

Theoretical roots of the totalitarian model of mass communication

Oleg Manaev
Belarusian State University
Minsk, Bielo-Rússia

RESUMO

As bases teóricas do modelo totalitário de comunicação de massa estão contidas nas obras dos fundadores do marxismo-leninismo. O autor sintetiza as principais contribuições de Marx, Engels, Lenin, bem como dos seus continuadores soviéticos. Mesmo os trabalhos teóricos publicados após 1985 continuam essa tradição, reproduzindo falsas metas para os jornalistas profissionais. Por isso, uma condição indispensável para o desenvolvimento da "glasnost" e consequentemente para a democratização da sociedade soviética está na superação dos princípios teóricos que sustentam o conceito marxista-leninista de imprensa.

Palavras chave: Teoria da comunicação; teoria do jornalismo; marxismo-leninismo; imprensa soviética.

ABSTRACT

Theoretical basis of the totalitarian model of mass communication can be found in the works of the founders of marxism-leninism. The author summarizes the main contributions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and their followers. Even the analysis of theoretical papers written after 1985 proves that the tradition persists setting false goals for practical journalism. Defeating the marxism-leninism concept of press is therefore an essential condition for development of "glasnost", for actual democratisation of the soviet society.

Key Words: Communication theory; journalism theory; marxism-leninism; Soviet press.

RESUMEN

Los fundamentos teóricos del modelo totalitario de comunicación masiva se encuentran en las obras de los fundadores del marxismo-leninismo. El autor sintetiza las contribuciones principales de Marx, Engels, Lenin y de sus continuadores soviéticos. Hasta los textos teóricos divulgados después de 1985 siguen esa tradición, generando falsas metas para los periodistas profesionales. Por eso, la superación del concepto marxista-leninista de prensa representa condición indispensable al desarrollo de la "glasnost" y a la democratización de la sociedad soviética.

Palabras clave: Teoría de la comunicación; teoría del periodismo; marxismo-leninismo; prensa soviética.

The author of the article demonstrates that theoretical basis of the totalitarian model of mass communication can be found in the works of the founders of marxism-leninism. The works of Marx and Engels formulate within the frames of the "great attempt to rewrite history in terms of class struggle" (H. Arendt) the principles of the press activities: rigid party adherence and instrumentalism. Lenin developed and widened these principles and, in fact, defended the necessity of "de-subjectivization" (F. Hyiek) of mass communication, i.e. depriving all the participants in the process, except for the power subject, of the subjective characteristics. An analysis of the practical activities of the founders of marxism-leninism and their followers (when conducted in the conditions of possessing real power — from the Paris Commune to the Comintern Congresses) clearly shows their closeness to theory, specifically to the totalitarian model of mass communication. Further analysis of the works of soviet theorists of journalism published after April 1985 proves that the tradition persists setting false goals for practical journalists. Defeating the theoretical principles of the marxist-leninist concept of press is therefore, in the opinion of the author, an important and necessary condition for development of "glasnost", for actual democratization of the soviet society.

"Perestroika" is not rather a new notion in the political dictionary of modern times but a euphemism as the true meaning of the process which started in the Soviet Union is transition from totalitarianism to democracy. Among the most important system attributes of the totalitarian model of society the researchers list global monopolization of the political, economic, spiritual activities; "substitution" of the social theory with ideology which by its principal characteristics is similar to religion; treatment of various social institutes and the man himself as a means for achieving the main supergoal-creation of a new and better society - i.e. "de-subjectivation" of social live (when its sole subject is the power subject and power itself becomes the goal and not an instrument) [Arendt, 1990; Hyiek, 1990; Orlov, 1976; Turchin, 1977]. For decades mass media were one of the instruments ensuring the said monopolization in the soviet society; they have "absorbed" all the above mentioned properties. Their transformation from an institute of totalitarianism into an institute of democracy is therefore impossible without proper changes in the model of their functioning. For this purpose, in its turn, an analysis of the theoretical basis of the totalitarian model of mass media is required; otherwise, it remains unclear what should be abolished and what dangers should be avoided in the future.

Freedom of Press as Instrument of Class Struggle

It is known that the theoretical foundation for all the complex of social sciences (including the studies of journalism) is in this country marxism-leninism. Representatives of theses disciplines prefer at present (especially after April 1985) to find roots of the social analysis traditions (including the studies of mass communication) in "authentic" marxism-leninism, i.e. in the "early" works of Marx and "late" works of Lenin. True, in the "Notes on recent Prussian Censorship Instructions" and "Debates on Freedom of Press" Marx

demonstrates brilliant sarcasm and an amazing for a twenty years old author thoroughly argued criticism of press censorship, of the principle of non-freedom of public opinion; he proves convincingly the conclusion that “the freedom of press is in itself an incarnation of an idea, a incarnation of freedom” [Marx C., 1955b, p. 54] and that “morality itself rests on autonomy of human spirit” [Marx C., 1955a, p. 13].

Were these ideas, however, further developed in the works of Marx and Engels? Have the ideas of freedom, democracy, “autonomy of human spirit” become the basis of the social philosophy of marxism? Unfortunately, no. Not long before the death of Marx they wrote: “For nearly forty years we considered class struggle as the main moving force of history and regarded class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat as a powerful tool of the present-day social transformation” [Marx C., Engels, 1961, p. 175]. Such an interpretation of the historical process has naturally lead to the fact that freedom, democracy started to be regarded not as goals-values but as goals-means: “To take political power proletariat also needs democratic forms, but for it they are only means similarly to all other political forms. If somebody regards democracy now as purpose, he must rely on bourgeoisie and peasants, i.e. on the classes doomed to perish” [Engels F., 1965b, p. 112]¹. Following the same logics, freedom of press is transformed from a principle, incarnating the idea of freedom into a principle of political struggle. Engels writes that “the party needs first of all a political organ” [Engels F., 1965a, p. 301]. In another place he clarifies: “That is the first position where it [the party - O.M.] Can, at least in the sphere of press, wage struggle with the enemy using an equally powerful weapon” [Engels F., 1966, p. 293]

It is obvious that the attempts of certain theorists to find support in “early” works of the founders of marxism are, to put it mildly, unsuccessful. By the way, the first person to point it out, was Lenin who underlined that the early works on press “indicated transition of Marx from idealism to materialism, from revolutionary democracy to communism” [Lenin V., 1977a, p. 32]. 70 years later a well-known soviet theorist of journalism E.P. Prokhorov follows this logics in a manual for students (in the section “Freedom of Journalism under Socialism”) where he recommends to note that “the work of Marx “Debate on Freedom of Press” was written at the period when he was yet to become the ideologist of proletariat. The main attention should be paid to the works of Lenin “Party organization and Party Literature”, “How to ensure Success of Constituent Assembly” and to his letter to G. Miasnikov [Prokhorov E., 1973, pp. 56-67].

It is clear thus that already as early as in the works of Marx and Engels the principles of the press activities — rigid party adherence and instrumentalism — were formulated within the frames of the “great attempt to rewrite history in terms of class struggle” [Arendt H., 1990, p. 203]

¹ More complete and deep analysis of understanding and use of tales about freedom and democracy in marxist social philosophy was made in a splendid work by Y. Bourtin [Bourtin Y. 1989]

Total Monopoly of Press - Inevitable Result of Generalization of Party Adherence Principle

Similarly to his predecessors Lenin constantly accused bourgeois press: "Thieves, public men, venal politicians, venal newspapers. This is our "big press" [Lenin V., 1976c, p. 8]. He did not limit himself to characterizing the phenomenon, but tried to expose its nature - the place of press in the political and socio-economic system of the society: "Freedom of press" is a deception until the best printing houses and the largest stocks of paper belong to capitalists, until the power of capital controls press" [Lenin V., 1977f, p. 495]. In addition to criticism, Lenin developed in detail the system of positive principles of the press activities or, using the modern language, the model of mass communication in the new society. Lenin's definition of press as "not only a collective organizer" [Lenin V., 1976q, p. 11] is well known; it was later used for building the system of functions of socialist press. The above formula hints already ("but also...") that the organizing, controlling function is given special importance. Later Lenin indicated directly that all other functions are subordinate: "All the propaganda (of communism — O.M.) must be oriented so as concentrate on practical control over creation of the state" [Lenin V., 1976 h, p. 408]. It should be noted that such an accent on the organizing and controlling function of press has a double meaning: on the one hand, a newspaper organizes social life — but in order to do this efficiently, it must be someone's organ. Whose? No doubts are left in the well known article "Party organization and Party Literature": "Literary work (journalism is meant here - O.M.) must become part of the common proletariat cause, "a wheel and screw" of one and single great social-democratic mechanism... Newspapers must become organs of different party organizations. Writers must become members of party organizations" [Lenin V., 1976b, p. 102].

The meaning of these statements is more than obvious. Sometimes attempts are made to "soften" it by indications that the author, first, acted in a hostile environment and, second, did not mean usually general press but party press ("we speak of party literature and its control by the party" [Lenin V, 1976b, p. 102]; it was also stated: "Do not worry, gentlemen!... There must be full freedom of word and press" [Lenin V., 1976b, p. 102]. Analysis indicates, however, that neither of the above indications has historical proofs. The article cited, appeared in November 1905 after the well known zsar manifest and was published in the legal bolshevist newspaper "Novaja Zhiznj" edited by Lenin himself after his return to Petersburg from emigration. As noted by the composers of the Lenin complete works "the editorial office was used also for the party meetings and discussions. The number of the newspaper copies printed daily reached up to 80 thousand (an extremely large number for that period of time - O.M.)" [Lenin V., 1976d, p. 497]. As far as the question of limiting the party adherence principle to party itself is concerned, it should be discussed in more detail because of its importance.

When considering the problem of the freedom of press in the article "How to Ensure Success of Constituent Assembly" published two months before the October revolution (also, by the way, in a legal bolshevist newspaper) Lenin

repeats again that “in fact this is not freedom of press but freedom of deception of the suppressed and exploited masses” and then asks: “Is it possible to struggle against this obvious evil and how can it be fought?”. He replies himself: first, “there is one simple, excellent and lawful way which I pointed out long ago... (underlined by O.M.) - state monopoly for private advertizing in the newspapers” and, second, “state power in the form of the Soviets takes all the printing houses and all the paper and distribute it justly: primarily to the state and in the interests of the majority of people...” [Lenin V., 1977b, pp. 210-212]. It is obvious that the recommendation follows classic marxist approach: introducing a monopoly for material and technical support of press.

Lenin’s concept of the freedom of press, of its party adherence, of its place in the socio-economic and political system of the society, has been developed to its logical end in the “Letter to Miasnikov” written in August 1921 (in the period of the New Economic Policy, i.e. this is “late” Lenin). In order to reject the slogan of Miasnikov “Freedom of press for monarchists to anarchists inclusive” Lenin uses a system of arguments based on the class approach and known from the already cited works of Marx and Engels: “let us see, what kind of the freedom of press, for what purpose?,. for which class?” [Lenin V., 1977i, p. 79]. The party adherence principle is the described in such an explicit and clear manner, that it is very difficult to interpret it from “different viewpoints”: “We do not believe in “absolute” things. We laugh over “pure democracy”... Bourgeoisie (all over the world) is still much stronger then ourselves. To give it in addition such a weapon as freedom of political organization (or freedom of press, as press is the center and basis of political organization) means to facilitate hostile activities, to help the class enemy. We do not want to commit suicide and therefore are not going to do it” [Lenin V., 1977i, p. 80]. It is amazing that the author cannot imagine that freedom of press can be regarded as different from “freedom of political organization” and press itself can be anything different but “weapon in class struggle”. Lenin continues then to comment the thought of G. Miasnikov who stated that “we have a lot of disgraceful things and abuses — free press would expose them”: “how could you degrade abandoning the general class approach and using instead a sentimental narrow-minded assessment? (i.e. human one - O.M.)” [Lenin V., 1977i, p. 81]. His surprise is convincingly genuine. It is very important to note what Lenin suggests to use as a substitute of free press: “Why should we be afraid of “hard” work (fighting abuses in the Central control committee, in party press, in “Pravda”? [Lenin v., 1977i, p. 82] — it is thus proposed to act within the party and state monopoly for press.

As soon as the party gets power the principle of party adherence is thus inevitably generalized and moves outside the frames of the party itself.² And as mass information penetrates all the social structures and spheres of activities, its monopolization logically leads to totalitarian society; mass media are turned from an institute of democracy into an institute of totalitarianism. A number of

² Only canonic (i.e. widely spread and officially recognized) Lenin texts are considered here. Non-canonic texts show still more open and absolutely cynical position. See, for instance, Annenkov J., 1990.

researchers maintain that development of a totalitarian propaganda apparatus becomes in itself one of the system indicators of the totalitarian model of society: the result seems to be turned into the cause [Orlov J., 1976, p. 280].

This conclusion was formulated in the West both in fiction [Orwell J., 1989] and in scientific works [Lendvai P., 1982] long ago, but it is still contested by many soviet theorists of propaganda; the counterarguments used are found in the same works of the founders of marxism-leninism. As already noted, their works really give grounds for that. In order to decide who is right in interpreting the marxist-leninist concept of press one should address practice which, as indicated by its founders themselves, is the best criterium of truth.

Logics of Totalitarian Model:

Communication - Propaganda - Control - Violence

We think that political and journalist proper activities performed not against, but in conformity with actual reality, can be considered as practice that has fully and adequately embodied the principles of the said concept. In other words, this is a situation when the theorists themselves have actual possibility to implement them fully and adequately, i.e. when they have power. From this point of view it is definitely an incorrect experiment to use as the criterium of truth of the said concept the political and journalist activities of Marx and Engels in the period of, for example, the "New Rhein Gazette" or the "Social-Democrat" (which is done usually). The only period when people supporting many ideas of marxism were in power while its founders were still alive was the Paris Commune; its "worldwide historical significance" was many times noted by Marx and Engels ("Look at the Paris Commune. It was a dictatorship of proletariat" [Engels F., 1962b, p. 201]. It is well known that initially the national guard confiscated or banned certain publications, then the Commune adopted a special decree making the military tribunal responsible for persecuting the newspaper editors and printing house owners for counter-revolutionary publications. In order to better understand and assess this precedent (the first in the history of communist movement) of using class approach in the sphere of press or, using the modern language, of "party management of press" let us remember how its founders regarded the political conditions of their activities in the period of the "New Rhein Gazette": "In the Rhein we had unconditional (underlined by O.M.) freedom of press and used this freedom to the last possibility" [Engels F., 1962a, p. 17]. It was said about the period of time when young Marx sharply criticized the activities of the top bodies of legislative and executive power in the sphere of press ("Freedom of press — and gallows nearby!") [Marx C., 1955a, p. 13].

The history of realization of the marxist-leninist concept of press after October 25, 1917 is still more impressive (already not a precedent); it ended "the accursed period of circumstantial talk, literary slavery, slave language, ideological serfdom" [Lenin V., 1976b, p. 100]. On the next day after power was taken, a decree of the Military Revolutionary Committee closed a handful of bourgeois newspapers — "Rechj", "Denj" etc. On October 27 the Sovnarkom adopted a Decree on Press (the third one after the Decree on Peace and Decree on Land);

its opening section stated: "As soon as new order becomes established, any administrative control of press will be stopped; it will have full freedom within the limits of legal responsibilities in accordance with the widest and most progressive laws" (Decrees., 1957, Vol. 1, p. 24). On November 4 at a meeting of Central Executive Committee devoted to discussion of the question of press well known bolshevik Avanesov, proposing the resolution on behalf of bolshevik fraction, said that "current revolution doesn't stop before violation the right on private property, the question about press should be considered from the same point of view". Trotzky supported the resolution fully and added that "attitude of socialists to press freedom should be as well as to freedom of trade. Creating Russian democracy demands liquidation of property pressure over the press as well as property pressure over the person". Summarizing this discussion Lenin stated very plainly: "Were said before that we would close bourgeois newspapers if we take power. To tolerate existence of these newspapers means to cease being a socialist. It's impossible to exclude question about press freedom from question of class struggle. We promised to close newspapers and we shall do it. The great majority support us" (Free speech can't be terrible to democracy, pp. 225-227). The resolution however hasn't persuaded everybody: nearly 40 percent of the Committee members (and not only left SR's but some bolsheviks as well) voted against support Sovnarkom policy in the sphere of press. Moreover, after this decision left SR's decided to recall their representatives from all institutions of Soviet power (ibid).

It was soon discovered that "administrative control of press" accomplished through the Commissariat on Press was not sufficient; in January 1918 (when it became clear that "ensuring success of the Constituent Assembly" was impossible a special decree of the Sovnarcom established the Revolutionary Press tribunal that could "imprison the guilty". Leaving aside the "criminal" offenses we list below the results of the "administrative measures" only of these establishments. In October 1917 (i.e. during 5 days) 33 bourgeois and 4 petty-bourgeois newspapers were closed for the first time, then:

in November	22	and	10
in December	20	and	3
in January	16	and	13
in February	13	and	14
in March	3	and	12
in April	13	and	27

(Fedotov M. 1990, p. 185).

It should specially be noted that of more than 200 newspapers closed within half a year 40 percent were so called "petty-bourgeois", menshevik or of the SR party, i.e. they were newspapers of the socialist (though not bolshevik) direction. Moreover in October each tenth closed newspaper was a "petty-bourgeois" one, in April two thirds belonged to that category!

One should not believe, however, that such "administrative measures" were caused by ideological and political reasons only; there were also much

more prosaic (though not less important) consideration - after October the material needs of bolshevik press were met by using property of the closed counter-revolutionary newspapers [Bereznoj A., 1989, p.42]. As stated by the founders of marxism, those controlling the production means are generally subordinated to the ruling class" [Marx C., Engels F., 1955 c, p. 46] While constantly introducing the "negative" (i. e. by prohibitions, confiscations etc.) and in the "positive" way. The Decree on Press was followed by a Decree of the Sovnarkom giving monopoly for publication of all advertisements (and, therefore, for the sources of financing) to the bolshevik press solely. Gradually all the printing houses and paper factories were nationalized. In the conditions of NEP when partial freedom of business activities led to revival of private publishing houses the question of the material-and-technical basis of press was raised by Lenin again: with concern he orders the Sovnarkom manager N.P. Gourbunov to check "on the basis of which laws and regulations more than 143 private publishing houses were registered in Moscow,... Who was responsible for it?" And to discuss "secretly the control of the matter by the Law Commissariat and CheKa" [Lenin v., 1978, pp. 155-156]. Such measures enable modern students of the history of soviet press to state quite objectively and with pride that "the material basis of the press of the new order was therefore created in a quite different manner as compared to any other society" [Bereznoj A., 1989, p. 59]. It should be remarked, however, that contemporaries regarded them quite differently. The world famous Russian scientist and humanist V.N. Vernadsky wrote in his diary: "The decision of bolsheviks on freedom of press is amazing in its cynicism. It is incredible" [Vernadsky V., 1990, p. 14] The criteria of assessment get changed, as we see; this is also one of the results of introducing into practice the marxist-leninist concept of press.

Especially noteworthy is change of the bolsheviks' attitude (after they came into power) to the role and functions of censorship which they had ruthlessly criticized before. As early as in January 1918 the Petrograd Soviet orders all the publisher to send to the Commissariat on Press 5 copies of each publication as soon as it goes on sale. The Commissariat was given the right to close and confiscate publications with further consideration of the matter by the Revolutionary Press Tribunal. Since 1919 each temporary instruction of the Gosizdat Tribunal (which controlled all the literary, publishing, publishing, agitation-and-propaganda activities in the country) 'carried a rule that any manuscript could be sent to printers only on permission of the Gosizdat or its local branches, i.e. post-publication censorship was actually replaced with pre-publication one. The rule also applied to the production of private (independent from the state) publishing houses as specially provided for by the Sovnarkom Decree of December 12, 1921. A special decision of the Soviet government dated June 6, 1922 created Glavlit; pre-publication censorship was thus established constantly widened their functions and the sphere of activities. First, as noted by soviet politologist M.A. Fedotov, the number of publications, subjected to censorship permanently increased. So, for instance, party press was initially free of censorship; it became also covered by censorship when the Rules of Glavlit were adopted in 1931. Later emblems, labels, badges were added. Second, the volume of information to be covered by censorship also

widened. For example, initially it was prohibited to publish and distribute works “containing propaganda against the Soviet power”, later “the sharpest points (facts, figures etc.) criticizing the Soviet power and the Communist party” were cut out. Third, new and new tasks were assigned to Glavlit. In June 1924 all the press was informed that any changes in the composition of the editorial boards and replacements of editors had to be cleared by Glavlit beforehand; failure to follow the requirement meant closure of the publication. As of 1930 prior authorization of Glavlit was required for opening new regional, district and local newspapers. Work of the Glavlit personnel was paid for by the publishing houses where they acted; in other words, the press was censored and was also made to pay for the censorship [Fedotov. M. 1990].

Realization of the marxist-leninist concept of press in the international activities of the bolsheviks is also worth attention. When preparing in 1920 the “Conditions for Entering the Communist International” for the 2nd Congress of Comintern Lenin put forward as the necessary requirement subordination of the press and publishing houses to the central committee of a party. He thought it absolutely unacceptable that “publishing houses misuse their autonomy for conducting policy not quite coinciding with that of the party [Lenin V., 1977g, p. 209]. Paragraph 17 of the resolution on the “Conditions” stated: “Legal press (newspapers, publishing houses) must be totally and unconditionally subordinated to the party as a whole and to its central committee. No concessions in this respect are permissible” [Second Congress of Comintern, 1934, p. 489]. It was underlined in the section “Press” of the resolution of the 4th Congress of Comintern [1922] on situation in the Czechoslovakian party: “Even if an editorial board thinks, that a responsible body of the party has made a mistake in a certain particular case, it is its duty to obey the decision taken” [Bereznoj A., 1989, p. 181]. The 5th Congress of Comintern that took place in summer 1924 considered bolshevization of the press as one of the most important tasks of the communist parties, as without it, bolshevization of the parties was not possible [Bereznoj A., 1989, p. 84]. It is thus clear that the basic principles of the marxist-leninist concept of press were not really explained by the actual historical circumstances but were considered by their authors as having universal and necessary character.

Therefore analysis of the practice of the founders of marxism-leninism in the sphere of press (when accomplished in the conditions of having real power) clearly shows its correspondence to the theory, i.e. to the totalitarian model of mass communication. It is thus impossible to disagree with those soviet students of journalism who write what they think “without corrections for the perestroika” and whose opinion is based on actual facts: “The theory of marxism-leninism encompasses the views of its founders on press. They are based on theory and were introduced into practice” [Bereznoj A., 1989, p. 1;59]. It is true that the class approach limits all the variety of social subjects to a sole progressive one (one class, one party, one leader...) thus giving it universal power. The monopoly of “subject” inevitably leads towards ideology and practice of total social control (“socialism is first of all accounting and control” as defined by Lenin in a well-known statement [Lenin V., 1977d, p. 199]; to achieve it “power resting directly on violence and not bound by any laws” [Lenin V., ; 1977e, p.

245] is required. Though there is seemingly large distance between the said theoretical provisions and the results of their implementation into social practice, they are logically interrelated and can be considered as cause and consequence. The logics which interpret communication as propaganda, propaganda as control, control as suppression including coercion inevitably "press away" (both in theory and practice) the statements that "...there will be full freedom within legal responsibilities in accordance with the widest and most progressive laws"; in the best case these are just good intentions. Holder of the Nobel prize F. Hyiek notes: "The famous question "Who wins?" which reflected in the first years of the soviet power the main problem faced by the socialist society cannot be limited to the simple dilemma of irreconcilable struggle for power... It encompasses in the most concise form the question of principal importance as to who will be the subject and who will be the object (underlined by O.M.) Of actions which determine the life of each person under socialism [Hyiek F., 1990, p. 107]. Press and then other mass media that from the beginning were considered by the founders of marxism-leninism as means or tools of party politics become by definition the instrument of such an objectivation (i.e. deprivation of the subject qualities) of all the social subjects that oppose or do not coincide with the party power. In our view that is the essence of the totalitarian model of mass communication: with a certain overstatement it can be said that mass communication just does not exist in the socialist society as the process cannot be of a monosubject nature.

Continuity of Theoretical Traditions

Though the notion of "totalitarianism" was not part of the system of concepts of the founders of marxism-leninism (as the phenomenon itself did not exist), it has been to a considerable degree, justified in their theories as demonstrated an analysis of the concept of press. Therefore revival of mass communication as a process of interrelation between freely and actively acting social subjects, is impossible without rejecting the theoretical principles realized in practice. It should be recognized however, that it is an extremely difficult task for the social science to reconsider theoretical foundations in the conditions when they are (in full compliance with the content) "in the blood" of mass communication of the soviet society (i.e. they are embodied both in the appropriate social institutions and in the public conscience); meeting this objective depends mostly on changing the world outlook of the scientists, than on bringing new facts to the scientists' attention (as noted on this matter by A. Zinoviev, "It is easier for an ideologically brainwashed man to live in the soviet society" [Zinoviev A., 1980, p. 150]). We shall not discuss here further development and application of these theoretical principles in the period of 30s - 70s. They are well known from numerous party and state decisions and from works of such ideologists as I. Stalin, A. Zhdanov, M. Suslov, E. Ligachev and others (even the reformist N. Khrushchev called journalists "assistants of the party"); it is more useful to see how these fundamentals are reflected in the works of soviet theorists of journalism after April 1985.

The well known soviet student of the history of press A.f. Berezhnoj writes: "Adherence to the Communist party, class approach to the phenomena of social life are the main and most important principles of our scientific methods. They are especially important and should be strictly followed in the science of journalism, in the science of the most powerful and long-range weapon of the Communist party" [Berezhnoj A., 1989, p. 173]. One can argue that this is only one and not the latest opinion in a large chorus of present-day theorists of journalism. The author of a manual prepared at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee state: "The historical experience shows that only constant purposeful control by a marxist party ensures purity and stability of the class position of mass median. The power of their influence over the process of social development depends to a great extent on the ability of the party committees to make full use of the available possibilities of ideological pressure" [Party Control..., 1987, p. 35]. It can be argued that the manual is meant for the system of party members education or, so to say, for internal use. "Introduction into Journalism" recommended as a manual for the students of colleges studying the profession "journalism" states: "If the activities of a newspaper are directed against the Soviet power, against the cause of the Communist party, it cannot be considered a lawful and legally free organ as it opposes the historical necessity to struggle for social progress" [Prokhorov E., 988, p. 73]. We see again that the party adherence principle gets inevitably generalized, its application acquires total character. The traditional theory of journalism developed in this country mainly by historians and philologists has become recently enriched by politological studies which add new bold viewpoints, new methods of analysis, new system of notions. The deepest and most original study of this kind is, perhaps, the dissertation of M.A. Fedotov already cited above (in 1992 he became minister of press and information in the new government of Russia). However, the author also states that "the marxist-leninist concept of the freedom of press in the socialist society embodies the idea of independence of press" [Fedotov M., 1989, pp. 67-71]; to prove that ten principles of the said concept are formulated - most of them are based on the same statements by Marx, Engels and Lenin that we have considered in this article! An example of such a work is also a book by T.H. Minnibaev, "Transforming Journalism". However, while describing the perverted nature of interrelations between mass media and the power bodies in the modern soviet society, the author makes an amazing conclusion: "In the conditions of a single-party system mass media could play an alternative role functioning as healthy opposition preventing political obesity and degradation" [Minnibaev T., 199, p. 29]. It is not clear how mass media can become an alternative for the party politics while they are one of the system-formation factors of that monopoly, when they have neither political nor economic basis for independence - which is the first and necessary condition for any kind of "opposition"? The XXXIIIth Congress of the CPSU (the last congress before August coup) made a very clear statement on this subject in a special resolution "On the Attitude Towards Mass Media" where it underlined: "The attempts of certain journalists who consider themselves party members (and the overwhelming majority of the member of the nearly 90-thousand USSR Union of

Journalists were also members of the party - O.M.) to transform party publications into a weapon of the forces opposing the CPSU are impermissible... The congress rejects the demands to deprive the party of its printing base" [Materials..., 1990, p. 177-178] Here the ruling party demonstrated with cynical openness continuity of the above described theory and practice and indicated without mistake their most important aspects: total ideological (through the contents of the reports), political (through the contents of the reports), political (through the journalists) and economic (through the material and-technical base) control over mass media.

Even the above concise review demonstrates that the traditions of theoretical substantiation of the totalitarian model of mass communications are not terminated till now. It is definitely possible to name scientists (such as A. Zinoviev, V. Chalidze, V. Turchin, B. Shragin, Y. Orlov and some others) who proposed and defended quite different assessments of the marxist-leninist theory including the propaganda and press aspects [Zinoviev A., 1981]; Chalidze V., 1983; Turchin V., 1977; Shragin B., 1977; Orlov Y., 1976] but, unfortunately, their scientific works are outside our social science (and the scientists themselves are outside the country); they had no considerable influence on its development.

As far as the practice of mass communication in the post-April period is concerned, the analysis of the present-day position of mass media in the political and economic system of the soviet society permits to determine their role in the process of transition from totalitarianism to democracy as being an ambivalent one. The activities of new social subjects (parties, public movements, associations, cooperatives etc.) begin to ruin the totalitarian system: in particular, this has lead to the creation of alternative mass media signifying transition to a new model of mass communication [Manaev O, 1991] - After the "Law on Press and Other Media" entered into force, and especially after failure of August coup and collaps of the USSR, the process of media transformation from the institution of totalitarianism into an institution of democracy has definitely accelerated. However, the political and economic system of the society has remained basically the same (the monopoly of the State for power and property remains, though its forms do change); the process therefore is reversible. It will only become irreversible when political, ideological and economic base for a pluralistic model of development of mass communication and the society as a whole is formed.

REFERENCES

- Annenkov Y. (1990) "From Memoirs", *Rodnik*, 9:46-51, Riga.
- Arendt H. (1990) "Origins of Totalitarianism", *Inostrannaja Literatura*, 4:202-207.
- Bereznoj A. (1989). *Leninist Journalism: Certain Questions of Theory and Facts of History*. Leningrad: Lenizdat.
- Bourtin Y. (1989). "Achilles" Heel of the Historic Theory of Marx". *Oktiabrij*, 11:3-41; 12:3-39.
- Chalidze V. (1983). *Future of Russia. Hierarchical Analysis*. Chalidze Publications, N.Y.

- Deures of Soviet Power (1957). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Engels F. (1962a). "Marx and "New Rhein Gazette"(1848-1849)" Complete Works. Vol. 21. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Engels F. (1962b). "Introduction to the Work of C. Marx "Civil War in France". Ibid. Vol. 22.
- Engels F. (1965a). "Letter to August Bebel". Ibid. Vol. 34.
- Engels F. (1965b). "Letter to Eduard Bernstein". Ibid, Vol. 36.
- Engels F. (1966). "Letter to Victor Adler". Ibid. Vol. 39.
- Fedotov M. (1989). Mass Communication Media as an Institute of Socialist Democracy. Dissertation, Doctor of Law. Moscow: Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Fedotov M. (1990). "Was "New Karphagen" Destroyed?" Political Institutions and Renewal of Society. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 186-194.
- Hyiek F. (1990). "Way to Slavery", Freedman and Hyiek on Freedom. Minsk: Polifact.
- Lendvai, P. (1982). The Bureaucracy of Truth. How Communist Governments Manage the News. London: Burnett Books.
- Lenin V. (1976a). "What to Begin With?" Complete Works. Vol. 5. Mosacow: Politizdat.
- Lenin V. (1976b). "Party Organization and Party Literature". Ibid. Vol. 12.
- Lenin V. (1976c). "Capitalism and Press". Ibid. Vol. 25.
- Lenin V. (1976d). "Notes". Ibid. Vol. 25.
- Lenin V. (1977a). "Carl Marx". Ibid. Vol. 26.
- Lenin V. (1977b). "How to Ensure Success of Constituent Assembly?" (On Freedom of Press). Ibid. Vol. 34.
- Lenin V. (1977c). "Speech on the Question of Press. Meeting of VTSIK on November 4, 1917". Ibid., Vol. 35.
- Lenin V. (1977d). "Hov to Organize Competition?" Ibid. Vol. 35.
- Lenin V. (1977e). "Proletariat Revolution and Renegade Kautsky". Ibid. Vol. 37.
- Lenin V. (1977f). "Ist Congress of Comintern". Ibid. Vol. 37.
- Lenin V. (1977g). "Notes for the IInd Congress of Comintern". Ibid. Vol. 41.
- Lenin V. (1977h). "Speech at All-Russia Meeting of Politprosvet Bodies". Ibid. Vol. 41.
- L:enin V. (1977i). "Letter to Miasnikov". Ibid. Vol. 44.
- Lenin V. (1977j). "Notes". Ibid. Vol. 35.
- Lenin V. (1978). "Letter to N.P. Gorbunov". Ibid. Vol. 55.
- Manaev O. (1991). "Etabliert und alternative Presse in der Sowietunion unter den Bedinguggen der Perestroika", Media Perspectives, 2:207-222.
- Marx C. (1955a). "Notes on the Newest Prussian Censorship Instructions". Complet Works. Vol. 1. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Marx C. (1955b). "Debates on Freedom of Press". Ibid. Vol. 1.
- Marx C., Engls F. (1955c). "German: Ideology". Ibid. Vol. 3.
- Marx C., Engels F. (1961). "Circular to A. Bebel. V. Libkhneht, V. Brakke and others". Ibid. Vol. 19.

- Materials of the XXXIIIth Congress of CPSU (1990). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Minnibaev T. (1990). "Transforming Journalism. Press as Subject of Political Creation". Kazanj: Kazanj University Press.
- Orlov J. (1976). "Is Socialism of Non-Totalitarian Type Possible?". Selfconsciousness. N.Y.: Chronika Publishing House.
- Oruell J. (1989). "1984", Novyj Mir. 2:36-85; 3:29-71; 4:52-93.
- Party, Management of Mass Media (1987). Moscow: Myslj.
- Prokhorov E. (1973). Basics of Marxist-Leninist Theory of Journalism. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
- Prokhorov E. (1988). Introduction into Journalism. Moscow: Vusshaja Shkola.
- Second Congress of Comintern (1934). Moscow Sotzegiz.
- Shragin B. (1977), Spiritual Opposition. London: Overseas Publications International Ltda.
- Turchin V. (1977). Inertia of Fright. N.Y.: "Chronika" Publishing House.
- Vernadsky v. (1990). "From October-November 1917 Diary". Ogoniok, 49:11-15.
- Zinoviev A. (1981). "Soviet Way of Life" We and Hu West Lozana.
- "Free speech can't be terrible to democracy", Druzhiba narodov (Peoples' friendship), 1991, n. 11, pp. 211-257.

ABSTRACT

1. O PAPEL DOS CURSOS DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO NA SISTEMATIZAÇÃO DA PESQUISA NA UNIVERSIDADE BRASILEIRA

RESUMEN

Análisis retrospectivo de la investigación de la comunicación en los cursos de posgrado mantenidos por las universidades brasileñas. Perfil de esos programas de posgrado y de sus líneas de investigación. El rol de Intercom para el desarrollo de la investigación brasileña de la comunicación. Evaluación de las tendencias de la investigación comunicacional y de los retos nacionales para su consolidación.

Uma análise retrospectiva da pesquisa de comunicação em cursos de pós-graduação para seus quadros professores visitantes estrangeiros. "Esses movimentos científicos contribuirão não só para que a USP conhecesse o nacionalismo na formação de toda uma geração de pesquisadores, como também desencadeasse o processo do ensino da ciência nas universidades" (1). A Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, por meio do Instituto de Biofísica. E a Universidade Federal de Viçosa,