CONCLUSION

State control on Soviet literature during Stalin period was the worst. After accession to power, Stalin adopted a policy of self-sufficiency under the title “Socialism in one country.” He brought all the key Party organs under his control. The doctrine of “Socialist Realism”, introduced by Stalin, was nothing but a device to suppress the individual’s freedom of expression, and to put the Party policy above everything else. Praise for the system, criticism of individual who failed to accept the Party-policy, positive heroes with happy endings, were the major themes of Soviet publication. Censorship on the literary activism was widely prevalent during Stalin’s reign. The 1920s was rather a barren time for poetry. Mandel’shtam, along with some other poets, was virtually banned from publishing. Akhmatova, Pastennak were affected in varying degrees. Writers enjoyed freedom to a considerable extent during pre-1930 period, though writers did not publish materials directly attacking the new political and social set-up.

Tyranny was imposed on the “Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), from late 1920’s until its dissolution in 1932. Two leading fellow travellers Boris Piln’yak and Yevgeny Zamyatin were hounded on account of work which had been published abroad.
Compulsory optimism was the basic ingredient in Socialist Realist Writing. By a decree in April 1932, Central Committee of the CPSU disbanded the "All Russian Union of Soviet Writers" and other residual groups. Writers were now to belong to a new organization called "Union of Soviet Writers." "Glavlit", the official censorship organ, played the major role and it functioned as an ideological and political watchdog.

In the year 1934, Stalin's "Great Terror" began. Hundreds of writers either perished or spent years in the Soviet prison or labour camps. Writers like Mandel'shtam, Pilnyak and Babel lost their lives through the terror. During the Second World War period there was a general relaxation of ideological pressure. Adoption of policies in the immediate post-war period were relatively milder than those of the 1930s. However, internal policies were not, relaxed. Prisoners of war released from German captivity were shot or sent to the concentration camps. Solzhenitsyn was arrested and imprisoned. Later Akhmatova and Zoshchenko were expelled from the Union of Writers. Andrey Zhdanov, the right hand man of Stalin, made the rules and regulations regarding publication of materials more harsher than before. The years 1946-53 may be remembered as "Zhdanov Era."

The later part of Stalin rule created an atmosphere, where creative intelligentsia had to live in constant state of fear. Political demands made on the writers community were excessive and they were made to portray
in their writings the fanciful pictures of material abundance and social harmony. There created a conflictless literature, projecting false positive aspects of the Soviet people and society.

After Stalin’s death, Khrushchev came to the power. Khrushchev era witnessed a general relaxation in Party policy toward censorship of Soviet literature. Soviet literature saw its development in many different directions. The years 1953 to 1956 are known as the time of the “thaw.” During this period censorship became less strict, and restrictions were put on the Stalinist literary policy. More or less, there developed an amiable relationship between the state officials and the writers. Writers were given freedom to a considerable extent to express their own views, although, in the theory the Party had continued to maintain that the literature must be regulated by ideological and administrative control. Poetry rather than prose, came up as a main literary medium of expression. At the same time poetry became aggressively political. Ehrenburg, in his article attacked bureaucratic regimentation and argued for the writer’s previlege to choose his materials and depict what is available to him and in light of his own writer’s experience. Ehrenburg’s novel “The Thaw” was published in May 1954.

Literature in Khrushchev era became less utopian and writers became more open and fearless in expressing their own thoughts, feelings
and views in their writings. Due to minimum ideological pressure from the Party leadership, writers turned to expose the 'truth' in their writings. Many politically detached works were published. But after the destalinization Congress of February 1956 came the 'October Revolution' in Poland and the more violent anti-Russian uprising in Hungary. For a time, literature was put under a strict control and Khrushchev warned the writers to adhere to the principles of socialist realism and to remember that they were servants of the Party.

When Khrushchev overpowered his political opponents in the "Anti-Party group", he turned his attention to literature and dismissed Simonov, the current editor of "Novy Mir", for his liberal publishing policy. Khrushchev placed himself in a more comfortable position and tried to establish an equilibrium between the two camps of writers.

Writers took advantage of Khrushchev's liberal policy toward literature. Many short stories, novellas (Povesti), though not the long novels, depicted Stalin's dictatorship and harsh literary policy during his reign, without much hesitation and fear. Sufferings of the ordinary people were described and reflected, not only in songs but also jokes and anecdotes - and directed with cheerful cynicism at their oppressors. Khrushchev's intervention in literary matters, particularly his speech to the Third Writer's congress in 1959 was a step forward for granting liberty to
the writers to a certain extent. The Party pursued a policy of holding a balance between the so-called “Conservatives” and the “Liberals.” Relaxations of Stalinist vigours were instituted and Krushèchev was able to gain political credit by espousing the cause of reform. The doctrine of traditional socialist realism was opposed by the liberals, but they were not permitted to say anything so openly.

Village prose in Khrushchev era reached to a much higher level. The main achievement of village prose, is to chronicle the rural affectionately and faithfully with respect for traditional features. Khrushchev took special initiative to bring the villages to the forefront, of national politics. Some of the village prose is remarkable for its political neutrality. But much of it conveys outspoken criticism of Party policy as imposed on the villages.

The Twenty-Second Congress was one step further to encourage and inspire the liberals and for the first time the writers community, represented by Tvardovskiy, gained greater political influence than before.

The year 1960-1962 witnessed an upsurge of “Youth Prose.” Many articles, memoirs, essays and fiction were devoted to Stalin, criticising and revealing many aspects of his rule. Rehabilitation of many leading figures purged and liquidated under Stalin was carried out during Khrushchev period. Even a special Ideological Commission of the Central Committee
was created with the approval of Khrushchev, to give higher priority to literature and the arts.

After Khrushchev’s fall in October 1964, Brezhnev came to the power. The commission for ideology was disbanded and new instructions were issued to publishers. There was a mild relaxation between 1964 and 1966, in ideological control of literature. News coverage was selective and negative aspects of the Soviet life and the Party were not allowed to appear in writings. Many aspects of internal Soviet life were regarded as State Secrets. No criticism of the policies or personal deficiencies of the political leadership was allowed. But the arrests and exile were somewhat less inhuman, in contrast to the Stalin era. Boris Pasternak and Anna Akhmatova could published their verse, after a long silence. The state control on literature was not uniform. Almost all the organization and institutions had the responsibility for media.

Imposition of a repressive policy against literary dissident in 1965, led to the arrest of writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuly Daniel. They were arrested and accused of having published their works abroad under the Pseudonyms of Abram Tertz and Nikolai Arzhak. Three copies of Solzhenitsyn’s novel “The First Circle” and his play “Feast of the Victors” were confiscated by the KGB.
The trial of Daniel and Sinyavsky was a major event in Brezhnev era. It prevented writers to articulate their views and opinions fearlessly and openly. Writers' community made an attempt for the release of the both accused, but the proposal for their release was rejected. After the appointment of Yury Andropov as chairperson of the KGB in May 1967, as firm but more flexible line was taken on culture and ideological matters.

The powerful Union of Soviet Writers was a creature of the Party. Tight control over the printed word made it impossible for writers to create any neutral literature. There were different departments and organs, like "Glavlit", "Agitprop", news agency "Tass", which used to control and check publication of materials. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Andrei Sakharov, Roy Medvedev were the main victims of Brezhnev era.

Majority of Soviet artists and thinkers choose new path to publish their works: Unauthorized circulation of their writings in crude typewritten form, smuggling of manuscripts for publication abroad. For the first time rebellious writers and intellectuals turned defiantly to "Samizdat" (self-publishing) and "Tamizdat" (publishing out there), that, is in the West.

There were contradictory developments in the relationship between the Soviet bureaucracy and the intelligentsia, during the Brezhnev leadership. The period since 1970 had been marked by greater caution. Variety of conflicting views on literature and society had been expressed
by the writers. Attacks on the liberal and dissident writers were not frequent, showing a general liberal policy towards dissent. By the mid and late 1970’s the Brezhnev regime seemed to become more lax.

The later years of Brezhnev saw the steady erosion of people’s respect for the Party leadership and the state bureaucracy. Communication was becoming more open and differentiated. On the other hand, Soviet mass media was becoming ineffective, as a medium of political information. Andropov, the member of the Politburo, issued a decree which demanded that writers fulfill the tasks of the Twenty-Sixth Congress, selecting subjects of contemporary relevance, concentrating on depicting “positive heroes” and inculcating worthy moral values.

During the two - decades of Brezhnev’s leadership, many writers and intellectuals were persecuted, some were exiled and some imprisoned. Though during that span of time many works were created based on human emotions mainly, the mediocre, ideologically correct writing for the masses, were encouraged. There was an attempt to prevent the circulation of works which might be construed as actively anti-Soviet; and the desire to pacify the liberal intelligentsia by permitting the small - scale publication of some excellent books and articles.

The Modern Russian Peasant literature which arose in the early 1950’s is known as Village Prose. It includes novels, short stories and
documentary sketches. Early pioneers of village prose was Valentin Ovechkin and Yefim Dorosh. Most of the works of Village Prose describe the difficult life of post-war Russian village and the character of Russian peasant, who has preserved his inner purity and high moral qualities despite of all difficulties. Some are written in the spirit of nostalgia for the good old life of the past, and values associated with it.

The most important aspect of the Village Prose is the absence of ‘positive heroes’, who, in Classical Socialist realism, were supposed to serve as inspirational models to Soviet readers. In the years of Stalinism, Russian countryside was plundered in order to pay for industrialization, and it has been demonstrated in an impressive body of writing, mainly in the form of sketches and short stories. Village prose writers like Fyodor Abramov, B. Mozhayev and other came to saying outright that the Party’s agricultural policy has been a disastrous failure from the beginning to end. Some of the Writers emphasized more on positive aspects of the countryside as a repository of traditional values which were disappearing in the town. Some of the well-known village prose writers are Vasily Belov, Valentine Rasputin and Vasily Shukshin.

During Stalin period village life was looked down upon or underestimated. Though, there had been numerous depictions of the
village in Stalinist fiction but most of them operated on the assumption that it needed to be changed.

In fact, the principal figures in village prose have been ordinary peasants, and most often oldest and most backward of them. Some other strains of village writing are environmental and ecological concerns and anti-urbanism, the diversions of rivers and drying up of lakes; and the flooding of farmland and settlements to build hydroelectric projects.

After the death of Stalin, writer’s attitude toward the peasantry began to change. The State and Party made an effort to reform the internal structure of Kolkhozes and agriculture method. It was Khrushchev who by his personal style and projected reform programmes moved the peasants to the forefront of national politics. Khrushchev wanted to divert resources from the traditional Stalinist priorities of heavy industrial and military expenditure in order that the countryside should have better facilities and the peasants should have material incentive to work on the collective fields rather than devoting their time to their own little private plot.

In “Dr. Zhivago,” Boris Pasternak makes the official Soviet regime responsible for destroying the position of moral superiority of the political “activists.” He focuses on the key situation, the conflict between Marxism - Leninism’s triumphant ideological course and the native concern for identity represented by Zhivago. Identity was defined through the
individual’s stand against historical intrusion, the opposition of personal moral freedom to moral doctrine imposed by external forces and the anguished appraisal of the writer’s aesthetic task in the midst of political terror. Pasternak emphasized more on the individual’s freedom, his feeling, his right to love nature and his argument is not based on any theoretical view, but on a direct poetical vision of Soviet Society. The dominant issues were formulated throughout the novel and crystallized in Zhivago’s poems by the skillful use of traditional Christian symbols and ideas. Through “Zhivago”, Pasternak stressed mainly on the personal and literary expression of a spiritual human destiny greater than materially limited or socially determined meanings.

In “One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich”, Alexander Solzhenitsyn shows his enormous concern with those ideological systems in which a spiritual human identity is rejected or neglected. Solzhenitsyn conveys the message that, corruption is endemic in the camps, which represents the corruption of Soviet Society at large, and, more, may be part and parcel of man’s nature and institutions. The work contains clear hints about what had destroyed Russia’s peasant culture. The state-sponsored break-up of farms and families has led to a steady decline in the rural economy and culture. The basic corruption of Soviet Society is reflected in the injustices inflicted on the prisoners, in the reasons and the way they were
sentenced, indiscriminately to ten or twenty-five years. The stories of the prisoners tell us of the thousand of returning prisoners of war who, far from being welcomed in the motherland, were rounded up and sent to labour camps.

The novella also reaffirms certain principles which official socialist realism had destroyed; genuine “narodnost”, concerns with human values, meticulous and honest reporting of the every day life of ordinary people. “Ivan Denisovich Shukhov” was a protest against the organised barbarity of a state apparatus which could produce horror of the Soviet prison camps. In rendering Ivan Denisovich’s day and the day of his fellow prisoners, Solzhenitsyn pictures the Stalinist - induced upheavals inflicted on the people: the collectivization of the countryside and the accompanying mass murder of Kulaks in the early 1930’s, the great purges of the Party, the revived Stalinism at the end of the war and during the post-war period; with its imprisonment of former Russian prisoners of war and so on.

In “On Apostolic Business”, Tendryakov sees in Soviet Society, the building of material abundance and the pursuit of scientific knowledge, ultimately losing their ultimate justification. In a society where his hero finds his existence meaningless and painful. Tendrayakov emphasizes on the failure of materialist philosophies to satisfy man’s inner aspirations and
the need to recognise this, Yury's, the main character of the novel, God reflects the whole relationship between Soviet Society and the authorities, in which the entire burden of seeking meaning and purpose is assumed by the authorities, and with it the prerogative of deciding men's fates.

In "Preliminary Stocktaking" Trifonov deals with the moral state of Soviet Society, demonstrating how the social and economic environment and the individual interact in shaping a person's moral consciousness. He is not concerned only with the depiction of everyday life, but, instead his main attention is attracted to the "emotional experience" of man in situations of everyday life. Post-Stalin reforms had changed the Soviet System and the essence of Soviet man very little. One of the main shortcomings of Soviet Society's post-Stalin period was the shallowness of the ethical values professed by most Soviet citizens. Tendryakov makes it clear in his novella, that each of us is responsible for helping to create the humane atmosphere necessary for a decent life, a life in which concerns for spiritual wellbeing take precedence over concerns for material comfort.

In "The Life and Extraordinary Adventures of Private Ivan Chonkin", Voinovich depicts a simple world of little Stalins. The hero, Chonkin, is shown as a kind of 'anti-Socialist Hero.' A new kind of positive hero, who is more passive, tolerant and kind, more attuned to the present than
the future, pragmatic rather than idealistic, and above all ordinary. He is not a victim of inauthentic existence forced on everyone in Soviet Society by an overbearing System of authority and ideology, which is not based on essentials of human existence. Inefficiency and indecisiveness of Party officials, the lazy and inactive collective -farm chairman, authority’s lack of interest in the welfare of collective farm, doublethink of the Party officials in the higher positions,- all this are portrayed satirically by Voinovich in his comic masterpiece.

Chinghiz Aitmatov, in his novella “Farewell, Gul’sary!” is concerned with the increasing disillusionment created by the Party during the post-war Stalinist period. He understands the demands of the times and devotes much attention to moral problems and formation of a new socialist individual. The tale of the Kirghiz peasant, Tanabai, in the novella, contains much implied criticism of collectivization and Party methods. Serious social upheavals are deeply felt by the main character of the novella. Mismanagement and mistakes of the Party leadership during collectivization made everyone to go through hardships and sufferings, to a considerable extent. Aitmatov emphasizes on honesty, enthusiasm and devotion to the cause of socialism, the moral purity of thoughts and actions. Aitmatov boldly discloses people who abuse their positions, their incompetence and loss of a sense of responsibility.
In “White Steamship”, Aitmatov portrays a truthful picture of reality and reflects the failure of the Soviet System to influence in a positive sense the personal family life of Soviet man. Aitmatov emphasizes on preserving harmony between man and nature, the beauty of the world around us. He is concerned with the problems like corruption in modern life, the prevalence of drunkenness and violence, in the society.

In the “Cranes Fly Early,” Aitmatov shows the confrontation between good and evil, in the moral, ethical, social and philosophical sense. Hardships and sufferings which the people had to go through during the Second World War period are portrayed vividly in the story. Actual events are described with historical accuracy but take on a legendary character. Courage and sense of duty symbolizes the high moral qualities of the country’s wartime youth. The tragic consequences of war could not destroy the moral strength and unity of the people. Aitmatov’s concept of humanness and the victory of high moral principles are conveyed by the story.

In “Sandro of Chegem”, Fazil Iskander pokes fun at nearly everything involving human nature. The violence of social disorder and blood vengeance, the harmful effects of the Soviet regime, collectivization, and the Stalinist terror on the native way of life; and the common human misfortunes of poverty, illness and death frequently come to the surface.
In “Chik’s Day” Iskander portrays the life of Abkhazia of 1930’s and 1940’s. Anxieties and sorrows of his native people, mysterious, disappearances and sudden exile, hardships and sufferings people had to go through, - are the main concerns of Iskander. Iskander’s belief in the younger generation is rooted in his belief that childhood’s faith in common sense and the world’s rationality provide man inner strength and will to struggle against the barbarity, and stupidity. Through the adventures of Chik, Iskander also portrays the colour, beauty and warmth of a rural Abkhazia, its people and the society as a whole.