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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the period of Khrushchev's speech, there was a considerable amount of writing and discussion about young people, their attitudes and problems. This interest in the situation and attitudes of the young spread over several dominant themes, and since, in most cases, the prose dealing with this subject contained a great deal of critical comment, often of essays that had been excluded from discussion, it grew upon itself the like of a spring of criticism and officialdom. There was a tendency to see the writing which fell into this category as an illustration of the 'conflict of generations', and, certainly, in at least two of the principal themes, that of de-Stalinization and that of republicanism, it did appear as if there was a division along generational lines among the characters portrayed.

However, there was a determined rebuttal of this analysis (as the part of writing was in official statements) particularly after the 'conflict of generations' became something of a cliché in western accounts of this kind of literature. It was argued on the Soviet side that this was a false notion, that there was no division among the generations that the 'isms' were faithfully taking over the ideological battle of the 'fathers', and finally, that western commentators had totally misunderstood the whole 'fathers and sons' illusion which they were blissfully promulgating.

Indeed, if one looked closely at the literature, there did appear to be a careful distribution of the positive characters and of the villains fairly impartially over the whole of the represented age-range. There were fathers (or grandfathers) who were fighting on the side of the sons, and some were sons who had allied themselves with villains or fathers. Now we may feel that to a certain extent this careful arrangement could be
During the period of Khrushchev's power there was a considerable amount of writing and discussion about young people, their attitudes and problems. This interest in the situation and attitudes of the young spread over several dominant themes, and since, in most cases, the prose dealing with this subject contained a great deal of critical comment, often of matters that had hitherto been excluded from discussion, it drew upon itself the fire of orthodox literary critics and officialdom. There was a tendency to see the writing which fell into this category as an illustration of the 'conflict of generations', and certainly, in at least two of the principal themes, that of de-Stalinisation and that of meshchanstvo, it did appear as if there was a division along generation lines among the characters portrayed.

However, there was a determined rebuttal of this analysis (on the part of critics and in official statements) particularly after the 'conflict of generations' became something of a cliche in western comment on this type of literature. It was argued on the Soviet side that this was a false notion; that there was no divisiveness in Soviet society between the generations; that the 'sons' were faithfully taking over the ideological baton of the 'fathers', and finally, that western commentators had totally misunderstood the whole 'fathers and sons' allusion which they were blithely promulgating.

Indeed, if one looked closely at the literature, there did appear to be a careful distribution of the positive characters and of the villains fairly impartially over the whole of the represented age-range. There were fathers (or grandfathers) who were fighting on the side of the sons, and renegade sons who had allied themselves with villainous elders. Now we may feel that to a certain extent this careful arrangement could be
due to facile conformism, or a trimming of the creative sails to the prevailing critical wind, but it is a possibility worth entertaining that the whole argument as to whether or not there was a conflict between the fathers and sons may have been somewhat wide of the mark.

It could be argued that while the revelations of the 20th Party Congress had caused an enormous trauma to the people who had built their lives and careers in the atmosphere and conditions of Stalinism, and who had rationalised many of its features, somehow accommodated themselves to this reality, even found significance and satisfaction in their lives by accepting the interpretations of reality that were officially put forward, the young people, the adolescents of the post-1957 period, would have had no more than a distant feeling about the more repressive parts of the Stalin era. To them it was far more likely to have a historical significance, rather than an experiential and affective one (unless they had grown up in an extremely politically minded and outspoken family, or had been personally and directly affected by the repressions). So we could, perhaps, entertain certain reservations as to whether the 'fourth generation' really had any great concern for the revelations of Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation campaign, and perhaps also consider whether it was possible that it were rather the 'second' and 'third' generations that were deeply affected by the moral problems which confronted them after the disclosures of the 20th Congress.

Certainly, in the literature itself, the agony over the past and the painful attempts at self-justification are mainly the lot of the older characters, who would belong to the second or third generations, or who fall somewhere between the third and fourth.

The post-Stalin period differed markedly from the preceding quarter
of a century in several ways. There was a reduction in arbitrary repression, more access to information and ideas, and a freer circulation of these, as well as a secularisation of intellectual life which followed the abandonment of the quasi-religious Stalin cult. At the same time, contact with the rest of the world grew, and was accompanied by a certain percolation of cultural influences and material goods. Recovery from the devastation of the war, while well under way during Stalin's last years, was almost complete by the time of his death, and memories of war suffering were beginning to recede. The improvements in living conditions (though already felt earlier) became widespread after 1953. Finally we ought to take into account the great changes wrought in the social and cultural environments by the rapid technological developments in many areas.

These substantial differences between the two worlds, that of the Stalin era and that of the post-war, post-Stalin period, would at least contribute to, if not determine, a considerably different view of reality in the generation brought up in one of these worlds as against that which grew up in the other. So, while the gulf between the generations does exist, and while there may be conflicts between them on various issues, it seems more likely that this gulf and the conflicts too, arise from a different perception of reality which may be attributed to the very different worlds in which these generations grew up, and not solely to the disillusionment and shock of the revelations of the 20th Congress and the de-Stalinisation campaign. This is not to deny these events a great significance in shattering or challenging the previously held view of reality in persons of particular generations, just as the defeats of the early years of World War II had a similar effect in shaking some taken-for-granted aspects of reality.
The extensive criticism of many aspects of Soviet society, and a degree of cynicism about official moralising and formal declarations of faith ('fine words') that were attributed in the literature of 1957 - 63 to the young, were seen by the older generations as a questioning of the part that they themselves had played in Stalin's building of the Soviet society and as a questioning of the ideological basis of that society. 

If, however, we look at these criticisms by the young from a rather different position, we may find that they flow rather from a different perception of reality, are akin to the criticisms that western youth makes of its society, and may be accounted for precisely by the rapid changes in the environment which make the early universes of the generations so different. The significance of such environmental changes can be gauged from the fact that while some time ago a generation was considered to span some thirty years, much recent sociological writing tends to take a five-year interval as a generation gap. With this alternative view in mind, we may suspect that the preoccupation of the second and third generations with the nature of their own involvement in the Stalin era has led to a projection of this preoccupation, and the guilt feelings associated with it, onto the criticisms made by the younger generation. In other words, the older generations translated the criticisms of the fourth generation into their own terminology and in so doing have altered the substance of the criticism.

Another theme, meshchanstvo, is often linked with the Stalin cult and is treated as a distortion which has resulted from the abnormal pressures inflicted on social life at this time. Libedinsky goes so far as to suggest that the mechanism of repression was used as an
instrument to forward petty self-interest, and that the ambitions of meshchane fed the machine of repression, whose continued operation was essential in order to advance the careers of some individuals.

Here again, we may agree that there was interaction between Stalinism and meshchanstvo, but the assumption that, had Stalinism not taken place, then meshchanstvo would have died out as a phenomenon does not seem warranted. The apparent re-emergence of that whole syndrome of attitudes, values and patterns of behaviour which is contained in the notion of meshchanstvo seems to be due to the altered socio-economic conditions rather than to the abuses of Stalinism alone. The use of material incentives as a method of encouragement and reward has gone hand in hand with official support and propaganda of the revolutionary ideals of asceticism, self-sacrifice and satisfactions that come from a sense of having contributed to society, and from identification with society, rather than from personal and material gains. 8

Since the expression of an ideologically acceptable motivation and intention was necessary to justify actions that might have been suspect on grounds of their being prompted by self-interest, professions of high-mindedness that accorded with official values became commonplace and ritualised. We have a situation where, on the one hand, an appeal is made to those very desires that are officially frowned upon, and, on the other, an acceptable formula is offered which may or may not be a true account of the state of affairs. For instance, skilled workers on Far North construction sites are supposed to be volunteers wishing to contribute to the speedy building of communism; the higher rates of pay and other material rewards that go with such jobs are not overtly acknowledged as the main reason why the workers might volunteer.
At least two consequences seem to stem from the difficulty of having to accommodate these contradictions. One is that there is a great deal of legitimising in terms of orthodox formulae; these are applied to actions and situations that have very little relevance to the principles that are invoked in order to render them respectable, and this 'cover up' use of moral principles and declarations tends, as it becomes more ritualistic, to empty them of credibility and also may encrust them with secondary overtones of meaning, far removed from the original sense. The second consequence is that confusion builds up as to the possible reasons which may exist for acting in certain ways, and also about the ways in which situations can be interpreted and evaluated.

The formation and expression of young people's attitudes to meshchanstvo or de-Stalinisation is often connected with their entry into the adult world, and with the way in which they perceive reality and interpret or 'create' it. Since the main preoccupation of Soviet literature, for ideological reasons, is with man in his social role (particularly in the work situation), and since the method of approach is 'realism', there is a very pronounced flavour of social material and comment about it. While I would be most reluctant to argue directly from literary evidence to the 'real life' situation, one would probably be justified in assuming that in some ways at least, particularly in the selection of the theme or social problem, (and what is even more interesting, in the way it is resolved), there is a strong reflection of contemporary concerns and attitudes.

It is almost impossible to properly answer such questions as to what extent the author's real position and belief in the solution he suggests are contained in his published work; or how much editorial
and censorship interference was present; or even how much self-censorship the author applied to his work. What can be asserted with a measure of confidence is that certain problems are raised, and that they are handled and/or resolved in a particular fashion. An examination of the material with these reservations in mind leaves us free to approach and discuss it from our own point of view on these matters. Thus, we are in a position to describe and comment on the preoccupations of Soviet literature in a specific thematic area during a particular period, and on the ways in which these are presented and resolved. We may also find that this attention to the social element in literature provides a fruitful way of examining that huge proportion of officially published contemporary literature (almost the whole of it with a small number of exceptions), which would neither warrant nor repay close analysis on strictly literary lines.

It might be asked why we should pay any close attention to this literature, granted that most of it may be mediocre qua literature. It is only if we assume, however, that the only proper way of studying a literature is that of the literary critic concerned with the allegedly perennial insights of the writers that we shall assume that there could be no good reason for studying this type of literature. We may also study the literature, however, not primarily in the manner of the critic, expatiating on its alleged insights, but rather in the manner of the sociologist, for whom the conventional and possibly mediocre character of the works may enhance rather than diminish their interest, since this will indicate the extent to which they can be seen as typical products of the society. Since Soviet literature is of a quasi-official character, written in and for a highly ideological situation, its interest for the sociologist will thus lie in what the literature can
tell us about that situation, what light it might throw on prevailing ideologies, their changes, and their relation to the social situation.

It might be objected against this approach, that this is to abandon any literary enterprise at all, for it might seem that this is no longer to be interested in these works qua literary works at all, but merely as historical documents. It might further be objected that they will only tell us anything about the social situation in which they were written, and about Soviet ideology, if we adopt an extremely naive view (in itself a vulgar-Marxist view) of the purely functional relations obtaining between a given ideological and social situation on the one hand and this type of literary production on the other.

I think one could reply to both these criticisms in the following way. First, even if we suppose both these criticisms to be valid, it still would not follow that we would not learn something important about Soviet society at the time by studying specifically this type of literature. One can certainly learn several things from these sources. First, they tell us about some of the received and accepted values and attitudes of the society, notably towards young people, at a time when the question of their ideological purity was particularly an issue in the society. Just because this is a censored and quasi-official source, we may be sure that the values and attitudes being celebrated in this literature are certainly the received values, which people are to be encouraged to sustain and secure. It tells us, one might say, what the official imaginative projections of the society are, what projections of itself in fictional terms are sanctioned. And it tells us not just the nature but also the range of these - e.g., one might note what is missing, what is specially emphasised, and so on. We do
not need to accept any naive correspondence theory to be able to insist on this point. And secondly, equally unquestionably, they tell us about prevailing literary conventions. Precisely because these works may not be experimental or highly original, they are of special interest, for they will illustrate the accepted ways, the devices, the literary forms, which are, so to say, permitted as means of expressing the approved attitudes.

However, there is in fact no reason to accept that either of these above criticisms is valid. Against the first criticism, that this is not to make a literary study at all, one might argue as follows. Suppose that one wants to comment critically on any professedly 'good' with experimental or more original literature within this sort of genre and of this period. A number of western critics have certainly expatiated on the merits of the literature which they admire for this period. The point is that unless one first gains an acquaintance with the conventional themes and the conventional literary forms, which are precisely what this body of literature reveals to us, one will not have any measure at all of the degree to which it may be remarkable, original, or surprising, that a given writer should have ignored these themes, these conventions, and adopted his own. The sociology of literature and literary-critical appreciation cannot be divorced in the way the first criticism presupposes. The study of a body of literature which exhibits, rather than challenges, the prevailing conventions and attitudes is an essential study to undertake if one is to produce any well-informed account of just what is original or remarkable in the good literature of the time. It is only by knowing the conventions that one can judge in what ways and to what extent
truly creative writers are breaking out of these in respect of either form or content, or both. Otherwise one may underestimate, praise irre relevantly, or generally misunderstand.⁹

To turn to the second type of criticism, that a vulgar-Marxist methodology is implied by this type of study of literature, it is not in fact at all necessary to adopt such a position to show that the study of this type of literature has something to tell us about the society which one could not otherwise learn, and there is in fact a completely different methodology that one might adopt which will demonstrate this claim. A minor point is that because much of this literature is untranslated and deals with a society on which there is not very much information it can tell us a great deal of social detail about that society. But the main point is that we can discover something about ideology in general, and about role-playing in particular, in this society, from a study of such literature.

The literature of this period discloses that there were very defined roles in which the characters are made to see themselves, and that there is a very defined sense of what sorts of ideals one's behaviour is meant to conform to, and what would count as such a case of one's behaviour conforming to such an ideal. But it is also shown that there are characters for whom these roles are no longer real. Young people, in particular, are made to appear critical, in the sense that they reject that certain descriptions and roles specify all that there is to be said about their behaviour. What the young people are challenging, in fact, are social perceptions. Thus, what is exhibited in such literature is not so much a case of generation conflict as a case in which the given ideology which has controlled
people's perceptions of their behaviour in a total manner is challenged in the sense that it is seen to be a closed account of social reality and not all there is to be said.

The literature may thus be said to reveal an important fact about the role of Soviet ideology in relation to Soviet society. It might be said (as MacIntyre in a recent study of Stalinist ideology has put it) that Stalin's aim as an ideologist was to impose a single pattern and language, 'a closed system of concepts', but that he did not entirely succeed in closing the doors to alternative ways of perceiving and talking about the society. The special significance of this type of literature in this situation may thus be said to lie in the fact that it illustrates the prising open of a conceptual scheme which had been privileged — which had been set up as the way of perceiving and describing the social world — but was now being challenged.

During the period of deStalinisation this type of literature thus played a role in relation to the ideological shifts that were taking place, not only by reflecting the less closed situation, but also by helping to prise it open further still, in the sense of showing that some people were no longer convinced by the given language, roles and perceptions. The shifts between 'thaw' and 'freeze' periods may be regarded as the expression of official response to such an effect of literature on the permissible ways of viewing the world.

If this literature and its significance have been correctly characterised, then it may be further described as a literature in which the notion of one's behaviour answering to an ideology, and the notion of playing a role, living up to a given picture of one's behaviour, is very important. If this is so, then it follows in turn
that one appropriate way to study this literature will be to apply the insights of the tradition in theoretical sociology which has concentrated in general on the question of the sociology of knowledge and in particular on the notion of role-playing.

It is this approach which I shall in fact adopt in what follows. I shall draw in general on the literature which has recently been devoted to the way in which a given society succeeds in imposing on its members the roles which they play. And I shall make use in particular of the framework set up for the study of the sociology of knowledge by P. Berger and T. Luckmann in *The Social Construction of Reality*. The relevance of this approach for my own argument lies in its emphasis, derived ultimately from Max Weber, on the two ways in which the problem of 'legitimation' (Weber's phrase) arises for the leaders of any given society. First, we shall see from the literature to be examined how it arises, as Berger and Luckmann put it, as a problem in social perception. The leaders of the given society have to be able to produce a picture of social reality in which the existing social structure and the roles needed to sustain it are successfully legitimated. And secondly, we shall also see how it arises as a problem of social power. The leaders of the given society not only need to be able to enforce the orthodox view of social reality at the level of teaching it to very young people, they also need to be able to make it seem plausible to young people who have reached a more reflective - and so a potentially critical - phase in thinking about their own social situation and role. We shall see precisely these two preoccupations very clearly reflected in the literature to be examined.

The first theme I shall take up will be concerned with the
examination of what has been called 'role performance'. Berger and Luckmann\textsuperscript{14} point out that repeated actions and forms of behaviour that are shared and that are recurrent acquire a taken-for-granted character; when these involve two or more actors, actions whose meaning is shared (or 'reciprocally typified actions') emerge. These may be 'objectivated' as knowledge by means of language, and can then be transmitted to other members of the community. The behavioural patterns (and the actors) may also be typified as 'roles', and standards of role performance become part of the common stock of knowledge accessible to all members of the society, or to those who may, potentially, be performers of these particular roles. Further, it is suggested that roles may become institutionalised, and that while all roles represent the institutional order, some may 'symbolically represent that order in its totality more than others. Such roles are of great strategic importance in a society ... these roles help in maintaining such integration in the consciousness and conduct of the members of the society, that is, they have a special relationship to the legitimating apparatus of the society'.\textsuperscript{15}

The next theme I shall take up will be concerned with some literary examples of 'secondary socialisation'. Primary socialisation is taken to be the process by which an individual builds up a world and an identity, and this process ends when the 'concept of the generalised other' has been established in the consciousness of the individual and an internalisation of society, reality and identity has taken place.\textsuperscript{16} In primary socialisation the world of the parents (who are the usual no-choice socialising agents) is the world, while in secondary socialisation, i.e. all further internalisations of reality, this is not the case.
Secondary socialisation is the internalisation of the institutional or institution based "sub-worlds" ... we may say that secondary socialisation is the acquisition of role-specific knowledge, the roles being indirectly rooted in the division of labour ... The "sub-worlds" internalised in secondary socialisation are generally partial realities in contrast to the "base-world" acquired in primary socialisation. Yet they, too, are more or less cohesive realities characterised by normative and affective as well as cognitive components. 17

Secondary socialisation is built upon the base of primary socialisation, but the two may not fit neatly together, and the realisation that the world of primary socialisation is not the only one can cause crises. Also, both forms of socialisation require 'reality maintenance', so that some symmetry between objective and subjective reality is kept up. Though primary socialisation is much more 'massive' than secondary, the subjective realities internalised at both stages are vulnerable to challenge, though those of the latter are the more susceptible ones. 18

There is one further situation which is relevant to both the major themes I shall take up, and is therefore worth mentioning; this is the case where there is a discrepancy between primary and secondary socialisation (when the unity of primary socialisation is maintained, but alternative realities appear as subjective options in secondary socialisation). When the presentation of discrepant worlds takes place in 'secondary socialisation', then, since 'internalisation need not be accompanied by affectively charged identification with significant others ... the individual may internalise different realities without identifying with them. Therefore, if an alternative world appears in secondary socialisation, the individual may opt for it in a manipulative
manner ... The individual internalises the new reality, but instead of it being his reality, it is a reality to be used by him for specific purposes. In so far as this involves the performance of certain roles, he retains subjective detachment vis-a-vis them - he "puts them on" deliberately and purposefully.19

If the study of this type of literature, by means of this approach, is capable, as I hope to show, of yielding these sorts of insights about the society in and for which the literature was written, it might very tentatively be suggested that the findings of the following study have a certain methodological interest. The approach which I have now outlined to studying how a society maintains and transmits a particular image of its own values is still somewhat novel. Its value has been demonstrated in the case of the sociology of religion20 but it has still been rather little applied to literary studies. It does seem, however, as I hope to illustrate that this approach is not only valid but appears to be particularly fruitful when applied to studying the type of quasi-official and highly ideological literature with which I shall be concerned. It might thus be tentatively claimed for the following study that it represents not merely an application of this approach but a contribution to it, in the sense of providing an example in which this approach does seem specially appropriate as a way of studying the relations of literature and society, and showing that there are such relations, but without adopting any vulgar-Marxist position about the correspondence of the literature to the social situation. The situation, on the contrary, can be seen to be partly constituted out of this type of ideological projection of the society. It is this crucial fact which the methodology I have adopted seems particularly well-suited to establish.
Footnotes


3 Michael Rywkin gives a classification of the four generations (op.cit., p.7) as does Helen Ssachno in 'The Fourth Generation', Bulletin, Institute for the Study of the USSR, June 1962, pp.20-28. Here 'fourth generation' is used to mean the 17-25 year old group of characters. Strictly speaking, since the authors themselves belong to the fourth generation and are in their thirties during the period 1957-63, it would be more accurate to call their literary characters the 'fourth and a half' generation, or even the 'fifth' generation.

4 This is not to deny that the de-Stalinisation campaign and the 20th Congress did have an impact on and a significance for all generations. What is asserted here, rather is that the perceptions and interpretations of the one event differed.


6 George Gibian makes a similar comment in 'Themes in Recent Soviet Literature', Slavic Review, 23, No.3 (September 1964), pp.422-431.

7 Iu.Libedinskii, Dela semeinye, Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963.

8 There are numerous examples of this in the Soviet press; also see George S. Sherman, 'Soviet Youth: Myth and Reality', Daedalus, 91, No.1 (1962), pp. 216-237.

9 On the importance of this way of studying ideas see Q. Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', History and Theory, 8 (1969), pp. 3-53.


11 Ibid., p. 66.


A great deal of importance has always been accorded in Soviet literature to the presentation of the particular qualities, attitudes and patterns of behaviour that are considered ethical and socially desirable. The 'positive hero', the literary character who embodies the full range of such virtues, has been a mandatory figure in Soviet writing since 1931, and he is often referred to as a unique or prominent character in a book. He must reflect social reality, but with an optimistic reflection which serves as a guide as to how it ought to be perceived, and he must also inspire emulation. The second aspect of the positive hero - as a blueprint for acceptable ideals, personal attributes, and behaviour patterns - is generally recognised, and as a positive influence on young people it is reinforced by comment and discussion in the media of communication and in educational processes, as well as in general discourse and debate.

The positive hero of contemporary Soviet literature has a line of literary progenitors which reaches well back into the middle of the nineteenth century. Not only are most of his attributes derived even from the early radical and revolutionary ideals expressed in the 1860s, but the very existence of the positive hero as a type can be traced back to the debates of the time on the nature and role of literature. We can discern some of the characteristic qualities of the positive hero in Turgenev's Novyi veshchii and Razumov, and particularly in Chekhov's Pishchevnik. The heroes of Konkty, Fyodorov, Tarkov, Kiprensky, Orlovi and Belov display similar positive qualities: dedication, self-discipline, determination, incorruptibility,
A great deal of importance has always been accorded in Soviet literature to the presentation of the particular qualities, attitudes and patterns of behaviour that are considered ethical and socially desirable. The 'positive hero', the literary character who embodies the full range of such virtues, has been a mandatory figure in Soviet writing since 1932, and he is expected to perform at least two functions in addition to simply being an important character in a book. He must reflect social reality, but with an optimistic refraction which serves as a guide as to how it ought to be perceived, and he must also inspire emulation. The second aspect of the positive hero - as a blueprint for acceptable ideals, personal attributes, and behaviour patterns - is generally recognised, and as a putative influence on young people it is reinforced by comment and discussion in the media of communication and in educational processes, as well as in general discourse and debate.

The positive hero of contemporary Soviet literature has a line of literary progenitors which reaches well back into the middle of the nineteenth century. Not only are most of his attributes carried over from the early radical and revolutionary ideals expressed in the 1860s, but the very existence of the positive hero as a type can be traced back to the debates of the time on the nature and role of literature. We can discern some of the characteristic qualities of the positive hero in Turgenev's new men Insarov and Bazarov, and particularly in Chernyshevsky's Rakhmetov. The heroes of Gorky', Furmanov, Fadeev, Gladkov, Ostrovskii and Polevoi display similar qualities: dedication, self-discipline, resoluteness, incorruptibility,
singlemindedness, ruthlessness, rejection of private pursuits and subordination of personal life to public duties and activities. These characteristics were carried over and incorporated into the stereotype of the positive hero that dominated the post-1934 period until the Thaw of 1953.

Although the situations and problems which the positive hero was shown to confront varied periodically, the qualities which he possessed or deliberately acquired, and his patterns of behaviour, remained very much within the range I have cited. The critical representation of characters of this type also varied within this period. During the Twenties the fitness of this type of positive hero to act as a blueprint for the New Soviet Man was seriously challenged, and the implications latent in the selected list of idealised qualities was scrutinised. Olesha in Envy questioned some of the values and traits of the new man of this period, and contrasted them with the values of the old, superseded society. Thus Kavalerov and Ivan are measured against Andrei Babichev and Makarov -- in the balance lies their respective worth as human beings. Pil'nyak, in Naked Year and in Mahogany and Zamyatin, in We also criticised this ideal type at the same time, using distortion and caricature to make their points. During the Thirties, and until the time of Stalin's death, this form of criticism disappeared, and any criticism of such heroes was instead focused upon their possible shortcomings, flaws, errors or corruption due to external pressures or bourgeois tendencies. While the method of caricature and distortion had called the image of the positive hero into question, this second form of criticism offered no challenge to the morality or ethical nature of the man who
was shown to be the possessor of the qualities embodied in the myth. The criticisms instead ran along the lines of exposing the danger of having pretensions to these qualities, either by revealing actual deceptions in the hero's claims, or by showing his failure to display the appropriate qualities at the proper time, or by means of juxtaposing characters lacking the appropriate qualities with those possessing them.

During the period 1957 to 1963, however, a special variation of the negative character appears. The character in this case is a sincere and successful emulator of the ideal hero. He appears in a number of works of this period dealing with young people and their problems. Sometimes it is the young person himself who is such a character, while at other times he merely encounters such people. The character conforms to a greater or lesser degree to the ideal of the positive hero, with enough of the qualities and patterns of behaviour to pass as a worthy and acceptable person. With the development of the story, however, he is revealed as being only apparently a positive character. This revelation does not follow the lines of mistaken character assessment, for the character is all he professes to be, and does have most of the qualities required in the ideal type. The point is rather that these qualities are presented as insufficient to allow us to accept their possessors as ideal or even as particularly good people.

The line of criticism which this approach raises is thus of much greater interest, and brings in many more interesting issues and implications, than the quasi-critical literature of the Stalin period. In that literature the virtues of the positive hero remained
unquestioned. In this literature, however, it is the adequacy of the ideology in terms of which the positive hero's qualities are assessed which is in part at least being questioned. It is now questioned, that is, whether the qualities and characteristics which have hitherto been agreed upon as the essential qualities of a moral person within the communist ethical ideal are really necessary or exhaustive after all. The significance of this is not just that we are presented with a situation in which, contrary to expectation, a set of allegedly ideal social conditions are shown not to have brought forth the automatic moral improvement of human beings, such that it becomes open to us to ask why this has not happened, and how moral improvement (if such a thing is possible) is to be brought about. There is also the further significance, as I indicated in the Introduction, that if the given qualities of the positive hero are in some way inadequate or irrelevant, the whole question of 'what is a good man' is again made an open one, and not necessarily a question to which the existing Soviet ideology provides the complete answer.

It is possible to examine the way in which these questions were put and resolved in the literature dealing with young people and their problems during this period, if we turn to consider three novels by Vil'Lipatov: Glukhaia miata of 1960; Strezhen' of 1961; and Chernyi Iar of 1963. If we consider these works in parallel, it is possible to isolate two types of character. One type is the new man of the positive hero kind. (Since these characters are all endowed with the traditional and accepted virtues we may call these the 'seemingly-perfect' characters.) The other type is almost a parody of the first. The characters of this second type are portrayed as
having been compelled, because of circumstances, to adopt the role of public heroic figures. The grasp, with these characters, of the qualities required of them is thus a matter of assuming a style and a way of behaving, and some of the things they say are also part of this assumed character. But this performance only extends over certain parts of their lives. While it may be thoroughly assimilated by them for the required areas, there are parts of their lives which are conducted in a different manner. The basic difference between the two types of character is thus that while those belonging to this second type have acquired their qualities at a late stage and in a self-conscious manner, the characters of the first type have grown up with them or have managed thoroughly to integrate them.

The characters of Viktoria in Strezhen' and Alenochkin in Chernyi Iar belong to the first type of character. Alenochkin is a man of whose background we know little. He comes into the novel fully developed, and the reader is placed in the same position as the members of the group in which Alenochkin finds himself, who have to decide what manner of a man this is. Alenochkin is a less detailed character than Viktoria. He shares some of Viktoria's qualities, however, and is seen by Maxim Kovalev, a young engineer who is working under him, as a man with will-power, self-control, persistence, and knowledge. He admires Alenochkin
This picture of Alenochkin as an ideal type is built up from the beginning.

Maksim's very first impressions of Alenochkin were most favourable — he exhibited an easy, relaxed manner at their first encounter, with a transition from friendly banter to serious, comradely talk:

The character of Viktoria in Strezen is sketched with much greater detail, which serves an important function both in establishing her uncorrupted character in terms of external influences, and in revealing the traditional nature of the principles of her upbringing and of her models. Her upbringing was in the hands of her mother, a teacher, who had herself been a dedicated revolutionary and held to the strictest traditions of the ideal revolutionary upbringing. The father is presented as a mild man, preoccupied with his books and his teaching, to the secret relief of the mother, who had felt that their daughter needed strict discipline to offset the possible effects of being an only child, and thus of being more in danger of being spoilt and indulged. The main tenets according to which Viktoria is said
to have been raised were those of strict discipline, along with the development of self-discipline, mercilessness in the standards set for herself, will-power, and in general strength of character. Thus by the time Viktoria had reached the 8th class at school, she was outstanding for the demands she made on herself and others, for her firmness of character and her contempt for other more easy-going and less disciplined children.

In one of the first chapters of the novel Viktoria discusses life and her future with her friend and old school-fellow, Stepan. She begins by quoting the words of Nikolai Ostrovskii on the need to live in such a way that one does not regret in agony one's uselessly spent years, and then describes their effect on her:

Желание идти по жизни гордо, решительно, добиться многого, стать большим человеком.  

Clearly, Viktoria's model and her inspiration come from one of the revolutionary 'men of steel'. Further, Viktoria develops her own ideas on what life is all about:

- Человек живет только в стремлении к большему! Без этого жизнь становится пустой.

She encourages Stepan to display will-power, persistence, to find an aim in life, and undertakes to help him to turn him into a courageous, proud man.

Viktoria is shown as rejecting Stepan's friendship and love. This she justifies to her mother by explaining that she has been taught to strive after great things, and that though Stepan had other good qualities, he lacked will-power and self-discipline, and could never be worthy of her. Conversely, she sees her relations with her
fellow workers in the fishing brigade as entirely satisfactory:

Я могу работать, общаясь с людьми. Я не хвастаюсь, если говорю, что у меня есть и воля, и настойчивость, и знание людей... Там на песке, есть пьяница Тихий, там он побивает меня. Я не либеральничаю с ним, как другие.17

Viktoria's image, in short, is that of a principled, direct, outspoken person.

Viktoria is thus shown urging the brigade on to greater efforts by criticising their existing rituals and habits, and finally insisting, as a matter of pride and principle, on an explanation for her undeserved inclusion in a commendatory newspaper report. Tikhii, who is a near-alcoholic, is shown as the particular target of her uncompromising insistence on the observance of labour-discipline. And she is shown, in a dangerous moment during an emergency on the river, conquering her own fears and behaving with courage and competence, in a way that wins the respect of the fishermen for her meticulous work and her strict observation of the rules.

After her courageous behaviour in danger Viktoria feels sure of her own potential and is elated:

Смотри, мама, как ведет себя твоя дочь! Она выросла смелой, решительной, не боящейся трудностей. Она, Виктория, смеется над теми молодыми людьми, которые боятся жизни, теряются в ней, со страхом идут на производство. Она другая! Она добьется всего, что захочет, — будет хорошим врачом, может быть защитит диссертацию и станет учителем. Упорства и воли у неё хватит.18

Viktoria recalls an episode from her own childhood, which symbolises to her her own early will-power, persistence and strength of character. Each child in her class had been asked to copy a puppet
model. Viktoria was the only one to copy exactly the cold-eyed
passionless shop-made puppet.

- В точности как из магазина! Молодец, Виктория!19

Not one of the other children had managed to make such a puppet,
though theirs were good, but each in its own way, with a special
expression -- happy, sly, sad or cheeky.

The second type of character in these novels -- the type which
is almost a parody of the 'seemingly-perfect' characters can be
represented by the figure of Rakov in Glukhaia miata and by
Strel'nikov in Strezhen'. Both these men have been appointed or
elevated to a particular role, and because there is a conventional
belief that these roles go with certain required modes of behaviour,
and carry certain responsibilities, both Rakov and Strel'nikov are
shown to have adopted, with differing degrees of thoroughness and
success, the characteristics and mannerisms which, in their eyes,
properly belong to their positions.

Rakov is a tractor driver who has been singled out as a model
worker. After his portrait had appeared on numerous walls with
accompanying exhortations to emulate this man, and after the oblast
newspaper had run a laudatory article on his achievements, Rakov
faced his idealised image with fear and shame. Since he did not
recognise himself in the image, he felt that any comparison of his
real self and his real achievements with the imaginary, ideal Rakov
would make him appear inadequate and fraudulent. As no disastrous
revelations took place, however, he became accustomed to his role
and gradually took steps to reduce the discrepancies between his
own person and the idealised image:

Fame brought good things to Rakov. He married an outstanding beauty whom he had until then regarded as inaccessible, and he became accustomed to his good fortune. Rakov now believed in the 'correctness' of his life, and came to believe in the change he had undergone. As his attitudes thus became increasingly fixed and rigid, he began to see in them the best and most trustworthy modes of behaviour. The arrogant pose of the poster became his own ordinary posture. He lost the ability to behave spontaneously and naturally, because he was constantly constrained by the feeling that he was performing before an audience, and this made him pompous and self-important in everything he said. The rigid stereotype into which Rakov had forced himself thus came to act as a barrier in his ordinary relations with people, and effectively cut him off from ordinary contacts.

Strel'nikov is the brigade leader of a group of river fishermen, and his adopted pose is that which he thinks of as appropriate for an ideal brigade leader. His adoption of the posture he thinks appropriate is now shown as being so thorough or far-reaching as Rakov's, and there are times when he drops it entirely, and enters into a completely
different relationship with the people around him. At meals, at
moments of relaxation, and when he is at work, Strel'nikov drops the
self-consciously assumed role of brigade leader and becomes a person
instead of just the personification of a role: a skilful,
kind-hearted, rather simple man. And at such moments he has the
respect and affection of the other people.

Strel'nikov is portrayed not only as a man who feels compelled
to play his part, but also (when he is on his duty visits to the
centre) as a man compelled to feed and reinforce this compulsion, even
to the extent of creating situations in which he can then act his
part as brigade leader. He is shown issuing unnecessary orders,
assuming a commanding strut and tone of voice, trying hard to introduce
formal situations like 'production discussions' with his brigade,
simple-mindedly feeling that such performances are demanded by his
role, even if there is no justification for them in functional terms.
He is singularly unsuccessful in his attempt to introduce the public
meeting situation to the brigade. The other members are prepared to
play along, to allow him to make speeches and run the meeting, all
the while cooperatively comporting themselves with appropriate decorum.
The whole performance collapses, however, when their active participation
is demanded in questions and discussion.

Both these characters of the second type, Rakov and Strel'nikov,
are portrayed as outstandingly skilled at their special work, and
when they are caught up in the excitement, concentration and pleasure
of their work, the assumed poses drop away and they appear as far
more impressive people than their assumed roles ever permit them to be.
Although both characters are shown to have a certain arrogance,
neither is shown to have any conviction of superiority over other people, except that which is given to them, as they see it, by their respective roles.

This second type of character may thus be said to illustrate most clearly the sense in which the writers with whom I am concerned are interested in, and to some extent disturbed by, the way in which such characters' behaviour exhibit them to be the prisoners of the roles created for them by the prevailing ideology. They provide the clearest indication of the way in which their ideology not only controls but stereotypes their behaviour. They actually come, that is, to perceive themselves in terms of the roles laid down in the ideology, and to that extent they are shown becoming less than real people: in the case of Rakov, the man is ultimately seen conforming to the image of himself created by the posters advertising his merits. The behaviour of these characters is shown to have a meaning for them only in terms of the prevailing ideology, and yet the prevailing ideology is in turn shown to make their behaviour a parody of the ideology and the values it enshrines.

This second type of character, however, is not totally separate or distinguished in this respect from the first type. It is true that Rakov and Strel'nikov play out their roles in terms of such stereotyped phrases, physical bearing, tone of voice and other such devices that they appear foolish in the sheer ineptness and crudity of their interpretation of these roles. It is also true, however, that characters of the first type, such as Alenochkin or Viktoria, stage not wholly dissimilar performances in certain situations where there are available stereotypes. They use very much the same devices,
but because their performances are more convincing, and because the ideal pattern to which they are conforming is socially approved, their role-playing is in turn accepted with approval. Furthermore, since their performances are not only more convincing, but are also felt to be spontaneous by the actors themselves, and not the conscious enactment of a role at all, so their audiences tend to be less aware, as well as less critical, of the fact that they are nevertheless role-playing according to a pre-established model of correctness. It is still the case, however, even with these 'seemingly-perfect' characters, that they are just as constrained and limited in their responses to people and situations as are Rakov and Strel'nikov when they are playing their parts. Thus Alenochkin and Viktoria are also reacting and responding to a series of preconceived situations and pre-judged, pre-classified people: for every person they encounter there is a stereotyped evaluation and response, and this is the one they adopt.

When Alenochkin is shown, for example, taking charge of a tensely hostile situation between a workman and an engineer, he is also shown to slip into the appropriately commanding manner:

Так делать нельзя, Кузыменков! - строго продолжает он. - Просто немедленно занять свое место! Я не привык дважды повторять распоряжения! - властно ворчливует Аленочкин, когда видит, что Емельян не движется. - Я кому говорю, товарищ Кузыменков!

- Вот так! удовлетворенно замечает Аленочкин. - С дисциплиной у нас ещё не все ладно!21

Similarly Viktoria, consistently with her self-image of resoluteness and high principle, reacts to people and their actions by passing judgments on them. This response is merely a consequence of the
sense of self-righteousness which appears as a deeply felt emotion in the case of 'seemingly-perfect' characters. Their acceptance, that is, and their perfect imitation of the ideal revolutionary and new man images, combined with the knowledge that they are successful in following a series of patterns which are favourably evaluated in their society, leads these characters to adopt an attitude of superiority over the humbler and less perfect, who have been unable to attain such a moral level. The 'seemingly-perfect' not only know what the prevailing ethical ideals are, and thus what a good man must be like. They have also managed to mould themselves according to this model, and so can regard themselves as ethical beings. Thus they see it as part of their image to expose immoral actions and attitudes, to see that justice is done, that punishment is administered to unworthy individuals, and even if need be that they are extirpated from society. And the point is that when this role of prosecutor, judge and public conscience is being played, both the language and the postures even of these 'seemingly-perfect' characters betray that they are playing a part.

The clearest example of this is provided by the case of Viktoria, who is shown in three different situations behaving in such a way that it is clear that she is self-consciously acting a part, giving a performance. The first of these occasions is Viktoria's attempt to point out to the fishermen of her brigade the weaknesses in their work and in their attitude to it. She addresses them after the midday meal:

И вдруг она встает, высоко вскидывает голову, звонко произносит:
- Товарищи! Минуточку!
In the second situation, Viktoria again addresses the fishing brigade, this time demanding to know the 'truth' about her inclusion with the group in the commendatory report on some technical improvements in which she had not taken part. Her insistence on raising this issue finally provokes an unpalatable response, and Viktoria experiences a desire to retreat, but finds this impossible because of the formal, ritualised way in which she perceives the situation, and because of the implication for her self-image of such a withdrawal:

... and yet she had a wild desire to eat, to wrap her hand around, to try to forget the newspaper. She wants to do this, but she doesn't know it - as she doesn't know the table, the hand is not the one it is, the head is not the one it is, the hand is not the one it is. She says, "It's painful!" - she thinks. Viktoria. Yet she wants to eat, because it is their meal, because of the analysis made by Kolotovkina, the cold look of Semen Kruhila, the extreme silence. Yet, yet, yet, - she, this Kolotovkina, mockingly smiles.

- I do not need a deal! - she says. - He says "I want to eat!" -ulyan Tikhii... Ulyan Tikhii molchit potomu ....
- She stops, as if she does not know, why he protests Tikhii. She says, "I want to eat!" - he says. He wants to protest Tikhii. However, once it is all over, it does not make sense, and she suddenly understands, in what the matter is. - Tikhii molchit potomu, that it is not fair, and they think about him. Yet, it's hard to call a newspaper from a person of a man who has been in solitary confinement! 23
In each of these three situations a victim is required so that Viktoria can go through the approved rituals, and maintain her own self-image. She does not care who the victim is, what his suffering may be, or what might have brought him to such a condition. Tikhii, the near alcoholic, is a victim merely of administrative injustice and his own compassionate nature, and the other members of the group have been trying slowly to build up his self-respect and self-confidence. Viktoria, however, can only see the revolting drunkard and the violater of her notions of rightness and morality. Stepan, her school-friend, is equally easily sacrificed when he fails, by indulging in a light hearted game, to live up to Viktoria's uncompromising principles. To Viktoria, the victim is merely a prop, an object to be manipulated, a means in particular by which her own closeness to the ideal type can be established.

The same aspect of the 'seemingly-perfect' character, convinced of his own infallibility and virtue, and thus ready to sacrifice others
to establish his own goodness, or to maintain a situation he believes to be proper or moral, or to remedy a situation he believes to be wrong, is also discussed in several other works of this period. The character of Alenochkin, for example, is similarly shown to be adept at manipulating people in various situations in such a way as to allow himself to act in a manner compatible with his ideal image. This emerges clearly at the outset of the story, when Alenochkin's sister-in-law voices the only discordant perception of his behaviour. It is in fact his most exemplary remarks which call forth her impotent irritation and anger. But this puzzling response becomes comprehensible when Sof'ia Borisovna tries to express her feelings to Boris Egorov, a young engineer who is working for Alenochkin and boarding with his family.

When Sof'ia Borisovna finally ventures to make this accusation to Alenochkin's face, calling him a liar and an actor, he makes no attempt to answer the accusations, but handles the whole situation in a fashion which preserves his image, and which rests on the invulnerability of the rituals and roles he fulfils. Sof'ia Borisovna is sacrificed 'in rehearsal', not in actuality, because the scene is private, but it
is a clear indication of what would happen should she repeat her accusations publicly.

There is a similar gamut, moreover, of stereotyped postures and formulae which Alenochkin runs through when he clashes with Egorov, who has crossed his path in a premature trial of strength:

Later, as the incident draws to a close, Alenochkin assumes a fatherly, then a saddened attitude, finally resuming his usual presence:

In this clash, Emelian Kuzmenko is a pawn. The situation represents
a counterpart to that of Tikhii in Strezhen: a man who has been battered by circumstances, and who is about to give up any thought of struggling out of his predicament. His redemption has been the concern of Maksim, and in the power struggle between Egorov and Alenochkin, Kuzmenko is likely to be incidentally sacrificed. The whole of the clash between Egorov and Alenochkin is played out ostensibly at the level of high principle, but underlying this level there is another one, which appears to be known only to the two protagonists, and which is the level of self-interest related to the outcome of the conflict.

The slightly indicated possibility of underlying self-interest as an ulterior motive which determines the behaviour of the 'seemingly perfect' characters introduces a further complication. On the one hand, both in the case of Viktoria and in the case of Alenochkin, the author suggests that both characters have some sort of personal area of self-interest which is being furthered by the roles they play. On the other hand, it is nowhere suggested beyond doubt that self-interest is the dominant motive for their behaviour or for the positions they take up. So while we have the suggestion of hypocrisy or insincerity, this suggestion has no more force than a slight doubting of or wondering about people's innermost motives. Rather, it would appear that the real point about the failings in the 'seemingly-perfect' characters, leading to a gradual disillusionment in them amongst people who see them in certain situations, is the absence of identification in these types with the view of social reality shared by the others. These are people who have, in Berger and Luckman's phrase, 'successfully internalised' one version of social reality from the alternatives that that they have discerned. But they have not identified with it, and it
is in this way that a manipulative element enters their behaviour. This is not to imply, however, that there is anything Machiavellian in their behaviour, for they are, on the contrary, entirely taken in by their own propaganda. Thus Lipatov, for example, sets this attitude apart from one of simple cynicism when he briefly shows the anger that Egorov feels at the open cynicism of his brother.

A further example of this same readiness of the 'seemingly perfect' characters to sacrifice others in order to establish what they take to be the right situation is provided by one of V. Tendriakov's characters, Vasilii Vasil'evich, who is made to say these words to his chief, a man who belongs to the generation of 'iron man', builders of the new state:

Another character, however, is made to make this comment about the same man:

A further illustration of this same point is provided in the novella Chrezvychainoe, of 1961. The director of a school discovers
that the young people who are due to matriculate within a few weeks are ready to reject, cast off and punish a class-mate who is weak enough to believe in God. They are ready to do this without a thought for her feelings or her future, and with the absolute conviction that they are right. Again, the same theme recurs in Nilin's Zhestokost', and in Nagibin's short stories: the pitilessness and unconcern for other people which lives in men who are themselves incorruptible and wholly dedicated to living up to an ideal.

We may thus say that there are at least two criticisms, both of them stronger in force than the criticisms offered of such characters as Rakov, which appear to underlie the way in which all these writers treat the 'seemingly perfect' characters. First, it is clear that underlying this whole questioning of the adequacy of sufficiency of the particular qualities which have been used to define the good man is the wish to point to the following paradox: that the very men who are most dedicated to improving the lot of mankind, and who are moved by ideals of benefiting humanity, nevertheless become oppressors and executioners of the very people they seek to help. The point that all these writers are making is that to follow an ideal model of particular qualities, which prescribe particular patterns of behaviour that are automatically taken to determine one's goodness, is quite compatible with maintaining a contempt and a callousness towards other people. Conversely, their point is that the vital element around which the answer to the question of goodness and badness hinges ought really to be the element of concern, or lack of concern, for other people.

The second and more general criticism which all these writers appear to offer of the 'seemingly-perfect' characters concerns the
evident sterility and ultimate futility of imagining that any one set of prescribed categories for describing and classifying actions or situations can ever be relied upon to resolve human problems or deal with the human condition in a once-for-all fashion. The 'seemingly perfect' characters are used to illustrate the claim, that is, that there must inevitably be a weakness in any attempt to treat any one set of stereotypes as an exhaustive moral pattern for all real situations. The relevance of the traditional ideal type is thus questioned as providing a universal, and even an effective, moral guide. The question whether this ideal was ever a valid guide to moral action is not raised, but it is certainly implied that times change, and that the ideal may thus become less applicable in different times and new conditions. Uncle Istignei is thus made, for example, to say -- speaking of Viktoria's mother:

.... Мать у неё, говорит, строга, неуклонна .... а времена ласковые пошли .... 34

We may thus conclude that, at its most general, this literature is concerned, with respect to the notion of a given ideal of behaviour, to suggest the need for a certain reassessment of the prevailing ethical models. This is not to say, however, that the literature on this point divides along anything like strictly generational lines. The responses of the young people to this implied need for a reassessment of prevailing ideals are not presented in a uniform way. Sometimes it is the young people who are shown as the adherents of the traditional ethical images. At other times it is they who challenge their applicability in arguing with either their elders or their peers. And the members of the older generation are also shown questioning the given ideals, both as they
are deployed by their own generation, and as they are deployed by the young people themselves. The explanation, as I sought to suggest in the Introduction, is probably not to be sought in any theory of generational conflict tout court, but rather in an account (of the type I have sought to present) of the different mental worlds, and the different projections of social reality, of the different protagonists in the argument.

We may also conclude that one point which the literature I have examined in this chapter clearly illustrates, and was intended to illustrate, is the danger inherent in treating any one way of describing social life as having any uniquely privileged status. I have sought to indicate, moreover, from the illustrations I have given, that the role of this literature was not merely to mirror the social changes of this kind taking place in Soviet society at this time. It is clear that it also played a role, by way of its critique of the characters who are sustaining the traditional ideal type, in helping this process of challenge itself.
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CHAPTER III
SOCIAL ROLES

... Everyone is at some stage faced with the task of moving from the circumscribed life of childhood, where a single interpretation of the world, one seen that is held and passed on by the significant persons in a child's life, is accepted as the world, and where, equally, the child's identity and belonging within that world is accepted unquestioningly as something irrevocable. When this childhood world meets the wider, adult world taken for granted, it is likely that the shift will be accompanied by the discovery that the view of reality which was accepted earlier does not tally with the everyday adult interpretation of reality, and hence, that there may be several discrepant or conflicting interpretations prevalent in the society, under which a choice must be made. Also, in the wider society, the young initiate is expected to choose and to perform certain roles, and these, he may find, can be played in different ways, and with varying degrees of identification. It is possible, of course, to hold to an illogical or conflicting interpretation of reality, and to adopt unique or unusual roles: the tolerance for such choices would vary considerably from society to society.

The theme of how to find or choose a place in society, and how to integrate one's own view of reality in the light of such experiences is not an unknown one in literature, and between 1957 and 1961 this was a popular subject for Soviet writers who were concerned with writing about young people. The prevailing vision of the discovery of identity and a place in established society would have the person 'temporarily leave the establishment and, in a desperate struggle with the elements and moral values ... test his ability to be a man'. A certainuzuability of frontiers to which one can escape to, of course, e
Everyone is at some stage faced with the task of moving from the circumscribed life of childhood where a single interpretation of the world, the one that is held and passed on by the significant persons in a child's life, is accepted as the world, and where, equally, the child's identity and location within that world is accepted unquestioningly as something inevitable. When the transition from this childhood world to the wider, adult world takes place it is quite likely that the shift will be accompanied by the discovery that the view of reality which was accepted earlier does not tally with the everyday adult interpretation of reality, and moreover, that there may be several discrepant or conflicting interpretations prevalent in the society, amongst which a choice must be made. Also, in the wider society the young initiate is expected to choose and to perform certain roles, and these, he may find, can be played in different ways, and with varying degrees of identification. It is possible, of course, to hold to an idiosyncratic interpretation of reality, and to adopt unique or unusual roles: the tolerance for such choices would vary considerably from society to society.

The theme of how to find or choose a place in society, and how to revise and adjust one's view of reality in the light of such experiences is not an uncommon one in literature, and between 1957 and 1963 this was a popular subject for Soviet writers who were concerned with writing about young people. The Melvillian vision of the discovery of identity and of a place in established society would have the person 'temporarily leave the establishment and, in a desperate struggle with the elements and moral issues ... test his ability to be a man'. ¹ A certain availability of frontiers to which one can escape is, of course, a
necessary condition for this solution. Manhood achieved, the seeker re-enters society and takes up his place in it as a full member. In Soviet writing the frontiers which provide a testing ground for the young, are commonly the virgin lands or the big construction sites, though their earlier appeal has certainly been impaired by its official manipulation.

Anatolii Kuznetsov uses the Siberian constructions (Bratsk, Irkutsk) to provide a frontier situation for the hero of his novel *Prodolzhenie legendy*, restoring some of the original challenge by carefully dissociating Tolik's journey from any official arrangements or appeals, and showing it instead as a panic flight from a claustrophobic environment of closed doors, made with some vague hope of finding an identity and a place. Tolik realised only when he was already aboard a train and well on his way, that there are many easier ways of reaching construction sites than the one which he had chosen: there are recruiting officers looking out for labour, ready to arrange contracts and to finance recruits; there are komsomol-organised travel passes. His action of leaping into the unknown, blindly, on his own, was not necessary and this obliviousness points strongly to the fact that the purpose and significance of the journey are private. Tolik's friend, Viktor, called it his Твор (прости) 'трусливая затая бежать куда глаза глядят' and Tolik could not retrospectively, understand how he had dared to catch that train and leave:

До сих пор не понимаю, как я отважился вот так сесть в поезд, выехать, не имея знакомых, не представляя, что я буду делать в Сибири и нужен ли я вообще кому-нибудь. Может я сделал это потому, что плакала мать и умоляла устроиться рабочим в артели детских игрушек: 'Нак раз требуются, а это и близко и удобно. Будешь работать, как все люди'.
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The officially approved frontiers of Soviet society, the virgin lands and the construction sites were not enough, however, for the young heroes of *Zvezdnyi bilet*. Their sophistication and their rejection of establishment attitudes militated against such an 'acceptable' solution. The frontier of their choice, the Baltic seabord, was a romantic one, symbolically a pushing out to the unknown and the exotic, a move right out to the furthest possible point of their society. A similar choice of exotic frontiers was made by Vlad'ka and Aleksei, two of Vasilli Aksenov's heroes in *Kollegi*.4 The third, Sasha, was still sensitive to frontier challenge in volunteering for a post in a village which is isolated and backward, though neither particularly remote nor exotic, though Vlad'ka and Aleksei saw none of this in this situation. Instead, they considered that to take up such a place before having ever undertaken a trial of strength or a really testing challenge of their abilities and characters was to accept an invitation to a life of dull safety and slow stultification.

The event that triggers off such a change in attitude and perception, as Berger and Luckmann put it, is usually the socially accepted demarcation point at which a person must leave the shelter and protection of a special environment and of parental or adult care, and make a twofold declaration of intention -- the declaration of the intention to take up a particular role in society (and this may be a declaration which cannot be acted upon at once, but one which, nevertheless, would determine the prescribed course which must be followed if the selected role is to be attained), and the declaration of the intention to view one's role in society, and thus one's social relationships, in a particular way. The first intention may be signalled quite clearly and unequivocally, and
may be arrived at entirely unexpectedly, or it may be ambiguously stated and may develop gradually, in a tentative fashion. The second intention is not usually formulated or announced, but nevertheless it is built up and manifested in the manner in which courses of action are chosen, and in the way in which roles are perceived.

Sasha, Aleksei and Vlad'ka had already made their choice of a role, and Kollegi opens with their role already decided, and with preliminary training and in-group initiation out of the way. They are at the stage of deciding where and in what manner each one of them has perceived his role, and how he intends to play it. At this point it is their different interpretations of the role specifically of a doctor which become obvious, and these bear a relationship to their conceptions of social reality and to their understanding of their own part in it.

Sasha's view of the role is the clearest and most precise one: He comes from a family where medicine is traditionally the chosen profession, and is himself very conscious of this familial pattern. To him, 'being a doctor' is not a role made up of notions formed from encounters with some doctors, the way this role usually was talked about, or from the in-group constructions of the initiatory period in the Institute. For the role has a more specific, much more personal embodiment in his father and mother; therefore, for him the answer to the question 'what does being a doctor mean to me?' is 'behaving and living as members of my family have done'.

Aleksei and Vlad'ka, without such first-hand, internalised perceptions, arrived at their answer to the same question in a less direct and clear-cut way, being influenced by other considerations and more remote from the specifics or the role itself.
The four principal characters of *Zvezdnyi bilet* are afflicted with a discontent and restlessness which is deepened by the awareness of their uncertain balance on the edge of adult life. Although three of the friends do have definite ambitions and dreams, these are either unacceptable to their parents, or cannot be readily realised. The pressure of adult demands for commitment to a course of future action is felt very strongly by these adolescents because of their uncertainty, lack of self-knowledge and unwillingness to commit themselves to anything at this stage. It is a trivial incident that emphasises the clash between the adolescent and the adult perceptions of the situation, and which sparks off the decision of the young people to step, for a time, out of the adult world, with its concepts of morality and its prescriptions. Once the suggestion to 'opt out' is made, there is only a momentary qualm. Someone asks about going to College, but this is speedily dismissed, with the claim that this is just 'stupid nonsense', since it is possible to enter College anytime up to thirty-five, while they are only seventeen, and thus see themselves as having eighteen years to spare. The rejection of the adult perception of reality, where choice, commitment and decision must be made at once, suddenly opens up a whole host of possibilities - mostly hazily defined and perceived, but still genuine possibilities.

*Prodolzhenie legendy* opens with the narrator and hero, Tolik, in a similar predicament. This is the moment when his schooldays are over, and strong adult pressure is exerted on him to make some role commitment. Nevertheless, although the situation of both the characters in *Zvezdnyi bilet* and of Tolik are alike in this respect, there is a significant distinction in the perception of the situation as seen by the two sets of characters. Aksenov's young people see that their own rather diffuse desires
are rejected, or rather ignored, by their parents, who put before them instead alternative plans that are dissimilar to their own. Though the four are uncertain about the courses they want to pursue, and are extremely vague about the details of how to go about achieving them, they are vehement in their opposition to the suggested alternatives, and to the pressure for commitment. Fundamentally, what they wish to reject are specific roles that are preferred to them, and in particular the position in which they find themselves, where the patterns for their lives are laid down by adults, according to their particular conception of social reality. Dima formulates this in a tirade against Viktor, his older brother, when he makes it clear how Viktor's career appears to him, and why he has rejected any notion of following in Viktor's footsteps.

In Zvezdnyibilet, however, apart from a general indication of a certain lack of sympathy and a disproportionate adult disapproval of the attitudes and ways of the young people, the crux of the problem lies precisely in this search for one's own decisions in life. At the very outset of the novel the disinclination on the part of the young people to take the generally accepted social reality with much seriousness is made clear. The opening paragraphs describe Dima's deliberate stroll against the traffic lights, unfortunately straight into the arms of a policeman, whereupon he refuses to take at all seriously the ensuing ritual of identification and application of sanctions. Rescued by Viktor he is not in the least grateful, and delivers a parody of some pious institutionalised fictions. His note of mockery of generally accepted official values of the society is repeated later, for example, when the four are in a train on their way to Estonia, they almost come to blows with the young men sharing their compartment because of an irreverence
to some social shibboleths, concerned in this case with work. Igor'
Baulin, the leader of sailors, makes an attempt to laugh the matter off,
and seeks to re-establish amity by asking whether Dima is a Komsomol
member. This ploy again provokes a disrespectful outburst of derision.
Igor is characterised by his companion as 'a man of principle', and
later Galia's thoughts run to this remark; but they are typically
irreverent thoughts, and completely unlike the thoughts a young girl
would be expected to have on the subject.

However, in Prodolzhenie legendy Tolik's vision of his plight is
rather different. Though, as we have said, there is the immediate
situation similarity with Zvezdnyibilet, this distinction in the
perception of the problem is important. Tolik has two main difficulties
in finding and accepting an adult role and view of reality. This first
is that he has discovered that the 'official' interpretation of reality,
the institutionally presented one, that version which he had encountered
at school, in formal statements and in inspirational books, has been
misleading in the account it gave of the possibilities in life that are
open to him. 'Молодёжь всегда у нас дорога' is the catch phrase which
provides the initial premise from which the choice of an adult role and
life style will be made. This assertion had been reiterated throughout
Tolik's childhood and it was the one which he had accepted and even taken
for granted. But when school is over, and the search for an adult role
is beginning, Tolik finds that because he has failed to fulfil certain
formal requirements, the road to further education and most other roads
are closed to him. A further difficulty he finds is the impossibility
of reconciling the models that have been put up for a life-style with
the realities of contemporary life. He remarks:
When he searches for models and roles, Tolik discovers that the sort of guidelines for morality and conduct, and the models and heroes which have been presented for emulation are, in fact, completely irrelevant to his times and circumstances, and the love and admiration he had held for these 'ideal men' were frustrating because, ultimately, they do not represent an attainable personal goal. At this stage Tolik has reached a disillusionment with the official interpretation of reality on two points: first, that he has been mislead about the possibilities life holds, and second, none of the proffered examples of role-playing or identity seem at all appropriate. Dima and his friends do not experience this disillusionment within the pages of the novel, where their attitude to some elements, at least, of the official interpretation of reality, is already disbelieving and irreverent.

Since the official interpretation of social reality as Tolik observes it, he is faced with the central problem of somehow arriving at an interpretation of his own, which will give him a framework of premises that can serve as a rational starting point for arranging his life and for choosing a role and style. And now he finds that besides the official interpretation, there are at least two other interpretations known to him, and all these are in some aspects incompatible, or at least suggest incompatible modes of action. One such interpretation is the version given by Tolik's mother and by the father of his friend Viktor. These two versions are individual variants of one common view of reality, the 'soft' and the 'hard' lines respectively. Viktor's father sees the
universe as a dog-eats-dog place, where weaklings go to the wall, and to him the behaviour of the heroic models is no more than an irrelevant legend for children, which cannot be taken seriously and which must certainly be put aside with other childish things when the time comes to enter fully into adult life. To Tolik and to Viktor he says:

- Современная жизнь, молодые люди, — это дикий лес, в котором кишат гады. Кто кому скорее перегрызет горло, тот и прав. Красивые идеи только в книгах, они для внешнего пользования.8

He goes on to enlarge on this theme, urging the boys to look about them:

.... деловым людям навлевать на вашего Корчагина. Это вы, пока маленькие, забавляетесь, читае разные кники, волнуетесь, а у людей заботы о деньгах, о пальто, о квартире; кто поучнее да похитрее, тот продвигается, — глядишь уже ездит в собственном автомобиле. Зубы точите, зубы9

Tolik's mother echoes this view of the universe as a hostile and dangerous place, but her advice on handling this is to urge withdrawal and inconspicuous behaviour:

- Все мы, пока молодые, куда-то рвемся, ищем правду, а потом привыкаем.... Самое верное: найди себе тихий уголок и живи скромно, мирно, Бог с ними, с чинами и деньгами. Жизнь такая же тонкая, не лезь, не ищи справедливости. Не найдешь.10

Finally, the third interpretation that Tolik is left with, is the hotch-potch of his own past experiences and observations. He turns to these as the official interpretation and that of significant adults become contradictory and discrepant. But even his past experiences seem to reflect to a certain degree either the official view, or the viciously competitive interpretation. Retrospectively, Tolik realises that he has encountered conditions and situations which do not fit in with the official
view. He also finds that one of his close friends holds an interpretation which is very like the official one, and acts upon it, but this is not the case with the others, whose life styles support their interpretations, and, it would seem, whose affluence is secured by behaviour which makes sense within the framework of their interpretation of reality.

This moment of uncertainty and confusion sends both Tolik and Dima and his little group on a journey which appears in some way to be a solution. There is nothing new at all in this response to the problem, and both Kuznetsov and Aksenov use the 'journey episode' (Kuznetsov to a greater, Aksenov to a lesser degree) as a device which exposes their characters to further encounters and to views that will add to their stock of experience and enable a workable view of reality to be built up.

Dima and his companions have only one important encounter en route: the meeting (mentioned earlier) with two young sailors led by their 'man of iron' captain. And yet, the meeting is significant because it is illustrative of the way in which, despite initially easy and amiable contact, a very quick breakdown of the relationship can take place, caused by the manner in which the two sets of people see what is at first taken to be a common reality. Moreover, this divergence of interpretation is emphasised because it reaches its sharpest point exactly at the moments when it is assumed that a common view is held, simply because the appropriate attitude and perception of some subject is taken so much for granted that it is inconceivable that it should be seen in any other way. Dima's whole conversation with Igor' Baulin is an example of the shock and hostility engendered by a sudden revelation of contradictory apprehensions of matters which seemingly can be only seen in one particular way.

Tolik is going to Siberia, and his journey involves a close
proximity, for several days, with five very different people, each of whom represents a completely different background, life-style and outlook. He ponders over these differences and watches the behaviour of these people who are quite new and strange to him. This happens in particular after a violent fight between Grishka, who is a budding kulak and Leshka, a professional thief:

Again, Tolik's experiences bring out further discrepancies between the official interpretation of reality and his actual observations, and he begins to think about these different people as epitomes of life-styles that represent alternative possibilities for his own choice. These alternatives, though strange and somewhat bewildering, are nevertheless understandable, and can be weighed and judged because they do belong to the same social environment, and confront common social problems, conventions, institutions and situations: they have some mutual areas of experience. When a band of wandering gypsies besieges the train at a small station, Tolik is here exposed to something rather different. He comes face to face with a way of life which is based on a reality that is patently different from his own, quite divorced from it, and this, in addition, is so emphasised by alien appearance, clothing and manner that
he cannot even find a point from which to start in order to make some sort of sense of these people and their life:

... они куда-то ехали, какие-то у них есть свои цели ... Сегодя они не знают что будут есть завтра, мерзнут, мокнут, умирают, попрошайничают, а попробуй предложи им пойти в артель детских игрушек! Сколько надо беззаботности и еще чего-то, чего я не понимаю, чтобы жить вот так просто, 'подобно птицам небесным', и не пропасть, не умочиться! Тут один раз биться поехать, думашь-гадашь, оставляешь лазейку, чтобы в случае чего ударить. А они кончат и кончат. Не работают, не светят, не жнут, а живут, родятся и умирают в пути.12

This 'и еще чего-то, чего я не понимаю' is very revealing, because it is this incomprehensible mainspring that sets Tolik apart from the gypsies, and it is the central difference between his social experiences and reality and theirs: it is the sum of all his socialisation. There is of course a further level at which this phrase is interesting. It is possible that there is an allusion here to the constraints of 'normal' Soviet life, which, it is perhaps implied, are so deeply embedded that something as irresponsible and unconstrained, 'free', is removed beyond the limits of comprehension and formulation.

The final stage in the building up of a view of reality both Aksenov and Kuznetsov describe as the process of becoming involves in a work situation. In Prodolzhenie Legendy Tolik is thrown straight into a job where he is one of a team, but Dima and his two friends initially find themselves working for some petty tricksters. This episode has no significance in their search for identity and roles. Its function, rather, is of the 'new encounters' kind, an addition to experience of people and of life. (This also applies largely to the love episode of Galia and the cynical actor who picks her up.) When the three boys find themselves working for a fishing collective, as members of trawler crews, they gradually reach an understanding of what that particular role, at
least, involves, both in terms of actual tasks that need to be performed, relationships with workmates, and confrontation with hardships, moral and physical.

The three young doctors in Kollegi, Vlad'ka, Aleksei and Sasha Zelenin, though they are at the end of their training and are committed to a role, have unsettled and differing notions of what this role is, or, more precisely, of how they can interpret it. Though there is no question that they are all involved in their chosen role, and satisfied with it, nevertheless, as the novel opens, they become aware that there are very significant differences in the possible circumstances and ways in which the role may be played. Again, the process of working through to a clearer understanding and to an individual interpretation of reality is gained by means of the actual business of working, and of becoming involved with the problems of the work itself.

Zelenin, as mentioned earlier, has, of the three, the most definite notion of the role, and also expresses the most fully worked out view of life. He makes his decision as to the actual position that he accepts on the basis of the need there is for a doctor in that place. He works, that is, from his general view, which involves such notions as duty, service, and social involvement. The other two young men make a decision on the spur of the moment, and commit themselves to work as ships' doctors, because this course, at the time, seems to offer adventure, and more importantly, an escape from the suddenly alarming dullness and stultification of the life of a provincial doctor. Their work commences with a lengthy spell of port service while they await an appointment to a ship, and during this time Aleksei begins to see the work differently, partly stimulated to this reappraisal by realising that other people
engaged in the same work have totally different views of it, and reasons
for pursuing it, and this observation leads him to question his own
motives, and the rightness of his original perceptions.

At an intermediate stage between blundering into a work situation
and emerging with a fully-fledged identification with the role and with
a specific interpretation of it, there is a phase when an alternative
form of behaviour within the work role is put forward. The options of
falling in with this alternative, rejecting it, or condoning it as a
perhaps reprehensible, but somehow built-in characteristic of the role,
are left open, and the actual confrontation of this situation encourages
further steps in the development of a concept of the role as well as a
crystallization of an interpretation of reality. Such alternatives
are put forward in Prodolzhenie legendy, in Kollegi, and in Zvezdnyibilet.

Tolik is placed in a situation where he records the number of runs
made by truck drivers delivering concrete to his team (and they are paid
accordingly), and he finds that he is expected to add to each driver's
record sheet. If he rejects such demands, this means that the supply of
material to the team ceases. The drivers then make their deliveries to
other points on the construction site instead. However, when Tolik
decides to fall in with these expectations, he finds that the individual
demands grow and become more persistent. He is unable to resolve the
problem for himself, but when he turns to more experienced workers for
advice he finds that he is faced with contradictory attitudes and
suggestions. Eventually the matter is taken out of his hands, because
he is moved to another job. He does, nevertheless, become aware of the
ways in which an apparently simple work role can have complexities, and
he does see that his vacillations are due to his own uncertainties, since
no satisfactory solution comes from others. In fact, this extreme situation, where the only satisfying solution is the one which fits in with personally held values and attitudes, underlines his need to develop these for himself.

*Kollegi* also contains a situation which reveals that corruption and self-interest can be taken as reasons for doing a particular job, and also that they are possible elements in any work situation. In this case Aleksei discovers malpractices in which a fellow-graduate plays a part, receiving bribes for his cooperation. Here, the effect this discovery has on Aleksei is to force him to reformulate his general views. He, too, is offered a bribe and then threatened when he rejects it, and in looking for advice he is told to ignore the matter, to safeguard his position. He finds these suggestions completely unsatisfactory. The deciding factor that leads him finally to denounce the malefactor is the manner in which the man has twisted phrases which express notions to which Aleksei himself subscribes (though earlier, he objected to Sasha about the mouthing of fine words that are also parroted by scoundrels).

Максимов вспомнил, как он спорил с Сашкой о цене высоких слов. Теперь он по-другому смотрел на это, чем тогда. Высокие слова сохраняют свою цену, когда их произносит старый коммунист — Демпфер, когда их произносит Сашка Зеленин, когда их поют и выкрикивают миллионы честных людей. А сволочь, которые пользуются ими как дымовой завесой, надо бить! 13

In *Zvezdnyi bilet*, it is Dima's elder brother, Viktor, who is unexpectedly faced with alternatives of conduct when he discovers that some of his research findings are running counter to the general line of his research establishment, and that his almost completed thesis is invalidated by these results. He asks his 'chief' for supportive advice after he has visited his laboratory and looked through the notebook in
which the counter argument refuting his own thesis is written up. Viktor has a clear perception of the supportive role in which he would like his 'chief' to behave. The response which the situation evokes from him, however, is in fact wholly sarcastic in manner and cynical in its message. What his 'chief' in fact suggests to Viktor is that he ought to complete and defend his existing thesis, and only take up the new findings after he has obtained his degree. He asks Viktor point-blank how long he thinks he can wait for his degree, and this remark contains the substance over which Viktor is compelled to ponder. If he does not receive his higher degree soon, he will be passed over in the major area of cosmic physics, and will be no more than a humdrum physicist, an outcome which will represent a failure in his profession. The importance of this situation to Viktor lies in the way it echoes Dima's accusation: 'You never once in your life decided anything for yourself, never once risked anything.' And he works through the problem by recognising this, and recognising his need for precisely such an act of independence, which would in fact demonstrate a mental attitude vital to his worth as a scientist.

The final stage in achieving an interpretation of the world and in finding some sort of certainty about one's self and one's role in this world is reached when the young searchers endure and overcome the hardships of their work. Usually the realisation of this transformation in themselves is triggered off by a climax situation of some sort. Dima finds his sea legs, acquires the trappings of a fisherman, becomes involved with his fellow crew men sufficiently to speak out his mind, and after a particularly difficult trip thinks back over these events:

..... Я так устал, что даже не могу опять. Я лежу на своей койке, и мысли у меня скакут, как сумасшедшия. Я - член рыболовецкой артели 'Прометей'.

....
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Finally, after being caught in a severe storm and narrowly escaping total disaster, the three friends discover that each of them has worked out a decision about his future life. These decisions emerge from the self-awareness that they have developed, and are specific and based on a realistic sense of real wants and possibilities.

Tolik learns to endure physically exhausting labour, and after his first shift he already feels a pride in this achievement.

This sense of achievement continues to grow as Tolik manages to cope with the difficulties that crop up, and after he overcomes a moment of despair when he almost abandons the construction site. The culminating moment when he feels complete identification with other people, and a personal involvement in the project on which he is labouring, is at the moment when the dam which they had all been building is completed, and the river is diverted into its new course. He identifies himself as a builder, looking back over the experiences of the past months:

There is another element in this final stage, because, along with the importance of experiencing and overcoming the difficulties of the work situation, personal relationships are given a very important part. We can separate two kinds of relationships. There are 'ordinary' relationships, usually characterised by a growing concern for the newcomer, which are supportive, producing a sense of 'belonging' and being part of a community. Then there are the relationships with people who become important influences, who become models that are to be
followed or who are seen as representing an important continuum in human endeavours. The first kind of 'ordinary' relationship does not require much comment, except for the fact that it seems to function in a reassuring way, and serves to break down the isolation of the initiate. The second sort of relationship is more complex. It can be an older person as well as a peer who performs the function of acting as a model, but in the three novels we are considering here both age groups are represented. Between them they divide the task; the person who belongs to the peer group provides a well-developed attractive model which can be emulated, because it takes in similarities of circumstances and problems, while the older person provides an example of a life so lived, and also acts as a link with the enterprises of an earlier generation, giving a sense of purposeful continuity to the projects and activities of the society. Also, they refute (again, by precept and example) some of the other interpretations of social reality. There is one other function that seems to be common to the model personality and that is the 'sacrificial' function. At a point shortly after the dawning awareness of one's place and purpose in the young people, there occurs the tragic death, or near death, of the person who has become a model, and this death reinforces the newly formed conceptions in a twofold way. First the death is due to a living out to the end of the principles that the model person stands for, which lends the added significance to these principles of being something for which people die. This 'sacrificial' death in present-day circumstances links up with the whole revolutionary tradition of dying for the cause. So, the death sanctifies the cause, and, in addition, such a death must not be allowed to have occurred in vain.

Tolik's two models are an old revolutionary, Zakhar Zakharych, and
a young communist, Misha. Zakhar Zakharych is instrumental in influencing Tolik to change his mind when he is ready to give in to difficulties, and impresses him with his attitude to life and with his values. When Zakhar Zakharych dies, working to the limits of his strength, this death symbolises for Tolik the proper culmination of a worthwhile life.

Misha is a communist, vitally involved with the fortunes of his country, and he vehemently reaffirms Zakhar Zakharych's values, and rejects the significance of other interpretations of reality. Misha lives out his principles of involvement: he is in hospital, with a stab wound which he received when rushing to rescue a woman who was being assaulted by a group of drunkards. Tolik's uncertainties infuriate him, and they engage in impassioned disputes, the substance of which is finally taken up by Tolik into his own developing viewpoint. He says:

Now his future seems clear and unproblematic,

... После школы был такой ужас, а теперь, действительно, передо мной открывалась вдова дороги. Что случилось с моими глазами и со мной? Нет, я, конечно, ни за что не останусь просто бетонщиком. На следующий год подам заявление в заочный строительный институт.
In *Kollegi* there are two older mentor-figures, Dr Dampfer, who influences Aleksei, and the Chairman of the local Sovkhoz, Yegorov, who supports Sasha, and whose significance lies in the way he reinforces Sasha's feeling of taking up the baton of past generations. Of course, Sasha's position is always clearly worked out, but it is important to him that his convictions receive the support of Yegorov. The two discuss their interpretation of reality in a long conversation and agree

Я кажется понял. Главное - в этой непрерывной цепи. Мой прадед сидел в Шлиссельбурге. Разве он надеялся на свержение царизма при его жизни? И весь наш мир стоит на том, что большинство людей имеет свойство работать и жить не только для живота своего. ....20

Sasha himself turns out to be the model for Aleksei and his struggle with a criminal which almost ends in his death is the episode which pulls

Aleksei's uncertainties together into an acceptance of Sasha's values:

.... Раньше, в прошлые годы, века, жили Максимовы и Зеленины, похожие на них, теперь живут другие. Сейчас живут они. А после них будут другие, похожие на них, но другие. И нужно, чтобы те, новые, вспоминали о них. Тогда .... Тогда не будет страшно. Надо все делать для того, чтобы нас вспоминали. Не персонально Максимова, а всех нас. Сашка прав: нужно чувствовать свою связь с прошедшем и будущим. Именно в этом спасение от страха перед неизбежным уходом из жизни.21

*Zvezdnyi bilet* has no comparable figure of a much older mentor, but

Viktor, Dima's brother (who was an important early influence on Dima) recovers his former significance in their last encounter when, in some sense they discover that they are both in search of an answer to the same
question, and his death 'in the course of duty' leads to Dima's symbolic
discovery of the 'starry ticket' framed by the window in Viktor's room.

We can thus see that in the three novels we have examined the
search for a subjective reality follows a pattern which consists of
several steps. First there is the breaking away from a view of social
reality which is rejected, or from which escape is desired, because
of the uncertainty about the possibilities it holds, or because the
possibilities are unacceptable. Then there is the exposure to various
interpretations of social reality as exemplified by people, their
actions and their ideas. This is followed by involvement in a work
group, where a role is learned and some of the possible aspects it can
assume are seen. A measure of self-knowledge is acquired in this process
about one's capabilities and one's responses to others and to various
situations. This new knowledge is reinforced in a routine way by
supportive people, and formulated in general principles by outstanding
individuals, either by precept, example, or both. Finally, the newly
acquired construction of social reality is crystallised and strongly
reinforced by a crisis situation. In the case of the above novels,
the final perceptions appear to be covered by two main principles –
that one must live for others, and that the important guideline is to
maintain a continuity with people who have in this way contributed
something in the past. These principles are then invoked for guidance
in role selection and in role interpretation.
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CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL VALUES

I have been concerned so far with a number of writings in which it has been made clear that the ideal picture of how one should behave presents a number of stock responses. These are the writers, however, we go further than this, and write what amounts to direct attacks — though in a very oblique manner — on the view that the given picture of how one should behave is satisfactory in coming to grips with a number of important issues.

The strongest and most generalized of these attacks can be found in a number of Solzhenitsyn's stories. A number of parallel themes, however, are also taken up in the stories of Jurij Kanzov. It is no accident, of course, that these are both writers of even greater originality and power than those we have hitherto considered. They can be seen, in the stories I shall analyse, handling themes which closely parallel those I have already discussed. They can also be seen, however, to refine and extend the type of critique contained in those works.

The issue upon which Kanzov most clearly mounts a direct attack on the prevailing assumptions, and presents a situation in which the same character is shown to exhibit a perception of social reality completely remote from any generally accepted view, is the issue of artistic talent. The generally accepted view is, of course, that such talents ought to be made publicly available, and that it is inappropriate to criticise the exercise of such talents by reference to the prevailing ideology. What Kanzov shows us, however, is that there can be at least two types of situation in which this aspect is perceived by the possessor of the talent himself to be
I have been concerned so far with a number of writings in which it has been made clear that the ideal picture of how one should behave generates a number of stock responses. There are other writers, however, who go further than this, and write what amount to direct attacks - though in a very oblique manner - on the view that the given picture of how one should behave is at all satisfactory in coming to grips with a number of important values and issues.

The strongest and most generalised of these attacks can be found in a number of Solzhenitsyn's stories. A number of parallel themes, however, are also taken up in the stories of Iurii Kazakov. It is no accident, of course, that these are both writers of much greater originality and power than those we have hitherto considered. They can be seen, in the stories I shall analyse, handling themes which closely parallel those I have already discussed. They can also be seen, however, to refine and extend the type of critique contained in those works.

The issue over which Kazakov most clearly mounts a direct attack on the prevailing assumptions, and presents a situation in which the main character is shown to exhibit a perception of social reality completely remote from any generally accepted view, is the issue of artistic talent. The generally accepted view is, of course, that such talents ought to be made publicly available, and that it is appropriate to criticise the exercise of such talents by reference to the prevailing ideology.¹ What Kazakov shows us, however, is that there can be at least two types of situation in which this demand is perceived by the possessor of the talent himself to be
merely irrelevant.

The first of these cases, which Kazakov treats in the novella *Adam i Eva*, is the relatively conventional case of the young person who is himself an artist, and whose own perception of the proper way to exercise his talent is completely at odds with the perceptions imposed by the official ideology. The artist, Ageev, is shown to perceive the problems of art in general, and of his own work in particular, in such a way that the criticisms which are offered of his work are meaningless, because the terms in which they are couched are simply irrelevant to his way of thinking about it.

Ageev meets with the rituals which operate to protect the 'universe' of his society from any serious encounters with contradictory or challenging interpretations only after he has ceased to be a student. Up till then, his talent had been acknowledged and his work (although with some head-shaking and admonishment) had been accepted. When he had remained, that is, within the narrow and sheltered framework of the art institute, his deviant perceptions and attitudes had, to a certain degree, been accommodated. When he emerged, however, into the broader society outside the institute and beyond his student group, this previously tolerated deviance became impermissible and Ageev was then faced with a wide range of measures designed either to reform his notions about art and the artist, or to prevent him from visibly displaying them.
This concerted denial of any degree of validity does have the effect of shaking Ageev's confidence. It not only makes him doubt the rightness of his perceptions, moreover, it also makes him doubt his talent and thus freezes his ability to work. He begins to drink steadily, filling the emptiness of the day while waiting for Vika, his girl, to arrive. Vika is important to Ageev in this situation as a source of reassurance for him about his talent and the rightness of his perceptions. Thus when she makes it clear that she too may have her doubts about the validity of Ageev's view of things, Ageev immediately repels the possibility of allowing the relationship to develop, thus protecting himself against the added danger of unbelief on the part of someone who may become important to him.

At the moment when the decision to prevent the relationship from developing is made there is no comment on Ageev's action. Later, however, when Ageev is going over this disastrous meeting, he has no hesitation in identifying the precise moment from which the relationship was doomed, and in postulating the sort of response which would have made it viable.
This passage follows the second breach between Vika and Ageev, after a brief mellowing on his part, when a moment of confidence and quiet intimacy is broken by Vika's questioning neutrality, which to Ageev appears threatening and hostile.

Ageev's ultimate upsurge of self-doubt follows after some quiet recollections of his mother, of himself as a child, and of the many times when he was insensitive or unappreciative of her constant love.

With this recollection comes his self-doubt, and with this the thought that perhaps his critics are right after all, and that he does lack a basic 'idea' without which one cannot be a 'prophet'. Ageev is restored to a sense of purpose, however, by a chance encounter with
a friendly fisherman. They have a drink together, and the fisherman's
approving identification of Ageev as an artist, followed by a warm
invitation which opens the possibility of becoming included in the
fishing community, restore Ageev's faith in himself. With this
renewed faith comes the urge to work.

The story ends on this more optimistic note. We are thus shown
the need of the artist to defend his beliefs and perceptions against
their denial or rejection by the society in which he wishes to
participate. We are also shown the possibility of an integration
between the young man's perceptions and the more conventional
perceptions of his society at large by the medium of an accepting
individual or community. But the tension remains between the validity
of the artist's own perceptions of his role and his sense of what it
requires on the one hand, and the needs of the society with its very
closed perceptions of the functions of the artist on the other.

The second, much less conventional attack which Kazakov mounts
on the prevailing assumption that the man of artistic talent has
the social duty to exercise his talent publicly comes in his short
story Otshchepenets. 8 The protagonist of this story, Egor, is a
man who enjoys a very close and affectionate relationship with just
one other person, Alena, and the very complete nature of this
relationship is shown to make Egor completely indifferent to the
world of any wider community and to the demands it might seek to impose on him. Egor is a man who has been 'corrupted' by the easy and undemanding work he does as a beacon lighter and ferry man on the river. He is presented as a solitary, free man, with a deep-seated aloofness and indifference to other people. He is also shown, however, to enjoy moments of intense emotional depth, which are signalled first by a consuming restlessness and finally by the release of his feelings in tremendous and splendid outpourings of song. Egor's indifference to other people and to society is so great that in the presence of others he disdains to make full use of his tremendous natural talent as a singer, in the way that he does when he is alone with Alena. He does sing for other people, but only as an exercise in power, to stun and impress, and to assert himself. It is only when he is driven by his own intense inner urge that he reveals the full extent of his incredible natural talent, and even then he only does so when the moment of full ripeness has come.

... A настоящая слава у него бывает, когда, как он сам говорит, его затягивает. Затягивает же его раза два в месяц, когда особенно скучно и не по себе становится ему.

- Наконец наступает время. Случается это обычно к вечеру. И Егор уже не просит "дуета", он встает, нечесанный, хмурый, смотрит в одно окошко, в другое, выходит, пьет воду, потом сует в карман бутылку с водкой, берет полушок.

- Далеко-ль собрался? невинно спрашивает Аленка, но все в ней начинает дрожать.

- Пошли! - грубо говорит Егор и носолапо перешагивает порог.

The difference between the sharpness and the emotional significance of the two experiences, the public and the private singing, is vividly obvious from the description of Egor's mood after he finishes singing. In public, when the performance has ended:
After Egor and Alena have begun their solitary singing, however, the effect is completely different and far more intense.

Egor is thus presented as a man of great natural talent for whom it makes no sense to demand that the talent should be publicly displayed. When it is suggested that he should have his voice trained, he merely laughs. The intense and meaningful experience for Egor is never the public experience, in the way that accepted values would dictate, but is always the private experience. The whole notion of a public performance is shown to have no reality for him, but the talent is shown to be none the less genuine for that. The implication in this as in the first case is thus that there are situations in which the values of the received ideology are insufficiently sensitive, or else are completely irrelevant, for the characters concerned.

* * * * *
The same type of attack on the values of the received ideology for providing no guide at all as to how to understand a whole range of human situations is also taken up in several of Solzhenitsyn's stories about young people. Here, however, the attack is much stronger, for the accusation is not merely, as in Kazakov's stories, that the received ideology may be irrelevant in certain situations, but that it may do positive and obvious harm. Solzhenitsyn's recurrent point is that the stock ideological responses not only control the behaviour of good and sincere people, but also cause them to act, in spite of their obvious desire to behave correctly according to the received values, in ways which are clearly shown to be humanly stunting. This concern of Solzhenitsyn's can be illustrated particularly clearly from two stories which both deal with the interaction between young people and their society.

Both the stories I shall consider are concerned with situations in which the protagonists are shown to behave correctly according to the accepted values of the society. One of the stories, Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka, concerns a young lieutenant, Zotov, whose job, owing to the outbreak of the war, is concerned with the control of train and troop movements. The story is set in the railway station where Zotov meets an older man, Tveritinov, who tells him that he has become separated from his company in the course of the retreat. They fall into a long discussion, in which Zotov at first establishes a very human relationship with the older man. Zotov works out which train Tveritinov will need to catch in order to rejoin his company and gives Tveritinov the necessary details and documents. Tveritinov asks the location of the place and is told it is near
Stalingrad. He then asks about the old name of Stalingrad, thereby amazing Zotov that there could be a Soviet man who should want to ask such a question. Zotov is then shown to suffer a sudden crisis of conscience in which he accuses himself of not having been watchful enough in his dealings with a man whom he now becomes sure must be a spy. Once the suspicions which he is shown to have been conditioned to entertain are aroused in this way, Zotov is then quite clear how he ought to behave. He walks with Tveritinov to the guard room of the station. Tveritinov protests in a completely baffled way at this sudden and, to him, meaningless development:

- Что вы делаете! Что вы делаете! - кричал Тверитинов голосом гулким, как колокол. Ведь этого не исправишь! ¹³

Zotov nevertheless leaves him under guard, confused and lying as he backs out of the situation:

- Не беспокойтесь, не беспокойтесь, - угощал Зотов, ногой наступая горог сеней, - Надо будет только выяснить один вопросик ....

И ушел. ¹⁴

Zotov then immediately gets in touch with the NKVD in order to report that he has detained a suspicious character. Zotov is thus shown acting exactly in the way which his perception of his duty requires that he should act.

The other story, Dlia pol'zy dela, ¹⁵ concerns the overruling by the first secretary of the obkom of the allocation of a new building to an overcrowded technicum, in order to assign the building instead to a more prestigious institute of electronics research. The director of the technicum, Fedor Mikheevich, is shown seeking an interview with the obkom secretary, Knorozov, in an attempt to protest at this
decision. We are not only shown, however, that Knorozov rejects this appeal in a totally laconic, totally assured fashion, and suffers no uncertainty or pangs of conscience about this decision. We are also shown that the director of the technicum greatly admires the decisiveness and willpower of the obkom secretary, and is not really concerned to question his decision, but is fully prepared to accept its inevitability. Again, there is no question but that the secretary, in arriving at his decision, has behaved perfectly correctly according to the values of leadership which he has learned, and according to the communist values in which he believes.

Both these stories thus illustrate the fact that the way of perceiving social reality which is laid down in the received ideology not only controls people's behaviour, but is implicitly accepted by good and sincere people. In Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka, we are given an account of the young lieutenant, Zotov, which makes it clear from the outset that he is intended basically to be a sympathetic character. He is presented as a young idealist, a patriot, and as a man with a real capacity for human concern. Similarly in Dlia pol'zy dela, the director of the technicum, although he is prepared to accede in the decision which wrecks his hopes, is by no means presented as an unsympathetic person.

The main point, however, which both these stories are concerned to make is that it is the very commitment of such decent people to such a constraining view of social reality which makes it difficult for them to perceive, in the way that the reader is very clearly intended to perceive, that what is humanly and morally significant in these situations finds no place in the accepted way of viewing them.
The most that either of the protagonists in the two stories eventually feels is a deep but rather indefinite unease at the apparently contradictory demands placed upon them by the values in which they believe on the one hand, and their sense of the given situation on the other. Thus, at the end of Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka, we are told that Zotov, although not apparently in doubt about the correctness of his behaviour, cannot avoid something like a feeling of guilt about it as well:

- Все сделано было, кажется, так как надо. Так, да не так ....16

Similarly in Dlia pol'zy dela, the director is allowed a moment of pure bitterness and frustration at the end, and in the presence of the first secretary, when hearing his decision about the technicum, he at least fails to feel any of his customary feelings of uplift and confidence in the wisdom of his leadership.

The protagonists in both these stories are thus shown to be left merely in a state of puzzlement about the contradictory demands of their feelings and their beliefs. The reader, however, is left in no doubt that the stereotyped patterns of behaviour which are sincerely followed out completely fail to illuminate what is humanly important about these situations, and in fact bring positive harm. This is brought out particularly clearly in Dlia pol'zy dela. We are told that the new building is very badly needed for the children of the technicum since their existing buildings are not only overcrowded, but the conversion of the old building, once they have moved, will give them the hostel which they very badly need. We are also told that the children themselves have devoted their weekends and holidays to ensuring that their new building is ready in time. The sheer
injustice of the inflexible bureaucrats in rescinding the order to hand over the building is explicitly alluded to, moreover, at two points in the story. First, one of the women teachers, Lidia Georgievna, attacks the unfairness of the decision in an almost hysterical manner when she is first told of it. And later, when the secretary of the party bureau, who is also one of the teachers, attempts to justify the decision to her, she attacks the whole principle that the progress of state technology could possibly matter more than the education of the children. And secondly, when the secretary of the city committee goes to visit the first secretary, Knorozov, we are shown him actually engaging in a direct argument over whether (as he puts it) communism is to be about stones rather than people.

The attack on the received ideology represented by these stories of Kazakov's and especially Solzhenitsyn's is thus of a particularly strong character. The hand of the bureaucrats operating the ideology, and even that of ordinary people seeking to impose it, is shown to be a dead hand. Nevertheless, it is not only shown that these false and misleading perceptions are accepted by characters whom it is clear we are otherwise intended to approve. It is also shown that these same false perceptions are the governing perceptions of the whole society. The leadership is presented not merely as blinkered, but as wrong, and the tragedy is that the wrongness is not seen through by those whom it most affects.
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CHAPTER V

SIMILAR THEMES -
DEEPENING PERCEPTIONS

I have now illustrated the major issues which revolve around the

nature of young people in the type of literature I am concerned to

study. First, I concentrated on the more conventional preoccupations of

these writers and then on their presentation in the work of two more

exceptional and original writers. I should now like finally to turn to

compare the methods of treatment and differences in outlook which I have

shown to arise in this way within the overall body of this type of critical

literature. The special emphasis, as I

indicated in my introduction, is as follows. It will enable me to show

practically what is unusual and original in the treatment of these themes by

the less conventional and more powerful writings which I examined in the

last chapter. It may thus be said that a preliminary study of the more

conventional writing I first examined actually represents a necessary

condition of any genuine critical appreciation of such writers as Tanasov

and Solodkova.

The most obvious distinction with which I shall now be concerned lies

in the different treatments of the same theme by these different writers.

The next important distinction, however, to which I shall finally turn,

lies in the suggestion of a quasi-convincing anti-ideological theme, notably

to Voloshinova's stories.

I am now able to examine the different devices and treatments of the

themes which these more exceptional writers are able to introduce.

The themes which I analyzed in Chapters 2 and 3 are generally of a

symbolic, narrative character. One obvious but very important

discrimination between theme and the stories of Solodkova is in particular

the latter's much more use of purely symbolic devices – the
I have now illustrated the major issues which revolve around the problems of young people in the type of literature I am concerned to analyse. I concentrated first on the more conventional presentation of these themes, and then on their presentation in the work of two much more unconventional and original writers. I should now like finally to turn to compare the methods of treatment and differences in outlook which I have shown to arise in this way within the general body of this type of critical literature. The special point of mounting this final comparison, as I indicated in my Introduction, is as follows. It will enable us to show precisely what is unusual and original in the treatment of these themes by the less conventional and more powerful writings which I examined in the last chapter. It may thus be said that a preliminary study of the more conventional writings I first examined actually represents a necessary condition of any genuine critical appreciation of such writers as Kazakov and Solzhenitsyn.

The most obvious distinctions with which I shall now be concerned lie in the different treatments of the same themes by these different writers. The most important distinctions, however, to which I shall finally turn, lie in the suggestion of a quite new and anti-ideological theme, notably in Solzhenitsyn's stories.

I turn first to examine the different devices and treatments of the common themes which these more exceptional writers are able to introduce. The novels which I analysed in Chapters 2 and 3 are generally of a straightforward, narrative character. One obvious but very important distinction between these and the stories of Solzhenitzyn in particular lies in the latter's much freer use of purely symbolic devices - the
symbols of transience stressed in setting a story late at night, in a
railway station; the very Ibsen-like symbolic force of the building as
the centre point of Dlia pol'zy dela.

Solzhenitsyn's handling of these themes is also remarkable for its
extended use of ironic devices, a form of perception which the more
conventional writers simply do not permit themselves. It is very
important, however, in both the Solzhenitsyn stories I have analysed.
There is a diffused irony in both the stories at the expense of the
pretensions generated in ordinary people by the demands of the official
perceptions of social reality. Thus in Dlia pol'zy dela the pretensions
of the Moscow and local officials are neatly deflated by pointing out, in
Swiftian vein, how their sense of position is defined for them by the
different types of hats they wear. Similarly, Zotov in Sluchai na
stantsii Krechetovka is ironically presented, at his moment of crisis,
making the mental resolve to read Das Kapital, in the hope that it will
arm him better to cope with his situation — the situation of a religious
man who has never had time to read his Bible.

Все студенческие пять лет мечтал он прочесть заветную эту книгу,
и не раз брал её в институтской библиотеке, и пытался конспектировать,
и держал по сеамстру, по году — но никогда не оставалось времени,
заездали собрания, общественные нагрузки, экзамены. И, не кончив
одной страницы конспекта, он сдавал книгу, когда щел с июньской
обходной. И даже когда проходили политэкономию, самое время
было читать 'Капитал' — преподаватель отговаривал: 'Утоните!',
советовал нажимать на учебник Лапидуса, на конспекты лекций.
И действительно, только — только успевали.

Но вот теперь, осенью сорок первого, в зареве огромной тревоги,
Вася Зотов мог здесь, в дыре, найти время для 'Капитала'. Так
он и делал — в часы свободные от службы, от всевобуча и от
заданий районной партии. На квартире у Авдеевых, в залыце,
установленной филодендронами и алоэ, он сидел за шаткий палевый
столик и при керосиновой лампе (не на все дома поселка хватало
мощности дизельного двигателя), поглаживая грубую бумагу рукой,
читал: первый раз — для охвата, второй раз — для разметки,
третий раз — конспектируя и стараясь все окончательно уложить,
As well as these fairly genial touches, Solzhenitsyn allows himself a degree of really bitter irony, found in none of the other works, against the excesses of the Stalinist period. In Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka there is an extended and bitterly ironic passage in which Zotov and Tveritinov completely fail to understand each other in talking about the events of 1937. For Zotov, this was pre-eminently the year of the Spanish Civil War, and he describes to Tveritinov how he attempted to enlist. For Tveritinov, of course, 1937 was pre-eminently the year of the purges, about which Zotov is presented as completely oblivious, in a way that strikes Tveritinov into silence.

- А что вы упомянули о тридцатом седьмом? - только спросил он.
- Ну, вы же прочитали обстановку тех лет! - горячо рассказывал Валя.
- Идет испанская война! Фашисты - в Университетском городе Интербригада! Гвадалахара, Харама, Теруаль! Разве усидишь? Мы требуем, чтобы нас учили испанскому языку - нет, учат немецкому.
- Я достаю учебник, словарь, запускаю заметки, экзамену - учу испанский. Я чувствую по всей ситуации, что мы там участвуем, да революционная совесть не позволяет нам оставаться в стороне! Но в газетах ничего такого нет. Нак же место туда попасть? Очевидно, что просто бежать в Одессу и садиться на корабль - это мальчишество, да и пограничники. И вот я - к началу четвертой части военкомата, третьей части, второй части, первой части: пошли меня в Испанию! Смеется: ты с ума сошел, там ничего наших нет, что ты будешь делать?... Вы знаете, я вижу, как вы любите курить, забирайте-ка эту пачку всю себе! Я все равно для угощения держу. И на квартире еще есть. Нет уж, пожалуйста, положите ее в вещевую, завяжите, тогда поверю!... Табачок теперь - "проходное свидетельство", пригодится вам в пути.... Да, и вдруг, понимаете, читаю в "Красной звезде", а я все газеты слышу читал, цитируют французского журналиста, который, между прочим, пишет: "Германия и СССР рассматривают Испанию как опытный
poligon". A я - дотоочный. Выпросил в библиотеке этот номер, подождал еще дня три, не будет ли редакционного опровержения. Его нет. Тогда иду к самому военкому и говорю: "Вот, читайте. Опровержения не последовало, значит, факт, что мы там воем. Прощу послать меня в Испанию простым стрелком!" А военком как хлопнет по столу: "Вы - не провоцируйте меня! Что вас подсказал? Надо будет - позвоним. Кру-гм!" 2

In Dlia pol'zy dela Solzhenitsyn allows himself a similar and unusual degree of bitterness in alluding to one of the ideals which had become particularly valued and stressed during the Stalinist period. During the scene in which the obkom secretary is shown rejecting the plea that the technicum building should not be turned over to the research institute, the secretary is described as standing up at one point in the course of announcing this decision. His subordinate, we are told, at this moment has the perception that:

Кнорозов повернул голову - только голову, не плечи - на Грачкова и, уже отзванивая металлом, сказал:
- Я не понимаю. Ты - секретарь горкома. Мне ли тебе объяснять как бороться за честь города? В нашем городе не бывало и нет ни одного НИИ. Не так легко было нашим людям добиться его. Пока министерство не раздумало - надо пользоваться случаем. Мы этим сразу переходим в другой класс городов - масштаба Горького, Свердловска. ....
- В конце концов что нам дороже? камни или люди? - выкрикнул Грачков. - Что мы над камнями этими трясемся?
Кнорозов поднялся во всю свою рабочую фигуру, и увиделось, что он- из стали весь, без сочленений.
- Демагогия! - прогремел он над головой слушника.
И такая была воля и сила в нам, что, кажется, протяни он длань - и отлетела бы у Грачкова голова. 3

The cherished ideal of the 'man of steel' is thus placed in a totally equivocal, because inhumane, context.
The most important way, however, in which Solzhenitsyn's stories in particular can be shown to extend and to depart from the main conventions of this type of writing, lies in the quite different relations which begin to emerge in his discussions about the official ideology and modes of social perception.

We can distinguish, first of all, two different ways in which Solzhenitsyn actually attacks the adequacy of the official perceptions which do not seem to be present in any other of the representative writings I have examined. First, it is particularly stressed in Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka that there can be human situations which are simply bypassed by the responses available in the received ideology.

This point is made generally at an early stage in the story. Zotov is shown being confronted at every step with things not being as they ought to be, and with no way of making them as they ought to be. The curtain has gone up at the wrong moment. The actors and the whole scene are caught in totally inappropriate and disillusioning behaviour.

Before the climax of the story, Solzhenitsyn presents us with two incidents which again make this point, and which also foreshadow the nature of the bad faith which Zotov is programmed to exhibit at the climax of the story. Two echelons meet at the station. One carries thirty
coaches of soldiers, who had been trapped in an encirclement, under the
guard of five NKVD men. The other echelon carries flour in sealed wagons
and bagged flour in open wagons. The soldiers immediately attack the open
wagons, rip open the bags, and take away as much flour as they can manage.
One of the two guards of the flour train shouts a warning, and since no
help is forthcoming from the escort guard van he shoots one of the soldiers
dead. The incident is then discussed by two women and a very old man,
and Zotov is impelled to join in, because '.... не так они говорили, не
tак они понимали.'5

The young woman in the discussion, Valia, defends the guard's action
and, arguing moralistically, condemns the soldiers on grounds of principle.
This is contrasted with the attitude of the old man, who does not try to
argue in this way at all, but merely talks in terms of human needs and
the immediate actuality.

- А что же ему оставалось? - доказывала Валя, приступивая карандашом.
- Ведь он на посту, ведь он часовой!
- Ну, правильно, кивал старики, роняя крупный красный пепел махорки
на пол и на крышу фонаря. - Правильно .... Есть все хотят.
- К чему это ты? - нахмурилась девушка. Кто это - все?
- Да хоть-бы мы с тобой, - вздохнул Нордубайло.
- Вот безобидный ты дед! Да что-ж они - голодные? Ведь им казенный
пайк дают. Что-ж их, без пайка везут, думаеть?
- Ну, правильно, - согласился дед, и с цигарки опять посыпались
раскалённые красные кусочки, теперь к нему на колено и полу бушлата....6

The old man goes rambling on in an apparently irrelevant and
roundabout way to his final point: ' - Значит, голоду вы не видали, милые.'7
Zotov now steps into the discussion, and he is shown leading it away from
these merely humane considerations into what he takes to be the proper
and ideologically approved channels. The contrast between the genuine
feeling of the old man's response, and the hollowness of the approved ideological formulae is brought out with quite unusual clarity and bitterness in the following passage.

- Слушай, дед, а что такое присяга - ты воображаешь, нет? Зотов заметно для всех окаль.

Дед мутно посмотрел на лейтенанта. Сам дед был невелик, но велики и тяжелы были его сапоги, напитанные водой и кое-где вымазанные глиной.
- Чего другого, - пробурчал он. - Я и сам пять раз присягал.
- Ну, и кому ты присягал? Царю Миколаше?

Старик мотнул головой:
- Хватай раньше.
- Как? Еще Александру Третьему?

Старик сокрушенно смокнул и курил свое.
- Ну! А теперь - народу присягают. Разница есть?

Старик еще присыпал пеплу на колено.
- А мука чья? Не народная? - горячилась Балы и все отбрасывала назад веселые спадающие волосы. - Муку - для кого взвали? Для немцев, что ли?
- Ну, правильно, - ничуть не спорил старик. - Да и ребята тоже не мечты ехали, тоже наш народ.

Докуренную козью ножку он сорвал до конца и погасил о крышу фонаря.
- Вот старик непонятливый! - задело Зотова. - Да что такое порядок государственный - ты представляешь? Это все каждый будет брать, что ему понравится, я возму, ты возьмешь - разве мы войну выиграем?
- А зачем мешки ножки резали? - негодовала Балы. - Это по-кановски? Это наш народ?
- Должно быть защиты были, - высказал Кордубайло и вытер нос рукой.
- Ну, правильно, сказал старик. - А в такой вот должь в полувагонах и остальная президент.
- А,де, что с ним говорить! - раздосадовался Зотов на себя больше, что встрял в ничейный и без того ясный разговор. - Не шумите тут! Работать мешаете!

The other incident, before the climax of the story, which makes this same point, occurs when Zotov has to face the problem of an echelon
of soldiers which has been travelling without rations for eleven days since every station equipped to supply them has been reached after closing hours for revictualling, and since the regulations do not permit issues to be made after the stipulated hours. Again this is a symbolic microcosmic situation, which contains the suffering soldiers, the sergeant at the point of almost any action to procure food, and set against them, the meaningless regulations which do nothing to smooth the way but only hinder and harm, and the cynicism of those who turn the rules to their own convenience, indifferent to all but their own wants. In the midst of the hopeless situation stands the idealist Zotov, who perceives that something is terribly wrong, but cannot permit himself to perceive that there are two irreconcilables: the reality and the official morality he accepts, and the everyday reality and the appropriate morality for the actual situation.

The second way in which Solzhenitsyn directly attacks the adequacy of official perceptions, in a way not present in any of the other writings, is in his accusation that motives of self-interest are able to masquerade under the guise of the sort of behaviour regarded as quite proper according to official perceptions of social reality. It is true, of course, that several of the other writers I have examined make the point that it is possible to abuse the prevailing ideals of the society by presenting them as a facade for social actions which are in fact self-interested. The very much stronger point, however, which Solzhenitsyn alone seems to make is that the stereotyped responses which the ideology generates actually encourage this type of cynicism, since it is always possible to present self-interested actions in a readily acceptable ideological form. In the absence of the ideology, it is implied, this would at least be far less
easy to achieve.

This point - not that the ideology can go sour, but that it cannot fail to go sour just because it is an ideology - is brought out with particular clarity in Dlia pol'zy dela. The nominal reason for the decision to turn the technicum's new building over to the research institute is of course that this will help the promotion of national technological advancement, an approved ideological aim. During the interview with the obkom secretary, the underlying appeal to a quite different and wholly cynical motive is unashamedly brought out. The special value of the Institute over the school to the local community is said to be that it will allow the town to be moved into a different and higher category of classification - a matter of prestige to which, it is presumed by the obkom secretary, everyone will naturally respond.

We may say, finally, that underlying all these perceptions of Solzhenitsyn's there appears to be a more general commitment to the criticism of the official perceptions of social reality. This perception is, of course, no more than hinted at throughout the two stories I have analysed. It is the capacity, however, to offer these hints which finally sets Solzhenitsyn apart from the more conventional criticisms I began by considering, and which begins to give us the measure of his special courage and insight as a critic of Soviet society. The point towards which Solzhenitsyn's stories appear to tend is that there will not only be many situations in which the official picture of social reality cramps and stereotypes the behaviour even of sincere people. The further point seems to be that it is altogether a mistake to look to any pre-established picture of social reality as the proper guide for a decent ethical life. The appeal here seems not so much - as with the more official writings - to be in favour of an opening up, a humanising of the received ideology
and what it prescribes. It appears instead to be an appeal away from any such ideology altogether, and an appeal instead to a sense of common humanity and to the ideals of conduct which this would dictate.
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If we now review the literature I have analysed, following the methodology I outlined in my Introduction, we are now in a position to give an account of both the functions which this literature concerned with the problems of young people served in society, as well as an account of the range and limitations of the literature itself.

I turn first to consider the functions which we have now seen this literature performed. In my introduction, I outlined two respects in which the problem of legitimating a given way of perceiving social reality arises: for the leaders of any society in which this is felt to be an important need. The first problem was one of social perception, the second was essentially one of social action. I derived this typology from the account of the sociology of knowledge given by Berger and Luckmann in *The Social Construction of Reality*. We are now in a position to summarise the ways in which this typology can be particularly appropriate as a way of classifying and analysing the kind of literature I have considered.

We have seen, first of all, how the issue of social perception arises in this literature. There is a given ideal of conduct, in which one is expected and attempts to conform. We have seen, however, that this literature illustrates two forms of tension which can arise for the social agent between the demands of the given ideal, and the agent’s own social perceptions. The first tension arises because the given ideal is no longer perceived as the way to give an account of social reality, but purely as one possible way. In Chapter 2, we saw this taken reflected in the case of social action. It now
If we now review the literature I have analysed, following the methodology I outlined in my Introduction, we are now in a position to give an account of both the functions which this literature concerned with the problems of young people served in its society, as well as an account of the range and limitations of the literature itself.

I turn first to consider the functions which we have now seen this literature performed. In my Introduction, I outlined two respects in which the problem of legitimising a given way of perceiving social reality arises for the leaders of any society in which this is felt to be an important need. The first problem was one of social perception, the second was essentially one of social power. I derived this typology from the account of the sociology of knowledge given by Berger and Luckmann in The Social Construction of Reality. We are now in a position to summarise the ways in which this typology seems peculiarly appropriate as a way of classifying and analysing the type of literature I have considered.

We have seen, first of all, how the issue of social perception arises in this literature. There is a given ideal of conduct, to which one is expected and attempts to conform. We have seen, however, that this literature illustrates two forms of tension which can arise for the social agent between the demands of the given ideal, and the agent’s own social perceptions. The first tension arises because the given ideal is no longer perceived as the way to give an account of social reality, but merely as one possible way. In Chapter II, we saw this tension reflected in the case of social action. It turns
out, according to the works we have considered, that the traditional figure of the Soviet positive hero cannot after all be taken to be the sum of all the appropriate social virtues. In Chapters III and IV, we also saw how the same tensions arise in a wider class of social situations. In Chapter III we saw how the adult way of perceiving the work situation is no longer unquestioningly accepted by the young people. The adolescent's evaluation of his given roles in society is shown to be to some extent out of line with the values of the parental generation. In Chapter IV we saw how the way in which a young person with a special talent might evaluate his role and situation can again be out of line with the form of evaluation required by the accepted ideology. The situation is shown to arise in which the young people want to feel a sense of belonging in their society, and yet feel a tension between their sense of what would count as belonging on the one hand, and the conventional demands of their society on the other.

The second form of tension which we have now shown to arise at this level is generated when the young people, in perceiving that the given ideals of their society merely represent one possible construction of social reality, also come to perceive that in several respects it is simply not an ideal construction at all. I have attempted to show in the latter two chapters that the writers with whom I have been concerned vary greatly in the courage with which they attempt to mount this criticism. As we saw in Chapter IV, a number of them are content to make the point that there may be a range of human situations in which the given ideals are simply irrelevant. There is also the more daring accusation, however, that even when the given ideals may be perceived to be relevant, what they produce is a parody of the human
situation, which can lead to positive harm. In Chapter II we saw some element of this claim in the discussion of 'seemingly perfect' young people. The most detailed case is that of the character of Viktoria in Strezhen'. She is shown to be engaged in a sincere attempt to live up to the revolutionary ideals of her early upbringing. She is also shown, however, to be in part betrayed by this picture of what is proper in her social behaviour not only into parodying herself, but also into behaving in a thoroughly unfeeling way. In Chapter V, however, we saw that incomparably the most subtle and daring presentation of this theme is found in Solzhenitsyn's stories.

We have seen in the second place how the issue of social power arises in this literature. There is a need to maintain the perceived legitimacy of the official picture of social reality and of the roles which it requires. The aim of the leaders of the society is thus to get the adolescent, at what Berger and Luckmann have called the potentially critical stage of his secondary socialisation, to accept the whole given picture of the roles and values needed to sustain the structure and self-image of the society. We have seen, however, that it is an important theme of this literature to exhibit the adolescents as unwilling to accept this official ideology. This is most clearly illustrated in the responses (which I analysed in Chapter III) of the adolescents to their work situation, and in the doubts which some of the adults are even made to feel in Solzhenitsyn's Dlia pol'zy dela (analysed in Chapter V) about the effect on the children's faith of the bureaucratic injustice which is done to them.

It may thus be said, as I indicated in my Introduction, and I have now tried to illustrate, that in raising this problem of the
relations between social perceptions and social power, this literature performed an important social function in its period. It is clear, that is, that these preoccupations of this literature not only reflect a period of ideological thaw. They can also be seen to have played a part in what I called the prising open of the given and closed perceptions of social reality.

I turn finally to consider what this study may be claimed to have shown about the range and limitations of this literature itself. It may be said that the material analysed in Chapters II and III still consists in the main of a critique of the given ideology which still accepts the appropriateness of thinking in ideological terms. It does not seem to be questioned in the novels considered in Chapter II that, even though the traditional picture of the ideal Soviet man may after all leave something to be desired, there is nevertheless some such ideal type to be discovered. And it similarly does not seem to be questioned by the writers considered in Chapter III that, although the roles assigned to the young people may not fully satisfy them, there are nevertheless some such wholly satisfying roles to be discharged. I have also sought to show, however, that what might be called this ideological critique of ideology is not uniformly followed out in this type of literature for this period. The best writers - and it is surely part of the definition of who are the best writers - can be seen to break out of the given ideological terms of debate altogether, and at least to begin to sketch a quite different and thoroughly anti-ideological set of values. It is of course the special achievement of Solzhenitsyn (as I tried to show in Chapter V) to have produced the only complete vision of this kind
within this literature. It is a necessary condition of fully understanding this achievement, however, that we should first study the more conventional versions of the themes with which I have been concerned. I hope that this comparison has by now been explored in sufficient depth to vindicate the methodological claim which I stated in my Introduction: that the sociological study of literature, in the way in which I have attempted to pursue it in this thesis, is not separate from, but can on the contrary make its own contribution to purely literary appreciation.
The sources for this study have been prose works which appeared in the principal Soviet literary periodicals over the relevant period (1957-1963), as well as relevant novels, short stories and collections which appeared as separate publications. Since the final choice of material for discussion and analysis was selective, there was little point in listing the contents of the journals that were consulted, or apart from listing the journals in which only the works actually used in the text will be fully cited. Soviet critical material (e.g. Voennoe literatury) was also consulted, but again, as most of it was not immediately relevant to this approach it is not listed in this bibliography.
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