised phrase ‘он был импотентом’ (he was impotent)<sup>141</sup> could remain as the translation of ‘he was impotent’,<sup>142</sup> but a long passage that described a sexual encounter between the two characters in romantic terms was reduced to one short paragraph, where the narrative abruptly halts at the embrace:

*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.*

(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.)<sup>143</sup>

The scene was cut, even though the English original is actually tender and even modest in its description of the sexual act. It continues:

He thought he had never felt her body 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.<sup>144</sup>

At other points in the novel where the descriptions of sex are less lengthy, there was a little censorial leeway, where references to sex were softened, but not removed entirely, as in the following example. The phrase ‘His hand found the warm nipple of her breast under her dress’<sup>145</sup> was made less explicit in the Russian, through the substitution of the euphemistic *грудь* (breast/ chest) for the more specific and thus more explicit *сосок* (nipple): ‘Его рука ощутила теплоту ее груди под платьем’ (‘His hand felt the warmth of her breast under her dress’).<sup>146</sup> The sexual taboo in foreign texts was, as this text shows, only partial, whereas political and ideological taboos were total. Where the editors could carefully gauge just how much ‘explicit’ content could be included in the translation, the same cannot be said for politically sensitive material, which required an ultra-cautious approach. While Stalinist society as a whole became ever more prudish and the puritanical censorship of Soviet literature was strengthened, the special status of foreign literature allowed it some flexibility in this limited area.

Puritanical censorship could also be affected by the predominant political agenda. A quasi-scientific pronouncement in which a minor character compares his forthcoming book to an orgasm or ‘a magnificent spasm of the body’ and ponders the existence of ‘social’ and ‘economic’ orgasms is shortened, entirely removing the indelicate comparison of sex and culture.<sup>147</sup> In addition to erasing the sexual metaphor, these cuts in the Russian translation misrepresent the ideological impulse of the speaker’s utterance. The equation of a philosophically pointless orgasm with the production of a novel, an instrument of Soviet culture, implies a lack of economic or social relevance: it was subject to censorship perhaps because it comes dangerously close to championing the avant-garde; here, moral censorship has a distinctly ideological edge.

A similarly close relationship between the political and puritanical modes of censorship can be observed in the Russian translation of Ernest Hemingway’s *Fiesta* (also published as *The Sun Also Rises*, 1926), which was translated by Vera Maksimovna Toper, a ‘staunch’ member of the Kashkin translation collective.<sup>148</sup> Describing the activities and relationship of a group of American and English expatriates in Paris, it examines the angst of Hemingway’s generation, focusing strongly on personal matters. The novel takes the protagonists to Spain, where they drink heavily when they attend the titular fiesta. The humanistic – apolitical – themes that preoccupied Hemingway were somewhat problematic in the Soviet context, especially homosexuality. Male homosexuality had been

illegal since 1933; both male and female homosexuality were largely invisible phenomena.<sup>149</sup> Homosexual themes were consistently suppressed in published literature, even in translations of Greek and Roman classics, where homosexual referents were replaced by heterosexual ones or simply erased.<sup>150</sup> The censorial approach to homosexuality in this text was only barely more open. In the following example, one character claims: ‘that was what the Civil War was about. Abraham Lincoln was a faggot. He was in love with General Grant [. . .] Sex explains it all. The Colonel’s Lady and Judy O’Grady are Lesbians under their skin’.<sup>151</sup> This passage was altered in the translation to replace the vulgar term ‘faggot’ with a neutral equivalent and remove the reference to lesbianism, cutting the end of the paragraph so that the Russian version read as follows: *‘Из-за этого разыгралась Война за Освобождение. Авраам Линкольн был гомосексуалист.’* (That was why the Civil War broke out. Abraham Lincoln was a homosexual).<sup>152</sup> The translated item chosen in this passage, *‘гомосексуалист’* (homosexual) does not contain the vulgar element that ‘faggot’ does, although it is a term with an implicitly negative connotation, used in formal, neutral discourse in a quasi-medical way. Dmitrii Ushakov’s Stalin-era dictionary marks it as literary language and defines it as a ‘person suffering from [*страдающий*] homosexuality’.<sup>153</sup> Thus, in translation the element of vulgarity was removed, altering the jocular and sarcastic tone of the original, and the negative inference retained. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the term should be retained at all, given the fact that the censorship of same-sex content even in translation was ‘for the most part uncompromising’.<sup>154</sup> One possible explanation is that the reference to the capitalist enemy retained this negative attribute deliberately, notwithstanding its modification to meet the stylistic norms of the Russian literary language. It was a common feature of puritanical censorship to leave ‘moral or aesthetic defects’ intact in the description of enemies.<sup>155</sup> Lesbianism was not subject to a specific criminal code, although lesbians were also victims of harassment and victimisation, personally and professionally.<sup>156</sup> In the translation, the invisibility of lesbianism was reinforced. If the retention of homosexuality had a political aim, the reference to lesbianism has no such purpose – and might conceivably push the text beyond the ‘limit’ of acceptability.

### ‘SOVIETISING’ FOREIGN CULTURE

While ‘moral’ censorship of translated literature was slightly weaker, the avoidance of political taboos in the translated literature of the Stalin period was near-total: all text producers were aware of the risk posed

by the inclusion of such material. The danger could never be far from the minds of the journal's editorial staff and their fear must have been exacerbated by constantly changing norms and frequent U-turns in official policy, which was especially fluid in the years before and during the war. As this chapter has discussed, a policy that was lauded one year might be condemned the next; a friend of the Soviet Union might suddenly become an enemy.<sup>157</sup> As official policy and rhetoric zigzagged, the censors and the journal's staff struggled to keep up with the ever-changing taboos. The avoidance of particular subjects, names and words was the 'primary mode' of censorship in the Stalin period and translated literature was achieved through the excision or manipulative rewriting of material that was politically and ideologically taboo.<sup>158</sup> The censorship of translated texts in the Stalin period demonstrates a strong tendency to remove or drastically alter content, a tendency that became especially strong in the less free years after 1937 and during the war. Taboo themes were completely erased, with the result that the translated texts, unbeknownst to their readers, came to function almost as entirely new works, with different political conclusions and themes, and which bore little or no relation, ideologically speaking, to their originals.

The political censorship of the Stalinist era was linked to two important strands of the country's wider political culture. The first was the internal politics of the Soviet Union that required strict observance of official taboos against, for example, critique of Marxism–Leninism. Secondly, censorship of translated texts was governed by Soviet external politics, and was closely related to the Stalinist ambivalence to the West and the rising sense of official xenophobia of the period, which exhibited a mistrust of the foreign and a desire to neutralise any political view that potentially clashed with and thus threatened the sanctioned Soviet outlook. This combination of impulses governed the censorship of foreign texts in the Stalin period. Stalinist censorship did not seek only to exclude, although that was a vital function of its operation; it also exercised a formative force.<sup>159</sup> Thus, censorship could be used to create and maintain discursive canons; censorship practices regulated the discursive domain by delineating what was acceptable,<sup>160</sup> demarcating limits of textual production and thereby producing discourses. Susanna Witt has 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 and thus contributing 'to the creation of a global Socialist Realist canon'.<sup>161</sup>

The censorship of these foreign texts had an instrumental function, which was to establish an ideological link between the Western canon and the Soviet canon, fully incorporating foreign literature into Soviet culture.

This can be observed both in the choice of texts for publication and the extensive censorship to which they were subjected by editors, translators and censors. The incorporation of these foreign texts into the Soviet canon in strict adherence to Soviet political and ideological norms is one of the most significant features of the censorship of translation. Through a more strictly controlled publication process and the sustained intervention in the texts the Soviet presentation of the West gradually became heavily inflected with the Soviet point of view. A certain tension is present in the treatment of foreign literature in translation. Though representing a desirable modernity and a model for emulation, foreign literature also posed a clear ideological threat and a challenge to Soviet self-determination. As a result, what can be observed in the censorial treatment of translated literature is the result of these tensions and of a shift in broader cultural discourses in relation to the West. As feelings of superiority grew and the political relationship with the outside world changed (a change especially dramatically manifested in the period immediately before and during the war), the Soviet Union seems to have sought to assert its leading role in world literature through the internalisation of foreign literature, drawing it into the Soviet canon. The effect of the changing censorship in the 1930s is to cause a shift in the function of censorship from the showcasing of foreign culture to its domestication and ideological incorporation. The growing trend through the 1930s constitutes a shift from viewing Western literature as external to Soviet culture to bringing it inside. As Katerina Clark has astutely noted, ‘Western culture was not just appropriated. In the process it was reworked, reinflected for the specific[s] of Marxism–Leninism and the Stalinist epoch’.<sup>162</sup> This appropriation happened at every level, from the choice of texts and authors to the finely-grained reworking carried out by the extensive censorship at the level of the text. The ultimate aim of the Stalinist censorship of translation was to produce a text which met the requirements of official discourse and which functioned as a quasi-Soviet text in the target culture.

## NOTES

1. *Tsement (Cement)*, the 1925 socialist realist classic by Fedor Gladkov; *Gidrotsentral’ (Hydrocentral)*, a socialist realist novel about industrialisation, written by Marietta Shaginian in 1930–1.
2. A line from Alexander Bezymenskii’s parody of Gogol’s ‘Chuden Dnepr’.
3. Gal’, *Vospominaniia, stat’i, stikhi, pis’ma, bibliografiia*, p.57. Gal’ (real name Eleanora Iakovlevna Gal’perina) was a translator and critic who translated works including Antoine de Saint-Éxupéry’s *Le Petit prince (The Little Prince)*, (1943) and Harper Lee’s *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960).

4. Blium, “‘Internatsional’naia literatura”: Podtsenzurnoe proshloe’.
5. Blyum, ‘George Orwell in the Soviet Union’, p. 403.
6. Mikheev, ‘Mezhdu dvumia “ottepeliami”’.
7. Safiullina and Platonov, ‘Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s’, pp. 250–1.
8. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 25.
9. Safiullina and Platonov, ‘Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s’, p. 251.
10. Ibid., p. 251.
11. For copies of some of Rokotov’s correspondence with figures such as Virginia Woolf and Charlie Chaplin, see Safiullina, ‘The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture under Stalin’, pp. 39–44.
12. Suchkov would become one of the earliest authorities on Kafka and, in the 1960s, director of the Gorky Institute for World Literature (IMLI). On his criticism of Kafka, see Tall, ‘Who’s Afraid of Franz Kafka?’, p. 495.
13. Safiullina and Platonov, ‘Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s’, p. 247.
14. Shchedrina, ‘Chetyre psis’ma L. B. Kamenevu’.
15. Semenov, ‘V zashchitu Internatsional’noi literatury’, p. 2.
16. Mikheev, ‘Mezhdu dvumia “ottepeliami”’.
17. RGASPI f. 17, op. 163, d. 1361, l. 19. Included in Maksimenkov, *Bol’shaia tsenzura*, p. 536.
18. Soima, *Zapreshchennyi Stalin*, p. 445.
19. Report by A. A. Kuznetsov to the Central Committee, 1947. Quoted in Soima, *Zapreshchennyi Stalin*, p. 445.
20. Ivanov, ‘Moskovskie tetradi’.
21. Safiullina and Platonov, ‘Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s’, p. 262.
22. Ibid., p. 262.
23. Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 16.
24. Ibid., p. 169.
25. That Joyce’s novel could be published after such public opprobrium might have been partly due to the delays inherent in the translation and publication process; it is highly likely that work on the translation began prior to Radek’s speech.
26. Luppel et al., *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s’ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934*, p. 316.
27. Genieva, ‘Iz-za Dzhoisa’. Ekaterina Genieva was acquainted with Romanovich’s wife as a child and is now the Director of the all-Russian State Library for Foreign Literature (formerly the all-Union State Library of Foreign Literature).
28. Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 310. On the history of Joyce’s work in the Soviet Union, see Tall, ‘James Joyce Returns to the Soviet Union’; Voitkovska, ‘James Joyce and the Soviet Reader: Problems of Contact’; Tall, ‘The Reception of James Joyce in Russia’.
29. Diakonova, ‘Aldous Huxley in Russia’, p. 161.
30. David-Fox, ‘The Fellow Travelers Revisited’, p. 326.
31. 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.
32. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69, l. 8.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.

35. Hughes visited the Soviet Union and was an admirer of Stalin throughout the 1930s. He signed a declaration in support of the trials against so-called traitors in 1938. Rampersad, *The Life of Langford Hughes*, p. 374.
36. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*. See Chapter 8.
37. Luppel et al., *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934*, p. 302.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 298.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 309.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 318.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 318.
43. Racine, 'L'Association des écrivains et artistes révolutionnaires (A.E.A.R.)', p. 35.
44. For detailed studies of foreign fellow travellers and their intercultural contacts with the Soviet Union, see for example Stern, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union*; David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*.
45. On Rolland's special relationship with the country and its leadership, see David-Fox, 'The "Heroic Life" of a Friend of Stalinism'.
46. See the discussion later in this chapter.
47. David-Fox, 'The "Heroic Life" of a Friend of Stalinism', p. 8.
48. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*, p. 286.
49. Safiullina, 'The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture under Stalin', p. 58.
50. Humphrey, 'Dangerous Words', p. 377.
51. Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, p. 21.
52. Humphrey, 'Dangerous Words', p. 381.
53. Fradkin, 'Istoriiia literatury i kritika v "Internatsional'noi literature"', p. 248.
54. For an account of the potential consequences, see Plamper, 'Abolishing Ambiguity', p. 533. On taboo and danger more generally, see Steiner, *Taboo*, p. 20.
55. Bogdanov, 'The Rhetoric of Ritual', p. 186.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 186; Humphrey, 'Dangerous Words', p. 380.
57. On Freeman's life and politics see Beck, 'The Odyssey of Joseph Freeman'; McConnell, 'Joseph Freeman: Artist in Uniform'.
58. Bloom, 'About Joseph Freeman (1897–1965)'.
59. *An American Testament* was translated by Zinaida Evgen'evna Gan, later Aleksandrova (1913–2006). She was trained at the Moscow State Institute of Foreign Languages in French, English and Polish, graduating in 1933. Among her most notable works were translations of Walter Scott, Henry David Thoreau and Mark Twain. Her interests centred on the literary – her *kandidat* (doctoral) dissertation was on Thackeray's style – and the linguistic: she published a dictionary of Russian synonyms in her later life.
60. It is worth noting, however, that the text does not seem, like many others, to have been subjected to post-publication censorship and physically removed from library copies – Soviet holdings remain intact.
61. Worrell, *Dialectic of Solidarity*, p. 34.
62. Beck, 'The Odyssey of Joseph Freeman', p. 113.
63. Freeman translated his *Armii iskusstv* (Army of Arts, 1918) for the *Nation* magazine.
64. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 367.
65. Blium, *Zapreshchennyye knigi russkikh pisatelei i literaturovedov 1917–1991*, p. 13. Literature by 'non-persons' was removed from circulation; books were defaced to

erase any evidence of their existence. Glavlit circulated a list of banned books' titles and authors. Additionally, translations were often suppressed if they were produced by such people. The holdings of *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in the all-Russian library of foreign literature in Moscow contain dozens of examples of this kind of post-publication censorship. Contents pages were defaced and photographs of non-persons either cut or inked out, leaving unexpected holes in the pages and making it almost impossible for the reader to know what had been published. Most of the excised sections are articles by authors, both Soviet and foreign, who had at some point been deemed enemies and therefore non-persons.

66. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 1, d. 41.
67. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 242.
68. Friman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 2, pp. 142–3.
69. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 245.
70. Friman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 2, p. 144.
71. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 340.
72. Friman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 3, pp. 164–5.
73. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 238.
74. Friman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 1, p. 182.
75. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, p. 117.
76. Freeman, *An American Testament*, p. 377.
77. Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!*, p. 112.
78. Friman, 'Zavet amerikantsa', vol. 3, p. 171.
79. Plamper, 'Abolishing Ambiguity', p. 540.
80. On similar swings of policy and censorship of domestic literature and film, see Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, pp. 108–12.
81. On the creation of an anti-fascist bloc, see Stern, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union*, p. 10.
82. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*, p. 310.
83. Grigor'eva, 'Obraz Germanii na stranitsakh "Pravdy"', p. 231.
84. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 20, l. 1.
85. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 5, d. 69. Anti-fascism may even at times have been a more important consideration than modernism, as Clark has noted: 'What was published in translation was largely, but not exclusively, literature by prominent anti-fascist writers, not by modernists. But most of the leading European writers of the time were in any case anti-fascists (though not Joyce particularly), and modernism was less in vogue in Europe generally.' Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 310.
86. 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. Palmier, *Weimar in Exile*, pp. 181–2.
87. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 225.
88. Payne, *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism*, pp. 126–7.
89. *Ibid.*, pp. 266–7.
90. Preston, 'Liberally', vol. 12, p. 90.
91. Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 191.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 371.
93. Preston, 'Liberally', vol. 12, p. 111.
94. Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 12.
95. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

96. Preston, 'Liberal', vol. 11, p. 45.
97. In other contexts, however, the picture was 'confused' and there was a 'tentative leakage of counter-messages that, in reality, fascism remained the USSR's true enemy'. Johnston, *Being Soviet*, p. 13.
98. Grigor'eva, 'Obraz Germanii na stranitsakh "Pravdy"', p. 223.
99. Johnston, *Being Soviet*, p. 4.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
101. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*, p. 109.
102. See also Searle, 'Letters of Robert Briffault', p. 175.
103. Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 234.
104. Briffo, 'Upadok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', p. 197.
105. Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 230.
106. Briffo, 'Upadok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', p. 196.
107. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 31, l. 67.
108. RGALI, f. 1397, op. 1, d. 25, ll. 165; 167.
109. Sinclair was a member of the socialist party and twice ran for the office of governor in California. His unsuccessful attempts were recounted in his memoir, *I, Candidate for Governor* (1935).
110. Sinclair, 'A Letter to Eugene Lyons', p. 5.
111. Arthur, *Radical Innocent*, p. 232.
112. Mattson, *Upton Sinclair and the Other American Century*, p. 226.
113. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 402. It is possible that the *Internatsional'naiia literatura* translation was produced from Sinclair's privately published edition of the novel, which was produced for pre-distribution to selected individuals, and which was the edition held by the all-Union (now all-Russian) State Library of Foreign Literature.
114. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 367.
115. *Ibid.*, p. 352.
116. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 17.
117. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 356.
118. *Ibid.*, p. 362.
119. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 20.
120. Pinkus, *The Jews of the Soviet Union*, p. 138.
121. Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!*, p. 189.
122. Blium, 'Evreiskaia tema glazami sovetского tsenzora', pp. 190–1.
123. Blium, *Evreiskii vopros pod sovetской tsenzuroi*, p. 89.
124. *Ibid.*, pp. 46–7. Klara Blum (also known by the Chinese name Zhu Bailan) was a Jewish writer, who wrote in German, Russian and Chinese. She spent eleven years in the Soviet Union and in the 1940s emigrated to China, where she became a professor of German and wrote poems and a novel. See Colin and Rychlo, 'Czernowitz/ Cernăuți/ Chernovtsy/ Chernivtsi/ Czerniowce', pp. 57–76.
125. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 343.
126. *Ibid.*, p. 349.
127. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 16.
128. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 363.
129. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 21.
130. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 378.
131. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 26.
132. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 379.

133. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 27.
134. Sinclair, *Dragon's Teeth*, p. 631.
135. Sinkler, 'Zuby drakona', p. 65.
136. Hoffmann, *Stalinist Values*, p. 94.
137. Gibian, *Interval of Freedom*, p. 75.
138. Baer, 'Russia', p. 1141.
139. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 92.
140. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
141. Preston, 'Liberally', vol. 11, p. 43.
142. John Hyde Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 33.
143. Preston, 'Liberally', vol. 12, p. 96.
144. Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 329.
145. *Ibid.*, p. 195.
146. Preston, 'Liberally', vol. 12, p. 53.
147. Preston, *The Liberals*, p. 263.
148. Burak, 'The "Americanization" of Russian Life and Literature', p. 55. Vera Maksimovna Toper (1890–1964) translated from French, English and German. She produced works by Charles Dickens, Mark Twain and James Aldridge, and also worked as an editor.
149. Baer, 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia', p. 25.
150. Baer, 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia', p. 26; Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 33.
151. Hemingway, *Fiesta*, p. 134.
152. Kheminguici, 'Fiesta', vol. 1, pp. 5–6.
153. Ushakov, *Tolkovyĭ slovar' russkogo iazyka*, vol. 1, p. 594.
154. Baer, 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia', p. 26.
155. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. xvii. Dan Healey has also noted the link often made between homosexuality and fascism in rhetoric of the 1930s, propagated by the likes of Maksim Gorky. Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia*, p. 189.
156. Kon, 'Russia', p. 225.
157. On upheaval as an important feature of Soviet, and especially Stalinist, culture, see David-Fox, 'Cultural Memory in the Century of Upheaval'.
158. Plamper, 'Abolishing Ambiguity', pp. 532–3.
159. Butler is one of several scholars who has argued that censorship is 'not merely privative but formative as well' (Butler, 'Ruled Out', p. 252).
160. *Ibid.*, p. 252.
161. Witt, 'Between the Lines', p. 151.
162. Clark, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome*, p. 8.

# Censorship in the Khrushchev Era: *Inostrannaia literatura*

Following the deep freeze in intercultural relations in the late Stalin period,<sup>1</sup> the years after Stalin's death saw a gradual, albeit fitful, re-engagement with the West. Cultural events such as the Geneva Summit of July 1955 and the development of new cultural exchange programmes – culminating in a formal exchange agreement in 1958 – ‘created a pleasanter atmosphere’, notwithstanding their relatively small impact on policy.<sup>2</sup> As diplomatic relations warmed and political attitudes to the West became more positive, visits from foreigners increased and some Soviet citizens were able to travel abroad more frequently, albeit still under tight control; VOKS and its successor organisations expanded their operations in the realm of formal cultural exchange. A high point was the sixth World Festival of Youth and Students, held in Moscow in 1957; the festival opened up relations between East and West, allowing foreign visitors to see the Soviet Union and establishing new contacts between Soviet citizens and foreigners.<sup>3</sup> Such officially sanctioned and organised interactions were used as tools to strengthen cultural influence in the other sphere, as weapons of soft power in the so-called ‘cultural cold war’, the struggle between the Soviet Union and its adversaries for cultural influence in the others’ sphere.<sup>4</sup> The official opening up to the West was paralleled in the cultural scene: more informal, non-state connections included the consumption of foreign cultural products, principally literature and, in later years, pop-culture products such as records. The West, particularly America, became an important model for Thaw culture.<sup>5</sup> These new, more open tendencies at all levels in society are reflected in a renewed enthusiasm for Western literature that was represented by the production of translated literature and, critically, in the approach of the state towards it.<sup>6</sup>

Although publication of foreign literature in book form continued

throughout the 1940s and early 1950s (albeit on a much curtailed scale), there was at this time no journal dedicated to foreign literature. It was to be more than a decade after the closure of *Internatsional'naiia literatura* before a new journal of translations was established. Issued by the Union of Writers, *Inostrannaia literatura* was founded in 1955. Like its predecessor, it published fiction and poetry translated from a wide range of languages,<sup>7</sup> as well as some pieces of journalism and literary criticism. The journal's main remit was the publication of contemporary foreign writing. In comparison to the pattern of book publication, still heavily dominated by 'classic' nineteenth-century authors like Jack London and Charles Dickens,<sup>8</sup> *Inostrannaia literatura* had a much more modern perspective and often issued works only a matter of months after their original publication. The journal's print run grew from 40,000 to 70,000 during the 1950s.<sup>9</sup> Although this was smaller than other important 'thick' journals – *Novyi mir*'s circulation was around 140,000 in the 1950s<sup>10</sup> and around 100,000 in the 1960s<sup>11</sup> – it was nonetheless an important journal, especially among intellectuals. After being introduced to the slightly more niche audience of *Inostrannaia literatura*, many of the texts published on its pages were released in book form.

Though it was widely recognised as a liberal publication, from 1955 to 1963 *Inostrannaia literatura*'s editorial board was led by Aleksandr Borisovich Chakovskii, a 'watchdog of literary orthodoxy'.<sup>12</sup> This conformist 'time-server'<sup>13</sup> was a powerful figure on the literary scene. Following his wartime service as a journalist, he wrote a number of socialist realist novels and works of criticism for which he received numerous honours and medals; he also wrote about his experiences during the siege of Leningrad. From 1962 to 1988 he was the editor of the literary newspaper *Literaturnaia gazeta*, and he was a senior member of the Writers' Union. In later years he was a candidate member, then a full member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. In his role as an 'unofficial cultural arbiter' and literary bureaucrat he held firmly to the Party line,<sup>14</sup> virulently attacking the dissident movement; and he was a leading voice in the campaigns against writers such as Pasternak, Sinyavsky and Daniel'. Despite this conservative side, Chakovskii was fluent in English and an active supporter of Soviet–Western cultural exchange who made several visits to America. Under his leadership the journal was closely aligned with liberal 'Thaw' values of literary freedom, and published some of the most interesting and surprising new works of foreign literature, due in no small part to the influence of the broader editorial collective.

Publicly, *Inostrannaia literatura* pledged to publish 'progressive literature' and those writers 'fighting for independence against colonialism

and imperialist aggression'; it undertook to pay 'great attention to the themes relating to the building of a new life in the Socialist countries'.<sup>15</sup> In the inaugural issue,<sup>16</sup> as well as in internal communications with the Party, the editorial board acknowledged its politically important role in depicting foreign societies and stressed its intention to 'publish the works of the best writers who, through their works, struggle for peace and socialism, as well as those who, although they stand outside this struggle, depict their society correctly'.<sup>17</sup> Despite these stated aims, the publication of Western 'bourgeois' authors was far more significant, both in terms of numbers and cultural impact. For its readers, it contributed to the normalisation of the West in Soviet culture, acting as a small window onto a new society and ideology and filling a 'spiritual vacuum', as Raisa Orlova wrote in hindsight.<sup>18</sup>

The editorial staff was deeply concerned with creating a socio-political and literary role for the journal and its internal debates were often marked by disputes between liberal and conservative members of the board who refused, for example, to print Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *Le petit prince* (*The Little Prince*, 1943) and the novels of Heinrich Böll on ideological grounds.<sup>19</sup> According to a Soviet author writing pseudonymously, around a dozen people read each manuscript, 'and it is a matter of prestige to find something questionable in what is submitted'.<sup>20</sup> How should the journal contribute to Soviet life? Should it privilege authors from friendly nations or publish the major American works desired by the readers? How should the personal ideologies and actions of individual authors be handled?<sup>21</sup> Often these questions were – at least partially – settled in discussion with the political and cultural authorities. The Culture Section of the Central Committee pushed an openly ideological approach to the publication of bourgeois writers: the journal should focus on the publication of realist works that 'battled with capitalism' while criticising their weak and reactionary sides. The Central Committee's claim that *Inostrannaia literatura* was not a tool of ideological struggle but rather a reflection of the same hints at a certain tension between ideological correctness and literary quality.<sup>22</sup>

### CHOOSING TEXTS: EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE AND INTERNAL DEBATES

---

The sometimes fraught decisions about what to publish and what to exclude were governed by negotiation with, and often interference from, outside bodies, which formed a major part of the journal's planning and day-to-day activities. The Writers' Union played a particularly

prominent guiding role, acting as consultant and gatekeeper. At one point Aleksei Surkov, the head of the Union, was asked by Chakovskii to give his opinion on a Japanese story that he feared might become unnecessarily politicised in the Soviet context. Showing a keen understanding of how cultural context impacts on the reception of a text, Chakovskii claimed that it was 'extremely important' that Surkov give his opinion, and presumably approval, before Chakovskii could move further and take the story to the meeting of the editorial staff.<sup>23</sup> The board also frequently sought the advice not only of the Soviet authorities but also of foreign cultural organisations like the British Publishers' Association, who were asked via the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR to suggest suitable authors for inclusion.<sup>24</sup> In pursuit of such recommendations, personal contacts were mobilised via Soviet embassies abroad; sympathetic foreign figures including Howard Fast, Paul Robeson and Pablo Neruda were also approached directly for submissions.<sup>25</sup> More overtly political suggestions were often made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which occasionally sent suitable works to the journal for its consideration; in 1956, for instance, the diplomat Vladimir Ivanovich Erofeev, father of the author Viktor Erofeev, passed a book of poems by the New Zealand author Rewi Alley, who was a member of the Communist Party of China, with a note from his fellow diplomat K. A. Efremov that it would be 'expedient to translate these poems'.<sup>26</sup>

The Culture Section of the Central Committee played a dual advisory and disciplinary role in the pursuit of texts for publication. It was furnished with plans for projected issues and received selections of proposed texts for approval.<sup>27</sup> In close contact with the journal's editorial board, it also sought to veto unacceptable items. Raisa Orlova, who was a founding member of the editorial board, recounts in her memoir a typical episode of state intervention. In early 1955, Chakovskii consulted Evgenii Filipovich Trushchenko at the Culture Section about the possibility of publishing Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952).<sup>28</sup> Viacheslav Molotov, then minister for foreign affairs, entered the debate, pronouncing the novel 'stupid' and stating that there was no possibility of publication.<sup>29</sup> Molotov's intervention – a bland statement of fact rather than an instruction – was, thankfully for the board, far from final. Il'ia Ehrenburg, at that time a member of the editorial staff although he left before the first issue came out, was dispatched by Chakovskii to 'ask about publishing Hemingway',<sup>30</sup> but received no official instruction. This delayed any editorial action for some months until Molotov informed Ehrenburg – face to face and thus off the record – that the staff could in fact decide for itself on this issue. The novella was eventually published in the journal's third issue. This kind of quasi-official

ensorship must have provoked some uncertainty; editors were left to interpret statements made by the authorities, second-guess official intent and delicately argue the merits of their works. The fate of the translation depended on this careful negotiation with the authorities.

Certain members of the Central Committee often read the proposed texts closely, and were alert to potentially taboo material. Thus an essay that made a false comparison between the ‘fashionable’, ‘foreign’ and risqué (*пикантных*) plays of the American Arthur Miller and the ‘young communist writer from our brotherly country’, Czech poet, playwright and reformist communist Pavel Kohout, was ‘irresponsible’, according to Dmitrii Polikarpov, the head of the Culture Section.<sup>31</sup> Polikarpov was also intimately involved in the editorial debates relating to the proposed publication of Wolfgang Koeppen’s 1954 novel *Der Tod in Rom* (*Death in Rome*), a study of the cultural legacy of Nazism in post-war Germany.<sup>32</sup> Raisa Orlova recalled that one member of staff who disapproved of the publication wrote to the Central Committee, prompting intervention by Polikarpov, who considered there to be ‘more that is harmful than useful’ in the novel – such works ‘incorrectly oriented our readers’ and, moreover, Koeppen had over-emphasised the Jewish theme.<sup>33</sup> A partial translation of the novel was sent to Polikarpov for approval in the spring of 1960, along with an authorial biography. Chakovskii repeatedly requested a response from Polikarpov, pointing out the novels’ merits while admitting its serious failings and acknowledging the Central Committee’s ability to forbid publication. The main concern expressed in his correspondence was for the smooth running of the publishing process, taking no responsibility for the political side of the work at hand:

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.<sup>34</sup>

At a staff meeting in May 1960 Polikarpov expanded on his position, recognising the journal’s difficult position as being ‘concerned with the literature of bourgeois society in the period of imperialism’ and proposing several specific changes. Deriding the work as ‘disgusting’ owing to the potential effect on young readers of its ‘pornographic’ moments, he recommended that a number of editorial cuts be made and suggested that ‘something can be done by way of *free translation*’.<sup>35</sup> It would seem reasonable to assume that this suggestion was in reality intended as a veiled instruction and was taken as such. The record of a later 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)’.<sup>36</sup> Whereas ‘the second part of book . . . excludes any possibility of publication’, he suggested that ‘the question of the anti-communist places in the book could be removed by three cuts’.<sup>37</sup> The novel was not published until after Polikarpov’s death.<sup>38</sup> Thus guided by close cooperation with – and instruction from – the Party and the literary bureaucracy, the editorial collective was able to decide what to include and what would be impossible. The records of these decisions contained in records of meetings and commissioned reviews capture the anxiety provoked by the attempt to choose high-quality texts – and, moreover, texts that were representative of the West – while remaining responsive to cues from the political arena. These debates, and the contents of the journal itself, testify to the tension between literary and political factors and also to the cultural shifts of the Thaw period, which were especially marked in the early 1960s and which are reflected in *Inostrannaia literatura*’s contents.

A primary tool for deciding which texts to include or exclude was the internal review, produced by members of the board or commissioned from outside specialists. Such reviews allowed the editorial board to judge the suitability of the texts they received; additionally, they could push certain agendas and insert their own tastes into the process. The internal review was a ‘genre’ with a particular administrative significance, which 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’,<sup>39</sup> that is, without formal state intervention. The first task of the internal reviews commissioned by *Inostrannaia literatura* was to sift out ‘anti-Soviet’ content; it was for this reason that *Self Condemned* (1954), written by the ‘bourgeois liberal historian’ Wyndham Lewis, was rejected outright, the reviewer commenting that Lewis ‘speaks with particular anger of the “falsification of history by Soviet authors”’, displaying ‘animosity and bias’ towards the USSR; for this reason, ‘it would not be appropriate to translate the novel into Russian for the mass reader’.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, the reviewer of James Aldridge’s novel *A Captive in the Land* (1962) objected to its negative portrayal of the Soviet system, which he described as ‘unpleasant, excessive and tactless’.<sup>41</sup>

Beyond the exclusion of items offensive to Soviet ideology, reviewers also established positive norms for publication of foreign works, articulating a set of desirable criteria for inclusion in the journal. The reviews tended to follow a common pattern, centring around a unified set of criteria for the evaluation of new texts that drew, to a great extent, on

the tropes and discourse of socialist realism. Social themes were deemed especially important, particularly in the mid-1950s: the reviewer of Catherine Hutter's 1954 novel *The Alien Heart* noted with approval the novel's anti-fascist stance, but objected to the absence of any evidence of the workers' involvement in Austria in 1934. Even worse, in addition to her attachment to bourgeois democracy and her 'glorification of the American way of life',<sup>42</sup> '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 American post-war politics in Europe'.<sup>43</sup> The frequent use of such terms indicates that the standards of socialist realism were an important part of the approach to the publication of foreign texts;<sup>44</sup> such terms were also repeated in internal discussions, as Savva Artemevich Dangulov's declaration at a 1957 board meeting demonstrates:

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 in foreign circles who show loyalty to us, understand our position and can be our partners in the struggle.<sup>45</sup>

The reviewers' preoccupation with a 'correct' portrayal of foreign cultures that could benefit the readers in some concrete fashion recalls the educational task of socialist realism that saw the literary text as an ideological and political primer. Frequently the reviewers focused narrowly on the transmission of factual information about foreign countries, so that the reviewed works came to seem like textbooks of foreign culture for Soviet readers. Thus, from *The Blue Chips* by Jay Deiss (1958, published in *Inostrannaia literatura* the following year) 'we learn a lot about the life of the New York financial hierarchy'.<sup>46</sup> A review of *The Magic Fern*, the story of a left-wing activist by the socialist American writer Philip Bonosky, stated that the novel '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'.<sup>47</sup>

Although novels treating social themes were usually assessed positively, reviewers often noted with some dissatisfaction where they diverged from Soviet literary norms. Reviewers frequently asserted their wish to see the heroes in foreign works acting like those from familiar socialist realist novels and were bemused when characters diverged from the ideal literary exemplar.<sup>48</sup> The reviewer of *The Magic Fern* expressed

concern that the main character did not conform to the socialist realist trope of the positive hero, since he was portrayed in a somewhat negative light and, crucially, several minor characters were described in clearer and more striking terms than the hero himself. Nonetheless, it was possible to mitigate the artistic faults and the suggestion was made that a special journal edition might be produced as a joint venture – or, a less simple solution, the author might give permission for episodes from the novel to be published, allowing any ideologically unacceptable material to be removed.<sup>49</sup> The reviewed works were also compared to the narrative structures of socialist realism; thus the review of Archibald Cronin's *Northern Light* expressed disappointment that the author did not correctly set out the terms of the novel's central conflict,<sup>50</sup> a characteristic element of the socialist realist 'master plot'.<sup>51</sup> That foreign texts were examined by the reviewers primarily through a socialist realist lens is also confirmed by the frequency with which they employed key terms associated with Soviet literary discourse – especially in a negative sense – accusing works of being marred by 'decadence', 'formalism'<sup>52</sup> or 'reactionism'.<sup>53</sup> These terms, so reminiscent of the Soviet critical discourse, strongly indicate the existence of a ready-made structure and a stock set of criteria used by reviewers.

As in the Stalin period, works that exposed the failings of Western, especially American, political life were judged to be especially valuable and the topic of race relations in the USA was paid close attention; foreign works on this topic were widely published and well-received in Soviet publishing more widely.<sup>54</sup> The *Inostrannaia literatura* reviewers evaluated such works primarily in terms of their adherence or otherwise to Soviet positions on the subject. A certain B. Krylov, reviewing Martin Luther King's *Why We Cannot Wait* (1964), his account of the Birmingham campaign of the civil rights movement, commented that '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'. Drawing attention to his previous anti-Soviet credentials and noting that there had been previous consultation with the Central Committee, Krylov recommended that the book not be published in Russian.<sup>55</sup> A very similar observation is made by the reviewer of *The Wall Between* (1958), which was written by the civil rights campaigner Ann Braden.<sup>56</sup> Braden, according to the reviewer, approached the problem of racism from the 'wrong' angle of liberal democracy; by acting on purely moral basis, she was unable to perceive the social side of her actions. The bravery of the African-American characters stemmed from a bourgeois, family-centred view of the world, rather than the potential political struggle of the civil rights movement for universal fairness.<sup>57</sup>

It is not surprising that particularly in the early post-Stalin years, when the limits of literary freedom were often unclear, the reliance on tried and tested models for evaluating texts and placing them in the foreign context persisted. This factor, accompanied by the continuing official preference for the doctrine of socialist realism in domestic literature,<sup>58</sup> also serves to partially explain why *Inostrannaia literatura* predominantly published 'the writers of social protest' in these years: as well as demonstrating a genuine ideological commitment, they were also a safe choice while the position of literature and the new relationship with the West was somewhat unclear. Though punctuated by notable works by popular authors like Ernest Hemingway and Graham Greene, until the late 1950s the journal was dominated by authors known to be active in left-wing circles in their home countries; English-language authors who were members of the communist parties in their own countries included the Canadian Dyson Carter, Howard Fast, the Nobel prize winner Doris Lessing and the Australian author Katherine Susannah Pritchard, who co-founded the Communist Party of Australia. Accordingly, socially-oriented works were predominant. In the early 1960s, a reorientation can be observed in the tenor of the journal. 'Bourgeois', apolitical writers appeared more frequently and major works appeared that were more likely to be familiar to Western readers of the time. In 1960 J. D. Salinger's cult novel *The Catcher in the Rye* appeared, to a generally positive critical response; it soon became something of a sensation among (especially young) Soviet readers. One of the high points of this tendency might be the publication, also in 1960, of extracts of *On the Road* (1957) by Jack Kerouac. Its glorification of drug use and the 'beat' lifestyle meant that this novel could not be further from the official standards of socialist realism, demonstrating a more relaxed view of foreign authors as well as a certain laxness accorded to them precisely because of their foreignness.<sup>59</sup> In this vein one of the editorial staff, Nina Ivanovna Trifonova, reminded her colleagues at a 1959 meeting that 'we are armed with a Leninist understanding of Tolstoy, a methodology that allows us to see and evaluate accordingly those artists who occupy an ideological position far from ours'.<sup>60</sup>

Despite the 'harder freeze' that set in in late 1962,<sup>61</sup> and the upheaval and hardening stance against the arts that occurred after the Manezh affair, *Inostrannaia literatura* continued to forge a liberal path during the first half of the 1960s. This was perhaps partly a result of the long publication process, since the contents of each issue were given final approval at least several weeks in advance and the journal's annual plan was made up months ahead of printing. It seems also to be the case that, unlike in the late 1930s, the publication of foreign literature was somewhat insulated from domestic literary standards and changes in policy. It was, however,

not completely exempt from the impact of broader events in the literary scene, as the publication of Franz Kafka's 'In der Strafkolonie' ('In the Penal Colony') and 'Die Verwandlung' ('Metamorphosis') in 1964 demonstrates. Kafka had been published in Poland and other socialist countries from the late 1950s, but remained outlawed in the Soviet Union. This became a matter of greater significance when, at the 1962 World Peace Congress, Jean-Paul Sartre publicly raised the question of publishing his works. Soviet intellectuals' ignorance of this giant of world literature was a humiliation, all the more so since he was well known in the rest of the socialist bloc.<sup>62</sup> As the country sought to portray itself as a great power on the world stage, any lingering sense of parochialism in the Soviet cultural scene became highly embarrassing.

The opening up of the journal's list from the late 1950s to the early 1960s was accompanied by an internal debate between liberals and traditionalists.<sup>63</sup> Minutes of an editorial meeting in 1957 show a wish among some members of the board to be braver about their choice of works; one editor, S. Shmeral', expressed the desire to publish works that, while not anti-Soviet, nonetheless expressed a different worldview to that found in Soviet literature – and this is undoubtedly the road along with the journal was travelling by the early 1960s. One of the journal's translators, a certain Breivurd, disagreed, stating that the journal's privileged role as a barometer of foreign culture meant that it had to be particularly careful about the choice of works.<sup>64</sup> Discussions about broadening the journal's ideological horizons continued into the 1960s, although the filtering out of objectionably anti-Soviet authors of course continued, with 'reactionary' writers like Samuel Beckett remaining taboo.<sup>65</sup> The lessening of censorial restrictions in the early 1960s heralded a partial victory for the liberals, who, emboldened by the USSR's new links with the West, pushed for further expansion of the journal's ideological borders and were by 1960 preparing to publish books by 'contemporary foreign writers who are extremely popular, albeit completely antithetical in terms of their ideological content'.<sup>66</sup>

Despite this shift in the journal's output, the internal discourse of the commissioned reviews remained almost unchanged; the terms in which items were discussed were strikingly uniform. Even as more humanistic, non-ideological literature appeared, purely personal stories were still described as 'boring', and texts concerned with social issues continued to receive more positive appraisals.<sup>67</sup> Authors continued to be assessed in the terms of socialist realist critique, and their social origins also attracted comment.<sup>68</sup> It seems from these documents that usefulness – primarily formulated in terms of what a text could teach an audience about the social questions of life abroad – remained of prime

importance.<sup>69</sup> It is therefore important to consider how we read these reviews. Internal documents were also subject to ideological controls and agendas and it is likely that reviewers wrote with a mind to the standards required of them: they knew the 'rules of the game' and internalised and reproduced the standards of discourse in their reviews.<sup>70</sup> This impression is strengthened when one considers that similar clichés are present both in negative and positive reviews: works were rejected because of these qualities or approved in spite of them; the reviewers' discourse is thus circular and non-productive. Whereas the reviews continued to articulate their judgements in terms of the norms of socialist realism, 'bourgeois' works appeared frequently, and were even more strongly represented as the Thaw progressed. How can this discrepancy be accounted for? Alexei Yurchak's work on the late Soviet period may offer some answers. Following 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'.<sup>71</sup> 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'.<sup>72</sup> It 'became increasingly more important to participate in the reproduction of the *form* of these ritualized acts of authoritative discourse than to engage with their constative meanings'.<sup>73</sup> While the form of an utterance was constantly repeated, its meanings could begin to float free.<sup>74</sup>

I would argue that such performative meanings are also enacted in *Inostrannaia literatura's* internal documents in the earlier Thaw period. Despite the constant employment of socialist realist discourse, the Khrushchev-era journal often published work well outside its parameters. While this can be accounted for to some extent by the changing political mood, it is also possible to see the reviews as performative acts that fulfilled a ritualistic cultural function and thus allowed for the presence of new 'bourgeois' texts as long as the formal steps of the censorship process were adhered to, thus granting the editors some freedom to include new texts and discourses into Soviet culture. The static nature of the internal review as a genre made it highly susceptible to this performative shift, turning the production of a review (and perhaps also the records of discussions at the editorial level) into a formal, performative exercise, despite the frequent invocation of socialist realist terminology. Aside from carrying out the vital task of highlighting still-taboo

anti-Soviet material, the content of the reviews became less relevant. The implementation of formal censorship acts activated the widening of the Soviet presentation of foreign culture. As Yurchak notes, ‘these acts are not about stating facts and describing opinions but about doing things and opening new possibilities’.<sup>75</sup> The production of a review could have much the same function, acting as a cover, a kind of censorial fig leaf, for the inclusion of new kinds of texts and non-official discourses. The growing acceptance of Western culture in all its ideological variety was thus brought about not just by wider cultural changes, but by the detachment of ideological meaning from ritual form, a fact that editors and reviewers used to their advantage. Yurchak describes the presence of Western cultural products in terms of an ‘imaginary “elsewhere”’ termed the imaginary West.<sup>76</sup> The West as a discursive construct is distorted in its removal from its own context, forming a discursive object that bears little relation to empirical reality, but that had significant representative power in Soviet culture. On the pages of *Inostrannaia literatura*, we can observe an official manifestation of the imaginary West; this official West is ideologically distorted, but nonetheless was intended to form the authoritative picture of the West for the Soviet reader. The extent to which this formalistic approach to censorship was a conscious, tactical choice can be further illuminated through an examination of censorial practices on the level of the text, as the next section will demonstrate. Reviews were intended to define and control this imaginary construct, but were prone at the same time to undermine it.

The editors of *Inostrannaia literatura* were only too aware of their responsibility to act as censors and, as with all other branches of publishing, making political changes was an integral part of their day-to-day work. They conceived of their work as a kind of censorship, discussing it in precisely those terms; Chakovskii warned that ‘we need to underline with our “censor’s pencil” places that provoke any kind of political doubt’,<sup>77</sup> and the board was only too aware that their censorial changes could destroy the original author’s artistic intent.<sup>78</sup> Guided by interactions with Party institutions, the censorship of foreign texts was often carried out in close cooperation with the foreign authors; indeed, editorial changes were, in theory, all to be cleared with the original author.<sup>79</sup> Foreign authors, especially those who were considered politically friendly, often had close links with their Soviet counterparts in the 1950s and 1960s, when international exchanges and other initiatives were on the rise. Several authors visited the editorial offices of *Inostrannaia literatura*, including James Aldridge and John Updike in 1964,<sup>80</sup> and the journal frequently consulted with friendly writers, seeking copies of books and recommendations for items to publish.<sup>81</sup>

These relationships sometimes went beyond the strictly literary. Kurt Vonnegut, for example, maintained a long, close friendship with his translator, Rita Rait-Kovaleva, claiming to be closer to her than to anyone else outside his family.<sup>82</sup> Graham Greene was welcomed to the journal's office as 'our old friend' in 1960. Addressing those in attendance, he acknowledged that some of his work was subject to censorship; of the Russian stage adaptation of his *Our Man in Havana*, he noted that 'in the novel there are some sentiments that would not be met with sympathy in the Soviet Union, and these parts could have been removed at the wish of the adapter. However, he did not do that, they were not removed; I make note of that and appreciate it.'<sup>83</sup> Consultation on questions of cuts or alterations was controversial as permission was not always forthcoming, but to make unauthorised changes could open the journal up to international embarrassment, as the records of a conflict over publication of Erich Maria Remarque's anti-war novel *Zeit zu leben und Zeit zu sterben* (A Time to Live and a Time to Die, 1954, published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1956) demonstrate. One member of the board, a certain Fradkin,<sup>84</sup> complained bitterly about the unneeded and unauthorised changes made by the journal:

Why does the journal sometimes make unauthorised cuts? It is, in a sense, the politics of the ostrich. We see the danger that threatens us tomorrow, but we do not see the danger threatening 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 excess prudishness. Some of the cuts soften political reminiscences in the novel. These should not have been made either. Perhaps you received a reprimand from someone in authority, but these unauthorised changes can create a situation in the West where you find yourself in an unpleasant situation and are portrayed in a poor light; this could have been foreseen and avoided.<sup>85</sup>

The Western perception of the journal as a representative of Soviet culture was a matter of prestige and could be damaged by any evidence that the work of foreign authors was being mutilated, especially against their wishes. Chakovskii responded strongly to this claim, reminding Fradkin that 'minor' cuts were indeed necessary, since they removed portrayals of a brothel and a portrait of Trotsky. Moreover, it was a matter of pride that cuts to texts were always acknowledged, and censorship outside the USSR was perhaps even worse: the Western German publisher did not have the decency to do this when it 'ruined'

the novel. This was of course a disingenuous answer, and his colleagues must have known it. Truly abridged texts were always highlighted as such, but other changes – manipulations or excisions of a few words or paragraphs – were never openly communicated to the reader.

## THE COLD WAR

Textual interventions by editors and, somewhat less frequently, translators were mainly concerned with the mediation of politically incorrect material. Glavlit forbade the publication of anti-Soviet material and insults against the Soviet Union in both foreign and domestic texts, a directive that intersected with Soviet anxieties about the position and prestige of the country in relation to the West. Negative opinions of the Soviet Union were particularly troubling when articulated by Western authors; implications of Soviet inferiority (perceived as an insult) were frequently softened or neutralised in the translated texts through textual manipulations or small cuts. Particular attention was paid to ensuring the correct portrayal of contemporary political tensions, leading to the removal of material such as allusions to potential future Chinese rule over the USSR during a period when relations between the two countries were poor.<sup>86</sup> The censors of Greene's *Our Man in Havana* (1958, published in Russian the following year) cut a number of sections that seemed to express Western disapproval of Soviet policies. The following passage did not survive in the published version because it made a taboo connection, albeit a tenuous one, between Hitler and communism, and because of the negative judgement of the communist states to which it refers (recall the similar impetus for censorship of the Stalin-era texts):

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.<sup>87</sup>

The passage was retained by the translator, and not marked for attention in the typescript,<sup>88</sup> suggesting that after the two typescripts had been produced and edited for style, further negotiations on political content occurred prior to publication, perhaps even at the stage where Glavlit became involved in checking and censoring the text. Less openly disparaging material that linked the Soviet Union to espionage was also cut,

suggesting some anxiety over the potential inclusion of a state secret as well as politically incorrect material, a fact that also highlights the continued censorial attention to implicature and the potential for readers to interpret the texts ‘incorrectly’. Thus in one scene a character deported from Cuba was said to find it ‘necessary to return to Switzerland on a matter to do with his precision instruments’. Another character asks, ‘With a passage booked on to Moscow?’, hinting that he is a spy. The second sentence was retained by the translator, but subsequently cut from the typescript by an editor,<sup>89</sup> demonstrating the Soviet sensibility to accusations of spying, which did not support a positive self-image. Similarly, the second, revised typescript of the novel shows editorial attention being paid to a section alluding to Khrushchev, the end of which was removed, the censor ever alert to the potential for negative interpretations:

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.<sup>90</sup>

The novel was also subject to ideological censorship, centring on the canonical status of the ideologeme *red*. Maurice Friedberg notes the 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’,<sup>91</sup> and a similar manipulative translation can be observed in this text. The term ‘red vulture’,<sup>92</sup> used to refer to a corrupt and violent police chief, was rendered in the Russian text only as *стервятник* (vulture),<sup>93</sup> omitting the word *red*. *Red* carried very important positive connotations in Soviet discourse: the word was closely associated with official activities and with 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. The archival documents demonstrate that this change was instigated by the translator,<sup>94</sup> possibly demonstrating an internalisation of the norms of Soviet discourse.

The topic of the cold war was not treated in the same way as in the Stalin period: it did not form an absolute taboo. The year before Greene’s novel appeared, *Inostrannaia literatura* published a novel by the Scottish author Compton Mackenzie in which the cold war formed the backdrop for the comical action. In *Rockets Galore* (1957, published

in Russian in 1958) Mackenzie recounts the struggles of a community of Scottish islanders against the interference of outside bureaucratic forces in the form of the British government, which is seeking to install a defensive rocket system on the island of Little Today. The subject of the cold war was treated rather lightly in the Russian translation, which is striking not only in its subject matter but also in its retention of politically marked material, even that which is oriented negatively toward the Soviet Union. It is not the case that such content escaped editorial attention – several points in the text were highlighted on the typescript but retained in the text, suggesting that each moment was noted and negotiated. Such an approach is strikingly different from that taken at *Internatsional'naiia literatura*, where even the potential for incorrect interpretation could provoke the effective destruction of a text as its author imagined it, and demonstrates just how far the tolerance of the West was progressing by the late 1950s.

The potential for nuclear war between the Western powers and the Soviet Union, which forms the background for the plot, survived unchanged in the Russian, even including descriptions of Moscow pointing rockets at the West; most of the censorial interventions are aimed at neutralising the characters' sarcastic comments about communism or communists, although none of these could be considered outspoken denunciations, nor did they form a coherently aimed attack on the Soviet system. Typically for the period, the political changes were made via small excisions and replacements; however, the prioritising of ideological correctness over literary sense sometimes had strange, counter-intuitive results. In one such example, a conversation between two principal characters in the pub, one tells the other, 'another dram, Eachann, and you'll be as full of wind as a Communist',<sup>95</sup> creating a humorous, though of course mildly negative, image of communism. The translated version is sensitive to communism's being the butt of a joke: the phrase 'full of wind' was replaced with a positively-oriented adjective and 'communist' expanded so that the Russian version read as follows: *'Еще одна рюмка, Эхан, и ты начнешь рассуждать, как заправский коммунист'* (another glass, Eachann, and you'll start to talk like a true communist).<sup>96</sup> The attempt to mitigate the criticism is not entirely successful: the new verb *'рассуждать'* (to talk, hold forth) contains the root *суд-* (reason), and so has connotations of reason and wisdom. The insertion of *'заправский'* ('true/seasoned') seems to imply that Eachann's drinking and his irritating behaviour are qualities to be found and admired in a real communist; the sense of the phrase remains negative, even sarcastic. Mackenzie's sarcasm was particularly problematic, since it irreverently reworked Soviet ideologemes, misappropriating important symbols of

official Soviet discourse for comic effect, requiring ideological censorship as a response. The islanders of the novel finally win their battle against the installation of the military base by carrying out an audacious trick: they dye the island's seagulls pink and claim to have discovered a new species requiring conservation. Part of their campaign involves a demonstration calling for the preservation of these 'unique' birds. This scene provoked significant anxiety in the journal's staff in its use of a manipulated version of the Soviet state slogan, *'Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь!'* (Workers of the world, unite!) This slogan, reproduced constantly in Soviet public discourse, was a key marker of Soviet official ideology, making the translation of such a canonical item quite problematic for the editors – on the cover sheet of the translators' first typescript it was marked for further attention, circled emphatically in red pencil. It was evidently the subject of some concern, being altered by editors several times. In the novel, the reworked version of the slogan is painted onto a banner carried by a protestor, which reads: 'BIRD-WATCHERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE'.<sup>97</sup> The translators, aware of the slogan's importance, modified it slightly to avoid an exact duplication of the canonical version. With a new prefix, their version reads as follows: *'Любители птиц всех стран, объединяйтесь!'* (lovers of birds of all countries, come together!),<sup>98</sup> while an alteration in an editorial hand restored a literal translation: *'Птицеловы всех стран, соединяйтесь!'* (bird-catchers of all countries, unite!), strengthening its ideological resonance.<sup>99</sup> A second draft of the typescript shows further consideration of this phrase; at this stage the editor drastically changed the slogan, replacing it with a considerably less evocative alternative: *'Сомкните ряды, птицеловы мира!'* (close ranks, bird-catchers of the world!).<sup>100</sup> This version, which was employed in the final published edition, neatly avoids the unacceptable adaptation of the ideogeme, retaining the denotative meaning while avoiding an unacceptable ideological term and preserving the tone of the original through the use of the standardised military command.<sup>101</sup> The desire to preserve at least the spirit, if not the politically incorrect expression of this material, marks an important evolution from the much more radical approach of Stalinist censorship. The translators and editors who worked extensively on this text evidently sought to preserve as much of the original as possible without overstepping the boundaries of political and ideological acceptability.

An afterword to Mackenzie's novel written by the critic Boris Leont'ev sought to make suitable the subject matter, which of course touched upon a major point of tension in Soviet international relations, and ensure it was understood correctly by readers. Although the work is set in the West, Leont'ev initially framed it in terms of

the Soviet context, stating that ‘the year 1957 will undoubtedly enter history as a year of great changes [. . .] It was the year when the Soviet Union celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the great October socialist revolution’.<sup>102</sup> He continued, ‘at the end of 1957, British social opinion was shaken as never before’ by the growing anti-nuclear movement.<sup>103</sup> Praising the novel for accurately uncovering the faults of British politics – albeit from a position of bourgeois liberalism – Leont’ev appreciated the deeper meaning of this gentle comedy as an anti-cold war novel and denunciation of ‘those for whom personal peace is more important than all the most important problems of our time’.<sup>104</sup> Nonetheless, despite its political sharpness, the novel ends with no real resolution, just a ‘kind of dead end’, which, ‘of course, lessens the social impact of the novel on the English reader’.<sup>105</sup> Its failure to employ the metaphor of the path or journey, central to socialist realist literature and Soviet official culture,<sup>106</sup> marked the novel’s deviation. Nonetheless, Leont’ev sought to incorporate the novel into a broader struggle carried out together with the ‘mighty camp of socialism and peace – to stop war and destroy the plans of aggressors’.<sup>107</sup>

Mackenzie’s novel was not the only one that used and misused this canonical item of Soviet discourse. The increasing freedom of editors and translators can be seen in the last years of the 1950s and early 1960s by an apparent relaxation in the approach to such items, which survive uncensored in later translations. In Jay Deiss’s novel *The Blue Chips* (1957, published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1960) a discussion of the use of scientists as instruments of political propaganda retains the modified slogan: “‘Scientists of the world, unite,” chirped Miss Goldstein, “you have nothing to save but your brains!’”<sup>108</sup> was translated without any reworking of the first half of the slogan: ‘—Ученые всех стран, соединяйтесь, — чирикнула мисс Гольдштейн — Вам нечего терять, кроме ваших голов!’ (Scientists of the world, unite! — chirped Miss Goldstein. — You have nothing to lose except your heads!).<sup>109</sup> The second half of Miss Goldstein’s utterance was actually brought closer to the Russian version of the slogan by changing the relevant verb from ‘save’ to ‘lose’, ‘Пролетариям нечего терять кроме своих цепей’.<sup>110</sup> In the Russian translation of Alan Sillitoe’s *Key to the Door* (1961, published in *Inostrannaia literatura* in 1963), an exclamation by one British soldier fighting in Malaya attracted no special attention, except for the removal of the vulgarity ‘bloody’. Where the original has, “‘Workers of the world unite!” Jack shouted. “Let’s get on that bloody train,” the Russian version retains it in its entirety: ‘Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь! — крикнул Джек. — садиться в поезд!’ (Workers of the world, unite! — cried Jack. — Onto the train!)<sup>111</sup> The growing

openness to foreign culture was paralleled by an increased ambiguity in the application of censorial norms; the political and ideological limits in relation to foreign texts were beginning to become more blurred.

Throughout the cold war, the journal was preoccupied with representations of the conflict and with Soviet–Western relations more broadly, reflecting the importance of Western views in creating a Soviet self-image and provoking a particular censorial anxiety relating to the proper portrayal of the Soviet side.<sup>112</sup> Presenting the Western view of the Soviet Union was a challenging task: even those politically sympathetic authors who thought they were presenting the country fairly could be blinded by their own prejudices and ignorant of the proper presentation of the Soviet Union. To take one example, James Aldridge's *Captive in the Land*, received by the journal in manuscript, could not be published owing to its repetition of 'numerous unpleasant, excessive, tactless observations' about the Soviet people. Although the author presents the narrator as having penetrated the 'drab' exterior to reveal the decency at the core of Soviet life, the negative portrayal was enough to disqualify the book from publication.<sup>113</sup> The Western view of Soviet reality was thus a tricky area to negotiate: despite its usefulness in promoting an image of the Soviet Union as an object of interest and attraction among left-wing intellectuals especially, and in promoting closer intercultural contact, Western judgements could be perceived as insulting, as the example of Aldridge shows. The difficulty faced when publishing foreign impressions of the Soviet Union in *Inostrannaia literatura* was further complicated by the close associations that were cultivated between the editorial board and the authors whose work it published. While seeking to avoid any offensive portrayal of the Soviet people, it was also imperative to maintain friendly relations and avoid offending foreign authors. Moreover, the revelation that foreign authors were being censored could be highly embarrassing and damage the journal's image among the very circle of writers it sought to attract. The careful negotiation of these two contradictory factors characterised the extensive editorial discussion – and friction – surrounding the publication of *Meeting at a Far Meridian* by Mitchell Wilson, which was published simultaneously in the United States and the Soviet Union in 1961.<sup>114</sup> The novel, based on Wilson's lengthy trip to the Soviet Union, examines the international tension characterising the cold war through the depiction of a visit by an American scientist called Nick Rennett to the Soviet Union where he is drawn into political and personal rivalry with his Soviet counterpart, Goncharov,<sup>115</sup> and falls in love with a Soviet woman, Valia.

Wilson, only a moderately successful author in his home country,

was hugely popular in the Soviet Union. He also worked as a research scientist and published a number of books about science as well as fiction about scientists, including *Live with Lightning* (1949) and *My Brother, My Enemy* (1952). His works were published in print runs of several hundreds of thousands of copies, and he was 'ranked side by side with Hemingway',<sup>116</sup> at least in terms of public prominence. While *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, according to a short introductory footnote, confirmed 'the ideal of mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence of states, despite differences in social structure', it also demonstrated 'the author's insufficient acquaintance with Soviet reality and sometimes his insufficient understanding of it'.<sup>117</sup> Wilson's inadequate understanding of Soviet reality led him, in a number of places in the novel, to present a picture of the country that worried and frustrated the editors and might need to be modified. While American critics judged the novel to be broadly 'nonideological',<sup>118</sup> the staff of *Inostrannaia literatura* took the opposite view. According to *Time* magazine, Chakovskii apparently considered it a 'remarkable contribution to the cause of peace and coexistence'.<sup>119</sup> In internal discussions, some editors argued that the novel must be published, not only because it would be 'interesting' for readers, but also because Western works that portrayed the country positively were so rare.<sup>120</sup> Wilson approached the subject matter from a position of solidarity, argued the head of the journal's criticism section, Tamara Lazarevna Motyleva: where references to poor conditions were made, they were not insults and not made 'out of exoticism', but served instead to demonstrate the struggle, endurance and morality of the Soviet people.<sup>121</sup> The novel could be politically useful in its assertion of the necessity of peaceful existence.<sup>122</sup> Another editor expressed disquiet over Wilson's tendency to 'equate the two worlds', and mistakenly suggest that both sides were equally to blame in the cold war.<sup>123</sup> The character of Valia, over whom Nick and Goncharov fight, was also a concern and was a factor that could prevent publication. The fact that she falls in love with the American character and carries on an affair with him, and in doing so acts less correctly than the American female character, would, according to one member of the board, Dolmatovskii, 'provoke a storm of indignation in the Soviet Union'.<sup>124</sup> In the end publication was approved, although the board agreed that careful censorship and attentive editing would be required;<sup>125</sup> Chakovskii noted that 'there are a number of moments in the novel which it would be desirable to remove or soften in translation', which would 'erase the sense that in the cold war both we and they are to blame'.<sup>126</sup>

Good relations between authors and the journal meant that authors were sometimes consulted about the modifications made to their texts

and Chakovskii admitted that ‘we discussed these places for a long time with Mitchell Wilson and he objected to some of them.’<sup>127</sup> Interestingly, Wilson reported in an American interview that his objections had been heeded and that the novel had been published without any changes. The requested changes struck him as ‘curious and unexpected . . . they may say nothing about a serious criticism of their government and then object to a passing mention of poverty in the villages’.<sup>128</sup> Apparently unbeknownst to Wilson, the editors treated this text very carefully and over two drafts made several significant changes to material that might have been seen as politically problematic. Ten sections were highlighted on the typescript as requiring further attention and clarification; most of these sections were changed between translation and publication. In one instance, Soviet–American relations were improved by the translators, who modified a discussion between Nick and his colleagues about the closure of certain areas of the country to American scientists. Nick’s comment, ‘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’,<sup>129</sup> lost the adjective ‘meaningless’, in the Russian translation, thus diffusing the negative attitude. Many of the interventions were concerned with softening the negative portrayals of Soviet history and contemporary life, frequently involving subtle linguistic shifts, as the following example shows. This extract makes reference to the fear among Soviet citizens of fraternising with foreigners that stemmed from the terror of the Stalin period. The translator’s original version reads: *‘Такие времена, только и всего. И чем эти люди отличаются от русских, которые все еще боятся встречаться с нами, когда мы едем туда?’* (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?)<sup>130</sup> The translator made a simple change, from *‘боятся’* (they are scared) to *‘предпочитают не’* (they prefer not to), which was subsequently erased by the editor. The final published version was a compromise, reading as follows: *‘все еще настороженно встречающихся с нами, когда мы бываем там’* (all the same they are wary of meeting with us when we are there).<sup>131</sup> The effect of the final alteration is to weaken, although not entirely erase, the author’s evocation of the pervasive fear that persisted even after the Stalin period, in keeping with the prevalent rhetoric of peaceful coexistence and an official desire to draw a firm line under the excesses of the Stalin era. Unlike Aldridge’s text, where the negative comments about Russia’s drabness could not be tolerated, Wilson’s novel could be revised so that such descriptions were minimised. Nick’s first impressions of Moscow are hardly positive:

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.<sup>132</sup>

The translators preserved Wilson's image more-or-less entirely, though the 'drab' photographs become neutral black-and-white (*серых*) and the 'shapeless' caps became 'uniform' (*форменных*).<sup>133</sup> Subsequent alterations made by the editor further altered Wilson's imagery, and the final Russian version implies simplicity and modesty rather than poverty. The published version reads as follows:

*Русских ему приходилось видеть только на плохих фотографиях, изображавших рабочих в кепках, и либо в сапогах, либо в широких брюках из недорогого материала.*  
(He had seen Russians only in bad photographs, depicting workers in caps and either in boots or wide trousers made of inexpensive material.)<sup>134</sup>

The original image of rows of indistinguishable figures in poor-quality clothing – an image that loomed large in the Western imagination when it came to communist countries – is problematic, as much for the implication of a lack of personality and individuality contained in the adjective '*форменных*' (uniform) as for the reference to Soviet backwardness in relation to the quality of consumer goods, a particularly sensitive area when issues of consumption and living quality were the 'stick with which the West beat its Cold War adversary'.<sup>135</sup> Here it is the photograph rather than the clothes that are poor quality. The Russian version portrays the Soviet people as modest rather than destitute, a self-image that coincides with a flattering notion of making do and building towards something better. A similarly subtle repositioning of the text also occurs in a scene describing preparations for the parade to mark the October revolution holiday. Nick watches the rehearsal:

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.<sup>136</sup>

In the Russian version, the viewpoint is shifted from negative to positive so that rather than moving from a negative to a positive state, the

parade simply strengthens its already positive state: *‘И каждую ночь репетиция становилась все богаче и полнее’* (And every night the rehearsal became ever richer and fuller).<sup>137</sup> These manipulations exhibit a combination of political and ideological censorship; first, the translated version avoids any potentially problematic collocation of a negative term with the ‘sacred’ imagery of revolution and also positions the extract in terms of socialist realist teleology, implying perpetual improvement. Additionally, through these minor manipulations, the political line of the novel is quietly redirected and made more suitable. Negative descriptions of Soviet society were minimised and the implication that the Soviet Union shares any blame in the cold war was at least partially neutralised. Because there was no obvious mutilation, like many of the changes to the *Inostrannaia literatura* texts, it could be reasonably claimed that no censorship had taken place. After Stalin, the more subtle operation of censorship allowed it to acquire a plausible deniability.

#### PURITANICAL CENSORSHIP: EUPHEMISM AND STRUCTURAL CENSORSHIP

Progress towards freer publication was sometimes slow and fitful,<sup>138</sup> and this also was the case where censorial interventions of a puritanical nature are concerned. Generally, sexual content continued to be subject to censorship, although the suppression of sex in Soviet culture was slightly eased after Stalin’s death.<sup>139</sup> In Russian literature, some excisions in texts published in the Stalin period were reversed in the late 1950s.<sup>140</sup> The changes in domestic censorship were unstable and so could have ‘puzzling’ results that demonstrated a ‘hypocritical priggishness’, according to Herman Ermolaev.<sup>141</sup> In these foreign texts, puritanical alterations are often subtle in their execution; they tend to be achieved through euphemistic translation as opposed to simple excision of parts of the text. Consequently, the non-direct translation of ‘You all talk like poufs’ in Graham Greene’s *The Quiet American* (1955, published in *Inostrannaia literatura* the following year)<sup>142</sup> as *‘У вас каша во рту’* (You have kasha in your mouth [that is, you mumble])<sup>143</sup> avoids open reference to homosexuality, which remained illegal. The aim was not to rewrite or reconfigure the text, but only to mitigate its worst excesses in order to make the translation publishable.

Frequently, the puritanical censorship of sexual content stemmed from the internalised norms of Russian literary language which, following Bourdieu, we might characterise as ‘structural censorship’, the internalised form of discursive control exercised by the structure of the

literary field itself.<sup>144</sup> In the Soviet case, translators had to deal with the linguistic deficiency of the Russian language in terms of the vocabulary of sex. The foreignism *секс* (sex) appeared in Russian during the post-Stalin period in order to fill a semantic gap; before that, public discourse did not speak of sex in direct terms.<sup>145</sup> As a result, references to the sexual act were problematic. In some cases, the Russian translators struggled to render an item in an appropriate register. The use of the word ‘tart’, for instance, in Archibald Cronin’s *Northern Light* had to be translated as ‘*проститутка*’ (prostitute); the slang word *шлюха* (whore) was too vulgar to be included, and the jocular tone of the English could not be captured in Russian by the neutral translation. This difficulty has been attested to by translators: ‘either you write the medical word or the swear word – there is no middle ground’.<sup>146</sup> The euphemistic treatment of sex in translation was therefore governed both by censorial standards of propriety and linguistic norms – the interaction between the two can be difficult to disentangle.

On occasion, the use of manipulative translation as a censorial tactic inserted value judgements into a text. In Greene’s *The Quiet American*, where a character declares ‘I had experience to match his virginity, age was as good a card to play in the sexual game as youth’,<sup>147</sup> the translators employed a euphemistic alternative: ‘*В игре, где ставкой – любовь*’ (In the game, where the stake is love).<sup>148</sup> ‘Virginity’ acquired a moralistic tone through its translation as ‘*нетронутость*’,<sup>149</sup> a marked choice (the standard Russian word is *девственность*) which connoted untouchedness and carried an implication of negative judgement. A similarly loaded substitution was made in the translation of a description of a dice game, of which the main character notes: ‘The sexual jargon of the game was common to all the Sureté’.<sup>150</sup> The translation goes beyond simple replacement, replacing ‘sexual’ with ‘*малопристойный*’ (coarse, off-colour),<sup>151</sup> so indicating a negative attitude to the game not present in the original. In a continuation of censorial practices observed in the Stalin period, euphemistic translation recast the sexual act with an expression of love, as in the typical substitution of ‘*объятии*’ (embraces)<sup>152</sup> for ‘love-making’.<sup>153</sup> In the same text, the evocative phrase ‘shuddering at the orgasm’<sup>154</sup> is translated metonymically as ‘*в охватившей его страсти*’ (in the passion engulfing him).<sup>155</sup> The censorial approach to sexuality, in the absence of formal rules and statements regarding its control, was by no means uniform, relying as it did on convention and the good judgement of editors and translators, who were most active in censoring ‘vulgar’ content.

Some texts, particularly those published in the early 1960s, were able to take advantage of liberalising tendencies and publish more openly

about sex. Kerouac's *On the Road* is just such an example. The novel was published in 1960 in a special youth-themed issue, dedicated, as the flyleaf of the issue records, to the life, hopes and struggle of the youth of all countries. With its glorification of drug use and the beat lifestyle, it could not have been 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.<sup>156</sup> The publication of the novel was a sign of the growing interest in American fiction that was to mark the 1960s, accompanied by a growth in relatively sympathetic critical appraisals of American writing, including the beat generation. In part, this was because those novelists and poets could be seen to have a social function as exposing the underbelly of American capitalism;<sup>157</sup> a major factor was surely also the increasing familiarity with new works and authors, and an appreciation of their aesthetic appeal. The publication of Kerouac was rather tentative and the novel was shortened and published in three extracts, entitled 'The Mexican Girl', 'Jazz of the downtrodden generation' and 'Through the mountains and valleys of the universe'.<sup>158</sup> The translator, Vera Konstantinovna Efanova,<sup>159</sup> smoothed out the non-standard English, adding new punctuation and paragraph breaks in place of Kerouac's stream-of-consciousness style. The result is rather more uniform, closer to standard literary Russian than Kerouac's style is to standard English. Nonetheless, the extracts published in *Inostrannaia literatura* are fairly illustrative of the work as a whole in terms of narrative content. Although references to marijuana and lovemaking remained in the Russian version, the choice to publish the work as a series of extracts allowed the editors to choose the least explicit sections. Thus Kerouac's description of Ross Bar in New York City, where 'all kinds of mad sexual routines are initiated'<sup>160</sup> could be easily cut, while the reader received at least a flavour of his work. Nonetheless, even in these published extracts it was necessary to remove some of the most vulgar language, as in a scene where Kerouac listens to a jazz band and pronounces of the bass player: 'Man there's a cat who can really fuck his girl.'<sup>161</sup> The Russian translation softened this by employing a conversational set-phrase, which removes some of the vulgarity of 'fuck'; at the same time, the vulgar tone is preserved to some extent in the use of the phrase 'сукин сын' (son of a bitch) to replace the fashionable slang term 'cat', demonstrating the careful approach to such material on the part of the translators and editors, who sought to preserve the maximum amount of material: 'Смотри, этот сукин сын любую девку в бараний рог согнет. . .' (Look, that son of a bitch can bend any girl to his will).<sup>162</sup> The translator and editors thus approached

the text with a maximal approach, seeking to reproduce it as fully as possible. Despite this carefully managed first publication, Kerouac remained relatively unknown to a wider Soviet audience, and *On the Road* would not be published in full until the post-Soviet period.

J. D. Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye* explores similarly new themes for Soviet literature, and was also able to discuss sexuality and human relationships in strikingly free terms. The novel became something of a phenomenon among the generation of the 1960s, known as *shestidesiatniki* (*шестидесятники* – people of the 1960s),<sup>163</sup> after it was translated by Rita Rait-Kovaleva.<sup>164</sup> Unlike many of the other texts published in *Inostrannaia literatura*, which appeared very shortly after their original publications, there was a gap of nine years between the English and Russian publications of the novel, when the translator was able eventually to obtain a copy through unofficial channels.<sup>165</sup> Rait-Kovaleva wrote passionately about her version of Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, one of her most famous translations, describing it in almost romantic terms:

The novel by Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, long remained 'overboard' (*за бортом*) because several reviewers and translators, having read it, took this book, which Faulkner called 'the best book in contemporary America', to be the empty chatter of a young good-for-nothing, written, moreover, 'in a nonsensical, untranslatable style'. The book had to wait for a translator who, having heard its clean, magical voice, having seen its distraught, tender and virtuous soul, started with passion and care to find Russian words for the tale [. . .]<sup>166</sup>

Like some other translations of the 1960s, the Russian translation was able to be strikingly open in its references to sex, a central preoccupation of Holden Caulfield. 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 entirety. Similarly, the phrase 'whorish looking blondes',<sup>167</sup> as Holden describes the women in his hotel, was translated by a vulgar neologism, '*иллюховатых*' (whorish).<sup>168</sup> This is not to say that all the sexual content in the novel was retained in its entirety – there continued to be some use of euphemism in translating sexual content. For instance, some uses of the English phrase 'sexual intercourse' were translated euphemistically, as in the following example: 'some babe he was supposed to have had sexual intercourse with the summer before'.<sup>169</sup> The phrase was translated as '*про какую-то девчонку, с которой он путался прошлым летом*' (about some girl, with whom he had messed

about last summer);<sup>170</sup> the phrase does not preserve the gentle irony contained in Holden's use of the formal, medicalised phrase.<sup>171</sup> Similarly, the phrase that follows was also slightly softened in the translation: 'I know you're supposed to feel pretty sexy when somebody gets up and pulls their dress over their head, but I didn't'.<sup>172</sup> The Russian translation neutralised and generalised the overt reference to sex, although it seems likely that the reader would understand what kind of excitement was being referred to:

*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.*

(I know that when someone suddenly pulls their dress over their head in front of you, then you should experience something, some kind of excitement or something like that, but I didn't experience anything.)<sup>173</sup>

Where sex could find some expression in these 1960s texts, homosexuality remained a problematic subject, if not quite completely taboo, in the post-Stalin period. In *The Catcher in the Rye* the theme of homosexuality was masked, but only partially, demonstrating the close attention paid to taboo words, while paying relatively rather less attention to their referents. Although Maurice Friedberg has claimed that foreign literature 'was censored no more leniently than domestic literary production',<sup>174</sup> the translations of the Thaw period seem to demonstrate that foreign literature actually enjoyed more freedom. Because of its status as a translation combined with a euphemistic translation approach, Salinger's novel could cross boundaries that Soviet literature could not. This is exemplified in the description of Holden's teacher, Mr Antolini, who makes a pass at him. The English original calls him a 'flit',<sup>175</sup> a contemporary American slang word for homosexual; this was avoided in the Russian version, where he was instead described as a man '*со странностями*' (with quirks/ eccentricities).<sup>176</sup> Despite the removal of the homosexual signifier, the rest of the description of the act remained intact: Mr Antolini approaches Holden and tries to touch him as he sleeps, waking him up. It is abundantly clear that this is a description of homosexual desire, the substitution of the more direct term allowed the translator to retain otherwise taboo material.

A similar 'masking' technique was employed in the translation of vulgar language, which was evidently a point of contention between translator and editorial board. According to the critic Aleksandra Borisenko, Rait-Kovaleva was 'not the well-mannered lady presented to

the contemporary reader; she loved and was able to use strong language; she implored the editor to allow her to put in just the word asshole (*зобнюк*) but even this was not allowed'.<sup>177</sup> Despite this, some mild swearing survives, a mark of the youth language that Rait-Kovaleva is credited with capturing so well in her translation.<sup>178</sup> The translation of Caulfield's language maintains most of the mood 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 is, 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, the use of very strong language – an important stylistic choice in the original – is altered in the translation. Near the end of the novel, Holden sees two pieces of graffiti, both of which read 'fuck you',<sup>179</sup> and becomes profoundly upset at the sight of them.<sup>180</sup> This phrase was each time translated as '*похабщина*' (an obscenity).<sup>181</sup> What is perhaps most interesting about this translation choice is the word *похабщина* functions also as a metalinguistic device that draws the reader's attention to the absence. The reader could plausibly reconstruct the intent of the original, substituting the swear word themselves.

The relative freedom granted to *The Catcher in the Rye* was made possible by the use of a framing device, in the form of an afterword by the 'Party writer'<sup>182</sup> and three-time Stalin prize winner, Vera Panova. Like the internal review, this paratext served a performative function, not only containing factual information but also serving to 'impart an authorial and/or editorial intention or interpretation',<sup>183</sup> as a result, it acted as a guide to the reader. By offering a guide to the interpretation, in the same way as Leont'ev's foreword to *Rockets Galore*, it could also be seen as a part of the formal 'apparatus' that allowed the text to be published, giving the reader advice on how to approach potentially problematic content. At pains to avoid any connection between Soviet and American youth, Panova consistently co-opts her reader into the evaluative process through the repeated use of the first person plural form and references to a generalised reader: as she states, 'the reader is indignant' at Holden's behaviour.<sup>184</sup> Panova employs a number of negative terms to describe the 'infantile youth':<sup>185</sup> in addition to calling him a '*барчук*' (landowner's son) – an eighteenth-century term that had acquired negative connotations of bourgeois idleness in the Soviet period – she also calls him variously a '*бездельник*' (loafer) and '*лодырь*' (idler), a '*лгун*' (liar) and a '*стиляга*' (*stiliaga*), which was a particularly contemporary insult.<sup>186</sup> Much like the authors of the internal reviews, Panova uses socialist realist terminology to assess the work, noting that 'Salinger often resorts

to decadence'.<sup>187</sup> Despite this, Panova's conclusion is positive, and she judges Salinger's novel to be a great work of American literature with much to teach the audience about American life and youth.

It seems likely that there were two interconnected functions of this paratext. First, it had a mediating function between author and reader, guiding and attempting to control the reader's interpretation and thus ensure an ideologically correct reading. Secondly, the afterword served as a signal of adherence to the norms of the official literary sphere, regardless of its actual effect on readers. It was only because the foreword pointed out its faults that the work could be included at all; problematic material could be mitigated by the presence of the interpretative text. Of course, reading that text was not compulsory, and it is likely that the 'official' interpretation could easily be ignored and the text enjoyed on its own terms by readers. Nonetheless, the paratextual framing could grant a translation legitimacy, creating the conditions for a more liberal approach at the level of the text.

A more open attitude towards sex is also displayed in the Russian translation of Erskine Caldwell's *Jenny by Nature* (1961, *Inostrannaia literatura* publication 1962), the affectionately told story of an ex-prostitute who rents rooms to various misfits and unsavoury characters. That such a story could be told at all demonstrates that foreign literature was experiencing significant liberalisation in at least some respects, though, like *The Catcher in the Rye*, it was certainly also possible to see the novel as a critique of the moral failings of capitalist society. Caldwell's sympathy for his heroine and his openness about her former profession come across very clearly in the Russian translation and, as one might expect from such subject matter, the novel contains numerous references to sex, which have tended to survive, albeit frequently in a somewhat softened form. These references were occasionally removed by the editor, so, for example, Jenny's vivid warning to her young lodger was shortened. The English reads:

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?<sup>188</sup>

The Russian omits the most 'obscene' content:

*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?*

(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?)<sup>189</sup>

Colourful phrases like ‘naked whore on a bed-quilt’<sup>190</sup>, which was translated as ‘*гол[ая] шлюх[а], которая лежит в постели*’ in the translator’s typescript (a naked slut who is lying in bed),<sup>191</sup> were removed by the editor. However, most often these vulgarities were subjected to euphemistic translation. Jenny, the ‘loose-titted prostitute and a bare-assed whore’<sup>192</sup> was recast as simply ‘*развратная женщина*’ (licentious woman) at one point.<sup>193</sup> Although the use of euphemism seems on the face of it to preserve at least some of the author’s intended content, albeit in a modified, bowdlerised form, euphemism could be just as destructive to the meaning of the text as careless cuts. Caldwell tries to expose the hypocrisy of a preacher, Preacher Clough, who seduces a teenage singer after choir practice. In the Russian version, the author’s description of them making love was neutralised, where the English is clear about the action of the preacher:

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.<sup>194</sup>

In Russian, the preacher’s excesses were lessened:

*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.*<sup>195</sup>

(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 at them and shone his torch into the car until Preacher Clough came to his senses.)

The replacement of the verb ‘to make love’ with ‘*любезничать*’ (to flirt/to court), produces a much softer alternative that excludes the physical act of sex. By avoiding the neutral phrase *заниматься любовью* (to make love), the translated version completely altered Caldwell’s image: the father’s reaction lacks sufficient justification in the Russian version.

The manipulative translation also lessened the satirical impact of the passage; by minimising the seriousness of Preacher Clough's actions against this young girl, the anti-church message of this deeply unflattering portrayal is diminished.

The approach to sexual content could therefore be varied and unpredictable, even within the same text. While it seems clear that the texts were, on the whole, less strictly regulated in their portrayal of sex, one cannot say that there is complete openness. At times translators and editors employed a more daring approach – most obviously in *Jenny by Nature*, which represents the high point of this liberalising tendency in the early 1960s – while at others a more careful approach is obvious. The changing norms, not to mention the special status of foreign literature, meant that translators had to approach the problem in something of a vacuum. The lack of clear guidance – there were fewer formal pronouncements from Glavlit on sex and swearing – means that standards shifted and multiple tactics could be employed to exclude or mediate such material.

---

## TRIMMING FOREIGN TEXTS

---

Arlen Blum has argued that, although dramatic changes occurred in many areas of life after 1953, post-Stalin censorship remained a crucial force in Soviet society and was as oppressive as in preceding years.<sup>196</sup> This was partly a result of the successful inculcation in editors and authors of censorial standards, which allowed Glavlit to take a back seat in the control process. Yet these case studies show that where the 'special case' of foreign literature was concerned a clear, albeit fitful, shift towards liberalisation did occur. Nowhere is this more vividly demonstrated than in the choice of texts for publication. Compared to the occasional inclusion of modernist works in *Internatsional'naiia literatura*, *Inostrannaia literatura* was able to offer to its readers a rather different balance between ideological 'fellow travellers' and 'bourgeois' writers; by the early 1960s, the journal was presenting a broadly non-communist (although not quite apolitical) canon of contemporary literary works to its readers, frequently attempting to parallel the trends of Western literature. Literary quality became an increasingly important factor in choosing texts, with the result that editors were able to create an image of Western culture that more closely approximated the reality of the foreign literary field. These changes reveal much about the growing importance of the reader during the Thaw, when relations between literary actors and the official sphere were being renegotiated. *Inostrannaia literatura's*

approach to the publication of translated literature, which attempted to follow popular taste rather than simply imposing top-down choices, underlines the 'complex and evolving negotiation between the interdependent fields of official ideology and popular taste.'<sup>197</sup>

Notwithstanding this more reader-oriented approach, the journal also represented a microcosm of the Soviet–Western cultural relationship. As a result, the anxieties of the cold-war period were played out on its pages, which reflected the strains between the two spheres certainly, but also acted as testimony to a growing openness in East–West relations, and a shift can be observed in the ways in which the subject was modified for Soviet consumption. The West no longer appeared to be subject to quite the same level of anxiety and fear as in the Stalin period. The presentation of the imagined West in the post-Stalin period gradually unhitched itself from its highly ideologised manifestation in the Stalin period: as the 1950s progressed, the emphasis on socialist 'fellow travellers' gave way to a focus more accurately conveying the trends of foreign literature as it existed in its home countries.

The post-Stalin censorship of foreign literature, whether it encompassed the choice of texts or the linguistic manipulation of those that were published, had a strongly performative dimension, which contributed significantly to the change in censorship practices. Internal reviews, which by the early 1960s used the discourse of socialist realism in a circular fashion to justify both inclusion and exclusion, fulfilled a ritualistic function: passing through the formal 'gatekeeper' process of review was the price of entry into the literary sphere. In adhering to the official requirements, and using the authoritative discourse, new foreign items could be introduced into the Soviet literary context.

The Stalinist mode of censorship – the ideological domestication of foreign texts – gave way to a subtler, inclusion-oriented approach that sought to 'trim' the texts to exclude the most unacceptable material, a tactic that demonstrated a keen editorial knowledge of the limits of acceptability. By removing just enough to pass the higher layers of censorship, the text could be published in an almost full version or, at least, as full as possible. This may have been due to the growing dominance of editors in the censorship of literature and the related shift from external to internal control, which was intended by Glavlit to embed censorship and perfect its implementation. However, the particularity of the editorial role, which required negotiation between literary and ideological spheres, did not operate in quite the way that Glavlit had intended. Treading the fine line between producing acceptable works and producing the texts in as full a form as possible, the translators and editors constantly exercised a keenly strategic approach, seeking to mitigate their

reluctant acceptance of their censorial role by bringing a set of tactics to bear on the texts, removing ‘just enough’ that texts could pass into publication.<sup>198</sup> By becoming dispersed, censorship ceased to be a completely reliable means of control; those agents charged with censorship tried to meet the demands of their multifaceted cultural roles by undermining the demands of the censorship even as they implemented it.

The combination of changes at the cultural level after Stalin’s death that brought about increased access to the West, the dispersal of censorship practices and the gradual withdrawal of Glavlit from dealing with the censorship of foreign texts conspired to create a rather more open atmosphere for the consumption of translation in the 1950s and early 1960s. At this time, foreign literature was able to escape the worst excesses of official intervention that continued to affect domestic literature, and came to occupy an area in the cultural sphere that was somewhat sheltered. The changes of the post-Stalin period – both in terms of the attitude to the West and the administration of censorship – had a strong impact on the publication of foreign literature; as a result, the Soviet enthusiasm for Western cultural products grew, and Soviet readers could begin to embark on a more genuine engagement with foreign culture than had been possible in previous years.

## NOTES

1. Nonetheless, there was limited consumption of foreign cultural products; for example, foreign trophy films were very popular. Johnston, *Being Soviet*, p. 197.
2. MacKenzie, *From Messianism to Collapse*, p. 160.
3. On the Youth Festival and its impact, see Koivunen, ‘The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival’ and Roth-Ey, ‘“Loose Girls” on the Loose?’. Eleonory Gilburd describes the festival as one of the events that contributed to cultural exchange becoming a ‘distinct and legitimate concept’ in post-Stalinist culture. Gilburd, ‘The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s’, p. 369.
4. On official exchanges and the ‘cultural cold war’, see for example Richmond, *Cultural Exchange & The Cold War*; Scott-Smith and Krabbendam, *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe*; Cauter, *The Dancer Defects*; Andrew Rubin, *Archives of Authority*; Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*.
5. Brusilovskaia, *Kul'tura povsednevnosti v epokhu 'ottepeli'*, p. 43.
6. In 1960, Glavlit considered liberating translated literature, alongside children’s literature and works from socialist countries, from advance control. GA RF, f. 9425 op. 1, d. 1053, ll. 45–6.
7. English was by far the dominant language of the journal, followed by French and German (with around half as many translations each). Smaller numbers of works were translated from other European languages, particularly the languages of other socialist countries, and non-European languages featured only occasionally.
8. *Ezhegodnik knigi SSSR*, pp. 387–93.

9. This increase in print run size had to be approved by Glavlit. GA RF, f. 9425, op. 2, d. 251.
10. Turkevich, 'Soviet Literary Periodicals', p. 369.
11. Kozlov, *The Readers of Novyi Mir*, p. 34. *Novyi mir*'s circulation would reach an enormous two and a half million by 1990, before dropping drastically in the post-Soviet years. Latynina and Dewhirst, 'Post-Soviet Russian Literature', p. 235.
12. Kazin, *New York Jew*, p. 273.
13. Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor*, p. 158.
14. Lyons, 'Aleksandr Chakovsky Dies at 80', p. 26.
15. 'Inostrannaia literatura', p. 288.
16. 'Ot redaktsii', pp. 3–4.
17. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 3, l. 38.
18. Orlova, *Vospominaniia*, p. 207.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
20. Gavrilov, 'Letter from a Soviet Writer', p. 16.
21. RGANI, f. 5, op. 35, d. 3, ll. 71–4. Included in Afanas'eva et al. *Apparat TsK KPSS i kul'tura 1953–1957*, pp. 457–9.
22. RGANI, f. 5, op. 36, d. 4, ll. 75–7. Included in Afanas'eva et al., *Apparat TsK KPSS i kul'tura*, p. 479.
23. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 79.
24. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35, l. 86.
25. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 11, ll. 1–4.
26. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35, l. 104.
27. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 35 ll. 74–6.
28. Chakovskii wrote to Trushchenko enclosing a copy of the text. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 3 l. 56.
29. Orlova, *Vospominaniia*, p. 211.
30. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 5, l. 94.
31. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 23.
32. As a study of intergenerational conflict and the reconciliation with the Nazi past, this novel would have been timely and relevant for the readers of the Thaw, who were grappling with similar problems. On questions of the traumatic Soviet cultural memory see Jones, *Myth, Memory, Trauma*, especially Chapter 4.
33. Kopelev and Orlova, *My zhili v Moskve*, p. 127.
34. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 53.
35. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, l. 59. Emphasis added.
36. RGALI, f. 1537, op. 5, d. 304, l. 17. *Inostrannaia literatura* sometimes consulted with authors when cuts were required, but this does not seem to have happened in all cases.
37. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 25, ll. 58–60.
38. Kopelev and Orlova, *My zhili v Moskve*, p. 128.
39. Tihanov, 'Viktor Shklovskii and Georg Lukács in the 1930s', p. 45.
40. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 77, ll. 15–16.
41. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 428, l. 24.
42. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 83, l. 40.
43. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 83, l. 42.
44. The same can be said of the reviewing process of domestic texts.
45. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 71, l. 15. During the Khrushchev period, *Inostrannaia literatura* had several prominent cultural figures on its staff. Savva Artemevich

- Dangulov was no exception: as well as serving as a diplomat and correspondent in the 1940s, Dangulov published several political novels and became the editor of the English-language journal *Soviet Literature* in the late 1960s.
46. Compare Eleonory Gilburd's examination of comments books from the 1956 Picasso exhibition in Moscow, which are similarly repetitive and express a desire to understand 'ethnographic knowledge' of foreign culture. Gilburd, 'Picasso in Thaw Culture', p. 76.
  47. Bonosky's novel was first published in the United States in 1961, but reviewed by the journal in 1959, suggesting that the journal was working from a manuscript copy, possibly sent directly by the author.
  48. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, ll. 10–11.
  49. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 265, l. 11.
  50. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 199, l. 9.
  51. Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, p. 5.
  52. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 21, l. 8.
  53. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 203, l. 9.
  54. Ruggles, 'American Books in Soviet Publishing', p. 428.
  55. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 480, l. 96.
  56. Braden's memoir recounts the struggle of the author, her husband and their African-American friend Andrew Wade. When Wade's family moved into a house purchased by Braden they were attacked by local people.
  57. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 26, l. 22.
  58. Gibian, *Interval of Freedom*, p. 12.
  59. The Soviet critic T. L. Morozova later wrote approvingly of Kerouac and the other beatnik writers' rejection of official capitalist propaganda. Morozova, *Obraz molodogo amerikantsa v literature S.Sh.A.*, p. 23.
  60. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 58.
  61. Jones, 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization', p. 12.
  62. Priscilla Johnson discusses this episode, pointing to the 'cynicism' of the editor (the 'unreconstructed' Stalinist Boris Riurikov had replaced Chakovskii), who, in her opinion, published *In the Penal Colony* to grab attention away from the rival *Novyi mir*. Johnson, *Khrushchev and the Arts*, p. 84.
  63. Raisa Orlova recalls the tension between these two groups in her recollection of her time working on the editorial board. Orlova, *Vospominaniia*, p. 207.
  64. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 126, ll. 3–4.
  65. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 24, l. 15; 50.
  66. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 50.
  67. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 428, l. 26.
  68. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 475, l. 16.
  69. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 475, l. 21.
  70. Lamaison and Bourdieu, 'From Rules to Strategies', p. 111. Bourdieu also refers to the 'feel for the game', a 'tactical intelligence' (Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, p. 103) that combines conscious and unconscious behaviour, being connected to the action of the habitus, and encompasses the 'practical mastery of the logic or immanent necessity of a game, which is gained through experience of the game, and which functions this side of consciousness and discourse'. The feel for the game is an encounter between the habitus and the field, referring to the internalised understanding of how the field functions, and the range of action available to cultural agents (Lamaison and Bourdieu, 'From Rules to Strategies', p. 111).

71. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever Until It Was No More*, p. 24. Yurchak focuses mainly on the Brezhnev period, but notes that the performative shift was in effect in the Khrushchev era.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 25. Emphasis in original.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 25. Emphasis in original.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
76. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, p. 159.
77. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 10.
78. *Ibid.*
79. Maurice Friedberg approached a number of British and American authors regarding the issue of permission and each denied that they were ever consulted about making changes or cuts to their works, insisting that they would never allow it. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 139. At *Inostrannaia literatura*, however, the archive clearly records several instances of this kind of consultation.
80. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 521. Tat'iana Kudriavtseva remembers Updike's visit, and the embarrassment of being unable to find a suitable coat for him to buy with his non-transferable Soviet royalties. Kudriavtseva, *Prekratnosti odnoi sud'by*, pp. 40–45.
81. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 11, ll. 3–4.
82. Vonnegut, *Fates Worse than Death*, p. 180.
83. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 311, l. 2.
84. Although the first name and patronymic are not recorded in the archival record, this is likely to be the critic and German literature specialist Il'ia Moiseevich Fradkin.
85. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 242, l. 66.
86. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 342, l. 150.
87. Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 165.
88. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 260, l. 65.
89. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 2, d. 260, l. 120.
90. Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 30.
91. Friedberg, 'Soviet Censorship: A View from Outside', p. 27.
92. Greene, *Our Man in Havana*, p. 34.
93. Grin, 'Nash chelovek v Gavane', vol. 3, p. 24.
94. RGALI, f. 1537, op. 1, d. 260.
95. Mackenzie, *Rockets Galore*, p. 60.
96. Makkenzi, 'Raketaia goriachka', p. 127.
97. Mackenzie, *Rockets Galore*, p. 237.
98. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 342, l. 144.
99. *Ibid.*
100. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 1, d. 343, l. 144.
101. Mikhail Epstein terms this kind of change an 'evaluative conversion'. Epstein, *Relativistic Patterns in Totalitarian Thinking*, p. 23.
102. Leont'ev, 'Posleslovie', p. 169.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
104. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
105. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
106. Lih, 'The Soviet Union and the Road to Communism', p. 706.
107. Leont'ev, 'Posleslovie', p. 173.

108. Deiss, *The Blue Chips*, p. 118.
109. Dais, 'Krupnaia igra', vol. 2, p. 132.
110. Marx and Engels, *Manifest kommunisticheskoi partii*, p. 82. (Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.)
111. Silitou, 'Kliuch ot dveri', vol. 6, p. 196.
112. This was a continuing preoccupation. Michael David-Fox discusses the importance of Western views during the earlier period and the cultural cold war in *Showcasing the Great Experiment*, p. 314.
113. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 5, d. 428, ll. 19–21.
114. Simultaneous publication was unusual, but by no means unheard of. Tat'iana Kudriavtseva, who was responsible for American and European literature at the journal between the 1960s and 1980s, recalled travelling extensively to find new works and receiving the proofs of Ernest Hemingway's *A Moveable Feast* from his wife so that it could be published at the same time as the posthumous American publication. Kudriavtseva, *Prekratnosti odnoi sud'by*, p. 38.
115. *Inostrannaia literatura's* typescript names the scientist 'Tarchakoff', while the published English version calls him Goncharov. The editor of the Russian translation changed his name to Gorchakov.
116. 'Big in Russia', p. 64. The article noted that Wilson was unusual among foreign authors in receiving royalties and could expect to make around 15,000 dollars from the Russian edition.
117. Uilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', p. 37.
118. 'Big in Russia', p. 66.
119. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
120. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 5.
121. *Ibid.*
122. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 6.
123. *Ibid.*
124. *Ibid.*
125. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 17.
126. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 10.
127. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 10, l. 14.
128. Brooks, 'Best-Seller', p. 20.
129. Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, p. 32.
130. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 504, l. 53.
131. Uilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', vol. 1, p. 61.
132. Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, p. 47.
133. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 504, l. 62.
134. Uilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', vol. 1, p. 65.
135. Reid, 'Cold War in the Kitchen', p. 213.
136. Wilson, *Meeting at a Far Meridian*, p. 239.
137. Uilson, 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', vol. 3, p. 155.
138. Recent scholarship has modified the view of the post-Stalin period as a time of unrestrained liberalisation. See, for example, Jones, *Memory, Myth, Trauma*; Hornsby, *Protest, Reform and Repression in Khrushchev's Soviet Union*.
139. Kon, 'Sexuality and Culture', p. 25.
140. Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature*, p. 175.
141. *Ibid.*, pp. 174 and 176.

142. Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 241.
143. Grin, 'Tikhii amerikanets', p. 162.
144. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 138. Judith Butler connects this kind of implicit censorship to 'prior foreclosures and operative principles of selectivity that form the field of linguistic intelligibility'. Butler, 'Ruled Out', p. 248.
145. Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade, *The Russian Language Today*, p. 40.
146. Volevich et al., "'Vsekh etikh slov po-russki net . . .".
147. Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 81.
148. Grin, 'Tikhii amerikanets', p. 110.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 110.
150. Greene, *The Quiet American*, p. 177.
151. Grin, 'Tikhii amerikanets', p. 133.
152. Sillitou, 'Kliuch ot dveri', vol. 7, p. 149.
153. Sillitou, *Key to the Door*, p. 427.
154. *Ibid.*, p. 373.
155. Sillitou, 'Kliuch ot dveri', p. 150.
156. Quoted in Friedberg, 'The U.S. in the U.S.S.R.', p. 528.
157. Friedberg, 'The U.S. in the U.S.S.R.', p. 549.
158. Kerouac, 'Na doroge', pp. 170; 185; 190.
159. Efanova (1909–2006) was of German extraction. She lived in Irkutsk before the revolution and emigrated with her family to China in the face of the post-revolutionary danger of arrest or death, returning in the mid-1950s. As well as being the first translator of Kerouac, she also translated works by Doris Lessing, H. G. Wells, Stefan Zweig and, in the post-Soviet period, Melvyn Bragg. She recalled her early experiences and travels in a memoir, *Domoi s chernogo khoda* (1998).
160. Kerouac, *On the Road*, p. 232.
161. *Ibid.*, p. 338.
162. Kerouac, 'Na doroge', p. 188.
163. Romanova, 'What American Novels Do Russians Read?', p. 180.
164. Rait-Kovaleva (1898–1988) first trained in the medical faculty at MGU before becoming a translator full time. Among many other Western authors, she translated works by Faulkner, Salinger, Mark Twain and Anne Frank.
165. Rita Rait-Kovaleva, letter to Martin Dewhirst, 7 December 1961. The English copy was sent by the British scholar of Russian culture, Martin Dewhirst, to whom I am grateful for providing me with a copy of this letter.
166. Rait-Kovaleva, 'Nit' Ariadny', p. 7.
167. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, p. 62.
168. Selindzher, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', p. 63.
169. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, p. 32.
170. Selindzher, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', p. 47.
171. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
172. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, p. 76.
173. Selindzher, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', pp. 84–5.
174. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 139.
175. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, p. 175.
176. Selindzher, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', p. 128.
177. Borisenko, 'Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet'.
178. It has been suggested that Rait-Kovaleva 'did not so much translate the slang of

- American teenagers as invent the Russian equivalent'. Young, 'Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger', p. 414.
179. Salinger, *Catcher in the Rye*, pp. 180, 182, 183.
180. The graffiti is important in creating a link between sex and death in the novel; it also 'verbalizes the traumatic insult' of his brother's death. Rosen, 'A Retrospective Look at *The Catcher in the Rye*', p. 557.
181. Selindzher, 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhi', pp. 131, 132, 133.
182. Pilkington, 'Vera Fedorovna Panova 1905–1973', p. 613.
183. Genette and MacLean, 'Introduction to the Paratext', p. 268.
184. Panova, 'O romane Dzh. D. Selindzhera', p. 138.
185. *Ibid.*, p. 138.
186. The word *stiliaga* referred to a young person dressed in a fashionable way, and unhealthily interested in style and especially American culture. In the official press these young people were subject to widespread abuse. On the *stiliaga* phenomenon see Fürst, *Stalin's Last Generation*, pp. 218–50.
187. Panova, 'O romane Dzh. D. Selindzhera', p. 138.
188. Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 90. Emphasis added.
189. Kolduell, 'Dzhenni', p. 108.
190. Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 208.
191. RGALI, f. 1573, op. 3, d. 1033, l. 159.
192. Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 15.
193. Kolduell, 'Dzhenni', p. 77.
194. Caldwell, *Jenny by Nature*, p. 59.
195. Kolduell, 'Dzhenni', p. 94.
196. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 45.
197. Bullock, 'Not One of Us? The Paradoxes of Translating Oscar Wilde in the Soviet Union', p. 264.
198. Bourdieu's comments on strategies as 'the product of a practical sense, of a particular social game' illuminate the ways in which strategies and practices are conditioned by immersion in a particular social field. The censorial actors attempted to assert their interests while conditioned by the social context. Lamaison and Bourdieu, 'From Rules to Strategies', pp. 112–13.

# Resisting Censorship

The preceding chapters have discussed the methods by which censorial agents mediated foreign influences in their work, avoiding political and moral taboos and reinforcing the special status of the authorised Soviet language, and at certain points pushing the boundaries of what was acceptable in translation by negotiating between the state and the reading public to satisfy both to the maximum extent. This chapter will examine more marked manifestations of contestation. The particular status of translation – and translators – in Soviet culture allowed those engaged in the transmission of foreign texts to engage in acts of resistance intended to disrupt the state control of literature and defy censorial controls. Translators came, in Brian James Baer’s words, ‘to embody resistance, especially during the worst periods of repression’;<sup>1</sup> as a result, they formed part of an ‘alternative pantheon of heroes’.<sup>2</sup> Tactics employed to resist the censorship of translation included the employment of an Aesopian approach to translation and, a more obvious form of opposition, the production of *samizdat* translations, which began to appear in the 1950s. The employment of resisting tactics – especially as they frequently existed alongside accommodating or acquiescing approaches – complicates the widely held view of censorship as a monolithic force and further illustrates the complex relation of cultural producers to censorship experiences.

## AESOPIAN TRANSLATION

---

An important tactic employed in the face of censorship was the ‘smuggling’ through of alternative, resistant meanings embedded in the text. This ‘Aesopian’ method of writing attempted to divert the attention of the censor and so allow resistant meanings to pass through to the

reader. Lev Loseff, the Russian poet and scholar, described the means by which Aesopian language functioned in the Soviet context in his *On the Beneficence of Censorship: Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*, in which he emphasised the importance of the participation of the ‘shrewd Aesopian reader’ in decoding the censored text.<sup>3</sup> The complicity between the reader and the author, who enter into a time- and space-separated relationship, is key in transmitting material that could avoid detection by a political authority. The Aesopian approach was a strategy to mitigate repressive censorship through a strategic employment of euphemism. To do so, the author of the text employed a set of ‘screens’ and ‘markers’; the first was ‘bent on concealing the Aesopian text’ while the latter drew attention to it,<sup>3</sup> drawing the intended reader into the process of meaning (re) creation. The Aesopian approach is necessarily reader-oriented, aiming to produce a particular effect. Its function is, according to Kevin Moss, to ‘make the reader name, at least to themselves, the Soviet reality to which the text does not overtly refer’.<sup>4</sup> As a result, the successful interpretation of the Aesopian text depends to a large extent on ‘preaching to the converted’, that is communicating to an audience already primed to receive oppositional meanings. As Loseff notes, ‘it is not in the text, but rather in the consciousness of the reader that stylistic devices achieve their function’.<sup>5</sup> The status of the translated text could act as a screen, allowing messages that would not be tolerated in domestic production to be tactically introduced through translation, making that text the ‘Aesopian original of its translator’,<sup>6</sup> even if no such meaning were present or intended in the original. The status of the translator is worn as a mask to conceal the translator’s own creative input.<sup>7</sup> Brian James Baer has explored the use of Aesopian language by homosexual translators in the 1930s, who used translation as a shield in order to allow for the circulation of texts that ‘could also be read *queerly*’ by a select in-group of readers alert to such meanings.<sup>8</sup> Taking advantage of the censors’ blindness to queer themes, homosexual translators such as Mikhail Kuz’min could cue their readers to potentially resistant or alternative interpretations in their translations.

Such an approach was employed by Boris Pasternak in his translations, produced in the Stalin period when he was unable to publish his own original writing. Although forced into translating, Pasternak managed to make that work not only a creative outlet but also an ideological one. His skill as a translator allowed his Russian versions of Shakespeare, for example, to carry new information while the original imagery was also transmitted adequately, a tactic described by Sergey Tyulenev as ‘semiotic smuggling’;<sup>9</sup> such an approach allowed him to ‘give vent to his (and his reader’s) frustration though under someone else’s name’.<sup>10</sup> He thus was able to hide behind the very foreignness of

translation, using it as a shield for sentiments that could have no outlet in original writing. On Pasternak's side was his status as a literary figure and his more-or-less-sanctioned approach to translation. Championing an extremely free approach to the translated text, he could be granted some leeway in his production of the text; it also put him on the right side of the formalist/realist debate in translation theory, although Pasternak's political intentions were of course opposed to those of the theoreticians.<sup>11</sup> His tendency to 'pasternakise' (*онастернакивать*) thus affording him some freedom, his *Hamlet* (first published in 1940) 'often bore greater resemblance to his own verse than to Shakespeare's'.<sup>12</sup> What was crucial, however, was that this was not invention purely for its own sake, but rather an attempt to produce and transmit his personal position within the translated work. Although he came under pressure to make the translation of *Hamlet* more literal (and the various editions demonstrate that he edited the text substantially), and despite the fact that he bowdlerised some of the sexual innuendoes,<sup>13</sup> Pasternak managed to encode a number of 'markers' directed towards the reader in his versions of Shakespeare, prompting an Aesopian reading and encouraging the reader to make parallels between the past fictional events and the present state of cultural and political affairs.<sup>14</sup> His translation portrayed Hamlet sympathetically, as trapped in his predicament, seeking a reaction to tyranny, but unable to act. Baer suggests that this Russian Hamlet might have been a proxy for Pasternak himself: 'avoiding a call to political engagement on the one hand and total surrender to apathy on the other, in his *Hamlet* Pasternak paints the moral predicament of members of the Soviet-era intelligentsia in heroic terms'.<sup>15</sup> In translation, Pasternak sounds 'outright defiant'.<sup>16</sup>

At several moments in his translation of the play Pasternak seems to be subtly guiding the reader towards a particular contemporary interpretation. The third act's performance of *The Mousetrap*, whereby Hamlet hopes to entrap the king and force him to expose his guilt in his brother's murder, presents an rather curious example of his approach, aimed at drawing the reader's attention to parallels with the Soviet Union. This scene allows the prince to comment on the usurpation of the throne:

For thou dost know, O Damon dear,  
This realm dismantled was  
Of Jove himself, and now reigns here  
A very, very – pajock.<sup>17</sup>

The 1951 edition of the Russian translation renders the sentence in the active voice, strengthening the sense of action and deliberateness in Claudius's usurpation of the throne and the violence associated with it:

Ты знаешь, дорогой Дамон,  
 Юпитера орел  
 Слетел с престола, и на трон  
 Воссел простой осе – тр  
 (You know, dear Damon  
 the eagle of Jupiter  
 Flew down from the altar and to the throne  
 ascended a simple ose – tr)<sup>18</sup>

These final words give the reader pause. The reader of the English would expect to see the word ‘ass’, in keeping with the rhyme, though Shakespeare opted instead for the word ‘pajock’, meaning peacock.<sup>19</sup> The Russian version incorporates the beginning of ‘ass’ (*осел*) before breaking off. If the ellipsis is removed, we end up with the Russian word *осемь* (sturgeon); the fish, and its caviar, was a highly valued item in pre-revolutionary and Soviet culture and was a typical holiday dish.<sup>20</sup> Pasternak’s translation is successful in its retention of Shakespeare’s animal imagery, but it also slyly incorporates a term with immediate resonance in Soviet culture. It is possible that this was simply an inspired translation choice, though it could be the case that Pasternak was slyly incorporating a ‘marker’ through the use of this word, strongly associated with Russian culture, encouraging readers to be aware of the parallels between Hamlet’s world and their own.

Pasternak’s translation of the play was revised several times, each version quite different from the last. In the famous ‘to be or not to be’ soliloquy, each variation encodes a ‘political’ reading in slightly different ways, as can be demonstrated by comparing the opening in each edition. The English original reads as follows:

For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,  
 The oppressor’s wrong, the proud man’s contumely,  
 The pangs of disprized love, the law’s delay,  
 The insolence of office, and the spurns  
 That patient merit of the unworthy takes,  
 When he himself might his quietus make.<sup>21</sup>

The earliest variation of the text, published in the journal *Molodaia gvardiia* in 1940, bears hardly any resemblance to the original and is very open in its allusion to the contemporary situation. Here, Pasternak took great liberties with the source text with the result that its rendering of the famous ‘to be or not to be’ soliloquy would seem to the attentive reader like a denunciation of the Soviet system

*А то кто снес бы униженья века,  
 Гонителя насилье, спесь глупца,  
 Любовь без разделенья, волокиту,  
 Ругателей приказных и пинки  
 Нестоящих, лягающих достойных*  
 (And who would bear the degradation of the age  
 the violence of the persecutor, the arrogance of the fool,  
 Love without separation, bureaucracy,  
 The kicks of the lawful abusers  
 of the worthless, lying worthies)<sup>22</sup>

This edition makes explicit the author's condemnation of the state, referring openly to 'bureaucracy' and strengthening the sense of violence in the Russian version. The 'unworthy' of Shakespeare's original are portrayed even more negatively by the addition of the insulting adjectives '*нестоящих*' (worthless) and '*лягающих*' (lying). Additionally, the use of *век* (the age) alludes not to the passage of time, as in the English, but to a particular period, the age in which Pasternak lived. Accordingly, Pasternak's translation 'sounds like a precise description of Pasternak's own lot or of the situation of many Soviet artists and intellectuals',<sup>23</sup> the translated Hamlet coming to act as a proxy for Pasternak himself, allowing the translator to put into Hamlet's mouth his own words about the society in which he lived.<sup>24</sup>

The 1941 Detgiz edition also emphasises the fate of the downtrodden under the yoke of the rulers, making even more explicit the lawlessness and personifying the authorities through the use of the participle to refer to those in power and through the figure of the 'fool', also present in the 1940 version, which Shakespeare's original rendered as a depersonalised 'office'. In Pasternak's version the law is defined by its silence, perhaps recalling the terror, where the rule of law was warped to justify and excuse the repressions:

*А то кто снес бы униженья века,  
 Позор гоненья, выходки глупца,  
 Отринутую страсть, молчанье права  
 Надменность власть имущих и судьбы*  
 (And who would bear the degradation of the age,  
 The shame of persecution, the tricks of the fool,  
 rejected passion, the silence of the law  
 the arrogance of those who have power and fate)<sup>25</sup>

Much of this passage as rendered in the 1947 edition, which refers openly to the 'rulers', is pure invention on Pasternak's part.<sup>26</sup>

*А то, кто снес бы ложное величье  
 Правителей, невежество, вельмож,  
 Всеобщее притворство, невозможность,  
 Излить себя несчастную любовь  
 И призрачность заслуг в глазах ничтожеств*  
 (And who would bear the false greatness  
 of the rulers, the ignorance of the grandees,  
 the general pretence, the impossibility  
 of giving vent to the unhappy love  
 and the illusoriness of services in the eyes of nonentities)<sup>27</sup>

Pasternak's rendition here is perhaps even stronger in its allusion to and condemnation of the state than the *Molodaia gvardiia* edition. Shakespeare's 'oppressor' was recast as the 'rulers' (*правителей*), instantly clear to the Stalin-period reader. Moreover, the insertion of *излить себя* (to give vent to) alludes to the censorship regime and the impossibility of self-expression – such as that experienced by Pasternak himself. One can gain a sense of the translator's anger in this version, directed towards those nonentities (*ничтожеств*) to whom he refers. The 1951 version contained in his collected *Tragedies* is again different, but continues to play with the themes of power, leadership and oppression:

*А то кто снес бы униженья века,  
 Неправду угнетателя, вельмож  
 Заносчивость, отринутое чувство,  
 Нескорый суд и более всего  
 Насмешки недостойных над достойным*  
 (Or else who would bear the degradation of the age,  
 The untruth of the oppressors, the grandees'  
 haughtiness, the rejected feeling,  
 the delayed trial and moreover  
 the mockery by the unworthy of the worthy)<sup>28</sup>

Each of these versions contains clear references to power, especially in the repeated use of 'униженья века' (degradation of the age), which functions as a synonym for the state.<sup>29</sup> Each form of the soliloquy approaches the original English from a highly creative standpoint, manipulating the source material extensively. What unites them all is the fact that in each edition Pasternak was attempting to encode his feelings about the state of his own society.

In addition, the monologue allows Pasternak, by stressing

inevitability and fate, to emphasise a parallel between Hamlet and Christ, activating motifs of self-sacrifice and victimhood.<sup>30</sup> The ‘to be or not to be’ soliloquy was compared to the Gethsemane prayer by Pasternak himself,<sup>31</sup> who saw the work as a drama of ‘duty and self-denial’.<sup>32</sup> The emphasis on religious themes in the Russian translation ‘provid[ed] a quiet affirmation and slaking of the Soviet audience’s thirst for transcendental truths’.<sup>33</sup> In his translation, Pasternak’s Hamlet is a Christ-like figure who stands up to authority; his murder is ‘a version of Soviet martyrdom and saint-hood’.<sup>34</sup> As Aoife Gallagher has suggested, Pasternak is here using the translation as a form of indirect communication with readers, and attempting to use Hamlet ‘as a model for behaviour’ for the reader under Stalinism.<sup>35</sup> His Hamlet, like his later *Zhivago*, becomes an alternative to the new Soviet man (the so-called *Homo Sovieticus*), although ‘only one could pass the censor’.<sup>36</sup>

*Hamlet* was certainly the work closest to Pasternak’s heart, and its themes preoccupied him throughout his working life. However, his other translations of Shakespeare also display a similarly Aesopian approach. I will turn now to his translation of *Macbeth*, first published in 1951; this tragedy, centred thematically on state power and violence, lent itself well to an Aesopian approach in which the translation was itself the screen. Thus, Pasternak’s version of *Macbeth* also allowed him to retain motifs and statements of Shakespeare’s that had a strong resonance for the reader; additionally, he was able to strengthen these parallels through his approach of free translation, inserting new, context-dependent meanings for the Soviet reader to appreciate. The translation, screened by its displacement in time and place and by its status as a ‘classic’ of world culture, comes to comment upon Soviet reality in a way that a Russian text could not.<sup>37</sup>

The significance of the scene in Act 4, in which Macduff and Malcolm talk of Macbeth’s rule over Scotland, bemoaning the lack of moral legitimacy and the violence with which he reigns, is easily understandable for the reader; it would take no great leap of imagination to interpret the characters’ statements as applying equally easily to the Soviet Union. Very often in this scene Pasternak translated directly, allowing the text to speak for itself. Thus, Macduff’s description of Macbeth provokes potential parallels with Stalin without any need for manipulation:

Not in the legions  
Of horrid Hell can come a devil more damned  
In evils, to top Macbeth<sup>38</sup>

The Russian translation reads as follows:

*Никто из дьяволов в аду  
С чудовищным Макбетом не сравнится*  
(None of the devils in hell  
is comparable to the monster Macbeth)<sup>39</sup>

The following extract is also highly evocative for the Soviet reader. Here, Malcolm mourns the country under Macbeth's rule:

I think our country sinks beneath the yoke,  
It weeps, it bleeds, and each new day a gash  
Is added to her wounds.<sup>40</sup>

The translation is again direct. The phrase '*каждый божий день*' and the reference to blood and tears are set-phrases in Russian; as the doctrine of realist translation demanded, Pasternak domesticated the translation to make it immediately accessible to the reader:

*Страна исходит кровью и слезами  
Под тяжким игом. Каждый божий день  
Ей прибавляет раны*  
(The country pours out blood and tears  
Under the heavy yoke. Every blessed day  
wounds are added to her)<sup>41</sup>

In these extracts, Pasternak's mobilisation of the *Macbeth* translation to comment on contemporary Soviet life was achieved primarily through the use of the translation itself as a 'screen'. While certain aspects of it were subtly strengthened so as to direct the reader's interpretation, the text was more or less able to speak for itself in translation.

At other points in the translation, small shifts allow for certain points to be played up, directing the reader's interpretation or strengthening parallels with the domestic context. In this extract, Pasternak slightly modified Ross's lament for his country, strengthening the idea that these horrors were everyday and perhaps eternal:

Alas poor country,  
Almost afraid to know itself. It cannot  
Be called our mother, but our grave; where nothing  
But who knows nothing, is once seen to smile;  
Where sighs, and groans, and shrieks that rend the air

Are made, not marked; where violent sorry seems  
 A modern ecstasy – the deadman's knell  
 Is there scarce asked for who, and good men's lives  
 Expire before the flowers in their caps.  
 Dying or ere they sicken.<sup>42</sup>

The Russian translation is as follows:

*К несчастью.  
 Страна неузнаваема. Она  
 Уже не мать нам, но могила наша.  
 Улыбку встретить только у блажных.  
 К слезам привыкли, их не замечают.  
 К мельканью частных ужасов и бурь.  
 Относятся, как к рядовым явлениям.  
 Весь день звонят по ком-то, но никто  
 Не любопытствуют, кого хоронят.  
 Здоровьяки хиреют на глазах  
 Скорей, чем вянут их цветы на шляпах,  
 И умирают, даже не болев.*  
 ('sadly,  
 the country is unrecognisable. It  
 is no longer a mother to us but our grave.  
 A smile is encountered only among the capricious  
 They [that is, the people] have gotten used to tears, they do not  
 notice them.  
 [They have gotten used] to glimpses of frequent horrors and  
 storms  
 They regard them as everyday occurrences.  
 All day bells sound for someone but no one  
 is interested in who is being buried.  
 The healthy decay before your eyes  
 before the flowers in their hats wither  
 and they die without even having become ill)<sup>43</sup>

Pasternak's translation is less vivid than the original: the mood is one of resignation and perhaps depression. His use of *привыкли* (they have gotten used to) in particular strengthens Shakespeare's idea that the sighs and groans of the populace go unnoticed and that they are a constant feature of life. Further importance is granted to this idea by the emphatic supplement to the first verb, '*их не замечают*' (they do not notice them). The reader could more easily draw a parallel between this description of Scotland

under tyranny and the darkest days of the terror in their own country, since Pasternak's translation strongly emphasises the commonplace nature of these horrors.<sup>44</sup> Opting for the simple phrase *‘рядовым явлениям’* (everyday occurrence) also creates a sense of ‘numbness or dumb apathy’ among the people who are subject to it.<sup>45</sup> It is no great leap for the Soviet reader to create a mental link between Macbeth's reign and Stalin's. The resonances of the passages are clear, and made even more so by Pasternak's translation approach. *‘Не любопытствуют, кого хоронят’* (they are not interested in whom they bury), more direct than the English version, recalls the sense of alienation and fear that gripped society during the Terror, fragmenting personal relationships and communities.<sup>46</sup>

Macduff and Malcolm's laments about the state of Scotland are sometimes generalised in the translation, so that they might more easily apply to another context; for example, where Macduff cries ‘O Scotland, Scotland’ in the English edition,<sup>47</sup> in the Russian this was shifted to read *‘О бедный край’* (O, poor region).<sup>48</sup> The following passage from Ross's address to Lady Macbeth in Act 4 was modified in a similar way:

But cruel are the times, when we are traitors  
And do not know ourselves; when we hold rumour  
From what we fear, yet know not what we fear,  
But float upon a wild and violent sea.<sup>49</sup>

Here, the translated version shifted from the inclusive first person plural to a more general third-person impersonal form. At the same time, where the threat of the English text is vague and ill-defined, the Russian text makes the danger faced by the speakers concrete and therefore more pressing. The accusation is more direct, recalling the purges and, especially, denunciations.

*Времени ужасны,  
Когда винят в измене и никто  
Не знает почему; когда боятся  
Ползущих слухов, не имея средств  
Опасность уяснить; когда безвестность  
Кольшется кругом, как океан.*  
(The times are terrible,  
When they accuse [people] of treachery and no one  
knows why; when they are scared  
using rumours, without the means  
of comprehending the danger; when obscurity  
heaves round, like the ocean)<sup>50</sup>

Pasternak's *Macbeth* was judged by critics to be rather unsuccessful, especially in conveying the psychology of Macbeth and how it relates to his crimes;<sup>51</sup> however, approaching the translation from a slightly different perspective, the image is somewhat different. Using the translated text as an Aesopian screen, Pasternak carefully and subtly strengthened particular lines in order to convey his own ideological agenda, engaging in an act of creative resistance and addressing – and thus entering into a kind of relationship with – an imagined reader. Without overtly referring to the Stalinist reality, Pasternak was able to produce a translation that nonetheless quietly evoked it, turning this story of a foreign land into a commentary on contemporary life and the rulers of the Soviet Union.

It is useful to ponder for a moment the efficacy of Aesopian language as a means of resistance. Its critics have pointed out that users of this language were incapable of open expressions of dissent and, in fact, confirmed the order of things, making its users collaborators.<sup>52</sup> The salient issue is that the producers of Aesopian language were addressing a closed group, who did not need to be convinced: the audience that is ready to receive the Aesopian message is already complicit in the author's game. As Helen Freshwater comments, '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'.<sup>53</sup> The Aesopian approach therefore cannot truly be regarded as a mobilising force; it might be said that the use of such language serves to create in-groups and strengthen personal bonds rather than effect actual political change. At least some of the Pasternak's audience was indeed primed and alert to its Aesopian meanings, though of course the reception process was unpredictable.<sup>54</sup> At performances of his *Hamlet*, spectators applauded when the line 'something is rotten in the state of Denmark' was spoken, clearly interpreting it as a comment on their own society.<sup>55</sup> Additionally there was a kind of private satisfaction to be had from the creative act of Aesopian translation, even if only speaking to a small and already knowledgeable group. One should not underestimate the power of making a space for creative work, albeit hidden, as a form of personal liberation. Pasternak's resistance to censorship had a personal, imaginative function: encoding meanings in these texts allowed the translator to express his feelings about – if not to – the regime, giving vent to his dissatisfaction in relative safety. Aesopian translation could never be a weapon against the state, but it could be a kind of 'lyrical confession'<sup>56</sup> whereby Pasternak could engage in free expression and attempt to make a connection between himself and his audience. The creation of such a connection was an important tactic in the cultivation of an oppositional

intelligentsia engaged in a ‘politically daring’ though often hidden form of ‘moral’ resistance.<sup>57</sup>

## WORKING OUTSIDE THE SYSTEM: SAMIZDAT TRANSLATIONS

Aesopian translation was a means of resistance intimately connected with the censorship regime; it sought to make heterodox expression possible within the sphere of official publishing by drawing upon the translators’ ability to navigate the norms of cultural production and to anticipate and ‘dodge’ the censor. It was also possible to disengage more fully from the official culture: one option was to write or translate ‘for the drawer’, without holding out any hope of publication. Another alternative, which achieved prominence in intellectual circles in the post-Stalin era, was to retreat to the ‘extra-Gutenberg’ sphere of *samizdat*.<sup>58</sup> *Samizdat*, the self-production and distribution of texts outside the state-controlled network of publishing houses, bypassed the censorship apparatus; *samizdat* texts were distributed via unofficial networks and among friendship groups. The term *samizdat* first originated in the 1940s, when the poet Nikolai Glazkov coined the term *samsebiaizdat* (самсебиздат, roughly, I-myself-publishing), and began to flourish after Stalin’s death; at this time the majority of circulating items were literary, especially poetic, texts.<sup>59</sup> The phenomenon reached its height in the Brezhnev era, by which time the focus had shifted somewhat to the dissemination of factual or political material; *samizdat* was a particularly important tool for the Soviet dissident and human rights movements, who used it to disseminate their own publications – such as the *Chronicle of Current Events* – and translations of journalistic or scientific texts from foreign publications.<sup>60</sup> *Samizdat* texts were usually typed out, often on carbon copy paper; the tissue-thin paper allowed for the maximum number of copies to be made at one time. Later, as the technology became available, photocopies began to circulate. Typescripts were passed from person to person, the informal distribution network making the phenomenon difficult to control.

Translators were among the first literary actors to make conscious use of and develop the ‘mechanism’ of *samizdat*, and translations were an important part of the *samizdat* literary sub-culture, especially in its early years,<sup>61</sup> although to date they have received only passing mention in the scholarly literature. Literary translation in *samizdat* was quite varied, encompassing a broad range of works that could not be published in the open press. The translations included works such as Arthur Koestler’s

*Darkness at Noon* (1940), translated by the art historian Igor' Naumovich Golomshtok in the late 1950s;<sup>62</sup> *Exodus*, Leon Uris's novel about the establishment of Israel; works by Kafka and Camus, and quite a large number of poems.<sup>63</sup> Many novels were produced as individual typewritten volumes and *samizdat* literary journals such as *Chasy* came to include translation sections, usually publishing translations of poetry. Many, if not most, *samizdat* translators were anonymous, likely because they were liable to be censured for such activities and, one assumes, because they wished to safeguard their ability to continue in their regular work. The specialisms of the *samizdat* translators often had little or no connection to their professional lives; this could be a deliberate tactic intended to protect their positions, or simply the result of a 'calling' to a particular kind of literature.<sup>64</sup> The purpose of *samizdat* was felt by its practitioners to be to allow the Soviet reader access to works officially denied to them by the state, and to broaden their knowledge of literary and philosophical cultures beyond that which could be obtained in the highly regulated sphere of official publication. Michel Meerson Aksenov ascribed it a philosophical significance when he wrote that translated *samizdat* expressed the 'enlightenment ideals' of the Soviet intelligentsia. As such, this kind of translation had a primarily humanistic rather than entirely 'political' significance.<sup>65</sup>

Natal'ia Trauberg, best known as the translator of the comic novelist P. G. Wodehouse, was an early translator of *samizdat*. She became involved in the illicit translation of religious tracts during the winter of 1960–1, when she lived near Moscow. Trauberg has also been perhaps the most extensive chronicler of the activity, in part due to the interest of the Western religious community in her work. Religious *samizdat* was an important method for establishing a canon of texts for the protestant movement; in the 1970s especially, *samizdat* translations and republications of older texts formed the majority of such texts.<sup>66</sup> It was, to a large extent, an amateur affair. Trauberg knew no other professional prose translators in her *samizdat* circle, which included the artist Zoia Afanas'evna Maslennikova.<sup>67</sup> Trauberg regarded her *samizdat* works as an act of Christian witness, distinct from her professional translation.<sup>68</sup> Her translations included the religious texts of C. S. Lewis and the Christian novels of G. K. Chesterton;<sup>69</sup> her first work in *samizdat* was his 1909 essay 'A Piece of Chalk'. Of these early efforts she wrote, 'I don't know if it can be called *samizdat*. I just gave away my translations as gifts,' betraying a lack of the firm political agenda that *samizdat* is often assumed to have.<sup>70</sup> Over a period of several years, she translated 'for the soul' a quite large number of religious texts, including pieces by Thomas Aquinas and St Francis of Assisi.<sup>71</sup> She described her work

as a form of ‘ministry’ carried out alongside her paid translations.<sup>72</sup> Her translations of religious essays and novels were at first usually produced in a self-typed run of four copies and distributed via friends; but by the middle of the 1960s the endeavour had become somewhat more professional, and a number of typists were recruited to make copies of her translations of Chesterton. The completed texts circulated within a rather small religious circle, although Trauberg recognised that the fate of every *samizdat* text was ‘medieval’; once it had been released, it could not be controlled.<sup>73</sup>

The ‘medieval’ existence of *samizdat* meant that a standard or ‘pure’ text could not exist. Although one might imagine these texts to be non-censored, since they were produced with no interference from the authorities, the *samizdat* text was marked or even defined by an ‘epistemological instability’;<sup>74</sup> its particular conditions of production – unregulated, and reproduced in diverse circumstances – rendered it highly variable. Each copy of a text could vary dramatically in terms of length, number of mistakes, medium or layout. Thus, however counter-intuitively, *samizdat* translations were also subjected to their own particular forms of manipulation or censorship, often arising out of practical need. Leon Uris’s *Exodus*, for example, was subjected to cuts by its translators, who found the central romance ‘inappropriate for Zionist reading’;<sup>75</sup> Trauberg recalled that religious *samizdat* was often edited to remove allusions that could not be understood by the reader without a commentary. This included references to works by Aldous Huxley and William Faulkner which were unfamiliar to Soviet readers, who had no access to them.<sup>76</sup> She commented, ‘in short, it was not an academic preparation of a manuscript’.<sup>77</sup>

How did this informal, often amateur mode of literary production function? What factors were important to translators? I will explore these questions with reference to a number of notable translations of works by George Orwell and Ernest Hemingway that circulated in *samizdat* in the late 1950s and 1960s, extending somewhat beyond the end of the Khrushchev era. Hemingway’s Spanish Civil War novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* circulated in several *samizdat* versions, at least two of which were initially produced within the official publishing apparatus: one official translation prepared in 1962 for limited circulation among Party officials ‘escaped’ into *samizdat*.<sup>78</sup> Extracts also circulated under the title *Povest’ partizana* (Tale of the Partisan) in several Soviet cities. The most well-known and widely circulated version was not initially intended as a *samizdat* text, but found its way into the unofficial publishing ecosystem only after it was banned from open publication. Translated by two members of the Kashkin collective, Natal’ia Volzhina and Evgeniia

Kalashnikova, it was completed in 1941, but banned as a result of its slanderous treatment of the Comintern and International Brigade figures André Marty and Dolores Ibárruri.<sup>79</sup> Indeed, this *samizdat* translation seems to have been in circulation since the late 1940s, reaching dozens or perhaps even hundreds of readers.<sup>80</sup> After numerous attempts to publish the novel, it eventually appeared in 1968 in a four-volume collected edition of Hemingway's works;<sup>81</sup> it has been suggested that it was the circulation of an uncensored version that forced the Party's hand and led directly to the publication of the revised edition.<sup>82</sup>

*Samizdat* texts had a particularly material significance, and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a perfect illustration of the care and attention paid to the production of such items and of their status as prestigious artefacts in an unofficial cultural economy. The 'samizdat object-sign' was an important, highly valued cultural product with positive connotations in unofficial culture.<sup>83</sup> One version of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was produced in two large volumes; the typescript was bound in cardboard, covered with a bright pink and green floral fabric. A photograph of Hemingway was pasted to the front endpaper. However, the prime function of *samizdat* literature was to open up for the reader what he or she was forbidden from accessing in the state system; as such, the transmission of information was an important aim. A comparison of the *samizdat* edition with the officially published version shows just how much had to be cut to make the text publishable, suggesting that readers would be better served by reading the unofficial version if they could access it.<sup>84</sup> The *samizdat* translation contains all the material cut from the 1968 edition, including this comparison of the communist party to religion, described by one scholar as 'blasphemous'.

That was probably why the Communists were always cracking down on Bohemianism. When you were drunk or when you committed either fornication or adultery you recognized your own personal fallibility of that so mutable substitute for the apostles' creed, the Party line. Down with Bohemianism, the sin of Mayakovsky.<sup>85</sup>

The *samizdat* translation preserved this in its entirety, including the reference to the 'Party line', which would have provoked particular official anxiety: 'начинаешь сомневаться в непогрешимости партийной линии, этого неустойчивого заместителя веры апостолов. Долой богему, грех Маяковского' (you begin to doubt the infallibility of the party line, this unstable replacement for the belief of the apostles. Down with bohemianism, the sin of Mayakovsky).<sup>86</sup> The later official

publication cut both the reference to fornication and adultery and the taboo equation of party line with religious feeling, a phrase that also carried a sense of derision about politics.<sup>87</sup> Hemingway's description of Karkov, a character modelled after the *Pravda* journalist Mikhail Kol'tsov, was also subject to extensive cuts in the official translation, intended to preserve his image and avoid any negative characterisation of a prominent communist. Two entire paragraphs describing Karkov as an adulterer and polygamist were removed from the 1968 edition,<sup>88</sup> but retained in the *samizdat* typescript.<sup>89</sup> A similarly defamatory description of the Spanish communist Lister as a violent and brutal leader was also cut:

They were Communists and they were disciplinarians. The discipline that they would enforce would make good troops. Lister was murderous in discipline. He was a true fanatic and he had the complete Spanish lack of respect for life. In few armies since the Tartar's first invasion of the West were men executed summarily for as little reason as they were under his command.<sup>90</sup>

Again, the *samizdat* translation is relatively literal:

*Они были коммунистами и сторонниками строгой дисциплины. Дисциплина, которую они насаждали, сделает из испанцев хороших солдат. Листер особенно лют насчет дисциплины. Он был настоящим фанатиком и отличался чисто испанским пренебрежением к жизни. Со времени татарского нашествия немного можно насчитать армий, где бы столько людей подвергалось казни за сравнительно мелки проступки, как это было у него.*

(They were communists and supporters of strong discipline. The discipline that they enforced would make good soldiers of the Spanish. Lister was especially fierce in discipline. He was a real fanatic and was characterised by his purely Spanish disregard for life. Since the time of the Tartar invasion there have been relatively few armies, where so many people were subject to execution for comparatively minor offenses, as in that army.)<sup>91</sup>

The 1968 edition highlights the moments where the translators' original choices had to be softened for publication, further highlighting how *samizdat* functioned as a more open critical space for the production of alternative discourses. In addition to cutting any reference to Lister's part in summary executions, the published version replaced 'лют'

(fierce, cruel) with a more neutral alternative, *‘строгий’* (strict). An invented addition replaced the original descriptor ‘fanatic’ with a phrase that seems to assess his military prowess positively: *‘он сумел выковать из дивизии настоящую боеспособную единицу’* (he was able to forge from the division a real, battle-worthy unit).<sup>92</sup>

*Samizdat* translation’s primary aim, and its main achievement, was the avoidance of censorship and the creation of a more ‘genuine’ picture of Western culture for its limited audience of intellectuals – a task that could be accomplished not only by distributing banned works, but also through avoiding state censorship of the text itself and producing translations that were not governed by the state agenda. However, *samizdat* should not be seen only as the transmission of information, but also as a creative exercise in its own right, governed in complex ways by the personal preferences and status of its creators.

The *samizdat* versions of George Orwell’s two most famous novels are an excellent demonstration of this kind of generative potential. *Samizdat* was the only outlet for Orwell’s works, since he was for many years a ‘non-person’ as far as the Soviet authorities were concerned. His two most famous novels, *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) emerged in various *samizdat* editions from the mid-1950s through to the late 1960s. Orwell was well known in intelligentsia circles and there was a keen interest in his work; during the Stalin period, there was also an official interest, though his ‘reactionary’ views on the Soviet system and participation in the Trotskyist Workers’ Party of Marxist Unification (POUM) during the Spanish Civil War made him *persona non grata* to the Soviet authorities, which nonetheless paid close attention to his activities in secret records.<sup>93</sup> Indeed, Sergei Dinamov wrote to Orwell in 1936 to request a copy of his novel *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937). Orwell, understanding that his involvement with a Trotskyist party would be problematic, warned Dinamov that they would perhaps not wish to publish his novel, given his preference for the POUM over Communist Party policies. The matter was referred upwards to the NKVD and Orwell was subsequently informed that there was no chance that any of his work could be published, or that any relations with members of the POUM could be entered into.<sup>94</sup> His works were banned and any mention of his name in the public sphere was practically impossible until the perestroika period, when the floodgates opened on a huge range of hitherto forbidden material. The Moldavian journal *Kodry* was the first to break the silence; taking advantage of the relatively lax control of regional journals, it published a translation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in 1988. Another version followed in *Novyi mir* in 1989, translated by Viktor Golyshev, son of the Soviet translator Elena Mikhailovna Golysheva. He

had read the novel 'a long time' previously, obviously in an illicit copy of some kind, though whether in English or Russian *samizdat* is unclear.<sup>95</sup>

Some members of the Soviet intelligentsia had been able to access the work for some decades before its appearance in official translations, since several versions of the novel circulated unofficially within the borders of the USSR. In the 1950s, translations from the English versions that had been smuggled into the country began to appear. One such unofficial translation was produced and disseminated 'before *samizdat*' (presumably in the early 1950s) by an informal circle that included the sculptor Ernst Neizvestnyi.<sup>96</sup> More versions began to appear in the later part of the decade, marking the important moment when a conscious agenda for *samizdat* began to assert itself; 'enthusiasts' started to intentionally circulate works they knew could never be published.<sup>97</sup> The impact on readers was great; speaking of her first encounter with the novel in 1962, the historian and dissident Liudmila Alekseeva remembered that although the translation was poor, the book was 'striking', since 'everything was similar to what we saw here every day'.<sup>98</sup>

In 1959, the ideology section of the Central Committee ordered the novel to be translated and secretly published by the *Inostrannaia literatura* publishing house. This anonymous translation was intended for secret distribution only to a select circle within the higher echelons of the Party, and seems never to have been lodged in the collection of any library.<sup>99</sup> At some later point, likely in the 1960s, the Party's own inspection copy came to be used against it: a photocopy of the anonymous edition was made on small-format (roughly five by four inches) glossy paper, suitable for inconspicuous distribution.<sup>100</sup> This *samizdat* copy bears the publisher's – also anonymous – introduction, which notes that the work is considered principally to be a satire on the Soviet Union and Stalinism taken to its logical conclusion; the *samizdat* reader must confront the fact that the copy they are holding contains lies and 'offensive slander against the camp of peace and socialism'.<sup>101</sup> The introduction acquired a highly ironic gloss in the *samizdat* mode of circulation, where its audience was ready to interpret the work as a comment on their own lives. The very act of subversive circulation reversed the purpose of the official text, initially created to serve as an illustration of the harmful works produced by the enemies of the Soviet Union; in *samizdat* the text was transformed into an exposé of the violence and coercion of the Soviet state.

Several different translations of the novel circulated at various times, making it impossible to speak of any canonical or standard *samizdat* version. As well as more-or-less complete versions, the novel's appendix, containing Orwell's glossary of 'Newspeak', also circulated as a

separate piece. One typewritten edition, now held by the Memorial Society archive in Moscow, bears some signs of having been produced by an inexperienced translator and displays a sometimes awkward faithfulness to the original text, rendering 'Newspeak' somewhat clumsily as 'Новъяз'. Nonetheless, this anonymous translator was able to demonstrate some creativity in making Orwell's linguistic examples comprehensive to Russian speakers. Where Orwell gives an example of the hyper-regular Newspeak tense formation, 'the preterite of *steal* was *stealed*, the preterite of *think* was *thinked* and so on',<sup>102</sup> the translator found a suitable equivalent in other irregular verbs: 'от ИДТИ – ИДИЛ, от НЕСТИ – НЕСИЛ и т.д.' (from TO GO – GOED, from TO CARRY – CARRYED [the past tense of the verb *нести* is *нес(ла)*] and so on).<sup>103</sup> The reader is alerted to these changes by a translator's note,<sup>104</sup> indicating that complete 'honesty', which meant faithfully and transmitting the content of the text, was of prime importance for this translator, perhaps meant as a reaction against the hidden interventions in officially published texts. The approach to the text is, though perhaps not professional, carefully planned and mindful.

One interesting feature of *samizdat* translation, despite the relatively tiny readership, was that it allowed a broader range of people to find self-expression through translation. Although those working outside the professional structures were not able to take advantage of the financial benefits and support available to full-time translators, they were also free of the ideological pressures under which professionals operated. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was translated in the 1960s by the philosopher Eval'd Vasil'evich Il'enkov, and again in 1968 by his fellow philosopher and historian Mikhail Konstantinovich Petrov. Petrov's version was issued in four copies, was based on the 1964 Penguin edition and, unlike the 1950s authorised translation, retained the appendix describing the 'Newspeak' of Oceania. Petrov's approach to translation of the appendix reflected his linguistic interests. His meticulous approach prompted one scholar to claim that this translation, though unpublished, was better than those that came out officially during perestroika.<sup>105</sup> Petrov did not work as a professional translator, but it would be wrong to characterise him as a rank amateur. In fact, he was a skilled linguist with enough knowledge of ancient Greek to translate the citations for his own books; in addition he taught English language at the Rostov State University throughout the 1960s. He translated philosophical texts and, although it also remained unpublished, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*.<sup>106</sup> Petrov's version is smooth and readable, using well-crafted Russian, in the vein of the translators of the realist school, who favoured a 'fluent' translation that read like an original work. Only his translation of the appendix departs

from the 'realist' approach. Rather than construct Russian equivalents of Orwell's examples, Petrov opted to retain the English; as a result, the typescript is peppered with gaps where the English should be written in by hand. This is a departure from his approach to the main body of the novel, where Orwell's non-standard inventions are recreated in Russian, so that 'doubleplusgood',<sup>107</sup> for example, becomes 'плюсплюсхороший' (plusplusgood).<sup>108</sup> There are two important observations to be made here: first, that Petrov was writing for a sophisticated audience who could at least read Latin letters and who likely had enough knowledge of the grammar of the language that they could appreciate Orwell's destruction of English in the vocabulary and grammar of Ingsoc. Similarly, when Julius Telesin organised a translation of this appendix in the late 1960s, he and his friends also retained English terms that were difficult to translate, judging that the 'sharp' (*сообразительный*) reader would understand them.<sup>109</sup> Secondly, the approach is reminiscent of an academic or formalist approach to translation, perhaps because of Petrov's professional background. Although we might imagine that *samizdat* translators were most interested in the simple transmission of banned information, the variety of approaches employed in these editions shows that the texts were approached in a highly creative way, with close attention paid to issues of appropriate style as well as content.

Creative approaches to translation can also be found in the *samizdat* editions of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, which also circulated in a number of different versions in the 1950s and 1960s. Like *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the novel initially circulated as an émigré translation which had been published by the Frankfurt-based publisher Posev in 1950.<sup>110</sup> It was translated by Mariia Kriger and her husband, the Berkeley professor of Russian literature Gleb Struve, under the Russian title *Skotskii khutor*. Orwell, refusing any royalties, hoped that it would be possible for it to be distributed within the USSR;<sup>111</sup> to this end, two versions were produced, one for publication in Western Europe and one printed on thin paper to better facilitate its distribution in communist countries.<sup>112</sup> At least one version of the novel circulated in *samizdat*;<sup>113</sup> it was prefaced by a heartfelt dedication, clearly with a specific, unnamed, person in mind:

*Тебе – любящему всех животных. Тебе – всегда мечтавшему поскорее вырасти, чтобы в сказках, чтобы узнать, где правда, а где ложь в сказках о животном царстве. Тебе – верящему вопреки очевидности. Тебе – лентяю, так и не понявшему, что изучать иностранные стоит хотя бы для того, чтобы лучше понимать язык своей родины ПОСВЯЩАЕТСЯ ПЕРЕВОД ЭТОЙ КНИГИ.*

(To you – who loves all animals. To you – who always dreamed of growing up faster, so you could discover where the truth is and where the lie is in tales about the animal kingdom. To you – who believes in spite of the evidence. To you – lazybones, and to the one who does not understand, that it is worth studying foreign languages even if only to better understand one’s own native language THE TRANSLATION OF THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED)<sup>114</sup>

The dedication emphasises the very particular connection felt by the translator to the text; dedicated to one individual, it is highly personal and somewhat sentimental. One might also detect a hint towards the political significance of the text. Is the one who ‘believes in spite of the evidence’ meant also to represent the Soviet citizen in general? If so, the dedication becomes a kind of mission statement, and we can infer that the anonymous translator saw his or her role as exposing the lie and showing the truth.

The translator of this version frequently prioritised content over form. Compare, for example, the *samizdat* version of the first stanzas of Old Major’s song ‘Beasts of England’ from the Posev version. The English original reads as follows:

Beasts of England, beasts of Ireland  
 Beasts of every land and clime,  
 Hearken to my joyful tidings  
 Of the golden future time.<sup>115</sup>

Kruger and Struve’s version preserves the metre of the original, making use of archaisms to maintain the tone of the English:

*Скот английский, скот ирландский  
 Скот всех климатов и стран,  
 Слушай весть мою благую  
 Будущих златых времен.*  
 (English farm animals, Irish farm animals  
 Farm animals of all climates and countries  
 Listen to my good message  
 of future golden times)<sup>116</sup>

The typescript version is more literal, closely following the English word order and making no attempt made to reproduce rhyme or rhythm:

ЗВЕРИ АНГЛИИ И ИРЛАНДИИ,  
 ЗВЕРИ ВСЕХ СТРАН И КЛИМАТОВ,  
 ВНЕМИТЕ РАДОСТНЫМ МОИМ ВЕСТЯМ  
 О ЗОЛОТОМ ГРЯДУЩЕМ ВЕКЕ  
 (Animals of England and Ireland,  
 Animals of all countries and climates  
 heed my happy message  
 about the golden future age)<sup>117</sup>

Where the typescript remained faithful to Orwell's original, it retained some of the parallels with the Soviet Union that were softened in other translations. Thus, where Orwell wrote that 'everyone worked according to his capacity', using a less-common, but nonetheless widely-known and recognisable, variation on the famous Marxist slogan usually rendered in full in English as 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need'. The Russian *samizdat* version reads: '*Каждый трудился по способностям*' (Each worked according to their abilities).<sup>118</sup> By contrast Struve and Kriger here domesticated the phrase, thereby losing something of the ideological sharpness: '*все работали по мере своих сил*' (Everyone worked to the extent of their strength).<sup>119</sup>

However, the anonymous *samizdat* translator did not adhere slavishly to literalism, but in places seems to have deliberately approached the translation in such a way as to heighten the significance of Orwell's politics for the reader. The song that replaces 'Beasts of England' on the farm after the revolution is a case in point, and demonstrates an attentive, creative approach to the source material. Orwell's original is relatively neutral in political terms: 'Animal Farm, Animal Farm, | Never through me shalt thou come to harm!'.<sup>120</sup> The *samizdat* version creates intertextuality by borrowing a phrase from the Soviet anthem:

О, ФЕРМА ЖИВОТНЫХ! ВЕЛИКАЯ ФЕРМА!  
 НАВЕКИ СПЛОТИЛА ТЫ РАЗНЫХ ЗВЕРЕЙ!  
 (O Animal Farm! Great farm!  
 You have forever united different animals!)<sup>121</sup>

The relevant line from the national anthem is '*Сплотила навеки Великая Русь*' (Great Rus' has forever become united). The translated verse even uses the same metre as the anthem, so that the reader could plausibly 'hear' the melody in their head. This sophisticated translation approach, whereby the translator was able to pick and choose the approach that best suited his or her purpose, indicates that a conscious effort was being made to strengthen the revolutionary parable, seeking to

engage readers in a politically oriented reading. Compare this to Struve and Kriger's more literal translation, which does not attempt to create anything not already in the source text:

*Скотский хутор,  
Скотский хутор,  
Никогда  
Через меня  
Не придет тебе беда!*  
(Animal farm,  
Animal farm,  
Never  
through me  
will you come to harm)<sup>122</sup>

There are therefore several indications that this *samizdat* translation was produced with a creative ideological agenda. Though of course the parallels with the Soviet Union were obvious to any reader, the translator nonetheless sought to heighten the novel's impact through the creation of moments of intertextuality. This *samizdat* edition can therefore hardly be thought of as transmitting a complete or 'pure' text. A three-stanza poem entitled 'Comrade Napoleon' was not reproduced in the *samizdat* translation – perhaps it was omitted for reasons of time, or perhaps the translator simply did not enjoy it. Regardless, the text holds no indication that it was omitted.

Liberated from the demands made of official publications, *samizdat* translations could demonstrate considerable linguistic and stylistic creativity. Although frequently produced by non-professional translators, these texts could mobilise political or creative agendas and were therefore subject to manipulations, just as in the official cultural sphere. *Samizdat* translations cannot therefore be thought of as unproblematically 'direct' transmissions of foreign texts; like all translations, numerous factors were at play. *Samizdat* is often assumed to be part of a dissident culture, and of course in certain manifestations it was a vital tool for the Soviet dissident movement of the 1970s. However, literary *samizdat* especially had a more complex status. It is not at all clear that reading *samizdat* produced overtly dissenting action, and the consumption of unofficial texts did not necessarily stem from an anti-government stance;<sup>123</sup> a simple desire to read quality literature or work by a favourite author seems an equally likely motivation. The political impetus for producing *samizdat* also frequently combined with other factors: text production is, even in non-official contexts, a highly dynamic process. It is perhaps more

accurate to describe *samizdat* as a 'mode of existence of the text' that does not necessarily presuppose a 'dissident' struggle against the state.<sup>124</sup> Rather, literary *samizdat* in particular represented an act of disengagement from state control, and an attempt to carve out a space for creative production outside the confines of censorship, albeit one that was often combined with conformist behaviour in other spheres. Thus, many of Natal'ia Trauberg's translations were published in the state publishing houses, even as those that were not sanctioned found an audience in *samizdat*. Similarly, Volzhina and Kalashnikova, the translators of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, were both in many ways entirely orthodox cultural agents, members of Kashkin's circle who published extensively within the realist translation mould and members of the leadership of the translators' section in the Writers' Union. Their translation was also consumed by many who were in no way dissident. The *samizdat* translations of Orwell's most famously anti-totalitarian works are more obviously political in their motivation, especially given the strengthening of the anti-Soviet messages, but even so, they should not be understood only as representations of dissidence; notwithstanding these 'underground' activities, those who produced such texts continued to engage with the state where necessary in other spheres of their lives. Additionally, these texts demonstrate the careful attention of the translator to literary factors, suggesting that the transmission of 'political' information was, although important, not the sole aim for the translator(s).

#### RESISTING CENSORSHIP: A COMPLEX BLEND OF PRACTICES

---

*Samizdat* translations cannot be thought of simply as a dissident activity, and still less an activity that produced dissident action in others. It is also difficult to endow Pasternak with any kind of 'dissident' status; indeed, only a few years before he produced his Aesopian translations of Shakespeare, he translated a number of Georgian odes to Stalin. Such ambiguities have in recent years prompted a reconsideration of the dichotomous relationship between repression and resistance in Soviet society, and indeed the usefulness of 'resistance' as an analytical tool.<sup>125</sup> Certainly it would be unhelpful to subscribe to a view such as that expressed by James Scott, which draws a clear line between repression and resistance, implying that there can be no middle ground between complete rejection (often hidden 'offstage') and total acquiescence, flattening the range of power relations and agent positions in society to dominant and oppressed.<sup>126</sup> For Scott, any expression of support by the

'subordinate' group is simply a mask, the performance of a 'public transcript'.<sup>127</sup> In fact, as recent scholarship has emphatically demonstrated, Soviet citizens did seriously and sincerely engage with official discourses in the process of 'self-scrutiny, empowerment, and individualization'.<sup>128</sup> As the variety of practices examined in this chapter demonstrate, cultural agents did not 'reside externally to state policies and Bolshevik ideology';<sup>129</sup> rather, they engaged in complex and often tactical ways with those policies, employing both resisting and complying practices, often simultaneously. As Igal Halfin states, 'while resistance was everywhere, it coexisted with discursive incorporation, as different aspects of the dominant discourse cut across each other.'<sup>130</sup> One approach has been proposed by Lynne Viola, who argues for a framework that recognises various 'acts of resistance or resistances'<sup>131</sup> and encompasses 'acts of varying dimensions, contours, and content, with multiple meanings and significance'.<sup>132</sup> In the context of translation, resistance(s) to censorship acquired a variety of different forms as translators mobilised multiple tactics to overcome or evade state control. Aesopian language sought to encode meanings available to the reader but not the censor. In the post-Stalin period, when the level of risk was lower, *samizdat* productions could become established as a 'stronger' form of resistance involving a complete retreat from state control although, of course, Aesopian translation did not cease to exist.

Considering resistance as a set of practices allows for an exploration of its ontological relationship to other practices and tactics by which Soviet agents could come to terms with the authoritarian regime. To engage in resisting practices in one sphere did not require that one was a 'dissident', and so did not presuppose rejection of the state in all areas of life: resisting and acquiescing were not antinomic. We should be alert to Lynne Viola's claim that resistance was only one possible response to the state 'that included accommodation, adaptation, acquiescence, apathy, internal emigration, opportunism, and support'.<sup>133</sup> I have already drawn attention to several moments in texts published under the official cultural regime where translators and editors attempted to push the limits of publishing, including as much as they could in the face of censorship. At times, such subtle negotiation tactics and tactics of resistance seem very similar. As a result, we might place these resisting practices at the extreme end of a continuum of practices; at the other end of the continuum are those other tactics I discussed in earlier chapters that allowed translators and editors to exist and even flourish in Soviet literary culture. Comparing such practices, it becomes increasingly possible to understand that there existed a close relationship between practices carried out within the official sphere and those outside it. Each approach

can be considered a variety of the ‘little tactics of the habitat’<sup>134</sup>, to use Stephen Kotkin’s term, that allowed Soviet text-producers to ‘get by’ and exercise some autonomy in the face of state censorship. Such an approach is similar to what Timothy Johnston describes as ‘*bricolage*’, a technique that ‘fused material from official and unofficial sources’.<sup>135</sup> Translators could supplement their official production with *samizdat* texts; readers could complement the official information provided to them with underground publications. Neither practice cancelled the other out and both existed at the same time, meaning that Soviet translators were active in both official and unofficial cultural fields ‘rather than stepping outside of the mechanisms of Soviet power’.<sup>136</sup> Agents could, therefore, work within and outside the system simultaneously.

## NOTES

1. Baer, ‘Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia’, p. 539.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 553.
3. Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. 51.
4. Moss, ‘A Russian Munchausen: Aesopian Translation’, p. 21.
5. Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. 23.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 77. Loseff also introduces the possibility that the creation of a pseudo-translation could be used to conceal the author’s message as that of a foreign ‘original’.
7. Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. 77.
8. Baer, ‘Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia’, p. 26. Emphasis in original.
9. Tyulenev, ‘Translation as Smuggling’, p. 256.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
11. Pasternak’s speech to the first all-Union conference of translators, in which he argued for free translation, was published as ‘Rech’ B. L. Pasternaka na pervom vsesoiuznom soveshchaniï perevodchikov’.
12. Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia*, p. 102.
13. France, *Boris Pasternak’s Translations of Shakespeare*, p. 34. France indicates that Pasternak made these changes ‘without undue pressure from his editors or critics’.
14. Baer, ‘Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia’, p. 546.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 548.
16. Markov, ‘An Unnoticed Aspect of Pasternak’s Translations’, p. 505.
17. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, p. 264.
18. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 234.
19. Levin, ‘The Question of Hamlet’, p. 109.
20. Anya von Bremzen, in her memoir of Soviet cooking, notes that sturgeon was one of a series of ‘shining political symbols, furthering the illusion that czarist indulgences were now accessible to the masses’. Von Bremzen, *Mastering the Art of Soviet Cooking*, p. 81. Jukka Gronow calls caviar a ‘highly valued Soviet delicacy’ that was an ‘ideal example of Soviet kitsch’. Gronow, *Caviar with Champagne*, p. 32.

21. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, p. 240.
22. Quoted in Semenenko, “‘Gamletovskii kontekst’ Boris Pasternaka”, p. 34.
23. Markov, ‘An Unnoticed Aspect of Pasternak’s Translations’, p. 505.
24. On this point, see also Aleksei Semenenko, ‘Identity, Canon and Translation’, p. 228.
25. Shekspir, *Gamlet: Prints datskii*, p. 74.
26. Semenenko, “‘Gamletovskii kontekst’ Boris Pasternaka”, p. 34.
27. Quoted in Semenenko, “‘Gamletovskii kontekst’ Boris Pasternaka”, p. 34.
28. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 220.
29. Semenenko, “‘Gamletovskii kontekst’ Boris Pasternaka”, p. 35.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
31. Pasternak, ‘Zamechaniia k perevodam iz Shekspira’, p. 76.
32. Foakes, *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 33.
33. Moore, *Kozintsev’s Shakespeare Films*, p. 11.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
35. Gallagher, ‘Pasternak’s Hamlet’, p. 125.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
37. Roland Mushat Frye argues that one can draw parallels between Shakespeare’s portrayal of tyranny in *Macbeth* and the Nazi and Stalinist regimes; he proposes that the play can be used to understand the nature of totalitarianism. Frye, ‘Hitler, Stalin, and Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*’, pp. 83–4.
38. Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, p. 184.
39. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 671.
40. Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, p. 184.
41. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 670.
42. Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, pp. 189–90.
43. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 674.
44. Loseff also notes this effect of the shifts in Pasternak’s translation. Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, pp. 81–2.
45. France, *Boris Pasternak’s Translations of Shakespeare*, p. 115.
46. Compare Pasternak’s translation to, for example, Rachel Polonsky’s statement that during the purge, “‘prominent Soviet workers’ would learn to keep the doors closed, not to look out when they heard the heavy tread of boots on the common staircase at night, the commotion of arrest in a neighbouring apartment.’ Polonsky, *Molotov’s Magic Lantern*, p. 63.
47. Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, p. 186.
48. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 672.
49. Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, p. 179.
50. Shekspir, *Tragedii*, p. 665.
51. France, *Boris Pasternak’s Translations of Shakespeare*, p. 127.
52. Irina Sandomirskaiia, for instance, notes that ‘the question of whether Aesopian language undermines the regime or confirms it’ is unresolved. Sandomirskaiia, “‘Bez stali i leni’”, p. 192.
53. Freshwater, ‘Towards a Redefinition of Censorship’, p. 223.
54. A significant limitation of the Aesopian approach was the impossibility of accurately predicting the reader’s response. In any text, and especially in one shrouded by layers of ‘shields’, the author’s subversive intent may be misconstrued, ignored, or simply missed completely. On the role of the reader in the context of censorship see Baer, ‘Translated Literature and the Role of the Reader’, pp. 338–40.

55. Holland, 'More Russian than a Dane', p. 334. *Hamlet* continued to occupy a prominent position in the post-Stalinist intelligentsia culture. In a classic example of community building around a liminal cultural figure, Vladimir Vysotskii played the lead in a production of *Hamlet* produced by Iurii Liubimov at the Taganka theatre in 1971 which included a performance of Pasternak's poem 'Hamlet'. On this production, see Smeliansky, *The Russian Theatre after Stalin*, pp. 94–6.
56. Markov, 'An Unnoticed Aspect of Pasternak's Translations', p. 506.
57. Baer, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', p. 540.
58. On *samizdat's* 'extra-Gutenberg' nature, see Komaromi, 'Samizdat as Extra-Gutenberg Phenomenon'.
59. On literary or 'classical' *samizdat* see, for example, many of the essays in Dolinin and Ivanov, *Samizdat: po materialam konferentsii '30 let nezavisimoi pechati, 1950–80 gody'*.
60. On the later 'political' development of the *samizdat* movement, especially in its association with the dissident movement, see among others: Saunders, *Samizdat; Voices of the Soviet Opposition*; Feldbrugge, *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union*; Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin, *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian Samizdat*; Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society in Central and Eastern Europe*.
61. Daniel', 'Istoki i smysl sovetskogo samizdata', p. 19.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
63. Dolinin, 'Leningradskii periodicheskii samizdat serediny 50-kh–80-kh godov', p. 5.
64. Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin, *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian Samizdat*, pp. 38–9.
65. Michael Meerson-Aksenov, 'The Dissident Movement and *Samizdat*', pp. 38–9.
66. Fokin, 'Religiozni samizdat', p. 221.
67. Trauberg, *Sama zhizn'*, p. 412.
68. The thinking of many dissidents in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was shaped by Christian morality. Boobbyer, *Conscience, Dissent and Reform in Russia*, pp. 226–7.
69. Trauberg described her attachment to the religious writings of Chesterton, Lewis and Tolkien late in her life, after she had become a nun, in Trauberg, 'Out of *Samizdat*', p. 44.
70. Trauberg, *Sama zhizn'*, p. 406.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 410.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 406.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 411.
74. Komaromi, 'Samizdat as Extra-Gutenberg Phenomenon', p. 632.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 635.
76. Trauberg, *Sama zhizn'*, p. 412.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 412.
78. Igrunov et al., *Antologiya samizdata*, p. 238.
79. Parker, 'Hemingway's Revival in the Soviet Union', p. 486.
80. Orlova, *Kheminguei v Rossii*, p. 30.
81. On the long battle to publish the work, see Kuznetsova, 'Sposob ideologicheskoi adaptatsii perevodnogo teksta'.
82. Telesin, 'For Whom the Scissors Cut', p. 81.
83. Komaromi, 'The Material Existence of Soviet *Samizdat*', p. 609.

84. In fact, this is still the case. Post-Soviet editions of the novel, reprinted from the 1968 edition, have not restored the cuts made by the Soviet censors. Several novels first published during the Soviet period face the same problem in their post-Soviet reissues.
85. Hemingway, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 171.
86. Forschungsstelle Osteuropa (hereafter FSO), 01–31.60, l. 170.
87. Kheminguei, ‘Po kom zvonit kolokol’, p. 285.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 358.
89. FSO, 01–31.60, ll. 238–9.
90. Hemingway, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, pp. 242–3.
91. FSO, 01–31.60, l. 241.
92. Kheminguei, ‘Po kom zvonit kolokol’, p. 359.
93. Blyum, ‘George Orwell in the Soviet Union’, pp. 410–11.
94. The correspondence between Dinamov and Orwell is reproduced in Blium, ‘George Orwell in the Soviet Union’, pp. 403–6.
95. Belkina, ‘Pomni o “1984”’.
96. Neizvestnyi, *Govorit Neizvestnyi*, p. 30.
97. Karasev, ‘Mekhanika soprotivleniia’, p. 13.
98. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
99. Blium, ‘Legal’no roman “1984” byl opublikovan v SSSR v 1988 godu’, p. 11.
100. Possession of Orwell’s work could provoke a prison sentence; Pavel Bashkirov, now a human rights activist, was sentenced to 3 years in 1976 for possession of enemy *samizdat* that included copies of Orwell’s novels. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
101. Arkhiv mezhdunarodnogo obshchestva ‘Memorial’ (hereafter Memorial), f. 175, op. 50, George Orwell, 1984.
102. Orwell, *Animal Farm; Burmese Days; A Clergyman’s Daughter; Coming up for Air; Keep the Aspidistra Flying; Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 919. Emphasis in the original.
103. Memorial, f. 175, op. 50, d. 21, l. 3.
104. Memorial, f. 175, op. 50, d. 9.
105. Ogurtsov, ‘Obrazovanie v perspektive tezaurnoi dinamiki’, p. 187.
106. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
107. Orwell, *Animal Farm; Burmese Days; A Clergyman’s Daughter; Coming up for Air; Keep the Aspidistra Flying; Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 773.
108. FSO 01–30, l. 43.
109. Telesin, ‘Dzhordzh Orvell “1984”’, p. 363.
110. A Ukrainian translation by Ihor Shevchenko was also produced, but was seized by the American military government in Munich and returned to the Russian Repatriation Commission, halting its distribution before it had even begun. Rubin, *Archives of Authority*, p. 41.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
112. Orwell, *George Orwell: A Life in Letters*, p. 272.
113. One copy is held by Memorial in Moscow; another in Bremen. The Bremen copy is typed on thick paper and hand-bound in a dignified blue and maroon cardboard cover that seems to have been formed from an old notebook. Memorial’s copy is typed on almost transparent onion-skin paper.
114. FSO 01–129, l. 1.
115. Orwell, *Animal Farm; Burmese Days; A Clergyman’s Daughter; Coming up for Air; Keep the Aspidistra Flying; Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 16.
116. Orvell, *Skotskii khutor*, p. 12.

117. FSO 01–129, l. 9.
118. FSO 01–129, l. 9.
119. Orvell, *Skotskii khutor*, p. 25.
120. Orvell, *Animal Farm; Burmese Days; A Clergyman's Daughter; Coming up for Air; Keep the Aspidistra Flying; Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 46.
121. FSO, 01–129, l. 69.
122. Orvell, *Skotskii khutor*, p. 71.
123. Johnston, 'What Is the History of *Samizdat*?', p. 133.
124. Komaromi, '*Samizdat* and Soviet Dissident Publics', p. 71.
125. Notable examples are found in the first issue of *Kritika*, later republished under the title *The Resistance Debate in Russian and Soviet History*: David-Fox, 'Whither Resistance?'; Krylova, 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies'; Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia'.
126. Gal, 'Review: Language and the "Arts of Resistance"', p. 414.
127. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, p. 45.
128. Chatterjee and Petrone, 'Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity', p. 978.
129. Hellbeck, 'Working, Struggling, Becoming', p. 340.
130. Halfin, *Stalinist Confessions*, p. 186.
131. Viola, 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s', p. 43.
132. Viola, 'Introduction', p. 2.
133. Viola, 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s', p. 43.
134. Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, p. 35.
135. Johnston, *Being Soviet*, p. xxxiii.
136. *Ibid.*, p. xxxiv.

# Conclusion

Soviet translation was not, as the old cliché would have it, simply a ‘window on the West’; it did not present to the Soviet reader an uninterrupted view onto foreign lands but, controlled by censorship, sought to present a suitable, ideologically-correct version of the West to readers. The constant pressure of censorship meant that translation functioned more like a fairground mirror, warping and distorting the picture, bending it to meet the norms of Soviet literary culture. This study has shown that translated literature presented a particular challenge to the Soviet authorities. While an engagement with foreign works was an important factor in Soviet intercultural relations, signalling to foreign rivals that the socialist state was modern, open and free, the authorities remained paranoid about the potential danger that such texts posed to the ideological education of Soviet citizens by furnishing them with alien, politically suspect or anti-Soviet material. Censorial interventions were governed by this anxiety over the impact of the text on the reader, a primary preoccupation for the literary authorities.<sup>1</sup> Both the import and the translation of foreign literature were therefore subject to censorial control that sought to mitigate these risks, manifested in multiple ways. The evidence from the texts and archival documents from *Internatsional'naiia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* demonstrates that in the censorship of translation, it is not accurate to conceive of censorship simply as an imposed, external force to which actors were either wholly subject or completely resistant. Censorial agents did not act only to implement the interests of the state, and the wishes of the authorities were not unthinkingly applied. On the contrary, negotiation was one of the defining features of the censorship process: editors negotiated with the Party and its officials; translators liaised with editors and authors and censorial actions were often highly tactical. Thus it is necessary

to reconsider our definition of censorship, which comes to appear not only as an oppressive application of power, but a blend of relations and practices which coincided in a particular moment and which existed on a spectrum from external state control at one end to internalised, unconscious action on the other.

The various tactics employed in these texts attempted to guide readers' understanding of Western literature, guarding against any reading that was incompatible with Soviet values. In its various modes of operation – political, puritanical and ideological – censorship had several related functions. It sought to mitigate taboo content, enforce Soviet discursive norms and preserve the canonical meaning of Soviet authoritative language. The function of censorship was thus 'not merely preventative but also constitutive';<sup>2</sup> exclusionary or manipulating practices sought to create a model of what was acceptable. In translation, censorship aimed to create an appropriate image of the West for Soviet consumption, an officially-imagined West that, although it might bear little resemblance to the reality it purported to portray, had a particular ideological orientation.<sup>3</sup> My close examination of these texts and the contexts of their publication has exposed some of the ebbs and flows of Soviet censorship in creating this official 'West'. In the Stalin period particularly, dramatic shifts mirrored the swings in Soviet domestic and foreign policy as the state veered from anti-fascism to anti-Semitism. The surprising openness to foreign culture that can be observed in the early and middle parts of the 1930s rapidly gave way, in the wake of the Soviet state's growing isolation and the coming terror, to the publication of fellow communists and harsh censorship at the level of the text. This is most markedly demonstrated in the political mode of censorship in the late 1930s and early 1940s. At this time, the desire to avoid political taboo reached its apogee and extensive censorial interventions mangled the foreign texts, drastically cutting large sections of novels to create new Russian versions that bore little relation to their English originals. Simply removing taboo material was not sufficient for the mobilising agenda of Soviet literature, and the ideological mode of censorship – which continued to function in a similar way in the post-Stalin period – sought, through its use of the language of socialist realism and its 'obsession with reducing signs to a single meaning',<sup>4</sup> attempted to produce an authoritative Soviet language, erasing the polysemy inherent in the translated text and creating intertextuality between the foreign and Soviet discourses. As a result, the secondary objective of Stalinist censorship was to 'Sovietise' foreign literature, incorporating it into the Soviet canon.

Though it has been suggested that censorship of the post-Stalin

period did not vary in its level of repression from previous years,<sup>5</sup> where translated literature is concerned a significant shift occurred between the censorship of the Stalin period and that of the Khrushchev period. In the 1950s and especially the early 1960s, coinciding with Glavlit's partial marginalisation in ideological matters, the censorial approach to foreign texts gradually changed as the Soviet Union once again became more open to the West and Soviet citizens could have increased, albeit still limited, interaction with foreigners. The endeavour to domesticate and incorporate Western works into a broader socialist realist canon gradually diminished. The shift from wholesale rewriting to a more restrained trimming of texts represents perhaps a diminishing fear of foreign contamination and a desire to interact more 'genuinely' with foreign cultures. Shorn of the most egregious material, the non-Soviet aspects of foreign literature finally became visible to the Soviet reader. Where the fate of foreign texts under Stalin was closely aligned to the vagaries of the state's political position, a more hopeful atmosphere during the Thaw meant that the translations of the later period became more detached from the broader cultural context; although the Thaw was marked by a series of 'swings' between liberalisation and repression,<sup>6</sup> *Inostrannaia literatura* was able to become ever more detached from the broader political context, maintaining a more or less liberalising trajectory into the early 1960s. A similar progression is also observed in terms of ideological and puritanical censorship, although it was, perhaps, rather fitful. Editors continued to display anxiety about the translation of ideologically-loaded material well into the 1950s, and some level of relaxation can be observed only in the 1960s. Similarly, sexual material was in certain cases treated more leniently in the Stalin period than in the years that followed. Nonetheless, during this period, a growing sense of freedom surrounded translated literature both in terms of the choice of texts and the level of manipulation to which they were subject.

Constant processes of negotiation characterise the work of the translators and especially editors of foreign literature, both in the Stalin and post-Stalin periods. One of the main tasks of this study has been to show how editors and translators of English-language works engaged in these processes, seeking to publish as much as they could within the limits imposed upon them and, where it seemed possible, to expand those limits. These moments of compromise and confrontation were inter-related; they can be understood in terms of the in-between status of these literary agents, who felt multiple responsibilities to the foreign cultures they mediated, to the reader and, of course, to the authorities. As a result, censorial interventions blended pragmatism and idealism, demonstrating a highly tactical approach as editors and translators, well

aware of the limits of expression, sought to maximise the discursive space available for their work.

Of course, censorial agents did submit in many senses to the requirements of Soviet censorship. Particularly in terms of puritanical and ideological censorship, where explicit instructions were relatively few, the norms of authoritative discourse were internalised by censorial agents and the texts sometimes extensively altered to conform to its standards. Thus 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 survive within that system of coordinates'.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, the inconsistent position of these agents and the resultant variability of their censorial practice, especially in the post-Stalin period, produces a rather more complex picture, where 'the same individual can belong to two authorities'.<sup>8</sup> The challenging position of agents in the middle of the hierarchy has been highlighted by Caroline Humphrey in her study of the discourse of the Party bureaucracy. Discussing the ways in which 'conflict and argument over propositional substantive meanings were crucial',<sup>9</sup> she emphasises the agency of Party bureaucrats to produce discourse through negotiation. Humphrey's concept of bureaucratic creativity is useful for an understanding of the actions of censorial agents outwith a simplistic oppression/resistance dichotomy. It allows for a more subtle understanding of the ways in which agents negotiate a space (sometimes an expanded one) within the Soviet context, without necessarily making them dissidents. If we assume that censorial agents can act with creativity – as workers in the literary sphere this is certainly the case for both translators and editors – then the ambiguity of censorship appears in a new light. Both translators and editors, with their multiple positions in the cultural sphere, 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. 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. Yurchak's insistence that 'Soviet people engaged with authoritative language at the level of the performative dimension'<sup>10</sup> is also useful for understanding the response to and implementation of censorship, especially as it was manifested in such paratextual elements as reviews and forewords. Without necessarily having a real ideological investment in the process, censorial agents could take advantage of the ossification of authoritative discourse, using it to 'pass' texts; they could also 'trim' text so that they could plausibly claim to have attentively censored it, while continuing to allow substantive meanings to appear in print. Without ever openly

dissenting, the performative actions of these censorial agents were an important tactic in maximising the discursive space available to them.

While my examination of *Internatsional'naiia literatura* and *Inostrannaia literatura* stresses the complex negotiations required to work within the system, a similarly tactical approach can also be detected in the practices of resistance. In his Aesopian translations of Shakespeare, Pasternak employed subtle linguistic strategies to encode new meanings intended to escape the attention of the censorship apparatus, undermine the authorities and express his personal convictions to an attentive audience. That he continued to work within the official sphere producing entirely conventional translations at the same time indicates that we should not regard this as a kind of attack on the state, but as a personalised, tactical form of resistance rooted in literary expression and rather aimed at engagement with his audience and the construction of an in-group able to speak freely to one another. Similarly, the appearance of *samizdat* translations in the 1950s should be regarded as a tactical retreat whereby political messages that would have been repressed in the official sphere of publication could be transmitted, albeit to a small, closed group. *Samizdat* translations, although frequently produced by non-professional translators, demonstrate careful attention to linguistic and literary factors. Thus, even resistance to censorship is a rather more complex affair than sometimes imagined; it is as multifaceted in its strategies and practices as censorship, and the two are closely linked. That practices of resistance and practices of censorship exhibit similar characteristics should give us pause. Rather than being mutually exclusive, each functions perhaps as the opposite side of the same coin; censorial agents could work to opposite ends simultaneously. Having absorbed the norms and censorial standards required of them, the censors frequently used censorial techniques to inclusive ends; by this is meant the removal of certain parts of a text as a concession to censorial norms and, most especially, the employment of formal devices such as internal reviews and perhaps paratextual elements to 'rubber-stamp' the inclusion of certain items. Resisting techniques are an extension of such urges observed in the 'official' arena; in each sphere the aim of text producers is to publish something they considered valuable.

This study has aimed to re-examine the state/society dichotomy in censorship, using the case study of translated literature to argue that culture is an arena where complex political and moral choices were constantly being made and the interaction with power was more ambiguous than usually assumed. Although the contact between the state and culture became more strongly contested in the post-Stalin period, the germ of such complicated engagement is seen already in the Stalin

period. It is clear from the case studies presented in this book that the multiple layers of censorship and the recruitment of editors, translators and writers to act as censorial agents did not, in fact, result in the unconscious and increasingly perfect application of censorial norms, as the totalitarian model would indicate and as the Soviet state hoped. In fact it might be said that requiring agents such as editors to censor works actually opened censorship up to undermining or heterodox influences, owing to the fact that editors brought with them different dispositions, combining their sense of literary responsibility with a clear perception of what the censorship required. As a result of these dual (or multiple) responsibilities, the supposed omniscience of censorship within publishing processes was destabilised. The paradox of censorship is that once it is 'released' from the official apparatus and assigned to complex agents with divided loyalties, the practice of regulation becomes unstable, as Judith Butler illuminates:

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.<sup>11</sup>

As Serguei Oushakine has indicated, 'the dominant and subordinate as belonging to the same discursive field, as relating to each other intradis-cursively rather than interdiscursively',<sup>12</sup> the action of censorial agents who were combining dominant and subordinate positions significantly complicates our picture of censorship, which begins to emerge as a simultaneously repressive and creative set of practices, where power was not just exercised against cultural agents, but also possessed by them.<sup>13</sup> As a result, despite the best efforts of the authorities, translation held the potential to release unanticipated and heterodox meanings into the receiving culture.

This effect of the multifaceted censorship is counter-intuitive from the point of view of the censorial authorities: censorship could aid in the inclusion of heterodox discourses in the receiving culture by eliciting the involvement of the reader. Censorial action thus 'produces encoded texts, generates alternative interpretive communities, to some degree at odds with the government's ideal of a homogenous national or party audience'.<sup>14</sup> I have drawn attention to the ways in which censors sought to draw their readers into a relationship, making them Aesopian readers. Such an approach does not have to be wholly resistant, and can also

be manifested in or be a side-effect of compliant censorship practices. Censorship can engage the reader in a kind of conversation with the translator/ censor: 'by enabling the text to pass through the censors' net', censorship can allow the articulation of numerous interpretations.<sup>15</sup> While 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.

Humphrey has noted that official discourse 'could not overcome the polysemic character of signification, nor control the responses to it'.<sup>16</sup> This was even truer of translated literature; the distinct 'in-between', hybrid status of the translated text and the complicated cultural position of its producers were important factors in destabilising censorship. Even in the worst years of the Stalin period, it was sometimes possible to evade or undermine censorship, an impulse that became stronger in the Thaw period. The core function of Soviet censorship, which was to create a fully orthodox culture, was challenged in its implementation by translation's inherent polysemy and by the approach of censorial agents.

The censorship of translated literature in the Soviet Union existed not simply as a destructive force or an imposition of state power, but a series of encounters between the state and its citizens. It was characterised by compromise and complicity, certainly, but also subject to debate, challenge and even subversion. This complexity and variability were the defining features of the censorship of translation; the resulting tensions between cultural producers and the state, and the commitment of those actors to the literary quality and cultural significance of their work, meant that the homogenising force of censorship was far from total.

## NOTES

1. Dobrenko, *The Making of the State Reader*, p. 16.
2. Kotkin, '1991 and the Russian Revolution', p. 406.
3. My use of the term borrows from Alexei Yurchak's concept of the 'Imaginary West' as an 'imaginary elsewhere' constituted in Soviet society. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever Until It Was No More*, p. 161.
4. Plamper, 'Abolishing Ambiguity', p. 526.
5. Blium, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade*, p. 13.

6. Jones, 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization', p. 2.
7. Quoted in Gromova, *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuzze*, p. 49.
8. Derrida, *Eyes of the University*, p. 45.
9. Humphrey, 'The "Creative Bureaucrat"', p. 7.
10. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, p. 76.
11. Butler, 'Ruled Out', p. 130.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
13. Billiani, 'Assessing Boundaries: Censorship and Translation', p. 10.
14. Baer, 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia', p. 24.
15. Mainer, 'Translation and Censorship', p. 84.
16. Humphrey, 'The "Creative Bureaucrat"', p. 12.

# Bibliography

---

## ARCHIVAL SOURCES

---

- Archive of the Memorial Society, Moscow (Memorial)  
Das Archiv der Osteuropa an der Universität Bremen (FSO)  
Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GA RF), f. 0425 (Glavlit)  
Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI), f. 631 (Soviet Writers' Union)  
Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI), f. 2464 (Moscow division of the RSFSR Writers' Union)

## PUBLISHED SOURCES AND ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

---

- Afanas'eva, E. S., Vitalii Iur'evich Afiani and Z. K. Vodop'ianova (eds), *Apparat TsK KPSS i kul'tura 1953–1957: dokumenty* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2001).  
Afanas'eva, E. S., Vitalii Iur'evich Afiani, L. A. Velichanskaia, Zoia Konstantinovna and E. V. Kochubei (eds), *Ideologicheskie komissii TsK KPSS, 1958–1964: dokumenty* (Moscow: Rosspen, 1998).  
Anisimov, I., 'Nedochety perevodnoi literatury', *Pravda*, 1 August 1935, p. 5.  
'Baza dannikh dokumentov', *Arkhiv Aleksandra N. Iakovleva*, <<http://www.alexanderyakovlev.org/db-docs>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).  
Arthur, Anthony, *Radical Innocent: Upton Sinclair* (London: Random House, 2007).  
Azadovskii, Konstantin, 'Ogladyvaias' nazad', in Mikhail Iasnov (ed.), *El'ga L'vovna Linetskaia: materialy k biografii, iz literaturnogo nasledia, vospominaniia, bibliografiia, fotodokumenty* (Saint Petersburg: Simpozium, 1999), pp. 121–6.  
Azadovskii, Konstantin, and Boris Egorov, 'From Anti-Westernism to Anti-Semitism: Stalin and the Impact of the "Anti-Cosmopolitan" Campaigns on Soviet Culture', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 4: 1 (2002), 66–80.  
Azov, Andrei, *Poverzhennye bukvalisty: iz istorii khudozhestvennogo perevoda v SSSR v 1920–1960-e gody* (Moscow: Vysshaia shkola ekonomiki, 2013).

- Babichenko, D. L., *Pisateli i tsenzory: sovskaia literatura 1940-kh godov pod politicheskim kontrolem TsK* (Moscow: Rossiia molodaia, 1994).
- Baer, Brian James, 'Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia', *The Massachusetts Review*, 47: 3 (2006), 537–60.
- Baer, Brian James, 'Russia', in Gaëtan Brulotte and John Phillips (eds), *Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1141–5.
- Baer, Brian James, 'Translating Queer Texts in Soviet Russia: A Case Study in Productive Censorship', *Translation Studies*, 4: 1 (2011), 21–40.
- Baer, Brian James, 'Translated Literature and the Role of the Reader', in Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (eds), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), pp. 333–45.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982).
- Barghoorn, Frederick Charles, *The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960).
- Bassnett, Susan, 'The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator', in Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (eds), *Translation, Power, Subversion* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), pp. 10–24.
- Beck, Kent M., 'The Odyssey of Joseph Freeman', *The Historian*, 37: 1 (1974), 101–20.
- Belkina, Tat'iana, 'Pomni o "1984": 50-letiu pervogo izdaniia romana Dzholdzha Oruella posviaschaetsia', *Den'*, 8 May 1999, <<http://www.day.kiev.ua/ru/article/lichnost/pomni-0-1984>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- 'Big in Russia', *Time*, 10 March 1961, 64–7.
- Billiani, Francesca, 'Assessing Boundaries: Censorship and Translation: An Introduction', in Francesca Billiani (ed.), *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media* (Manchester: St Jerome, 2007), pp. 1–25.
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *Za kulisami 'ministerstva pravdy': tainnaia istoriia sovskaio tsenzury, 1917–1929* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1994).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, 'Evreiskaia tema glazami sovskskogo tsenzora (po sekretnym dokumentam Glavlita epokhi bol'shogo terrora)', in D. A. El'iashchevich (ed.) *Evrei v Rossii, istoriia i kul'tura: sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1995), pp. 186–96.
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *Evreiskii vopros pod sovskaio tsenzuroi, 1917–1991* (Saint Petersburg: Peterburgskii evreiskii universitet, 1996).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *Sovskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora: 1929–1953* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *A Self-Administered Poison: The System and Functions of Soviet Censorship*, trans. I. P. Foote (Oxford: Legenda, 2003).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *Zapreshchennye knigi russkikh pisatelei i literaturovedov 1917–1991: indeks sovskaio tsenzury s kommentariiami* (Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet kul'tury i iskusstv, 2003).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, "'Internatsionalnaia literatura": podtsenzurnoe proshloe', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (2005), <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/bl21.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, *Kak eto delalos' v Leningrade: tsenzura v gody otpepli, zastoia i perestroiki 1953–1991* (Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2008).
- Blium, Arlen Viktorovich, 'Legal'no roman "1984" byl opublikovan v SSSR v 1988 godu', *New Times*, 22 (2009), 10–11.

- Bloom, James, 'About Joseph Freeman (1897–1965)', <[http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/a\\_f/freeman/about.htm](http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/a_f/freeman/about.htm)> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Blyum, Arlen [Blum, Arlen Viktorovich], 'George Orwell in the Soviet Union: A Documentary Chronicle on the Centenary of His Birth', trans. I. P. Foote, *The Library*, 4: 4 (2003), 402–16.
- Bogdanov, Konstantin, 'The Rhetoric of Ritual: The Soviet Sociolect in Ethnolinguistic Perspective', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 5 (2009), 179–216.
- Boobbyer, Philip, *Conscience, Dissent and Reform in Soviet Russia* (London: Routledge, 2005).
- Borisenko, Aleksandra, 'Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (2009), <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/7/bo16.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Market of Symbolic Goods', trans. Rupert Sawyer, *Poetics*, 14: 1 (1985), 13–44.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. Matthew Adamson and Gino Raymond, ed. John Thompson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Briffault, Robert, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1938).
- Briffo, Robert [Briffault, Robert], 'Upadok i razrushenie Britanskoi Imperii', trans. L. Vorovoi, *Internatsional'naiia literatura*, 12 (1939), 152–202.
- Brooks, Jeffrey, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!: Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Brooks, John, 'Best-Seller', *The New Yorker*, 6 January 1962, p. 19.
- Brown, Archie, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Brown, Glenora W., and Deming Brown, *A Guide to Soviet Russian Translations of American Literature* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1954).
- Brusilovskaia, L. B., *Kul'tura povsednevnosti v epokhu 'otpepli': metamorfozy stilia* (Moscow: Universitet rossiiskoi akademii obrazovaniia, 2001).
- Bullock, Philip Ross, 'Not One of Us?: The Paradoxes of Translating Oscar Wilde in the Soviet Union', in Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (eds), *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2013), pp. 235–64.
- Burak, Alexander, 'The "Americanization" of Russian Life and Literature through Translations of Hemingway's Works', *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 8: 1 (2013), 50–72.
- Burnett, Leon, and Emily Lygo, 'The Art of Accommodation: Introduction', in Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (eds), *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2013), pp. 1–30.
- Butler, Judith, 'Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor', in Robert Post (ed.), *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 247–60.
- Caldwell, Erskine, *Jenny by Nature* (London: Heinemann, 1961).

- Caute, David, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Chatterjee, Choi, and Karen Petrone, 'Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity: The Soviet Case in Historical Perspective', *Slavic Review*, 67: 4 (2008), 967–86.
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, 'Censorship Via Translation: Soviet Treatment of Western Political Writing', in Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (eds), *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars & Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 21–52.
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, *Tsenzura inostrannykh knig v Rossiiskoi Imperii i Sovetskom Soiuze: katalog vystavki* (Moscow: Rudomino, 1993).
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, 'Closing and Opening and Closing: Reflections on the Russian Media', in Miranda Remnek (ed.), *The Space of the Book: Print Culture in the Russian Social Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), pp. 281–300.
- Choldin, Marianna Tax, and Maurice Friedberg (eds), *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
- Chukovskii, Kornei, 'Iskusstvo perevoda', *Pravda*, 1 March 1935, p. 6.
- Chukovskii, Kornei, *Vysokoe iskusstvo* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1968).
- Chukovsky, Kornei [Chukovskii, Kornei], *Diary, 1901–1969*, trans. Michael Henry Heim, ed. Victor Erlich (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005).
- Clark, Katerina, *Petersburg, Crucible of Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).
- Clark, Katerina, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 3rd edn (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).
- Clark, Katerina, 'Germanophone Contributions to Stalinist Literary Theory: The Case of Georgy Lukacs and Michail Lifšic, and Their Roles in Literaturnyj Kritik and IFIL', *Russian Literature*, 63: 2–4 (2008), 513–32.
- Clark, Katerina, *Moscow, the Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931–1941* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).
- Clarkson, Verity, "'Sputniks and sideboards": Exhibiting the Soviet "way of life" in Cold War Britain', in Anthony Cross (ed.), *A People Passing Rude: British Responses to Russian Culture* (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2012), pp. 285–301.
- Colin, Amy, and Peter Rychlo, 'Czernowitz/ Cernăuți/ Chernovtsy/ Chernivtsi/ Czerniowce: A Testing Ground for Pluralism', in John Neubauer (ed.), *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures And Disjunctures in the 19th And 20th Centuries* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004), pp. 57–76.
- Dais, Dzheiz [Deiss, Jay], 'Krupnaia igra', trans. I. Gurova and R. Bobrova, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 1–3 (1960), 82–130; 110–72; 123–204.
- Daniel', Aleksandr, 'Istoki i smysl sovetskogo samizdata', in Viacheslav V. Igrunov, Mark. Sh. Barbakadze and E. S. Shvarts (eds), *Antologiiia samizdata: nepodtsenzurnaia literatura v SSSR, 1950–e–1980–e*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi institut gumanitarno-politicheskikh issledovanii, 2005), pp. 17–33.
- Daniels, Robert V. (ed.), *A Documentary History of Communism in Russia: From Lenin to Gorbachev* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2001).
- David-Fox, Michael, 'Whither Resistance?', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1: 1 (2000), 161–5.
- David-Fox, Michael, 'Cultural Memory in the Century of Upheaval: Big Pictures and Snapshots', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2: 3 (2001), 601–13.

- David-Fox, Michael, 'The Fellow Travelers Revisited: The "Cultured West" through Soviet Eyes', *The Journal of Modern History*, 75: 2 (2003), 300–35.
- David-Fox, Michael, 'The "Heroic Life" of a Friend of Stalinism: Romain Rolland and Soviet Culture', *Slavonica*, 11: 1 (2005), 4–29.
- David-Fox, Michael, *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to the Soviet Union, 1921–1941* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Deiss, Jay, *The Blue Chips: A Novel* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957).
- Derrida, Jacques, *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2*, trans. Jan Plug (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004).
- Dewhurst, Martin, 'Soviet Socialist Realism and the Soviet Censorship System', in Hilary Chung (ed.), *In the Party Spirit: Socialist Realism and Literary Practice in the Soviet Union, East Germany and China* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 23–9.
- Dewhurst, Martin, 'Censorship in Russia, 1991 and 2001', *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 18: 1 (2002), 21–34.
- Dewhurst, Martin, and Robert Farrell, *The Soviet Censorship* (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1973).
- Diakonova, Nina, 'Aldous Huxley in Russia', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 21: 1 (1997), 161–7.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny, *The Making of the State Reader: Social and Aesthetic Contexts of the Reception of Soviet Literature* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).
- Dobrenko, Evgeny, 'Socialist Realism', in Marina Balina and Evgeny Dobrenko (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 97–114.
- Dolinin, Viacheslav, 'Leningradskii periodicheskii samizdat serediny 50-kh–80-kh godov', in Viacheslav Dolinin and Boris Ivanov (eds), *Samizdat: po materialam konferentsii '30 let nezavisimoi pečati, 1950–80 gody', Sankt-Peterburg, 25–27 aprilia 1992 g.* (Saint Petersburg: Nauchno-informatsionnyi tsentr 'Memorial', 1993), pp. 3–21.
- Dolinin, Viacheslav, and Boris Ivanov (eds), *Samizdat: po materialam konferentsii '30 let nezavisimoi pečati, 1950–80 gody', Sankt-Peterburg, 25–27 aprilia 1992 g.* (Saint Petersburg: Nauchno-informatsionnyi tsentr 'Memorial', 1993).
- Dorman, Oleg, and Lilianna Lungina, *Podstrochnik: Zhizn' Lilianny Lunginoi, rasskazannaia eiu v fil'me Olega Dormana* (Moscow: Astrel', 2009).
- Epstein, Mikhail, *Relativistic Patterns in Totalitarian Thinking: An Inquiry into the Language of Soviet Ideology* (Washington, DC: The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1991).
- Ermolaev, Herman, *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917–1991* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997).
- 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' at: <[http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p232005\\_index.html](http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p232005_index.html)> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Etkind, Efim Grigor'evich, *Notes of a Non-Conspirator*, trans. Peter France (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- Ezhegodnik knigi SSSR* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia knizhnaia palata, 1955).
- Fairclough, Norman, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008).
- Fedorov, Andrei Venediktovich, *O khudozhestvennom perevode* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1941).
- Feiler, Lily, *Marina Tsvetaeva: The Double Beat of Heaven and Hell* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994).

- Feldbrugge, Ferdinand Joseph Maria, *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union* (Leyden: Sijthoff, 1975).
- Fish, Stanley, *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech: And It's a Good Thing Too* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila, 'The Emergence of Glavuskusstvo: Class War on the Cultural Front, Moscow, 1928–29', *Soviet Studies*, 23: 2 (1971), 236–53.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila, 'Cultural Revolution in Russia 1928–32', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 9: 1 (1974), 33–52.
- Foakes, R. A., *Hamlet Versus Lear: Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Fokin, D. A., 'Religioznyi samizdat: K voprosu o formirovanii protestantskoi kul'tury v SSSR (na primere publikatsii tserkvi adventistov sed'mogo dnia)', in S. V. Riazanova and V. I. Nichik (eds), *Protestantism v sovremennoi Rossii: Vklad na obshchestva, religii, istorii i kul'tury* (Perm': Knizhnaia ploshchad', 2012), pp. 218–26.
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979).
- Foucault, Michel, 'The Subject and Power', *Critical Inquiry*, 8: 4 (1982), 777–95.
- Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).
- Fradkin, I., 'Istoriia literatury i kritika v "Internatsional'noi literature" (1937–1939)', *Literaturnyi kritik*, 7–8 (1940), 246–62.
- France, Anna Kay, *Boris Pasternak's Translations of Shakespeare* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).
- Freeman, Joseph, *An American Testament: A Narrative of Rebels and Romantics* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1936).
- Freshwater, Helen, 'Towards a Redefinition of Censorship', in Beate Müller (ed.), *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 225–45.
- Freud, Sigmund, *Totem and Taboo* (London: Ark Paperbacks, [1913] 1983).
- Friedberg, Maurice, 'The U.S. in the U.S.S.R.: American Literature through the Filter of Recent Soviet Publishing and Criticism', *Critical Inquiry*, 2: 3 (1976), 519–83.
- Friedberg, Maurice, 'Soviet Censorship: A View from Outside', in Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (eds), *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 21–8.
- Friedberg, Maurice, *Literary Translation in Russia: A Cultural History* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).
- Friman, Dzhosef [Freeman, Joseph], 'Zavet amerikantsa', trans. Z. Gan, *Internatsional'naia literatura*, vols 1–3 (1937), 1176–82; 56–174; 40–62.
- Frye, Roland Mushat, 'Hitler, Stalin, and Shakespeare's Macbeth: Modern Totalitarianism and Ancient Tyranny', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 142: 1 (1998), 81–109.
- Fürst, Juliane, *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-War Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Gal, Susan, 'Review: Language and the "Arts of Resistance"', *Cultural Anthropology*, 10: 3 (1995), 407–24.
- Gal', Nora, *Vospominaniia, stat'i, stikhi, pis'ma, bibliografiia*, ed. Dmitrii Kuz'min and Edvard Kuz'min (Moscow: ARGO-RISK, 1997).
- Gallagher, Aoife, 'Pasternak's Hamlet: Translation, Censorship and Indirect Communication', in Eiléan Ní Chuilleánáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin, and David

- Parris (eds), *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 119–31.
- Garzonio, Stefano, and Maria Zalambani, 'Literary Criticism during the Revolution and Civil War, 1917–1921', in Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (eds), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 1–16.
- Gavrilov, Nikolai, 'Letter from a Soviet Writer', *The New Leader*, 46: 25 (1963), 14–18.
- Genette, Gérard, and Marie MacLean, 'Introduction to the Paratext', *New Literary History*, 22: 2 (1991), 261–72.
- Genieva, Ekaterina Iur'evna, 'Iz-za Dzhoisa', *Vestnik Evropy*, 15 (2005), <<http://magazines.russ.ru/vestnik/2005/15/ge41.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Gentzler, Edwin, and Maria Tymoczko, 'Introduction', in Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (eds), *Translation and Power* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008).
- Gibian, George, *Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature during the Thaw, 1954–1957* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960).
- Gibbels, Elisabeth, 'Translators, the Tacit Censors', in Eiléan Ní Chuilleánáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin and David Parris (eds), *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* (Dublin: Four Course Press, 2009), pp. 57–75.
- Gilburd, Eleonory, 'Picasso in Thaw Culture', *Cahiers du monde russe*, 47: 1 (2006), 65–108.
- Gilburd, Eleonory, 'The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s', in Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (eds), *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), pp. 362–401.
- Golovskoy, Valery Semenovich, *Is there Censorship in the Soviet Union?: Methodological Problems of Studying Soviet Censorship* (Washington, DC: The Wilson Center, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 1985).
- Goriaeva, T. M., *Politicheskaia tsenzura v SSSR, 1917–1991 gg.* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2002).
- Gorokhoff, Boris Ivanovitch, *Publishing in the U.S.S.R.* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1959).
- Gould, Rebecca, 'World Literature as a Communal Apartment: Semyon Lipkin's Ethics of Translational Difference', *Translation and Literature*, 21: 3 (2012), 402–21.
- Greene, Graham, *The Quiet American* (London: William Heinemann, 1955).
- Greene, Graham, *Our Man in Havana* (London: William Heinemann, 1958).
- Grigor'eva, O. I., 'Obraz Germanii na stranitsakh "Pravdy": ianvar' 1933–iiun' 1941', in A. V. Golubeva (ed.), *Rossii i mir glazami drug druga: Iz istorii vzaimovospriiatia* (Moscow: IRI RAN, 2009).
- Grin, Grem [Greene, Graham], 'Tikhii amerikanets', trans. Rita Rait-Kovaleva and Sulamif Mitina, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1956), 90–164.
- Grin, Grem [Greene, Graham], 'Nash chelovek v Gavane', trans. Natalia Al'bertovna Volzhina, *Inostrannaia Literatura*, 3–4 (1959), 5–72; 43–107.
- Gromova, T. V., ed., *Tsenzura v tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuzze: Materialy konferentsii 24–27 maia 1993 g., Moskva* (Moscow: Rudomino, 1995).
- Gronow, Jukka, *Caviar with Champagne: Common Luxury and the Ideals of the Good Life in Stalin's Russia* (Oxford: Berg, 2003).
- Grüner, Frank, "'Russia's Battle against the Foreign": The Anti-Cosmopolitanism Paradigm in Russian and Soviet Ideology', *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 17: 3 (2010), 445–72.

- Günther, Hans, 'Soviet Literary Criticism and the Formulation of the Aesthetics of Socialist Realism, 1932–1940', in Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (eds), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 90–108.
- Guseinov, Gasan Chingizovich, *D.S.P.: Sovetskie ideologemii v russkom diskurse 1990-kh* (Moscow: Tri kvadrata, 2004).
- Halfin, Igal, *Stalinist Confessions: Messianism and Terror at the Leningrad Communist University* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009).
- Healey, Dan, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- Hellbeck, Jochen, 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1: 1 (2000), 71–96.
- Hellbeck, Jochen, 'Working, Struggling, Becoming: Stalin-Era Autobiographical Texts', *Russian Review*, 60: 3 (2001), 340–59.
- Hemingway, Ernest, *Fiesta* (London: Jonathan Cape, [1926] 1927).
- Hemingway, Ernest, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (London: Random House, [1940] 2005).
- Hoffmann, David L., *Stalinist Values: The Cultural Norms of Soviet Modernity, 1917–1941* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).
- Holland, Peter, 'More Russian than a Dane: The Usefulness of Hamlet in Russia', in Shirley Chew and Alistair Stead (eds), *Translating Life: Essays in Transpositional Aesthetics* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999), pp. 315–38.
- Holquist, Michael, 'Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship', *PMLA*, 109: 1 (1994), 14–25.
- Hornsby, Robert, *Protest, Reform and Repression in Khrushchev's Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- Humphrey, Caroline, 'Dangerous Words: Taboos, Evasions, and Silence in Soviet Russia', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 2 (2005), 374–96.
- Humphrey, Caroline, 'The "Creative Bureaucrat": Conflicts in the Production of Soviet Communist Party Discourse', *Inner Asia*, 10: 1 (2008), 5–35.
- Iasnov, Mikhail, 'Biograficheskie zametki ob El'ge L'vovne Linetskoii', in Mikhail Iasnov (ed.), *El'ga L'vovna Linetskaia: Materialy k biografii, iz literaturnogo nasledii, vospominaniia, bibliografiia, fotodokumenty* (Saint Petersburg: Simpozium, 1999), pp. 11–18.
- Igrunov, Viacheslav V., Mark. Sh. Barbakadze and E. S. Shvarts (eds), *Antologiiia samizdata: Nepodtsenzurnaiia literatura v SSSR, 1950-e-1980-e: kniga 1*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi institut gumanitarno-politicheskikh issledovaniia, 2005).
- 'Inostrannaia literatura', in A. M. Prokhorov (ed.), *Bol'shaia sovskaia entsiklopediia* (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1969), p. 288.
- Ivanov, Vsevolod, 'Moskovskie tetradi', *Druzhba narodov*, 8 (2001), <<http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/2001/8/ivanov.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Ivkin, Vladimir Ivanovich, *Gosudarstvennaia vlast' SSSR: vysshie organy vlasti i upravleniia i ikh rukovoditeli, 1923–1991 gg.: istoriko-biograficheskoii spravochnik* (Moscow: Rosspen, 1999).
- Johnson, Priscilla, *Khrushchev and the Arts: the Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962–1964* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965).
- Johnston, Gordon, 'What is the History of Samizdat?', *Social History*, 24: 2 (1999), 115–33.
- Johnston, Timothy, *Being Soviet: Identity, Rumour, and Everyday Life Under Stalin 1939–1953* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

- Jones, Polly, 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization', in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1–18.
- Jones, Polly, *Myth, Memory, Trauma: Rethinking the Stalinist Past in the Soviet Union, 1953–70* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).
- Kalashnikova, Elena, *Po-russki s liubov'iu: Besedy s perevodchikami* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2008).
- Karasev, Maksim, 'Mekhanika soprotivleniia', *New Times*, 22 (2009), 12–13.
- Kashkin, Ivan, 'O metode i shkole sovetskogo khudozhestvennogo perevoda', *Znamia*, 10 (1954), 141–53.
- Kashkin, Ivan, 'O realizme v sovetskom khudozhestvennom perevode', *Druzhba narodov*, 4 (1954), 188–99.
- Kashkin, Ivan, *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika*, ed. P. Toper and M. Loric (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1968).
- Kazin, Alfred, *New York Jew* (New York: Knopf, 1978).
- Kerouac, Jack, *On the Road: The Original Scroll* (London: Penguin, [1957] 2011).
- Keruak, Dzhek [Kerouac, Jack], 'Na doroge', trans. Vera Konstantinovna Efanova, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (1960): 170–95.
- Kheminguei, Ernest [Hemingway, Ernest], 'Fiesta', trans. Vera Maksimovna Toper, *Internatsional'naia literatura*, 1 (1935), 3–44.
- Kheminguei, Ernest [Hemingway, Ernest], 'Po kom zvonit kolokol', trans. Natal'ia Volzhina and Evgeniia Kalashnikova, in *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh*, vol. 4 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1968), pp. 107–612.
- Khotimsky, Maria, "'I am – for the Free": Marina Cvetaeva as a Translator in the Soviet Cultural Context', *Russian Literature*, 73 (2013), 565–90.
- Khotimsky, Maria, 'World Literature, Soviet Style: A Forgotten Episode in the History of the Idea', *Ab Imperio*, 3 (2013), 119–54.
- Knipovich, E., 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', *Pravda*, 5 January 1933, p. 4.
- Koivunen, Pia, 'The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival: Propagating a New, Peaceful Image of the Soviet Union', in Melanie Ilič and Jeremy Smith (eds), *Soviet State and Society under Khrushchev* (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 46–65.
- Kolduell, Erskin [Caldwell, Erskine], 'Dzhenni', trans. Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 12 (1962), 71–162.
- Kolesnikoff, Nina, *Bruno Jasienski: His Evolution from Futurism to Socialist Realism* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1982).
- Komaromi, Ann, 'The Material Existence of Soviet Samizdat', *Slavic Review*, 63.3 (2004), 597–618.
- Komaromi, Ann, 'The Unofficial Field of Late Soviet Culture', *Slavic Review*, 66: 4 (2007), 605–29.
- Komaromi, Ann, 'Samizdat as Extra-Gutenberg Phenomenon', *Poetics Today*, 29: 4 (2008), 629–67.
- Komaromi, Ann, 'Samizdat and Soviet Dissident Publics', *Slavic Review*, 71: 1 (2012), 70–90.
- Kon, Igor, 'Sexuality and Culture', in James Riordan and Igor Kon (eds), *Sex and Russian Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), pp. 15–44.
- Kon, Igor, 'Russia', in Donald James West and Richard Green (eds), *Sociolegal Control of Homosexuality: A Multi-Nation Comparison* (New York: Plenum Press, 1997), pp. 221–42.

- Kopelev, Lev and Raisa Davydovna Orlova, *My zhili v Moskve: 1956–1980* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1988).
- Kotkin, Stephen, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
- Kotkin, Stephen, '1991 and the Russian Revolution: Sources, Conceptual Categories, Analytical Frameworks', *The Journal of Modern History*, 70: 2 (1998), 384–425.
- Kozlov, Denis, *The Readers of Novyi Mir: Coming to Terms with the Stalinist Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).
- Krylova, Anna, 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 1: 1 (2000), 119–46.
- Kudriavtseva, Tat'iana Alekseevna, *Prevratnosti odnoi sub'by: Zapiski literatora i perevodchika* (Moscow: R. Valent, 2008).
- Kuz'michev, I. S., *Russkie pisateli o perevode (XVIII–XX vek)* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1960).
- Kuz'mina, E. B. (ed.), *Pechat' SSSR za 50 let* (Moscow: Kniga, 1967).
- Kuznetsov, P., 'O literaturnom perevode', *Pravda*, 27 August 1949, p. 2.
- Kuznetsova, Ekaterina, 'Sposob ideologicheskoi adaptatsii perevodnogo teksta: O perevode romana E. Khemingueia "Po kom zvonit kolokol"', *Logos*, 3 (2012) 153–71.
- Lamaison, Pierre, and Pierre Bourdieu, 'From Rules to Strategies: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu', *Cultural Anthropology* 1: 1 (1986): 110–20.
- Latynina, Alla, and Martin Dewhurst, 'Post-Soviet Russian Literature', in Neil Cornwell (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 234–50.
- Lazzarin, Francesca, 'N. S. Gumilev – Perevodchik i redaktor frantsuzskoi literatury vo "Vsemirnoi literatury"', *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta: Seriya 9, filologiya*, 3 (2012), 163–78.
- Leont'ev, B., 'Posleslovie k romanu Makkenzi', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 7 (1958), 169–173.
- Levin, Harry, 'The Question of Hamlet', in Joseph G. Price (ed.), *Hamlet: Critical Essays* (New York: Routledge, 1986), pp. 99–122.
- Lih, Lars, 'The Soviet Union and the Road to Communism', in Ronald G. Suny (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Russia*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 706–31.
- Liubimov, Nikolai, *Neuviadaemyi tsvet: kniga vospominanii*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2000).
- Loeff, 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).
- Luppol, I. K., M. M. Rozental', and S. M. Tret'iakov (eds), *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934: Stenograficheskii otchet* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990).
- Lygo, Emily, *Leningrad Poetry 1953–1975: The Tham Generation* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010).
- Lyons, Richard D., 'Aleksandr Chakovsky Dies at 80; Enforcer of Soviet Line on Writers', *New York Times*, 19 February 1994, p. 26.
- McConnell, Gary, 'Joseph Freeman: Artist in Uniform', *Modern Age*, 41: 1 (1999), 40–6.
- Mackenzie, Compton, *Rockets Galore* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957).
- MacKenzie, David, *From Messianism to Collapse: Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917–1991* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College, 1994).

- Mainer, Sergi, 'Translation and Censorship: Robert Burns in Post-Civil War Spain', *Translation Studies*, 4: 1 (2011), 72–86.
- Makkenzi, Kompton [Mackenzie, Compton], 'Raketaia goriachka', trans. Rita Rait-Kovaleva and B. Gribanov, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 6 (1958), 99–173.
- Maksimov, Leonid, ed., *Bol'shaia tsenzura: Pisateli i zhurnalisty v strane soveto* 1917–1956 (Moscow: Materik, 2005).
- Markov, Vladimir, 'An Unnoticed Aspect of Pasternak's Translations', *Slavic Review*, 20: 3 (1961), 503–8.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *Manifest kommunisticheskoi partii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, [1848] 1948).
- Matsuev, N., '1933 literaturnyi god', *Literaturnyi kritik*, 5 (1934), 231–5.
- Mattson, Kevin, *Upton Sinclair and the Other American Century* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2006).
- Meerson-Aksenov, Michael, 'The Dissident Movement and Samizdat', in Michael Meerson-Aksenov and Boris Iosifovich Shragin (eds), *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian Samizdat: An Anthology*, trans. Nickolas Lupinin (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing, 1977), pp. 19–46.
- Meerson-Aksenov, Mikhail Georgievich, and Boris Iosifovich Shragin (eds), *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian Samizdat: An Anthology*, trans. Nickolas Lupinin (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing, 1977).
- Mikheev, Aleksei, 'Mezhdum dvumia "otpepliami"', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 10 (2005) <<http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2005/10/mizo.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Mitrokhin, N. A., and Vladimir Solodin, "'Ubezhden, chto rabotal na stabil'nost' godudarstva": interv'iu V. A. Solodina', in T. M. Goriaeva (ed.), *Iskliuchit' vsiakiie upominaniia: ocherki istorii sovetskoi tsenzury* (Moscow: Vremia i mesto, 1995), pp. 315–31.
- Moore, Tiffany Ann Conroy, *Kozintsev's Shakespeare Films: Russian Political Protest in Hamlet and King Lear* (Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 2012).
- Morozova, T. L., *Obraz molodogo amerikantsa v literature S.Sh.A.* (Moscow: Vysshiaia shkola, 1969).
- Moss, Kevin, 'A Russian Munchausen: Aesopian Translation', in Andrew Horton (ed.), *Inside Soviet Film Satire: Laughter with a Lash* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 20–35.
- Müller, Beate, 'Censorship and Cultural Regulation: Mapping the Territory', in Beate Müller (ed.), *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 1–32.
- Munday, Jeremy, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 19–20.
- Neizvestnyi, Ernst, *Govorit Neizvestnyi* (Moscow: Rossiiskoe filosofskoe obshchestvo, 1992).
- Nemchinskii, Ia., 'Ob otvetstvennosti perevodchika', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 1 April 1950, p. 3.
- Ogurtsov, A. P., 'Obrazovanie v perspektive tezaurnoi dinamiki (M. K. Petrov kak filosof obrazovanii)', in S. S. Neretina (ed.), *Mikhail Konstantinovich Petrov* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2010), pp. 186–202.
- Orlova, Raisa, *Vospominaniia o neproshedshem vremeni: Moskva, 1961–1981 gg.* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1983).
- Orlova, Raisa, *Kheminguei v Rossii: roman dlinoiu v polstoletii* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1985).

- Orwell, Georg [Orwell, George], *Skotskii khutor*, trans. Gleb Struve and Mariia Kriger, 2nd edn (Frankfurt: Posev, 1967).
- Orwell, George, *Animal Farm; Burmese Days; A Clergyman's Daughter; Coming up for Air; Keep the Aspidochelone Flying; Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1976).
- Orwell George, *George Orwell: A Life in Letters*, ed. Peter Davison (New York: Liverlight, 2013).
- Ostroi, O. S., 'Izdatel'stvo "Academia"', *Kniga: issledovannii i materialy*, 18 (1969), 155–74.
- 'Ot redaktsii', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 1 (1955), 3–4.
- Palmier, Jean Michel, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America* (London: Verso, 2006).
- Panova, Vera, 'O romane Dzh. D. Selindzhera', *Inostrannaia literatura*, 11 (1960), 138–41.
- Parker, Stephen Jan, 'Hemingway's Revival in the Soviet Union: 1955–1962', *American Literature*, 35: 4 (1964), 485–501.
- Parker, Stephen, and Matthew Philpotts, *Sinn und Form: The Anatomy of a Literary Journal* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).
- Pasternak, Boris Leonidovich, 'Rech' B. L. Pasternaka na pervom vsesoiuznom soveshchani peregovodchikov', *Literaturnaia Gruziiia*, 8 (1968), 38–41.
- Pasternak, Boris Leonidovich, 'Zamechaniia k perevodam iz Shekspira', in Boris Leonidovich Pasternak, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii s prilozheniiami v 11-ti tomakh*, ed. D. V. Tevekeliian, vol. 5 (Moscow: Slovo, 2004), pp. 2–90.
- Payne, Stanley G., 'Soviet Anti-Fascism: Theory and Practice, 1921–45', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 4: 2 (2003), 1–62.
- Payne, Stanley G., *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004).
- Pechat' SSSR v 1955 godu: statisticheskie materialy* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vsesoiuznoi knizhnoi palaty, 1955).
- Pechat' SSSR v 1960 godu: statisticheskie materialy* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vsesoiuznoi knizhnoi palaty, 1961).
- Pechat' SSSR v 1964 godu: statisticheskie materialy* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vsesoiuznoi knizhnoi palaty, 1965).
- Pilkington, Anna, 'Vera Fedorovna Panova 1905–1973', in Neil Cornwell and Nicole Christian (eds), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), pp. 612–14.
- Pinkus, Benjamin, *The Jews of the Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Plamper, Jan, 'Abolishing Ambiguity: Soviet Censorship Practices in the 1930s', *Russian Review*, 60: 4 (2001), 526–44.
- Plamper, Jan, 'Russia: Archives of Soviet Censorship', in Derek Jones (ed.), *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001), pp. 2093–5.
- Polonsky, Rachel, *Molotov's Magic Lantern: A Journey in Russian History* (London: Faber & Faber, 2010).
- Post, Robert, 'Censorship and Silencing', in Robert Post (ed.), *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), pp. 1–16.
- Preston, Dzhon Khaid [Preston, John Hyde], 'Liberaly', trans. Natal'ia Al'bertovna Volzhina and Nina Leonidovna Daruzes, *Internatsional'naia literatura*, vols 11–12 (1938), 23–109; 14–78.

- Preston, John Hyde, *The Liberals: A Novel* (New York: John Day, 1938).
- Racine, Nicole, 'L'Association des écrivains et artistes révolutionnaires (A.E.A.R.). La revue "Commune" et la lutte idéologique contre le fascisme (1932–1936)', *Le Mouvement social*, 54 (1966), 29–47.
- Rait-Kovaleva, Rita, letter to Martin Dewhirst, 7 December 1961.
- Rait-Kovaleva, Rita, 'Nit' Ariadny', in A. Mironova (ed.), *Redaktor i perevod* (Moscow: Kniga, 1965), pp. 5–22.
- Rait-Kovaleva, Rita, 'Vse luchshee vospominaniia . . .', *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologiiia: literaturovedenie*, 184 (1966), 257–87.
- Rampersad, Arnold, *The Life of Langston Hughes: I, Too, Sing America*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- 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: 2 (2002), 211–52.
- Richmond, Steven, and Vladimir Solodin, "'The Eye of the State": An Interview with Soviet Chief Censor Vladimir Solodin', *Russian Review*, 56: 4 (1997), 581–90.
- Richmond, Yale, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising The Iron Curtain* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).
- Rogachevskii, Andrei, 'Homo Sovieticus in the Library', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 54: 6 (2002), 975–88.
- Romanova, Elena, 'What American Novels Do Russians Read?', *Soviet Literature*, 7 (1961), 178–82.
- Rosen, Gerald, 'A Retrospective Look at *The Catcher in the Rye*', *American Quarterly*, 29: 5 (1977), 547–62.
- Roth-Ey, Kristin, "'Loose Girls" on the Loose? Sex, Propaganda and the 1957 Youth Festival', in Melanie Ilič, Susan E. Reid and Lynne Attwood (eds), *Women in the Khrushchev Era* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- Rubin, Andrew, *Archives of Authority: Empire, Culture, and the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).
- Ruggles, Melville J., 'American Books in Soviet Publishing', *Slavic Review*, 20: 3 (1961), 419–35.
- Ryazanova-Clarke, Larissa, and Terence Wade, *The Russian Language Today* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Safiullina, Nailya, 'The Translation of Western Literature and the Politics of Culture under Stalin' (unpublished PhD, University of Manchester, 2009).
- Safiullina, Nailya, 'Window to the West: From the Collection of Readers' Letters to the Journal *Internatsional'naia literatura*', *Slavonica*, 15: 2 (2009), 128–61.
- Safiullina, Nailya, and Rachel Platonov, 'Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s: The Role of the Journal *Internatsional'naia Literatura*', *Russian Literature*, 72: 2 (2012), 239–69.
- Salinger, J. D., *The Catcher in the Rye* (London: Penguin, [1951] 1994).
- Sandomirskaiia, Irina, "'Bez stali i leni": Aesopian Language and Legitimacy', in Per-Arne Bodin, Stefan Jedlund and Elena Namli (eds), *Power and Legitimacy – Challenges from Russia* (London: Routledge, 2013), pp. 188–98.
- Sarsenov, Karin, 'The Constitution of a Reliable Self: Word for Word by Oleg Dorman and Liliana Lungina', in Michael Schoenhals and Karin Sarsenov (eds), *Imagining Mass Dictatorships: The Individual and the Masses in Literature and Cinema* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 7–27.

- Saunders, Frances Stonor, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York: New Press, 2013).
- Saunders, George, *Samizdat; Voices of the Soviet Opposition* (New York: Monad Press, 1974).
- Scherr, Barry, 'Notes on Literary Life in Petrograd, 1918–1922: A Tale of Three Houses', *Slavic Review*, 36: 2 (1977), 256–67.
- Scott, James C, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Scott-Smith, Giles, and Hans Krabbendam (eds), *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945–1960* (London: Frank Cass, 2003).
- Searle, Arthur, 'Letters of Robert Briffault', *The British Library Journal*, 3 (1977), 169–76.
- Selindzher, Dzh. D. [Salinger, J. D.], 'Nad propast'iu vo rzhii', trans. Rita Rait-Kovaleva, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 11 (1960), 28–137.
- Semenenko, Aleksei, "'Gamletovskii kontekst" Borisa Pasternaka', *Scando-Slavica*, 51: 1 (2005), 31–48.
- Semenenko, Aleksei, 'Identity, Canon and Translation: Hamlets by Polevoi and Pasternak', in Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (eds), *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2013), pp. 213–34.
- Semenov, Ia., 'V zashchitu Internatsional'noi literatury', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 5 January 1940, p. 2.
- Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, ed. George Richard Hibbard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1603] 1987).
- Shakespeare, William, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, ed. Nicholas Brooke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1623] 1990).
- Shakhova, Erna, 'Rol' redaktora v izdanii knigi', in Barbara Lönnqvist (ed.), *Översättning som kulturöverföring: rysk-svenska och svensk-ryska översättningsproblem* (Turku: Åbo Akademis förlag, 1993), pp. 131–45.
- Shane, Alex M., *The Life and Works of Evgenij Zamiatin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).
- Shchedrina, Tat'iana G., 'Chetyre pis'ma L. B. Kamenevu, ili rol' Gustava Shpeta v perevodakh Shekspira', *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 92 (2008) at <<http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2008/92/sh9.html>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Shkspir, Vil'iam [Shakespeare, William], *Tragedii* (Moscow: Detgiz, 1951).
- Shkspir, Vil'iam [Shakespeare, William], *Gamlet: Prints datskii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1941).
- Sherry, Samantha, 'Better Something Than Nothing: The Editors and Translators of Inostrannaia Literatura as Censorial Agents', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 91: 4 (2013), 731–58.
- Shomrakova, I., 'Knigoizdatel'stvo "Vsemirnaia literatura" 1918–1924', *Kniga: Issledovaniia i materialy, sbornik*, 14 (1967), 175–93.
- Sidorenko, Nikolai, 'O khudozhestvennom perevode', *Izvestiia*, 13 September 1951, 8.
- Sillitoe, Alan, *Key to the Door* (London: W. H. Allen, 1961).
- Sillitoe, Alan [Sillitoe, Alan], 'Kliuch ot dveri', trans. N. Dekhtereva, B. Rostokin, and V. Smirnov, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 6–7 (1963), 50–107; 122–98.
- Sinclair, Upton, 'A Letter to Eugene Lyons', *New Masses*, 26 (1938), 5–6.
- Sinclair, Upton, *Dragon's Teeth* (New York and Pasadena: Viking, 1942).
- Sinitsyna, Olga, 'Censorship in the Soviet Union and its Cultural and Professional Results for Arts and Art Libraries', *Inspel*, 33: 1 (1999), 35–42.

- Sinkler, Epton [Sinclair, Upton], 'Zuby drakona', trans. D. Gorbov and V. Kurella, *Internatsional'naiia literatura*, 11 (1942), 12–65.
- Skilling, Harold Gordon, *Samizdat and an Independent Society in Central and Eastern Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989).
- Smeliansky, Anatoly, *The Russian Theatre after Stalin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Soima, Vasilii Mikhailovich, *Zapreshchennyi Stalin* (Moscow: OLMA-Press, 2005).
- Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 'Interview with Two Western Correspondents', *Index on Censorship*, 2: 4 (1973), 31–45.
- 'Soviet Censorship: Discussion', in Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (eds), *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 53–67.
- Steiner, Franz, *Taboo* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Stelmakh, V. D., 'Reading in the Context of Censorship in the Soviet Union', *Libraries and Culture*, 36: 1 (2001), 143–50.
- Stern, Ludmila, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union, 1920–40: From Red Square to the Left Bank* (London: Routledge, 2007).
- Tall, Emily, 'Who's Afraid of Franz Kafka?: Kafka Criticism in the Soviet Union', *Slavic Review* 35: 3 (1976), 484–503.
- Tall, Emily, 'James Joyce Returns to the Soviet Union', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 17: 4 (1980), 341–47.
- Tall, Emily, 'The Reception of James Joyce in Russia', in Geert Lernout and Wim van Mierlo (eds), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* (London: Continuum, 2004), 244–57.
- Telesin, Iulius [Telesin, Julius], 'Dzhordzh Orvell "1984": Glava iz romana nezvestnaia russkomu chitateliu', *Kontinent*, 10 (1978), 363–78.
- Telesin, Julius, 'For Whom the Scissors Cut: How to Improve Hemingway (Moscow Style)', *Encounter*, 46: 6 (1976), 81–6.
- Tihanov, Galin, 'Viktor Shklovskii and Georg Lukács in the 1930s', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 78: 1 (2000), 44–65.
- Tolz, Vera, *Russia: Inventing the Nation* (London: Arnold, 2001).
- Trauberg, Natal'ia, 'Out of Samizdat: Fifty Years of Chesterton in Russia', *Road to Emmaus*, 3 (2002), 43–9.
- Trauberg, Natal'ia, *Sama zhizn'* (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Ivana Limbakha, 2008).
- Tromly, Benjamin, *Making the Soviet Intelligentsia: Universities and Intellectual Life under Stalin and Khrushchev* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- Tsvetaeva, Marina, *Neizdannoe. Sem'ia, istoriia v pismakh* (Moscow: Ellis Lak, 1999).
- Turkevich, Ludmilla B., 'Soviet Literary Periodicals', *Books Abroad*, 32: 4 (1958), 369–74.
- Tymoczko, Maria, 'Censorship and Self-Censorship in Translation: Ethics and Ideology, Resistance and Collusion', in Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleain and David Parris (eds), *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 24–45.
- Tyulenev, Sergey, 'Translation as Smuggling', in James St. André (ed.), *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors* (Manchester: St Jerome, 2010), pp. 241–74.
- Uilson, Mitchel [Wilson, Mitchell], 'Vstrecha na dalekom meridiane', trans. I. Gurova, N. Dekhtereva and N. Treneva, *Inostrannaia literatura*, 1–3 (1961), 37–94; 85–147; 74–612.
- Ushakov, D. N. (ed.), *Tolkovyii slovar' russkogo iazyka*, 4 vols, 1935–1940.

- Viola, Lynne, 'Introduction', in Lynne Viola (ed.), *Contending with Stalinism: Soviet Power and Popular Resistance in the 1930s* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 1–16.
- Viola, Lynne, 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s: Soliloquy of a Devil's Advocate', in Lynne Viola (ed.), *Contending with Stalinism: Soviet Power and Popular Resistance in the 1930s* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 17–43.
- Vodop'ianova, Z. K. (ed.), *Mezhdú molotom i nakoval'nei: soiuz sovetskikh pisatelei SSSR dokumenty i kommentarii* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2011).
- Voitkovska, Ludmilla S., 'James Joyce and the Soviet Reader: Problems of Contact', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 16: 2 (1990), 21–6.
- 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>> (last accessed 12 January 2015).
- Voloshinov, Vladimir Nikolaevich, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
- von Bremzen, Anya, *Mastering the Art of Soviet Cooking: A Memoir of Food and Longing* (London: Doubleday, 2013).
- Vonnegut, Kurt, *Fates Worse than Death: An Autobiographical Collage* (New York: Berkley Books, 1992).
- Voslensky, M. S., "'Officially There Is No Censorship . . .'", *Index on Censorship*, 15: 4 (1986), 28–30.
- Walker, Barbara, 'On Reading Soviet Memoirs: A History of the "Contemporaries" Genre as an Institution of Russian Intelligentsia Culture from the 1790s to the 1970s', *Russian Review*, 59: 3 (2000), 327–52.
- Walker, Barbara, 'Kruzhok Culture: The Meaning of Patronage in the Early Soviet Literary World', *Contemporary European History*, 11: 1 (2002), 107–23.
- Walker, Gregory P. M., *Soviet Book Publishing Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Wilson, Mitchell, *Meeting at a Far Meridian* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1961).
- Witt, Susanna, 'Between the Lines: Totalitarianism and Translation in the USSR', in Brian James Baer (ed.) *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), pp. 149–70.
- Witt, Susanna, 'Arts of Accommodation: The First All-Union Conference of Translators, Moscow 1936, and the Ideologization of Norms', in Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (eds), *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2013), pp. 141–84.
- Witt, Susanna, 'The Shorthand of Empire: Podstrochnik Practices and the Making of Soviet Literature', *Ab Imperio*, 3 (2013), 155–90.
- Witt, Susanna, 'Totalitarizm i perevod: Kontekst Dzhambula', in Konstantin Bogdanov, Riccardo Nicolosi and Iurii Murashov (eds), *Dzhambul Dzhabaev* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2013), pp. 267–86.
- Wolf, Michaela, 'Censorship as Cultural Blockage: Banned Literature in the Late Habsburg Monarchy', *TTR*, 15: 2 (2002), 45–62.
- Woods, Michelle, *Censoring Translation: Censorship, Theatre, and the Politics of Translation* (London: Continuum, 2012).
- Worrell, Mark P., *Dialectic of Solidarity: Labor, Antisemitism, and the Frankfurt School* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

- Wright, Wyllis Eaton (ed.), *American Library & Book Trade Annual 1960* (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1959).
- Young, Jekaterina, 'Dovlatov's Reception of Salinger', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 36: 4 (2000), 412–25.
- Young, Jekaterina, *Sergei Dovlatov and His Narrative Masks* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2009).
- 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 Marianna Tax Choldin and Maurice Friedberg (eds), *The Red Pencil: Artists, Scholars, and Censors in the USSR* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 155–61.
- Zalambani, Maria, 'Literary Policies and Institutions', in Evgeny Dobrenko and Marina Balina (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 251–68.
- Zamiatin, E. I., 'Kratkaia istoriia Vsemirnoi literatury ot osnovaniia i do sego dnia', *Pamiat': istoricheskii sbornik*, 5 (1981), 237–314.
- Zaretskaia-Balsente, Ioulia, *Les Intellectuels et la censure en URSS (1965–1985): De la vérité allégorique à l'érosion du système* (Paris: Harmattan, 2000).
- Zemskova, Elena, 'Translators in the Soviet Writer's Union: Pasternak's Translations from Georgian Poets and the Literary Process of the Mid-1930s', in Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (eds), *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2013), pp. 185–212.
- Zhirkov, G. V., 'Ot tsenzorov-professionalov k tainym tsenzoram', in G. V. Zhirkov (ed.), *U mysli stoia na chasakh... tsenzory Rossii i tsenzura* (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: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).

# Index

---

- Academia publishing house, 20–1  
Agitprop, 54, 68, 72, 86, 89  
Aldridge, James, 107, 113, 120  
All-Union Society for Cultural Relations  
with Foreign Countries (VOKS), 2,  
71, 102  
anti-Soviet attitudes, 49–50, 51, 52, 78,  
107, 109, 113, 115–16, 120, 121–4,  
155–7, 171
- Blok, Aleksandr, 20  
Bonosky, Philip, 108–9  
Braden, Ann, 109  
Brecht, Berthold, 67, 72  
Britton, Lionel, 73, 74
- Caldwell, Erskine, 10, 23, 67, 72  
*Jenny by Nature*, 130–2  
censorship  
by editors, 47–8, 53, 55–8, 60, 85,  
113–15, 122–3, 129, 130, 133–4  
by publishing houses, 54, 56  
by translators, 29–30, 34, 58–60, 106,  
122, 125, 133  
instability of, 176–7  
self-censorship, 34, 47, 58, 60  
*see also* Glavlit  
Central Committee of the CPSU, 26,  
33–4, 46, 49, 54, 56, 58, 70, 103, 104,  
105–6, 109, 158  
Chakovskii, Aleksandr, 103, 105, 106–7,  
113, 114–15, 121–2
- Chukovskii, Kornei, 17, 20, 21, 28, 30–1,  
36  
cosmopolitanism, 22–3, 70–3  
Cronin, Archibald, 109, 125
- Deiss, Jay, 108, 119  
Dickens, Charles, 26–7, 29, 103  
Dinamov, Sergei, 68–9, 157
- Ehrenburg, Il'ia, 105–6  
Erofeev, Vladimir, 105
- fascism, 71, 73, 74, 82–6, 87, 172  
Freeman, Joseph, 77–81
- Glavisskustvo, 46  
Glavlit, 8, 22, 34, 45–8, 52–3, 55–6, 59,  
85, 89, 92, 115, 132–3, 173  
*Inootdel*, 48–50  
*perechen'*, 8, 46, 51, 52–3, 56  
*spetskhran*, 50–2  
Glavrepertkom, 46, 47  
Golyshev, Viktor, 59, 157  
Gorky, Maksim, 19, 20, 72  
Gosizdat, 54  
Great Patriotic War, 49, 69–70,  
86–91  
Greene Graeme, 110, 114  
*Our Man in Havana*, 114, 115–16  
*The Quiet American*, 124–5  
Gribanov, Boris, 37–8  
Gumilev, Lev, 20

- Hemingway, Ernest, 25, 28, 58, 67, 72, 110, 121  
*Fiesta*, 93–4  
*For Whom the Bell Tolls*, 154–7, 164  
*The Old Man and the Sea*, 105
- homosexuality, 93–4, 124, 128, 142
- Hutter, Catherine, 108
- Huxley, Aldous, 71, 154, 159
- Inostrannaia literatura*, history of, 25, 102–4
- internal reviews, 107–13
- International Association of Revolutionary Writers (MORP), 21, 69, 74
- International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature (MBRL), 21
- Internatsional'naiia literatura*, history of, 21, 67–70
- intertextuality, 81, 82, 162, 163, 172
- Jews, 29, 37–8, 84, 86, 89–91, 106
- Joyce, James, 28, 67, 71, 73
- Kafka, Franz, 67, 111
- Kashkin, Ivan, 28–30, 32–3
- Kashkin translation collective, 28, 71, 93, 154, 164
- Kerouac, Jack, 110, 126–7
- King, Martin Luther, 109
- Kipling, Rudyard, 69
- Koeppen, Wolfgang, 106–7
- Kopelev, Lev, 1
- Kruger, Mariia, 160
- Krivtsova, Aleksandra, 29
- Lann, Evgenii, 29
- Library of World Literature series, 25
- Lindgren, Astrid, 38
- Linetskaia, El'ga, 37
- Literatura mirovoi revoliutsii*, 21, 69
- Literaturnyi kritik*, 22, 23
- Liubimov, Nikolai, 28
- Lunacharskii, Anatolii, 19, 21, 37
- Lungina, Lilianna, 37–9
- Mackenzie, Compton, 116–20
- Mayakovsky, Vladimir, 36, 78, 155
- Mikhalkov, Sergei, 33
- Ministry of Culture, 26, 47, 54, 56
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 31, 105
- Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, 69, 78, 84, 85
- Molotov, Viacheslav, 105–6
- Nazi Germany, 82, 84–91
- non-persons, 78–82
- Novyi mir*, 57, 70, 103, 157
- nuclear war, 116, 117–18
- October revolution, 116, 118–19, 123–4
- Orlova, Raisa, 1, 58, 104, 105, 106
- Orwell, George, 157–8  
*Animal Farm*, 160–3  
*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 157–60  
*The Road to Wigan Pier*, 157
- Panova, Vera, 129–30
- Pasternak, Boris, 35–6, 103, 142–3, 175  
 translations of Shakespeare, 143–51
- peaceful coexistence, 121, 122
- Petrov, Mikhail, 159–60
- Polikarpov, Dmitrii, 106–7
- Posev publishing house, 160
- Preston, John Hyde, 83–4, 91–3
- Radek, Karl, 71, 73–4
- Rait-Kovlaeva, Rita, 36, 114, 127, 128–9
- Remarque, Erich Maria, 114–15
- Rokotov, Timofei, 69, 72, 86
- Rolland, Romain, 2, 73, 74, 82
- Romanovich, Igor', 71
- Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), 21–2, 77
- Salinger, J. D., 10, 110, 127–30  
*samizdat*, 36, 152–64  
 of religious works, 153–4
- Sartre, Jean-Paul, 32, 111
- self-censorship *see* censorship
- Shakespeare, William, 26, 35, 68, 142  
*Hamlet*, 143–7, 151  
*Macbeth*, 147–51
- Sillitoe, Alan, 119–20
- Sinclair, Upton, 24, 73, 86–91
- socialist realism, 1, 22, 29, 73, 75, 108–10, 112, 133, 172

- Soviet–Western relations, 23–5, 102,  
120–4, 171, 172  
*Sovremennyi zapad*, 20  
Spanish Civil War, 74, 83–4, 154–7  
*spetskhran* see censorship  
Struve, Gleb, 160  
Suchkov, Boris, 69, 70  
Surkov, Aleksei, 105
- taboo, 76–7, 72, 82, 83  
translation theory, 26–30  
    formalism, 27, 35  
    literal translation, 21, 26–7, 162–3  
    realist translation, 27–30, 34  
Trauberg, Natal'ia, 34, 36, 153–4, 164  
Treasures of World Literature series, 21  
Tret'iakov, Sergei, 68–9  
Tsvetaeva, Marina, 35
- Updike, John, 57, 113  
Uris, Leon, 153, 154
- Vaillant-Couturier, Paul, 68, 74  
*Vestnik inostrannoi literatury*, 21–2  
Vsemirnaia literatura publishing house,  
19–20, 25
- Wilson, Mitchell, 120–4  
World Festival of Youth and Students,  
2–3, 102  
World War II see Great Patriotic War  
Writers' Union, 7, 22, 38, 58, 69, 104–5  
    first congress of Soviet writers, 30–1,  
    71, 73, 74  
    translators' section, 27, 28, 30–1, 33
- Zamiatin, Evgenii, 20