

CHAPTER III

THE PRESS

THE condition of the Russian Press is conspicuously illustrative of the transition period through which the Empire is now passing. The Press is not free. It is

The Press. still subjected to a variety of harassing restrictions. But it is freer than it was eight or nine years ago. Words that in 1904 were rigorously banned by the censor are now in daily use in newspapers of all shades. Opinions that until recently were regarded as seditious have now become mere unexciting commonplaces in the articles of hack journalists. Public criticism of the Administration is now permitted within certain limits. The discussion of home and foreign politics is conducted in the capitals with a latitude that renders possible a tolerably adequate statement of the pros and cons. Public opinion does now find expression to a considerable degree in the Press. There are risks, it is true. A responsible journalist must have a very keen perception of what is and what is not likely to bring down on his paper severe penalties from the authorities. But it is no longer necessary—in the capitals at least—to resort, as in old days, to innuendo or to quaint paraphrase in order to describe events that are of everyday occurrence in Western Europe. In 1904, for instance, it was considered a very daring feat when a Liberal paper in humorous verse described the approach of a railway train bringing a lady named “Ko,” which, as the readers were supposed to understand, meant “Constitution.” The word constitution is now reiterated a hundred times daily in various Russian organs and arouses no emotion whatever, except one of vague disappointment.

The position of the Russian Press has undergone many changes during the turmoil of the last few years. Until October, 1905, the preventive censorship was in force.

Every number of a newspaper had to be submitted to a censor before publication, and the number could only be issued after the censor had erased whatever seemed to him objectionable. The opinion of the authorities constantly varies as to the limits of the permissible. A wide range of questions of burning interest might at any moment be declared unsuitable for treatment in the Press. Editors spent the midnight hours in tedious bargaining with censors over words and phrases. Sometimes the dispute would extend to more general topics, and the censors themselves would often unexpectedly express radical views. One night, in 1905, a tired and yawning editor was astonished to hear his censor—who happened to be particularly meticulous in his criticism—declare himself a Tolstoyan.

To evade the censor's red pencil skilful circumlocution was necessary. The phrase "legal order" did duty for "constitutional government." The words "socialism" and "socialist" were banned, but "Marxism" and "Marxist" **were often allowed to pass.** Opinions that could be freely expressed in a book of over 300 pages were sternly prohibited in newspapers. It was difficult for a press opposed to the bureaucracy to exist at all. That certain Liberal organs were allowed to exist was a concession to that modern spirit **which the bureaucracy could not wholly ignore.** And the appearance of several new Liberal organs in 1904 and 1905 was in itself an indication that the war and the internal unrest of those years had opened the eyes of the Government to the necessity of making concessions to public opinion. The growth of the Liberal Press, in fact, ran parallel with the steady multiplication of Government promises of reforms.

The Constitutional Manifesto of October 30, 1905, proclaimed the principle of liberty of the Press. For forty days—from November 4 till December 15—the Press did actually enjoy complete liberty. Editors simply ignored the censors, and no one interfered with them. Opinions of every kind were expressed with absolute freedom, and in the strongest

language. A large number of new organs—mostly of a socialistic character—appeared, and views that it had been until then possible to express only in revolutionary organs published abroad and smuggled across the frontier were enunciated with great force and emphasis in organs like the Social Democratic *Novaia Zhizn* that were sold daily in hundreds by elated newsboys on the Nevsky Prospect. Restrictive regulations were published on December 7, and again in March, and from the beginning of December onwards papers were constantly confiscated or suspended. But in spite of this renewal of administrative rigour, the Press continued to display great boldness. Newspapers were widely and eagerly read. New organs sprang up like mushrooms. Hundreds of educated and half-educated men and women flocked into journalism. The period from October, 1905, until the dissolution of the first Duma in June, 1906, was the hey-day of the Russian Press. In comparison with the liberty enjoyed then, the present state of the Press seems like a return to bondage. It is liberty only if compared with the pre-constitutional period.

If the position of the Press were determined only by the Provisional Regulations published in December, 1905, and March, 1906, Russian journalists would have comparatively little to complain of. The preventive censorship is abolished, Censors still exist, however, under another name. They are now called Press Inspectors, and Censorship Committees are known as Committees for the Affairs of the Press. The Censorship on foreign books and papers is maintained, and English, French, and German papers are still delivered with whole articles or illustrations blacked out, though this occurs less frequently than formerly, and the measure is now, as a rule, applied only to articles referring to the Imperial Family. But the permission of the authorities is not necessary, as it once was, in order to begin publishing a newspaper. All that is requisite is to make a formal notification. Separate numbers of newspapers may be confiscated on the order of

the Press department, but the grounds of confiscation must be investigated by a court of law, which must either confirm the confiscation and impose a penalty on the editor for the offending article, or must acquit the editor and rescind the confiscation. That is to say, Press offences are placed in a line with other offences, and the final decision in regard to them rests, theoretically, not with the censor but with the Law Courts.

Under such conditions the lot of the Russian journalist might be almost a happy one but for two facts. The first is that the Courts have, during the last few years, been extremely severe in their treatment of Press offences. For articles, words, or phrases that displease the Administration, editors are prosecuted under certain very rigorous paragraphs of the Criminal Code, conviction under which involves long terms of imprisonment or exile. Hundreds of Russian journalists have served, or are serving, terms of imprisonment in a fortress for articles that could only by a stretch of the imagination be described as seditious. The term "sedition" has been expanded in judicial practice so as to cover any expression of opinion or emotion that is distasteful to the Government or to individual representatives of the Administration. The Courts are constantly occupied with so-called "literary cases." When the more urgent cases had been disposed of, the Press Department went back to 1906 and 1905 and prosecuted unfortunate journalists for articles that had long since been forgotten by everyone including the authors themselves. This class of cases was, fortunately, expunged from the Court lists by the Amnesty, promulgated on the occasion of the Romanov tercentenary in February, 1913.

The second fact, which imposes a most appreciable restriction on the liberty of the Press, is the existence of the exceptional laws. That is to say, since the dissolution of the second Duma a very large portion of the Empire has been either under martial law, or one of the milder forms of the state of siege—of later years most frequently under the

form known as the state of enforced protection. Under these conditions the discretionary power of administrative officials, of governors-general, governors, and chiefs of police is very greatly increased. They may issue what are known as "Obligatory Regulations," and severely punish by fine, exile, or imprisonment all whom they regard as offenders against these regulations without recourse to a Court of Law. In many places the state of enforced protection is still maintained, long after every semblance of revolutionary danger is past, with the sole object of retaining rigorous administrative control over the Press. At the pleasure of prefects, governors, and chiefs of police, editors may be subjected to severe penalties, and the very publication of a newspaper rendered impossible. The practice of closing or suspending newspapers has been to a great extent abandoned, because it was discovered that such measures were made ineffective by the simple expedient of continuing to publish the same paper under another name. In consequence of repeated suspensions during 1906 and 1907, the number of possible titles of Russian newspapers was almost exhausted, so that to discover a title for a new paper now involves a heavy tax on originality. The Administration has found a much more **effective method of control**. It imposes fines which gradually wear down the capital of a newspaper and tend to make journalism an unprofitable enterprise. The imprisonment of the editor is offered as an alternative to a fine, and the poorer provincial papers frequently prefer this form of penalty to direct financial loss. But the practice of imprisoning editors has again led to a curious method of defence. The person who is liable to imprisonment is the so-called "responsible editor," whose name appears at the end of the paper. For this reason, as a rule, the actual working editor remains in the background, and the paper is signed by a person specially employed for the purpose, and known as the "sitting editor." A Liberal paper that commenced publication in St. Petersburg in 1912 broke with the custom, the

actual editor came into the open and signed as responsible editor. One night, in revising the proofs of an article attacking a certain police official named Colonel Halle, he struck out the name Halle as a precaution against possible penalties. When the article appeared, the Press Department took the word "colonel" as referring to a more exalted personage, and by administrative order the editor was sentenced to three months' imprisonment without the option of a fine. The proprietors took the lesson to heart, and engaged as responsible editor a long-bearded, impecunious peasant at a salary of five pounds a month while at liberty, and half as much again while in gaol.

The newspapers in the capitals maintain a fairly tolerable existence in spite of occasional fines and the constant prosecution of responsible editors. There is a very wide range of subjects now in regard to which free discussion is entirely permissible, and the fact that the whole extent of Imperial Policy is publicly discussed in the Duma makes it impossible to carry restrictions on the metropolitan Press to an extreme. The case of the provincial Press is infinitely worse. In the small provincial towns where the officials have little to do, everybody knows everybody, and there are all kinds of petty intrigues and personal accounts to settle, journalists are wholly at the mercy of governors and other officials armed with discretionary powers. The treatment of the provincial Press supplies an inexhaustible fund of curious anecdotes. One day, in 1906, the *Viatsky Krai*, in Viatka, failed to appear, because the governor had expelled from the town every member of the staff. A newspaper in Kherson was fined for publishing a telegram of the official Telegraph Agency reporting a speech of Sir Francis Younghusband's on Tibetan affairs. A governor of Tambov, M. Muratov, drew up a list of newspapers under three heads, "desirable," "undesirable," and "absolutely intolerable," and closed public libraries and dismissed elementary school teachers who subscribed to organs of the latter two categories. Printing works are frequently

closed so as to prevent the publication of a newspaper. The only printing works in the town of Kozlov, for instance, were closed three times so as to make it impossible to publish a little paper called the *Kozlovskaja Gazeta*. To evade such measures several papers intended for the town of Kaluga were printed in Moscow, which is only a few hours distant. The Administration constantly prohibits reference to certain facts in the Press. It has been forbidden, for instance, at various times and in various places, to refer to the dissolution of the Duma, to the funeral of the Speaker of the First Duma, Muromtsev, and the funeral of Tolstoy, to the fanatical monk, Iliodor, or to the notorious *agent provocateur*, Azev. All these subjects might be regarded as political, but reference has also been frequently prohibited to events of an entirely non-political character. The papers of one town were forbidden to refer to a woman who had thrown sulphuric acid in the face of a priest, other papers were forbidden to touch on the behaviour of the teachers in the local high school, while the papers of a town in the Northern Caucasus were not permitted to mention the bad acting of an artiste with whom the local chief of police was on friendly terms. Papers are occasionally fined for printing reports of Pan Slavist meetings, for misprints, and even for publishing shorthand reports of debates in the Duma. The total of fines imposed on the Press in 1912 was 100,000 roubles (£10,000). The editor of a paper named *Yug* declared he was ill, whereupon the local governor suspended his paper on the ground that a sick man could not edit a newspaper. Many provincial editors have been so harassed by the authorities that they have in despair offered to submit their papers to a preventive censorship. A paper called the *Yuzhnia Viedomosti*, published in the Crimea, was confiscated seventy times, but the editor was only prosecuted three times. And similar instances of the arbitrary attitude of the Administration to journalists might be multiplied endlessly.

The remarkable thing is, that in spite of the abuses that

are inseparable from the present system, the Russian Press, especially in the provinces, is steadily developing; the number of organs is increasing, and on the whole their quality is improving. People live and grow in spite of politics. There is a fairly wide neutral sphere which lies outside the range of the most acrimonious political dispute. Russia is an immense Empire. There are governors and governors, and, if in one town, the chief of police persecutes the editor of the Opposition journal, in another town he plays cards with him. And many editors have grown wise in this their troubled generation, and have learned to avoid possible pitfalls. Journalists suffer far more from administrative penalties than they did in the days of preventive censorship. But over against this must be set the fact that there are far more newspapers than there were, and that the number of journalists has greatly increased. And in spite of all restrictions the Press is now actually in a position to express, however imperfectly, to guide, and to educate public opinion.

The Russian Press falls into two very distinct categories, the Press of the capitals, and the provincial journals. In a highly centralised country like Russia the metropolitan press naturally occupies, as compared with that of the provinces, a position of commanding importance. It has

more direct access to the sources of political information, and is, moreover, less subject than the provincial press to harassing restrictions. The big St. Petersburg and Moscow papers circulate widely in the provinces, and frequently the local organs serve merely as a stop-gap to curiosity until the mail brings the big papers with all the news of the political centres. But of late years the provincial press has grown in importance, and there are some papers, like the *Kievskaja Mysl* (Kiev Thought), which are so well supplied by telegraph and telephone with the latest political news, and have such a wide circulation that they need fear no longer the competition of St. Petersburg and Moscow organs. In

The Press in
the Capitals and
the Provinces.

remote towns, too, like Baku, Tomsk, or Vladivostok, which receive the papers from the capitals many days after publication, the local press naturally plays a much more important part than, for instance, in towns like Yaroslavl or Riazan, which get the Moscow papers on the afternoon of the day of issue. In respect of provincial circulation there is a certain rivalry between St. Petersburg and Moscow. The St. Petersburg papers have the advantage of proximity to the Ministries and to the Duma, and for that reason their political news is a little more authoritative than that of the Moscow Press. But the Moscow papers get nearly all the important news by telephone in time for publication simultaneously with the St. Petersburg papers. The reports of Duma sittings and lobby gossip are regularly telephoned, so that the advantages of the St. Petersburg papers in this respect are almost inponderable, and are a matter rather of atmosphere and direct personal contact between journalists, deputies, and officials. And what St. Petersburg, as a journalistic centre, gains politically she loses geographically. Moscow, in virtue of her more central position, commands the communications with Eastern and Southern Russia, which the St. Petersburg papers reach a day later than those of the ancient capital. The St. Petersburg Press has direct access only to the more thinly populated Western and Northern region. Thus, the most widely-circulated paper in Russia is the *Russkoe Slovo*, a Moscow organ of the *Daily Telegraph* type, which is well supplied with the latest news by telegraph and telephone, but politically enjoys less authority than many other papers with a much more limited circulation.

The best known of the St. Petersburg papers is the *Novoe Vremia* (New Time), founded in 1877 by Alexis Suvorin. The distinguishing feature of the *Novoe Vremia* is its opportunism. It attacks individual ministers and even certain cliques or groups within the Government. But its criticism is not that of an outsider, but of a representative of the governing party.

The "Novoe Vremia."

The *Novoe Vremia* is not an official paper, the views it expresses do not by any means always represent the views held by the Government at a given moment. They rather represent a shrewd compromise between official views and public opinion. There are certain organs that are confessedly reactionary, that demand a complete return to the autocracy. The *Novoe Vremia* is not one of these. It stands for representative institutions, it stands for the existing system. If a Liberal government were to come into power to-morrow, the *Novoe Vremia* would probably be a Liberal organ. It owes its material success to the extraordinary skill with which its late proprietor—M. Suvorin died in 1912—combined a good news service with a system of playing off one bureaucratic tendency against another, so as to give the impression of a movement of public opinion. Every influential *chinovnik*, or government official, is, in his heart of hearts, a critic, and very frequently a cynic. He criticises the way things are done, criticises his superiors, criticises the whole administrative system, is constantly murmuring or complaining. He murmurs but he conforms, he does not revolt against the system. When the *Novoe Vremia* criticises, it as often as not expresses the views of influential *chinovniks*. And from time to time it clears itself of all suspicion of heretical Opposition views by vehement attacks on Opposition parties and an ardent defence of Government policy.

But at the same time the *Novoe Vremia* carefully takes into account the prevailing tendency of public opinion. It was during the Russo-Turkish war when a strong body of Russian public opinion enthusiastically supported the Government's Balkan policy that M. Suvorin founded his organ, and it was on the summit of this wave of national enthusiasm that the journal first came into prominence. Since that time the *Novoe Vremia* has pursued a Nationalist and Pan-Slavist policy, carefully adapting its expression to the shade assumed by official Nationalism at every given moment. After the

Russo-Turkish war official Nationalism sharply separated itself from that generous enthusiasm for the liberation of kindred peoples which was the mainspring of public interest in the war, and became almost exclusively synonymous with the oppression of subject peoples within the Russian Empire. The *Novoe Vremia* identified itself with the official policy, and during the reaction of the eighties and nineties, when public opinion was almost suppressed out of existence, Suvorin remained within the safe shelter of conformity, and devoted his attention to the development of a good news service. During the period of unrest which followed on the outbreak of the war with Japan, the *Novoe Vremia* closely followed the movement of public opinion, was liberal at a moment when Liberalism seemed to have invaded the higher ranks of the bureaucracy, and in the early days of the First Duma even ventured to publish a few articles in praise of the Constitutional Democrats, only to attack them the more violently when it became clear that they had failed.

The late M. Suvorin, the founder of the *Novoe Vremia*, and until a few years ago its sole proprietor, was of peasant origin, and had a peasant's shrewdness, a peasant's freedom from doctrinaire prepossessions. He was a cool observer, a sceptic, a talented and witty writer with an eye for talent in others, and a man of strong temperament, with a vigorous, instinctive attachment to Russia and things Russian, so that he was frequently able to impart to his Nationalist policy a tone of personal conviction. He gathered round him a group of clever writers, paid them well, and constantly gave the closest attention to details of organisation, making the *Novoe Vremia* unrivalled in Russia from the point of view of newspaper technique. He was a connoisseur of the theatre, and founded a theatre of his own in St. Petersburg. Suvorin's character was made up of curiously contradictory elements; he was a hard man of business and very generous in private life; loyal in his friendships and shrewdly unscrupulous in his politics; a genuine admirer of the arts and letters, but

capable from commercial, personal, or political motives, of substituting false values for true in art.

The most widely-known of the contributors to the *Novoe Vremia* is M. Menshikov, a journalist of amazing productivity. Fifteen years ago he published a weekly in which he advocated an almost undiluted Tolstovism. M. Menshikov parades his inconsistency, and his articles are the most perfect expression of the opportunist policy of the *Novoe Vremia*. The very length of the articles seems to increase their authority amongst officials, and their contemptuous fluency, their nonchalant word-play, the ceaseless shimmering of their facile generalisations, their insinuations and their flattery, are all factors in M. Menshikov's reputation as a publicist.

A journalist of a very different type is M. Vasili Rozanov, also a contributor to the *Novoe Vremia*. M. Rozanov is a man of very great and original talent with a curious, almost pagan, capacity for observing the movement of elemental processes, for noting the workings of nature in things human. There is a great deal in his writing that is suggestive of Tolstoy, and much more that is suggestive of Dostoievsky, and the originality, the unexpectedness of his point of view startles and charms, but now more and more frequently repels. M. Rozanov has a quaint, sly humour, and is the enemy of the doctrinaire habit of mind. His favourite themes are marriage, the family, and the Church. Consistency he does not even pretend to observe. He is a Russian to the core, and his talent largely consists in the boldness with which he expresses a peculiarly Russian, realistic outlook.

The oldest and most authoritative of the Liberal organs is the Moscow *Russkia Viedomosti* (Russian News), which was founded fifty years ago, that is to say, at the time when Alexander II was emancipating the serfs and carrying into execution his other great reforms. The *Russkia Viedomosti* has throughout these fifty years maintained the Liberal traditions of that epoch with a remarkable consistency that never faltered even

The "Russkia
Viedomosti."

in the darkest moments of reaction. There is a type of mind known as that of "a Liberal of the sixties," broadly humanitarian, rather cosmopolitan than assertively Russian; just, moderate, dignified, and full of a deep compassion with a fine loyalty to abstract principle, and an unflinching devotion to a clear, unclouded ideal of liberty. Of this type of mind the *Russkia Viedomosti* is the best representative in the world of journalism. Its reputation is unsullied. It stands guard over the public conscience. It is sometimes dry, but it is never vulgar. By its moderation and fairness it frequently incurs the contempt of violent partisans, but it has never pandered to any of the powers that be. In 1898 it was suspended for two months, and afterwards subjected to a special form of preventive censorship.

The *Russkia Viedomosti* has always been in close touch with Moscow University. Its former editors, MM. Sobolevski, Chuprov, Posnikov, and Anuchin were professors, and other professors frequently wrote leading articles or contributed special articles of various kinds. At present the principal members of the editorial staff are Professors Kiesewetter and Kokoshkin. The *Russkia Viedomosti* is famed for the accuracy of its news. In the pre-constitutional period its foreign correspondents, more especially Iollos in Berlin, and Dioneo in London, imparted constitutional lessons in a veiled form by emphasising those features of European life that most vividly illustrated the benefits of civil liberty. In 1905 the *Russkia Viedomosti* played an important part in connection with the Constitutional movement that found expression in the Zemstvo Congress, and it was the first Russian organ to publish a project for a Constitution. For the last few years the journal has supported the Constitutional Democratic Party in the main, but it retains an independent position, and cannot in any sense be regarded as the official organ of the party.

The official organ of the Constitutional Democratic Party, or rather the organ of its leader, M. Miliukov, is the *Riech*,

published in St. Petersburg. The *Riech* was founded in 1906, shortly before the opening of the First Duma, and has gained a position of authority by virtue of its connection with the strongest and most influential of the Opposition parties. It is published by two prominent members of the First Duma,

The "Riech"
and other
Journals.

the Zemstvo leader, M. Petrunkevich, and M. Nabokov. The working editor is M. Joseph Hessen, while the policy of the paper is determined almost exclusively by M. Miliukov, who writes the majority of the leading articles on political questions. M. Miliukov is one of the few publicists in Russia who have a considerable knowledge of international politics, and his articles on the Near East, of which he has a first-hand knowledge, are of special interest.

The Moscow *Russkoe Slovo*, the most widely-circulated paper in Russia, has already been mentioned. It was founded in 1900 by a printer and publisher named Sytin, and gained popularity during the Russo-Japanese war mainly on account of the telegrams of M. Nemirovich-Danchenko, a veteran war-correspondent and novelist, who made his name during the Russo-Turkish war, and again acted as special correspondent of the *Russkoe Slovo* during the war of the Balkan Allies with Turkey. Another contributor who has largely helped to increase the circulation of the *Russkoe Slovo* is M. Vlas Doroshevich, the author of witty feuilletons written in the form of short sentences, each of which is a paragraph in itself, the effect being that of a series of pistol shots. The *Russkoe Slovo* makes a speciality of feuilletons, articles of a light, descriptive, or pictorial character, and many prominent Russian writers contribute from time to time articles of this kind. The journal spends large sums on telegrams from the provinces and abroad. The *Russkoe Slovo* is a non-party paper, but its general policy is one of Opposition to the Government in conformity with the prevailing tendency of public opinion.

The *Birzhevia Viedomosti* (Bourse Gazette) is a St.

Petersburg newspaper that resembles the *Russkoe Slovo* in many respects. It is non-party, opposed to the Government, sensational and gossipy. Its provincial edition is widely read by country priests and village school teachers.

During the last two years two tiny Social Democratic papers, the *Pravda* and the *Luch* have been permitted to appear in St. Petersburg, though they have been confiscated almost daily, and their editors fined and imprisoned with monotonous reiteration.

The *Golos Moskvy* (Voice of Moscow), founded by M. Guchkov, was for some years the organ of the Octobrist Party. In so far as the party has an organ now, the *Novoe Vremia* must be regarded as such.

Since 1906 the Government has published an official daily under the name of the *Rossia*. The organ of the Ministry of Finance, *The Commercial and Industrial Gazette*, is valued by business men for its wealth of news.

A peculiar position is occupied in Russia by the so-called Right, or Reactionary Press. In the pre-constitutional period there were practically three organs of the type, which on principle upheld the autocracy. One was the *Moskovskia Vedomosti*, an old-established organ which subsists on Treasury advertisements, and acquired importance in the sixties under the editorship of Katkov, who was the leading spokesman of the policy of oppressing the subject nationalities, and the chief interpreter of that later school of Slavophil thought which identified support of the Autocracy, the Orthodox faith and the Russian Nationality with the harshest manifestations of the bureaucratic system. Katkov was a talented writer, and, for all his reactionary tendencies, he frequently revealed glimpses of certain broader aspects of Imperial policy which even a reactionary bureaucracy was compelled to take into account. His successor, Gringmuth, a Lutheran who went over to the Orthodox Church, was a typical "carrieriste," and pursued Katkov's policy without

his talent. Under the editorship of M. Lev Tikhomirov, a one-time revolutionary and terrorist, who assumed control of the paper after Gringmuth's death a few years ago, the *Moskovskia Viedomosti* has sunk into complete obscurity.

The second old-established organ of the Right is the *Grazhdanin* (The Citizen), a weekly published in St. Petersburg by Prince Meshchersky. The *Grazhdanin* was founded in 1872, and among its editors during the early years of its existence was the novelist Dostoievsky, who published in it week by week "A Writer's Diary." At first the general tone of the journal was that of a moderate Conservatism, but towards the end of the century it became markedly and aggressively reactionary. Since the promulgation of the Constitution, Prince Meshchersky has maintained in principle his reactionary standpoint, but under the cover of his defence of the autocracy he has permitted himself an undisturbed liberty of criticism of the Government's policy which is denied to more progressive journalists. The Liberal journals, in fact, frequently quote from Prince Meshchersky's organ strong remarks about the Government, which would involve fines or imprisonment if their author were a declared Constitutionalist. Prince Meshchersky is an able and witty writer, and a keen observer, and retains in old age a remarkable freshness.

The third of the Right organs dating from the pre-constitutional period is the little St. Petersburg daily *Sviet*, founded by a retired officer, Komarov, and circulating chiefly among petty tradesmen. The *Sviet* subsists on a few simple reactionary ideas which it expresses in plain, and at times, boisterous language. Its style is more moderate, however, than that of the Right organs of the post-constitutional period.

Of these organs, the most striking characteristic of which is a remarkable virulence of language, the most prominent is the *Russkoe Znamia* (Russian Banner). There is no paper

quite like the *Russkoe Znamia* anywhere. Its subject-matter consists of unbridled abuse of Jews, revolutionaries, Liberals, constitutionalists of all shades including Octobrists, of Poles and other non-Russian nationalities in the Empire, of Young Turks and Englishmen, varied with hysterical cheers for Throne and Altar, violent attacks on individual Ministers, or at times on the whole Cabinet, threats of physical violence against certain individuals or groups. The *Russkoe Znamia* is, in fact, the organ of that "Union of the Russian people" which played such a prominent part in the pogroms or anti-Semitic riots and massacres of a few years ago. It is characteristic of the spirit of the times that a journal of this kind enjoys complete liberty of abuse, and is only very rarely fined, while the Progressive Press is subjected to the severest restraint. The odd thing is, that enjoying practical immunity in virtue of their clamorous defence of the autocracy, organs of the *Russkoe Znamia* type frequently adopt an almost revolutionary tone, vehemently attack the bureaucracy and proclaim a revolt against the Holy Synod. During the last two years the protection accorded to the Reactionary Unions and their organs has been to some extent withdrawn, and they have been compelled to moderate their tone. All three, the *Russkoe Znamia*, the *Kolokol* (The Bell), a clerical organ, and the *Zemshchina* (The Voice of the Nation), the organ of the deputy Purishkevich, are valueless as purveyors of news, are devoid of talent, and owe whatever influence they possess to the support of certain powerful circles.

Newspapers are published in the Russian Empire in a great variety of languages besides Russian, in German, for instance, French, Finnish, Swedish, Polish, Lettish, Lithuanian, Esthonian, Hebrew, Yiddish, Little Russian, White Russian, Tartar, Kirghiz, Armenian, Georgian, Persian, and Yakut (in Eastern Siberia). This non-Russian Press presents many interesting features, but a detailed description of it would be more in place in an account of the various nationalities it represents than in a work like the present.

Apart from administrative restrictions the Russian journalist works very much under the same conditions as his confrère in Western Europe. There are certain peculiarities in the arrangements of Russian papers which strike the English eye. Articles are more frequently signed than not. The names of the most prominent journalists are consequently familiar to the public, and the personal element plays a great part in journalism. Nearly all newspapers publish from time to time—especially towards the end of the year, when subscriptions for the coming year are looked for—lists of their contributors, or lists of "collaborators," as the members of the editorial staff and contributors are usually called. Many of the so-called "collaborators" are well-known professors or literary or public men who rarely write in the journal in question, but are content to let their names add lustre to the list. When a collaborator is offended or dissatisfied with an article that has appeared in the paper or with some development in the paper's policy, he as often as not retires, and does so by publicly withdrawing his name from the list of collaborators. Sometimes a whole group of collaborators retires at once, and then they publish a letter in the journal from which they have retired, or in a rival journal, explaining the grounds for their resignation. Another feature that is strange to English newspaper readers is the "Review of the Press," which most journals publish daily, and which consists of short extracts from articles in other papers, accompanied with comments, more often caustic than laudatory. This constant bandying of compliments is in striking contrast with that English habit of resolutely ignoring the existence of every other paper but your own, which was so rigidly maintained until within recent years.

The regular staff of a Russian paper usually consists of an editor, an assistant-editor, a "responsible" or sitting editor, engaged specially in view of possible exigencies of prison service, a foreign editor with one or more assistants, an editor

of the provincial department also with one or more assistants, a "manager of the chronicle," or news editor with an army of reporters, a dramatic critic with assistants, an art critic, a music critic, and an editor of the literary department, all with more or fewer assistants, as the case may be. In addition, the big papers have foreign correspondents, and also correspondents in most of the provincial towns. Few Russian papers pay such attention to their foreign department as do the big English papers. The place of city editor is filled by the "editor of the economic department." There are "night editors," too, or "issuers," who read proofs, and, together with the printer, make up the paper. And then there are the regular contributors, of whom some have functions hardly distinguishable from those of English leader-writers, that is, they must be prepared to write at any moment on subjects of which they are supposed to have expert knowledge—while others are feuilletonists, whose duty it is to write witty or amusing articles on literary subjects or on occurrences in real life, on anything in fact, or nothing at all, **so long as the result is interesting or amusing.** Journalists are of all ranks and classes, peasants, Cossacks, country gentlemen, retired officers, officials, professors, students, artists, and novelists.

There is a considerable number of women journalists, some of whom are feuilletonists, others are reporters, while occasionally women occupy the editor's chair. During the short period when the Press enjoyed comparative liberty and newspapers sprang up in abundance, there was a stam-pede into the ranks of journalism, and one humorist remarked at the time that the bulk of the so-called journalists were dentists, chemists' assistants, and retired tailors. The reaction dealt hardly with this army of writers, and most of the journalists who are now active are, or have become, professionals. Jews play a conspicuous part in journalism in Russia, as in other continental countries. The bulk of the reporting is in their hands, and many

editors, leader-writers, and feuilletonists are of Jewish extraction.

In the capitals journalists are, on the whole, well paid. The average price for an article is ten kopeks ($2\frac{1}{2}$ d.) a line, and sometimes fifteen or twenty kopeks are paid, in exceptional cases twenty-five, while well-known and productive feuilletonists may receive even fifty kopeks (over a shilling) per line in addition to a large salary. A popular feuilletonist earns from a thousand to four thousand a year. Energetic reporters earn large sums, especially if, as they often do, they sell their news to several papers at the same time, and know how to take advantage of the reporters' syndicates, which serve for the interchange of news among their members.

The number of illustrated weeklies in Russia is small in comparison with those of England, France, and Germany. Such papers as the *Novoe Vremia*, and the *Russkoe Slovo*, publish weekly illustrated supplements, and their example has been followed by some of the provincial organs. Most of the newspapers in the capitals from time to time print photographs illustrating the events of the day, and there seems to be a growing demand for caricatures. An illustrated weekly of long standing called the *Niva* has a wide circulation. Its illustrations are old-fashioned, but it frequently publishes fiction by the best Russian authors. Tolstoy's *Resurrection*, for instance, was first published in this journal. And the *Niva* has done great service in issuing gratis to its subscribers complete editions of the Russian classics, and of the works of modern authors whose copyright has not yet expired.

Comic papers had a vogue in Russia during the months immediately following on the proclamation of the Constitution. These papers were devoted almost exclusively to political satire, and contained bitter, grotesque, violent, and extraordinarily witty attacks on representatives of the old régime. The Russian has a strong sense of humour, and the

conversation of merchants, workmen, and peasants is full of witty sayings. Comic papers ought to flourish. But the political reaction seems to have made such papers not only physically but psychologically impossible. The organs of political satire were suppressed, and most of their editors imprisoned or banished in the course of 1906 and 1907. And since then comic papers have almost ceased to exist. The only journals of the type that are published rarely dare venture into the field of politics, and are, as a rule, simply dull, when they are not vulgar.

Monthly magazines are plentiful, and occupy a very important position in Russian public life. In the pre-constitutional period they exerted a very appreciable influence. The censorship was far more lenient with the monthlies than with the dailies, just as it dealt more gently with big and dear books than with little books that everyone might buy. And in the monthlies it was possible by a judicious choice of phrase to discuss political and economic questions with considerable freedom. Moreover, the monthlies have always played an important part in the development of Russian literature. Novels and stories are, as a rule, published in magazines before appearing in book form. The great novels of Turgeniev, Dostoievsky, and Tolstoy nearly all made their first appearance in the "thick journals," as the monthlies are usually called in Russia, and even now the success of the monthlies depends upon the ability of the editors to secure for publication fiction by the most prominent writers of the day.

The appearance and make-up of the Russian monthlies are very different from English magazines like the *Fortnightly* or *Contemporary*. In the first place they are undoubtedly "thick." An average number contains from 400 to 800 pages, separate paging being sometimes adopted for different sections of the magazine. The first section is devoted to poetry and fiction, original and translated,

including serial novels and short stories which are printed in larger type than the rest of the magazine. Then follows a section containing contributed articles on political, economic, scientific, educational, or literary subjects, the length of each article varying from sixteen to thirty-two pages or more of close print. Then follow, in most magazines, reviews of home politics, foreign politics, and events in the provinces. The final section is devoted to book-reviews. There are no illustrations. Magazines of this kind were particularly serviceable in the pre-constitutional period, when they served as substitutes for newspapers, public meetings, and debating societies. As a rule they were well edited, and maintained a high literary and ethical standard, stimulated a sound and genuine interest in public questions, and systematically educated public opinion in a way that the daily Press was wholly prevented from doing. Perhaps a lingering tendency to excessive generalisation in the discussion of public questions is to be explained by the fact that for years the average Russian reader was accustomed to observe the march of history in the long perspective of a monthly review and not through the flashlight of the daily press, while the events he was permitted to observe were not the thousand-and-one occurrences at his own doors, but the broad outlines of movements in distant Western Europe. During the last few years the development of the daily press has led to certain modifications of the "thick journals."

The oldest of the existing monthlies is the *Viestnik Yevropy* (Messenger of Europe), founded forty-eight years ago, and edited for many years by the late M. Stasiulevich. The *Viestnik Yevropy*, like the *Russkia Viedomosti*, is a heritage of the Liberalism of the sixties, and has throughout maintained a very honourable tradition of scrupulous fairness, good taste, and unswerving loyalty to Liberal principle. Among its contributors were Turgenev, who printed most of his later works in the *Viestnik Yevropy*, another classical novelist,

Goncharóv, and such distinguished historians as Kostomarov, Soloviev (the author of the standard History of Russia), Kavelin, and Pypin. For the last thirty years M. Konstantin Arseniev has conducted the Review of Home Politics in the magazine with singular tact, ability, and firmness. His standpoint is that of a broad-minded Liberal hostile to excesses of every kind. A few years ago the magazine passed into the hands of Professor Maksim Kovalesky, a sociologist well known in France and England, who now edits it in conjunction with M. Arseniev. The *Viestnik Yevropy* is a sober, non-party organ of moderate Liberal tendencies, and it appeals chiefly to Liberal officials and comfortably-off, middle-aged members of the professional classes.

The *Russkaia Mysl* (Russian Thought), was founded thirty-three years ago in Moscow, and was for many years an organ of a progressive and eclectic type, printing contributions from most of the prominent writers of the day, irrespective of their political views. In 1908 M. Peter Struve became editor, and since then the magazine has been the organ of this most original of the Russian political thinkers of the present day. M. Struve, who was at one time a Social Democrat, and from 1902 to 1905 edited, in Stuttgart and Paris, the organ of the Liberal Zemstvo Constitutionalists *Osvobozhdenie*, is a man of great learning and of uncompromising independence of thought. He is an enemy of political dogma, of sectarianism, of catchwords, and hackneyed phrases. During the last few years he has waged constant warfare against certain inveterate mental habits of the Russian intelligentsia, or progressive educated class, such as an excessive tendency to negation, and a lack of sense of the State, which, in his view, largely accounted for the insignificant character of the results achieved by the Revolutionary movement of a few years ago. M. Struve's standpoint is now that of a "realist" liberalism, and he has developed his views in a series of able articles many of which appeared in the *Russkaia Mysl*, and have since been published in book form under the general title of

Patriotica. M. Struve was the initiator of a volume of essays by various writers called *Viehi*, or "Way marks," which aroused great interest by the severity of its attacks on the intelligentsia, and had, for a volume of essays, an unprecedented success, running into five editions. In the *Russkaia Mysl* M. Struve has gathered around him a band of kindred spirits, and this magazine is the freshest and most interesting of all the Russian monthlies. It is now published in St. Petersburg.

The *Russkoe Bogatstvo* (Russian Wealth), founded in 1876, was for many years the most widely-circulated of the Russian monthly magazines. It was the organ of the Russian Populists or Agrarian Socialists, one section of whom founded at the beginning of the present century the Socialist Revolutionary party. Nicholas Mikhailovsky, who edited the magazine from 1895 till his death in 1904, exercised by its means **an enormous influence**. In his monthly articles on current topics he expressed views on all aspects of economics, sociology, and literature, which rapidly became part of the mental stock-in-trade of the bulk of the Russian intelligentsia. His writings were of value in their insistence on the necessity of personal initiative and social service. But in many respects they had a narrowing effect, and it is the mental attitude they encouraged that writers like M. Struve are now combating. The most attractive feature of the *Russkoe Bogatstvo* is, and always has been, the warm sympathy it displays for the peasantry. M. Korolenko, a writer of short stories distinguished by their sincere humanitarian feeling, has for some years past been a leading member of the editorial staff, and with him are associated MM. Miakotin and Peshehonov, leaders of a party known as the Populist Socialists, which enjoyed a certain prominence during the session of the Second Duma.

Another Socialist monthly is the *Sovremenny Mir* (The Modern World), formerly known as the *Mir Bozhy* (God's World), which represents the opponents of the Agrarian

Socialists, the Marxists, or Social Democrats. This magazine owed its success to the energetic management of its former proprietress, Madame Davydova, wife of a well-known violoncellist and a friend of Rubinstein's. Under Madam Davydova's management the *Sovremenny Mir* was by no means exclusively socialistic, and opened its doors wide to contributions from every quarter. Thus M. Miliukov printed in its pages his *Studies in the History of Russian Culture*, which, in their collected form, became the standard work on the subject. The *Sovremenny Mir* has of late years declined in importance, and suffers from the competition of newer Socialist monthlies like the *Sovremennik* (The Contemporary), and *Zavety* (The Covenants). The subscription price of the large monthlies, which ranges from nine to fifteen roubles (eighteen to thirty shillings) a year, sets a definite limit to their circulation, and of late a cheaper type of magazine intended to appeal to a broader public has made its appearance. *Zhizn dlia vsieh* (literally "Life for all," in the sense of Everybody's Review), is a magazine of this kind, in which the articles and stories are written in exceedingly simple language adapted to the comprehension of the average working man and progressive peasant.

Russian journalism is passing through a very difficult period of transition. The Press is naturally peculiarly sensitive to the political atmosphere, and the character of the present political situation largely accounts for the limitations of newspapers and magazines. But non-political influences also make themselves felt. The whole tone and temper of Russian life is changing, and this change finds expression in a hundred different ways in journals of all shades of opinion. Standards are being modified, ideas and ideals cast into the melting pot. Perhaps one way of describing the change would be to say that Russian life is far more sophisticated than it used to be, both in the good and the bad sense. Less importance is attached to abstract principles and to

**Changes in
Journalism.**

generalisations of every kind. The demands of real life are asserting themselves with greater persistence and effect. Perhaps there is no less idealism than there was, but the stars of principle are being hitched to ponderous, rumbling waggons of everyday, cheerless necessity. The events of the last few years have dissipated fond illusions, or have substituted for them the chilling illusion that life is not particularly worth living. The average Russian has, at the best, become cooler and more hard-headed, and at the worst he has become a cynic and a sensualist.

The change is clearly reflected in the Press. Writers of leading articles are more disposed to concentrate their attention on details of current policy than to assert general principles, and this, not only because of administrative pressure, but because the whole mood of the time is averse from the reiteration of general principles. There is a certain gain in this, since sobering contact with reality tends to give a more practical turn to Russian political thinking and action. But the position is depressing and uncongenial to the Russian character, and certainly gives little scope for the display of journalistic talent. The governing commercial spirit, the increasing absorption in money-making is also distinctly affecting journalism. This is not to say that journalism pays. It does pay a certain limited number of persons, but under present conditions in Russia a newspaper must be regarded as rather a losing than a paying concern. Only a very few papers return big profits, and most proprietors consider themselves lucky if they can make both ends meet. There are, however, clear indications of a change in this respect. Business is growing in Russia by leaps and bounds. Foreign capital is coming into the country, native capital is growing more modern in its forms of enterprise. Modern business means advertising, and the advertisement sheets of the newspaper are far more important than they were a few years ago. Formerly most Russian papers were purely political organs, and owed whatever success they enjoyed

to the popularity of their policy. The papers that combined politics with commerce were the exception. But now the Press has become responsive to the swifter pulsation of economic life, and the secret of newspaper success, to judge by some of the Moscow and provincial papers, seems to lie in a judicious combination of radical politics with unabashed commercialism. One thing, however, must be made clear. There have been cases in which Russian papers have resorted to blackmail, subsidised articles and other methods of the kind in vogue in many European countries. But the great majority of Russian newspapers of standing are free from corruption, and this means a great deal in a country where the average standard of commercial morality is not high.

In their growing tendency to sensationalism the newspapers again reflect a prevailing mood. Twenty or thirty years ago writers on Russia frequently described Russian towns as overgrown villages. But the transformation of these overgrown villages into cities is going on rapidly, and the simpler tastes of a slower time are being superseded by the fancies of a jaded city population. Music halls, café chantants, and all kinds of places of amusement are multiplying, and the cinematograph every night attracts its millions throughout the Empire. It cannot be said that a love of sport is developing in proportion with the passion for being amused, but football, yachting, and motor sport are certainly much more popular than they were, and Russia has had a very acute attack of the aviation fever. Journalism feels the change. The popular temper is unfavourable to a tone of sedateness and sobriety in the newspapers. There is a demand for smart feuilletons, snappy telegrams, and piquant news items. The *chronique scandaleuse*, and the sensational murder, and will forgery trials that have been so frequent during the last few years afford abundant material, and the Russian Press is perceptibly assuming a yellowish tinge. But there is a strong counter tendency in favour of

the maintenance of a stricter literary and ethical standard, and it is very curious to watch the struggle. The struggle is particularly interesting, because Russia is so big that the Press will inevitably become an immense power as soon as the present limitations are removed.