

THE READERS OF *NOVYI MIR*, 1948 – 1969:

A SOCIAL PORTRAIT

An NCEEER Working Paper by

Denis Kozlov
Dalhousie University



**National Council for Eurasian
and East European Research**

University of Washington

Box 353650

Seattle, WA 98195

info@nceeer.org

<http://www.nceeer.org/>



TITLE VIII PROGRAM

Project Information*

Principal Investigator: Denis Kozlov
NCEEER Contract Number: 826-03g
Date: October 1, 2012

Copyright Information

Individual researchers retain the copyright on their work products derived from research funded through a contract or grant from the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research (NCEEER). However, the NCEEER and the United States Government have the right to duplicate and disseminate, in written and electronic form, reports submitted to NCEEER to fulfill Contract or Grant Agreements either (a) for NCEEER's own internal use, or (b) for use by the United States Government, and as follows: (1) for further dissemination to domestic, international, and foreign governments, entities and/or individuals to serve official United States Government purposes or (2) for dissemination in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act or other law or policy of the United States Government granting the public access to documents held by the United States Government. Neither NCEEER nor the United States Government nor any recipient of this Report may use it for commercial sale.

* The work leading to this report was supported in part by contract or grant funds provided by the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research, funds which were made available by the U.S. Department of State under Title VIII (The Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983, as amended). The analysis and interpretations contained herein are those of the author.

Executive Summary

In this working paper, on the basis of several thousand archival readers' letters from all over the Soviet Union, I draw a social portrait of the reading audience of the leading Soviet literary journal *Novyi mir* from the late 1940s to the late 1960s. I discuss in detail such characteristics as gender, age, ethnicity, party and Komsomol membership, places of residence, occupations, backgrounds, as well as certain relationships between these characteristics and the tactics of the letter-writers' verbal self-expression.

Introduction

This work draws a social portrait of the reading audience of the foremost Soviet literary journal, *Novyi mir*, from the late 1940s to the late 1960s. The portrait is based on readers' letters preserved in the archives. Specifically, my evidence comes from 2,415 letters that *Novyi mir* received from over 3,004 readers between 1948 and 1969. Most of these letters are in the journal's archive, while several more are in the archives of other periodicals, such as *Literaturnaia gazeta* and *Oktiabr'*. Records of a few other letters are in the family archive of Evgenii Borisovich Pasternak (the son of the poet Boris Pasternak), who generously granted me access to these materials.

The total number of letters in the *Novyi mir* archive exceeds 2,415 and amounts, by my approximate calculation, to nearly 12,000 letters grouped into about 600 archival files. My discussion here focuses on fifteen major publications in the journal, for which I located the largest numbers of readers' responses. In the chronological order, these publications are: Vasiliu Azhaev's 1948 novel *Far from Moscow*¹; Yurii Trifonov's 1950 novel *Students*²; Vladimir Pomerantsev's 1953 article "On Sincerity in Literature"³; Vladimir Dudintsev's 1956 novel *Not by Bread Alone*⁴; reactions to the Pasternak affair of 1958-59⁵; Ilya Ehrenburg's memoir *People, Years, Life* (1960-63, 1965);⁶ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1962);⁷ three of Solzhenitsyn's short stories (all 1963): "Matrena's House," "An Episode at the Krechetovka Station," and "For the Good of the Cause";⁸ Alexander Iashin's 1963 semi-journalistic sketch "*Vologda Wedding*"⁹; responses to the 1965 polemic between Tvardovskii and the sculptor Evgenii Vuchetich¹⁰; Emil' Kardin's 1966 article "Legends and Facts"¹¹; *Pravda* 1967 editorial "When One Lags behind Time"¹²; and finally, Aleksandr Dement'ev's 1969 article "On Traditions and Nationality."¹³

Inevitably, this portrait of the letter writers is tinted by many factors, not least because we

see these people through the prism of *Novyi mir*'s editors, their predilections and strategies of record keeping. Despite the commitment by Aleksandr Tvardovskii's (editor-in-chief in 1950-1954 and 1958-1970) to keeping all readers' letters in the journal's archive, not all have survived – although uniquely many did. Moreover, I do not know of a similar commitment by the other editor-in-chief of the journal in those years, Konstantin Simonov (1946-1950 and 1954-1958), or by editors of other periodicals. There is thus no indication that the surviving letters accurately represent the original pool of letters, let alone the journal's entire audience. Most likely, what has been preserved are responses to select publications from the groups of most active readers who perceived those publications as particularly relevant to their lives. Strictly speaking, then, what follows is a social portrait of several “interest groups,” or “guilds,” of readers, each brought together by specific life experiences.

A portrait is not necessarily a photograph, but it is still telling. By seeing who wrote the letters, and how the clusters of letters measure against each other over two decades, it is possible to draw some conclusions about *Novyi mir*'s “sphere of influence” in Soviet society, and also about the editors' ideas of what this sphere was. My analysis here is intended to make the readers as visible as they can be. This is especially important if such a portrait is the only image available.

Table 1 shows the overall picture of readers' reactions to fifteen major *Novyi mir* publications in 1948-1969. Since a few of these texts came out simultaneously or closely followed each other, the readers' reactions to them sometimes overlapped in the same letter. Someone writing about Solzhenitsyn in late 1962 or 1963 often mentioned Ehrenburg's *People, Years, Life*, and vice versa; many responses to Iashin's *Vologda Wedding* mentioned Solzhenitsyn; and letter writers reacting to Dement'ev's 1969 article frequently referred to Kardin's 1966 “Legends and Facts.” Therefore, in the table some publications are accompanied

by two figures – the overall number of letters/letter writers mentioning a publication in various contexts, as well as (in parentheses) the net number of letters/letter writers responding specifically to this particular publication.

Table 1. Readers’ Letters to *Novyi mir*, 1948-1969: A Numerical Distribution (Selected Major Publications)¹⁴

PUBLICATIONS	LETTERS	LETTER WRITERS
Azhaev, 1948-1949 ¹⁵	103	122+
Trifonov, 1950-1952	50	68+
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	104	135+
Dudintsev, 1956-1959 and through 1965	713 (696) ¹⁶	810+ (793+)
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	153 (134)	313+ (293+)
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	333 (305)	445+ (417+)
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich</i> , 1962-1969	532 (480)	579+ (528+)
Iashin, 1963	46 (42)	71+ (66+)
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	75 (53)	94 (71)
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	154	191+
Kardin, 1966	86 (81)	96+ (91+)
<i>Pravda</i> , 1967	68	89
Dement’ev / <i>Ogonek</i> , 1969	145	140+
TOTAL	2,562 (2,415)	3,153+ (3,004+)

Because of many collective and recurrent responses, the numbers of letters and letter writers were not identical. Also, because individuals occasionally signed on behalf of unnamed groups of several readers each, there were probably more letter writers than what the table shows,. In those cases, only those people who identified themselves made part of my calculation, while the unnamed ones appear in the table as a “+” sign.

Table 2. Anonymous Readers' Letters to *Novyi mir*, 1948-1969

Publications	Total Letters	Anonymous and semi-anonymous letters	% Anonymous
Azhaev, 1948-1949	103	0	0
Trifonov, 1950-1952	50	1 ¹⁷	2.0
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	104	9	8.7
Dudintsev, 1956-1965	713 (696) ¹⁸	46	6.5
Pasternak, 1958-1959	153 (134)	6	3.9
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	333 (305)	14	4.2
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich</i> , 1962-1969	532 (480)	32	6.0
Iashin, 1963	46 (42)	2	4.3
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	75 (53)	1	1.3
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	154	15	9.7
Kardin, 1966	86 (81)	3	3.5
<i>Pravda</i> , 1967	68	5	7.4
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i> , 1969	145	21	14.5
TOTAL	2,415	155	6.0

Anonymous letters were never too numerous in *Novyi mir*'s mailbox. At the same, anonymous letter writing existed and had its own dynamic. Table 2 shows that, compared to the mid-1950s and the early 1960s, by the end of the 1960s the proportion of anonymous letters to the journal had slightly increased. Apparently, many readers took note of the escalating official pressure on the cultural sphere and began to sense the dangers of expressing their support for the increasingly ostracized *Novyi mir*. One should not, though, overestimate the degree of these fears, as even during the last campaign against the journal in 1969, the overwhelming majority of readers' letters, 85.5%, were fully signed and included a return address.

Fear was much less of a factor for the Soviet literary audiences of those years than one

might imagine. Many readers viewed letter writing as an act of political participation, a legitimate expression of opinions to which they were entitled, feeling little need to resort to anonymity. Technically speaking, an anonymous letter was always a deliberate challenge to authority. When resorting to anonymity, whether out of caution, aggression, or both, the letter writer intentionally (although perhaps reluctantly) placed him/herself in opposition to the realm of politically acceptable opinions, which to some extent relieved him/her of the obligation to be politically correct. But a signature added credibility and authority to a message, while the lack of a signature had the opposite effect. If so, then most letter writers may have preferred a productive discussion to “crying out loud” radical statements of protest, apparently viewing anonymous letter writing as *a priori* incapable of bringing tangible intellectual or political results.¹⁹

Men wrote considerably more letters to *Novyi mir* than women did. As Table 3 indicates, the disproportion between male and female letter writers did not decrease over the 1950s and 1960s, but on the contrary, might even have grown with time. One possible explanation for the higher frequency of male letter writing is the persistence of conservative gender assumptions in Soviet culture and society at the time, including such intellectual and political activities as active response to literature.²⁰

Numbers do not necessarily reveal significance, especially not in this case. Many women were ardent letter writers to *Novyi mir*, keen on literary events and boldly taking civic stances that involved risk and responsibility. Frequently most perceptive and informative, their letters are central to my larger work on letter writing as a pathway into Soviet intellectual history.

Table 3. Gender Distribution of *Novyi mir's* Letter Writers, 1948-1969

Publications	Total letter writers²¹	Female	Male	Female : Male	Gender unidentified
Azhaev, 1948-1949	122+	54	56	1 : 1	12+
Trifonov, 1950-1952	68+	21	45	1 : 2.1	2+
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	135+	43	81	1 : 1.9	11+
Dudintsev, 1956-1965	810+ (793+)	203+	524	1 : 2.6	83+
Pasternak, 1958-1959	313+ (293+)	32+	265+	1 : 8.3	16+
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	445+ (417+)	95+	210+	1 : 2.2	140+
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i> , 1962-1969	579+ (528+)	132	391	1 : 3	56+
Iashin, 1963	71+ (66+)	13	40	1 : 3.1	18+
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	94 (71)	30	42	1 : 1.4	22
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	191+	27	129	1 : 4.7	35+
Kardin, 1966	96+ (91+)	17+	72+	1 : 4.2	7+
<i>Pravda</i> , 1967	89+	16	57	1 : 3.6	16+
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i> , 1969	140+	16	111	1 : 6.9	13+
TOTAL	3,153+ (3,004+)	699+	2,023+	1 : 2.9	431+

Table 4. Age Distribution of *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers, 1948-1969

Numbered columns stand for: 1 – Literary publications and cases in question; 2 – Total letter writers; 3 – Age Under 20; 4 – Age 20-29; 5 – Age 30-39; 6 – Age 40-49; 7 – Age 50-59; 8 – Age 60-69; 9 – Age 70-79 and above; 10 – Younger, no exact age; 11 – Senior, no exact age; 12 – Age not identifiable; 13 - % young (columns 3, 4, and 10 combined) from total; 14 - % young (columns 3, 4, and 10 combined) in identified age (columns 3 through 11 combined); 15 – Supposed % of younger letter writers (average between 13 and 14); 16 - % senior letter writers from total; 17 - % senior letter writers in identified age (columns 3 through 11 combined). 18 – Supposed % of senior letter writers (average between 16 and 17). Decimals are rounded up.

1 Publications	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Azhaev, 1948-1949	122+	-	1	--	--	1	1	--	34	2	83+	28.7	89.7	59.2	2.5	7.7	5.1
Trifonov, 1950-1952	68+	-	--	--	1	--	1	--	37+	--	29+	54.4	94.9	74.65	1.5	2.6	2.05
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	135+	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	62+	2	68	47.4	95.5	71.45	1.5	3.0	2.25
Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965	810+ (793+)	3	14	10	10	9	5	2	134+	26	597+	18.6	70.9	44.75	4.1	15.5	9.8
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	313+ (293+)	-	3	1	1	2	4	1	8	18+	275+	3.5	28.9	16.2	7.3	60.5	33.9
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	445+ (417+)	1	28	16	3	10	15	9	22	31	310+	11.5	37.8	24.65	12.4	40.8	26.6
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	579+ (528+)	-	9	14	12	13	25	6	32+	79	389+	7.1	21.6	14.4	19.0	57.9	38.5
Iashin, 1963	71+ (66+)	-	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	--	61+	6.6	40.0	23.3	2.8	20.0	11.4
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	94 (71)	-	--	3	--	1	2	-	--	10	78	0	0	0	12.8	75.0	43.9
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	191+	-	2	1	2	4	2	1	11	13	155+	6.8	36.1	21.45	8.4	44.4	26.6
Kardin, 1966	96+ (91+)	-	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	21	72+	1.4	4.2	2.8	21.9	87.5	54.7
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	89+	-	--	--	--	1	--	1	3	3	81+	3.4	37.5	20.5	4.5	50.0	27.25
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	140+	-	2	4	2	2	--	--	5	7	118+	5.0	31.8	18.4	5.0	31.8	18.4
TOTAL	3,153+ (3,004+)	5	62	51	34	45	56	21	351+	212+							

Table 5. Percentages of Younger and Senior Letter Writers to *Novyi mir*, Measured against Census Data, 1948-1969²²

Publications	Younger (Table 4, col. 15)	1939 census, % 16-29 within ages 15+	1959 census, % 16-29 within ages 15+	1970 census, % 15-29 within ages 14+	Senior (Table 4, col. 18)	1939 census % 60+ within ages 15+	1959 census % 60+ within ages 15+	1970 census % 60+ within ages 14+
Azhaev, 1948-1949	59.2	39.8	36.6	30.8	5.1	10.9	13.6	16.6
Trifonov, 1950-1952	74.65	39.8	36.6	30.8	2.05	10.9	13.6	16.6
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	71.45	39.8	36.6	30.8	2.25	10.9	13.6	16.6
Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965	44.75	39.8	36.6	30.8	9.8	10.9	13.6	16.6
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	16.2	39.8	36.6	30.8	33.9	10.9	13.6	16.6
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	24.65	39.8	36.6	30.8	26.6	10.9	13.6	16.6
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	14.4	39.8	36.6	30.8	38.5	10.9	13.6	16.6
Iashin, 1963	23.3	39.8	36.6	30.8	11.4	10.9	13.6	16.6
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	0	39.8	36.6	30.8	43.9	10.9	13.6	16.6
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	21.45	39.8	36.6	30.8	26.6	10.9	13.6	16.6
Kardin, 1966	2.8	39.8	36.6	30.8	54.7	10.9	13.6	16.6
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	20.5	39.8	36.6	30.8	27.25	10.9	13.6	16.6
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	18.4	39.8	36.6	30.8	18.4	10.9	13.6	16.6

Unlike gender, the letter writer's age can only be known if he or she identified it in the main body of the letter. Most people, however, did not, and this makes the data quite incomplete. In order to complement the picture, I have tried, where possible, to identify age by occupation. This worked mainly for the age-specific occupations – such as pensioners (mostly of an

advanced age), or junior military servicemen and students (usually young people in their twenties). This approach by necessity puts middle-aged readers at a disadvantage, since for them occupation rarely indicated age. Therefore, Tables 4 and 5 highlight the two age groups for which the data is most complete – the younger (understood here as up to and including age 29) and the senior letter writers (above 60 or 55, the standard male and female retirement ages according to the 1956 Soviet law on pensions).

Obviously, this method of calculation can be very imprecise. Yet, for the lack of more extensive and reliable data, this is at least some opportunity to investigate the age structure of *Novyi mir*'s reading audience.

Younger people comprised a very large proportion of *Novyi mir*'s letter writers during the late Stalin period. In the immediate postwar years young readers took active part in literary discussions, regularly read literary journals, and corresponded with writers and editors.²³ These practices had prepared youth to embrace the literary life of the Thaw and conditioned the forms this life initially took. However, from the late 1950s the proportion of younger letter writers began to decrease, and during the 1960s their share stayed uniformly low. By contrast, the proportion of more senior letter writers in 1958-69 became increasingly substantial – especially if measured, as in Table 5, against the proportions of these age groups in the country's adult population.

This shift in the letter writers' ages did not necessarily mean a decline in youth readership, but it might suggest that for younger people the activity of letter writing to *Novyi mir* became of less interest in the 1960s than before. A decline in organized reader-response practices, which had been more vigorously practiced during the earlier Soviet decades (readers' conferences, instigations for letter writing coming from teachers, etc.), is only part of the explanation. It is also likely that, while the younger letter writers of the 1950s continued to

follow the customary practices of intellectual communication available to them from their earlier experiences, during the 1960s youth became less and less literature-centered, finding other outlets for social (in)activity in the increasingly complex and diverse late Soviet cultural ecosystem.²⁴ That said, younger people's responses to *Novyi mir*'s publications in the 1960s remained overwhelmingly favorable.

It is safer to presume not that youth's interest in the journal or in literature as such drastically fell, but that readers of other ages began responding more actively. It was the middle-aged and especially senior readers who became the principal support group for Tvardovskii's *Novyi mir* during the 1960s. As Table 5 suggests, throughout the 1960s the share of letter writers' aged 60 and above nearly always surpassed the share of this age group in the country's adult population.

The explanation is likely in the shifting agendas of *Novyi mir* itself during Tvardovskii's second editorship (1958-1970). In a 2002 interview with me, Igor Ivanovich Vinogradov, a literary critic and in 1965-1970 a member of *Novyi mir*'s editorial board, explained why younger people had been somewhat less prominent than older readers among the journal's audience. Reading Tvardovskii's *Novyi mir*, he argued, had resembled listening to classical music – a pursuit that required a certain degree of intellectual and emotional maturity.²⁵ Tvardovskii's literary strategy of the 1960s, with its emphasis on social criticism and retrospectivism, indeed called for a mature reading audience with considerable life experiences. Reading *Novyi mir* increasingly became a pursuit that not only appealed to the readers' aesthetic preferences and critical reason but also asked them to look back at their own lives.

Table 6, part 1. Ethnic Distribution of *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers in the USSR Republics Outside the Russian Federation. Tentative, by Letter Writers' Names.

REPUBLICS / ETHNICITIES	Azhaev, 1948-1949	Trifonov, 1950-1952	Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	Dudintsev, 1956-1959 + through 1965	Pasternak, 1958-59 + through 1967	Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i> , 1962-1969
ARMENIA	0	0	0	6	0	0	1
Armenian	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
Russian	--	--	--	4	--	--	--
?	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
AZERBAIJAN	1	0	0	7+	0	1	2
Azerbaijani	--	--	--	--	--	1?	--
Russian	--	--	--	5	--	--	2
Armenian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
Ukrainian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
?	1	--	--	Several ²⁶	--	--	--
BELARUS	2	0	1	14+	2	5	10
ESTONIA	0	1	0	5	1	1	3
Estonian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian	--	1	--	3	1	1	2
Jewish	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
?	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
GEORGIA	0	0	--	4	0	4	4
Georgian	--	--	--	--	--	2	--
Russian	--	--	--	1	--	1	3
Armenian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	1	--
?	--	--	--	2 ²⁷	--	--	1 ²⁸
KAR.-FIN. SSR	2	0	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
KAZAKHSTAN	2	0	0	13+	1	9	14
Kazakh	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
Russian	2	--	0	11	--	5	9
German	--	--	--	1	--	1 ²⁹	1
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	2	2
?	--	--	--	1	--	1	1
KIRGHIZIA	0	0	1	5	2	1	1
Kirghiz	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Russian	--	--	--	5	--	--	1
Jewish	--	--	--	--	1	1	--
?	--	--	--	--	1 ³⁰	--	--
LATVIA	0	0	0	14+	2	4	9
Latvian	--	--	--	1	1	1	2
Russian	--	--	--	9	1	--	2
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	1	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	1	--	--	2
?	--	--	--	3 ³¹ + ³²	--	2 ³³	1
LITHUANIA	0	0	0	4	0	2	7

Lithuanian	--	--	--	--	--	1	3
Russian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
Jewish	--	--	--	1	--	1	1
Polish	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
?	--	--	--	1 ³⁴	--	--	1
MOLDOVA	0	1	0	3+	0	3	3
Moldovan	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian	--	--	--	2	--	2	1
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	1	--
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	1 ³⁵	--	1+ ³⁶	--	--	1
TAJIKISTAN	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Tajik	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian	--	1	--	--	--	1	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
TURKMENIA	0	0	1	2	2+	5	0
Turkmen	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
Russian	--	--	1	1	1	4	--
Jewish	--	--	--	1	--	1	--
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
?	--	--	--	--	several ³⁷	--	--
UKRAINE	6	9	15	123+	25	63	63+
Ukrainian	1	5	2	30	6	15	15
Russian	3	3	8	57	12	22	32
Georgian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Jewish	2	--	3	12	3	18	7
Latvian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Polish?	--	--	--	--	--	3?	--
?	Several ³⁸	1 ³⁹	2 ⁴⁰	24+	4	5	7+
UZBEKISTAN	2	4	1	15+	2	5	7
Uzbek	--	--	--	1?	1	--	--
Russian	--	1	--	11	1	1	4
Armenian	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish	1	2	--	1	--	1	--
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
?	--	1 ⁴¹	1 ⁴²	2+	--	2	2
Total USSR republics other than Russia	15	16	20	216+	37+	104	126+
Russia	82	34+	103+	511+	232+	199+	355+
Unattributed locations within the USSR⁴³	0	0	0	10	1	0	7
Foreign countries	5	1	0	5+	2	5	7
Place of residence not indicated	20+	17	12+	68+	41	137+	84
Total Letter Writers	122+	68+	135+	810+	313+	445+	579+

Table 6, part 2. Ethnic Distribution of *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers in the USSR Republics Outside the Russian Federation. Tentative, by Letter-Writers' Names.

REPUBLICS// ETHNICITIES	Iashin, 1963	Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	Tvardovskii- Vuchetich, 1965	Kardin, 1966	<i>Pravda</i> , 1967	Dement'ev- <i>Ogonek</i> , 1969	TOTAL LETTER WRITERS, 1948-1969
ARMENIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	8
Armenian	--	--	1	--	--	--	3
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
?	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
AZERBAIJAN	0	1	0	0	0	0	12+
Azerbaijani	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
Armenian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	1 ⁴⁴	--	--	--	--	2+
BELARUS	0	2	6	2	1	4	49+
ESTONIA	2	0	0	0	0	0	13
Estonian	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Russian	1	--	--	--	--	--	9
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
GEORGIA	0	1	0	0	0	7+	20+
Georgian	--	--	--	--	--	3	5
Russian	--	1	--	--	--	2	8
Armenian	--	--	--	--	--	2	3
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	--	--	--	--	several	3+
KARELO- FINNISH SSR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
KAZAKHSTAN	0	2	2	1	1	2	47+
Kazakh	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Russian	--	1	1	1	1	1	32
German	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
Jewish	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	1	5
?	--	--	1	--	--	--	4+
KIRGHIZIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Kirghiz	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	--	6
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
?	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
LATVIA	4	0	8	2	0	0	43+
Latvian	1	--	--	--	--	--	6
Russian	2	--	3	2	--	--	19
Jewish	1	--	3	--	--	--	7
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
?	--	--	2	--	--	--	8+

LITHUANIA	0	0	0	1	0	1	15
Lithuanian	--	--	--	1	--	1	6
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
Polish	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
MOLDOVA	2	2	0	0	0	3+	17+
Moldovan	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Russian	1	1	--	--	--	2	9
Jewish	1	1	--	--	--	--	3
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
?	--	--	--	--	--	1+	4+
TAJKISTAN	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
Tajik	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	1	5
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TURKMENIA	0	0	0	1	0	1	12+
Turkmen	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Russian	--	--	--	--	--	1	8
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Ukrainian	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
?	--	--	--	--	--	--	0+
UKRAINE	4	13	15+	9	5	17	367+
Ukrainian	1	5	3	6	1	5	95
Russian	2	5	7	1	4	3	159
Georgian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Jewish	--	--	3	--	--	2	50
Latvian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Polish	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
?	1	3 ⁴⁵	2+	2	--	7	58+
UZBEKISTAN	0	1	0	1	1	0	39+
Uzbek	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Russian	--	--	--	1	1	--	20
Armenian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Jewish	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
Ukrainian	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
?	--	1	--	--	--	--	9+
Total USSR republics other than Russia	12	22	32	17	8	36+	661+
Russia	46+	60	132+	68+	77+	93+	1,992+
Total USSR unattributed locations	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Foreign countries	0	1	0	1	0	0	27
Place of residence Not indicated	13+	11	27	10	4	11+	455+
Total letter writers	71+	94	191+	96+	89+	140+	3,153+

Table 7. Ethnic Distribution of *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers in Soviet Republics outside Russia, 1948-1969. Tentative, by Letter-Writers' Names. Aggregate.⁴⁶

Republics / Ethnicities	Letter writers, 1948-1969	%⁴⁷	% of Population, 1959 census	% of Population, 1970 census
ARMENIA	8			
Armenian	3	42.9	88.0	88.6
Russian	4	57.1	3.2	2.7
?	1	N/A		
AZERBAIJAN	12			
Azerbaijani	1	10.0	67.5	73.8
Russian	7	70.0	13.6	10.0
Armenian	1	10.0	12.0	9.4
Ukrainian	1	10.0	0.7	0.6
?	2	N/A		
BELARUS	49	?	N/A	N/A
ESTONIA	13			
Estonian	1	9.1	74.6	68.2
Russian	9	81.8	20.1	24.7
Jewish	1	9.1	0.5	0.4
?	2	N/A		
GEORGIA	20			
Georgian	5	29.4	64.3	66.8
Russian	8	47.1	10.1	8.5
Armenian	3	17.6	11.0	9.7
Jewish	1	5.9	1.3	1.2
?	3	N/A		
KARELO-FINNISH SSR	3	?	N/A	N/A
KAZAKHSTAN	47+			
Kazakh	1	2.3	30.0	32.6
Russian	32	74.4	42.7	42.4
German	3	7.0	7.1	6.6
Jewish	2	4.7	0.3	0.2
Ukrainian	5	11.6	8.2	7.2
?	4+	N/A		
KIRGHIZIA	10			
Kirghiz	1	11.1	40.5	43.8
Russian	6	66.7	30.2	29.2
Jewish	2	22.2	0.4	0.3
?	1	N/A		
LATVIA	43			
Latvian	6	17.1	62.0	56.8
Russian	19	54.3	26.6	29.8
Jewish	7	20.0	1.7	1.6

Ukrainian	3	8.6	1.4	2.3
?	8	N/A		
LITHUANIA	15			
Lithuanian	6	46.2	79.3	80.1
Russian	1	7.7	8.5	8.6
Jewish	3	23.1	0.9	0.8
Polish	2	15.4	8.5	7.7
Ukrainian	1	7.7	0.7	0.8
?	2	N/A		
MOLDOVA	17			
Moldovan	0	0.0	65.4	64.6
Russian	9	69.2	10.2	11.6
Jewish	3	23.1	3.3	2.7
Ukrainian	1	7.7	14.6	14.2
?	4	N/A		
TAJKISTAN	6			
Tajik	0	0.0	53.1	56.2
Russian	5	83.3	13.3	11.9
Ukrainian	1	16.7	1.4	1.1
TURKMENIA	12			
Turkmen	1	8.3	60.9	65.6
Russian	8	66.7	17.3	14.5
Jewish	2	16.7	0.3	0.2
Ukrainian	1	8.3	1.4	1.6
?	0	N/A		
UKRAINE	367			
Ukrainian	95	30.7	76.8	74.9
Russian	159	51.5	16.9	19.4
Georgian	1	0.3	?	0.03
Jewish	50	16.3	2.0	1.6
Latvian	1	0.3	?	0.02
Polish	3	1.0	0.9	0.6
?	58	N/A		
UZBEKISTAN	39			
Uzbek	2	6.7	62.2	65.5
Russian	20	66.7	13.5	12.5
Armenian	1	3.3	0.3	0.3
Jewish	5	16.7	1.2	0.9
Ukrainian	2	6.7	1.1	0.9
?	9	N/A		
Total USSR republics other than Russia	661+	N/A	N/A	N/A

Ascertaining the readers' ethnicity is an even less reliable exercise than determining their age. Letter writers almost never identified themselves as part of any ethnic group. As if ashamed of ever mentioning their own ethnic belonging, the overwhelming majority of them completely bypassed this issue. Out of 122 letter writers to Azhaev of 1948-49, only two (one Jewish and one Ukrainian) specified their own nationality.⁴⁸ Only one out of more than 135 letter writers to Pomerantsev of 1953-54 identified his nationality (by writing his letter in Ukrainian).⁴⁹ Merely two (a Tatar and a Ukrainian) out of more than 820 letter writers to Dudintsev of 1956-65 identified their ethnicities explicitly.⁵⁰ None of the letter writers to Pasternak in 1958-59 mentioned their nationality. Out of more than 445 letter writers to Ehrenburg of 1960-65 in *Novyi mir's* archive, only seven individuals specified their nationality: four of them Jewish,⁵¹ two German,⁵² and one Ukrainian.⁵³ Out of more than 579 letter writers to Solzhenitsyn in 1962-69, only five people mentioned their ethnicity: a German, an Austrian, two Russians, and one Tatar.⁵⁴ The same picture emerges from all other cases of letter writing. Ethnicity was practically absent from the concepts and categories in which the readers of *Novyi mir* reasoned in their letters to the journal. Even in cases that, by subsequent standards, would have invited the political abuse of nationality (such as the Pasternak affair of 1958 or the Dement'ev-*Ogonek* controversy in 1969), the letter writers largely stayed away from ethnic categorizations.

One cannot explain this absence of ethnicity by arguing that ethnicity was irrelevant to the texts of publications which the letter writers discussed. Many of these texts, such as Ehrenburg's memoir, Solzhenitsyn's *Matrena's House*, or Dement'ev's article, intensely dwelt on the problems of nationalism, internationalism, and ethnic tensions. Nor is there evidence to say that issues of nationality were irrelevant to the readers' worldviews. It is more plausible that the letters, rather than being exact fingerprints of mentalities, were in this case dictated by conventions of public self-presentation and argument. Most letter writers of the 1950s and 1960s

apparently did not view declarations of ethnic belonging as a factor that could enhance their arguments. Russianness, for instance, could be significant to one's inner world, but brandishing one's Russianness was thus far rarely viewed as an acceptable strategy of public self-expression. Possibly, the language and ideas of Soviet internationalism had indeed taken root within at least this segment of the educated audience.

Still, can ethnicity be an instructive category for analyzing *Novyi mir*'s active readership? To an extent it can, especially with the letters that came from the non-Russian republics of the USSR. Arbitrary and imprecise as such attributions are, in certain ethnic regions Russians could sometimes be told apart from "titular" nationalities by the sounding of their names.⁵⁵ The operation is often deceptive, not to mention that names tell nothing about identities. Yet names could show, at least approximately, to what extent *Novyi mir*, as a Russian-language journal, was a nationwide cultural phenomenon in the multiethnic Soviet Union of those years.

This very tentative ethnic distribution appears in Tables 6 and 7. In Ukraine, Belarus', and the Karelo-Finnish SSR, names were least reliable for distinguishing between the letter writers' ethnicities. Therefore, I did not analyze the data from Belarus' or the Karelo-Finnish SSR and proceeded with much caution in the case of Ukraine. In other regions, looking at names could be more informative. The cases for which it was especially hard to guess ethnicity by names appear in the tables under question marks. Letter writers from the Russian Federation are excluded from this distribution and figure only in the totals. Tables 6 and 7, again, do not claim to represent the ethnic distribution of *Novyi mir*'s letter writers, let alone readers, with any "scientific" precision. My goal was, rather, to chart a very approximate ethnic makeup of the journal's active audience.

The distinction between readers and letter writers becomes crucial here. Reading took only passive language skills, whereas writing required their active use and, at least

hypothetically, better proficiency (although in practice low literacy levels did not necessarily stop people from writing). *Novyi mir* was a Russian-language journal, so nearly all the letters were written in Russian, with two or three in Ukrainian. Meanwhile, someone whose preferred language of self-expression was not Russian might well have been impressed by a publication and yet unable or unwilling to write a response to it in Russian. So, in the letters the non-Russian audience might be slightly underrepresented.

Despite these remarks, the picture is telling. Although the ethnic republics provided a significant share of the letters, most responses to *Novyi mir* came from the Russian Federation. And in the ethnic republics, individuals with Russian-, Jewish- or (outside Ukraine) Ukrainian-sounding names vastly outnumbered the titular nationalities as letter writers. Overall thus, despite being a nationwide and avowedly internationalist periodical, in terms of its active readership *Novyi mir* under Simonov and Tvardovskii was mainly a Russian journal. Its publications had the greatest repercussions among those readers to whom the Russian language and culture were central elements of consciousness. This also helps to explain the near-absence of ethnicity in the letters. For many of their authors, the act of reading and responding to *Novyi mir a priori* placed them, together with the journal's authors and editors, on the platform of common Russian culture.

This, parenthetically, suggests some geographical and ethnic specifics of late Soviet cultural processes. The lukewarm response of the educated audiences in the ethnic republics to Russian literature may indicate that in one of its best-known forms – that is, literature-centered political and ethical discussion – the Thaw was an ethnically compartmentalized phenomenon. The degrees to which the ethnic intelligentsias in the Soviet republics were involved in Russian cultural life were uneven. Consequently, rather than following a single nationwide path, the Thaw proceeded diversely in various regional and ethnic contexts.⁵⁶

As far as party membership is concerned, Table 8 suggests that in most cases fewer party members showed up among the journal's letter writers than in the country's adult population (in 1959, Communist party members comprised 6.3% of the USSR population aged 20 and above).⁵⁷

It was not that especially many party members disagreed with *Novyi mir*'s ideas: on the contrary, many of them enthusiastically supported the journal. Fear of potential trouble is not a satisfactory explanation, either: most letters were fully signed and contained a return address. Apparently, more significant reasons for why so many people omitted mentioning their party membership had to do with the letter writers' self-perceptions.

There was, for example, a rapport between the letter writers' *age* and inclination to declare their party status. Relatively few middle-aged people indicated their party membership, and very few mentioned that they were non-members (*bespartiinye*). Just as with ethnicity, many if not most of the *middle-aged* letter writers apparently did not view party membership as capable of enhancing their argument. By contrast, party members usually showed up significantly when, such as with Solzhenitsyn's *One Day*, a published text brought many responses from senior readers (compare tables 4 and 8). The categories "middle-aged" and "senior," just as the threshold of 60 selected here to separate them, are of course imprecise, but they offer a possible point of departure. Evidently, party membership was more important to the people who had grown up with the Revolution and therefore saw belonging to the party as a mark of their creed, a symbol of reassurance and entitlement.⁵⁸ Some of them also used their party membership as an additional weight supporting their ideas. Middle-aged readers, by contrast, appeared far more skeptical about the weight of the "party card" argument.

Table 8. Party and Komsomol Membership, *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers, 1948-69

	Party members	Komsomol members	Non-members	Party or Komsomol membership undeclared	Total number of letter writers ⁵⁹	Declared party members among Soviet letter writers, % ⁶⁰	Declared Komsomol members among younger Soviet letter writers, % ⁶¹
Azhaev, 1948-1949	2	2+	0	118+	122+	1.7	5.7
Trifonov, 1950-1952	0	4+	0	64+	68+	0	10.8
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	2	0	0	133+	135+	1.5	0.0
Dudintsev, 1956-1959 and through 1965	26	6	2	776+	810+ (806+)	3.2	4.0
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	8 ⁶²	0	1	302+	313+ (310+)	2.6	0.0
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	11	1	0	433+	445+ (441+)	2.5	2.0
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	57 ⁶³	1 ⁶⁴	6	512+	579+ (573+)	9.8	2.4
Iashin, 1963	1	1	0	69+	71+	1.4	25.0
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	3	0	0	91+	94+ (93+)	3.2	0.0
Tvardovskii-Vuchetich, 1965	14	0	0	177+	191+	7.3	0.0
Kardin, 1966	17	0	1	78+	96+ (95+)	17.9	0.0
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	7	0	0	82+	89+	7.9	0.0
Dement'ev-<i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	6	1	1	132+	140+	4.3	14.3
TOTAL (average for %)	154	16+	11	2,967+	3,153+ (3,134)	4.9	4.9

As for the younger readers, eligible for Komsomol membership, the picture was even more radical. If a party card held at least some weight for some letter writers as an identity criterion, membership in the Komsomol fared much worse. The percentages of Komsomol members among Soviet youth were much higher than the share of younger people who indicated such membership in the letters.⁶⁵ What this suggests is that most of the younger readers viewed

Komsomol membership as irrelevant to a meaningful discussion of any significant political, cultural, or intellectual problem. This irrelevance is confirmed, for example, by the results of an opinion poll, “Komsomol Members about the Komsomol,” which the sociologist Boris Grushin conducted in March-April 1966 in the framework of *Komsomol'skaia pravda's* “Institute for Public Opinion.”⁶⁶ Analyzing the 3,101 responses by young people from several Soviet republics, Grushin described “an unprecedented, in its scale and acuteness, rejection [...] of the VLKSM's forms of activity overall, and their own personal participation in these activities.”⁶⁷ Again, the letter writers of *Novyi mir* by no means represented the entire Soviet society, but they do yield a very similar picture, which suggests that in the late 1940s – 1960s the authority of the Komsomol among youth was remarkably low.

Table 9, part 1. Places of Residence, Letter Writers of *Novyi mir*, 1948-1969

	1. Moscow		2. Leningrad		3. Kiev		4. Moscow + Leningrad + Kiev	
	Letters (%) ⁶⁸	Letter writers (%)	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)
Azhaev, 1948-1949	18 (21.4)	19+ (19.6)	5 (5.9)	5 (5.1)	3 (3.6)	2 (1.6)	26 (30.9)	26+ (26.3)
Trifonov, 1950-1952	3 (7.1)	5 (10.0)	2 (4.8)	2+ (4.0)	3 (7.1)	3 (6.0)	8 (19.0)	10+ (20.0)
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	20 (22.0)	61 (49.6)	8 (8.8)	7 (5.7)	1 (1.1)	1 (0.8)	29 (30.8)	69 (56.1)
Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965	89 (13.7)	93+ (12.6)	50 (7.7)	56+ (7.6)	24 (3.7)	24 (3.3)	163 (25.1)	173+ (23.5)
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	27 (24.1)	29 (10.9)	4 (3.6)	4 (1.5)	3 (2.7)	3 (1.1)	34 (30.4)	36 (13.5)
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	40 (13.6)	44+ (14.3)	29 (9.9)	32 (10.4)	11 (3.7)	11 (3.6)	80 (27.2)	87+ (28.2)
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	70 (15.8)	77 (16.0)	27 (6.1)	35+ (7.3)	9 (2.0)	9 (1.9)	106 (23.9)	121+ (25.2)
Iashin, 1963	9 (22.5)	10 (17.2)	1 (2.5)	1 (1.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (25.0)	11 (18.9)
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	14 (21.2)	16 (19.5)	5 (7.6)	4 (4.9)	1 (1.5)	1 (1.2)	20 (30.3)	21 (25.6)
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	42 (32.1)	64 (39.0)	13 (9.9)	19 (11.6)	5 (3.8)	5+ (3.1)	60 (45.8)	88+ (53.7)
Kardin, 1966	23 (31.1)	30 (35.7)	12 (16.2)	15 (17.9)	2 (2.7)	2 (2.4)	37 (50.0)	47 (56.0)
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	21 (32.8)	29 (34.1)	15 (23.4)	26+ (30.6)	3 (4.7)	2 (2.4)	39 (61.0)	57+ (67.1)
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	26 (19.7)	24 (18.9)	21 (15.9)	20 (15.7)	2 (1.5)	2 (1.6)	49 (37.1)	46 (36.2)
TOTAL	402 (18.1)	501 (18.8)	192 (8.6)	226 (8.5)	67 (3.0)	65 (2.4)	661 (29.7)	792 (29.7)

Table 9, part 2. Places of Residence, Letter Writers to *Novyi mir*, 1948-1969

	5. Large cities other than the capitals ⁶⁹		6. Smaller towns		7. Countryside		8. Foreign locations ⁷⁰		9. Unidentified locations		10. TOTAL ⁷¹	
	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)	Letters (%)	Letter writers (%)	Letters	Letter writers	Letters	Letter writers	Letters	Letter writers
Azhaev, 1948-1949	24 (28.6)	25+ (25.6)	21 (25.0)	32 (33.0)	13 (15.5)	14 (14.4)	2	5	17	20+	103 (84)	122+ (97+)
Trifonov, 1950-1952	21 (50.0)	26+ (52.0)	6 (14.3)	7 (14.0)	7 (16.7)	7 (14.0)	1	1	7	17	50 (42)	68+ (50+)
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	34 (37.4)	32+ (26.0)	18 (19.8)	15 (12.2)	10 (11.0)	7 (5.7)	0	0	13	12+	104 (91)	135+ (123+)
Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965	228 (35.1)	261+ (35.4)	153 (23.5)	177 (24.0)	106 (16.3)	127 (17.2)	6	5+	57	67+	713 (650)	810+ (738+)
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	41 (36.6)	192+ (71.9)	16 (14.3)	17 (6.4)	21 (18.8)	22+ (8.2)	3	3	38	43	153 (112)	313+ (267+)
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	104 (35.4)	106 (34.4)	68 (23.1)	65 (21.1)	37 (12.6)	45 (14.6)	5	5	39	137+	333 (294)	445+ (308+)
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	157 (35.4)	175 (36.3)	112 (25.2)	114 (23.7)	69 (15.5)	72 (14.9)	7	7	81	90	532 (444)	579+ (482+)
Iashin, 1963	12 (30.0)	17+ (29.3)	12 (30.0)	13 (22.4)	6 (15.0)	17 (29.3)	0	0	6	13+	46 (40)	71+ (58+)
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	26 (39.4)	28 (34.1)	14 (21.2)	18 (22.0)	6 (9.1)	15 (18.3)	1	1	8	11	75 (66)	94 (82)
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	43 (32.8)	49+ (29.9)	22 (16.8)	21 (12.8)	6 (4.6)	6 (3.7)	0	0	23	27	154 (131)	191+ (164+)
Kardin, 1966	27 (36.5)	26 (31.0)	5 (6.8)	5 (6.0)	5 (6.8)	6 (7.1)	1	1	11	11	86 (74)	96+ (84+)
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	11 (17.2)	14 (16.5)	8 (12.5)	8 (9.4)	6 (9.4)	6 (7.1)	0	0	4	4	68 (64)	89+ (85+)
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	56 (42.4)	57+ (44.9)	19 (14.4)	16 (12.6)	8 (6.1)	8 (6.3)	0	0	13	13	145 (132)	140+ (127+)
TOTAL	784 (35.3)	1008 (37.8)	474 (21.3)	508 (19.1)	300 (13.5)	352 (13.2)	26	28	317	465	2562 (2224)	3153 (2665)

Table 10. Letters to *Novyi mir*, 1948-1969, Geographic Distribution. Measured against the 1959 and 1970 Census Data⁷² Numbered columns stand for: 1 – Literary publications and cases in question; 2 – Moscow, % letters; 3 – Moscow, % USSR population, 1959 census; 4 – Moscow, % USSR population, 1970 census; 5 – Leningrad, % letters; 6 – Leningrad, % USSR population, 1959 Census; 7 – Leningrad, % USSR population, 1970 census; 8 – Kiev, % letters; 9 – Kiev, % USSR population, 1959 Census; 10 – Kiev, % USSR population, 1970 census; 11 – Large cities (over 100,000) other than Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, % letters; 12 – Cities over 100,000 other than Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, % USSR population, 1959 Census; 13 – Cities over 100,000 other than Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, % USSR population, 1970 census; 14 – Smaller towns (under 100,000), % letters; 15 – Towns under 100,000, % USSR population, 1959 census; 16 – Towns under 100,000, % USSR population, 1970 census; 17 – Countryside, % letters; 18 – Countryside, % USSR population, 1959 census; 19 – Countryside, % USSR population, 1970 census. Percentages of letters are based on the numbers of letters from identified locations. Decimals are rounded up.

1 Publications	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Azhaev, 1948-1949	21.4	2.4	2.9	5.9	1.6	1.6	3.6	0.5	0.7	28.6	18.7	26.0	25.0	24.6	25.0	15.5	52.1	43.7
Trifonov, 1950-1952	7.1	2.4	2.9	4.8	1.6	1.6	7.1	0.5	0.7	50.0	18.7	26.0	14.3	24.6	25.0	16.7	52.1	43.7
Pomerantsev, 1953-1954	22.0	2.4	2.9	8.8	1.6	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.7	37.4	18.7	26.0	19.8	24.6	25.0	11.0	52.1	43.7
Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965	13.7	2.4	2.9	7.7	1.6	1.6	3.7	0.5	0.7	35.1	18.7	26.0	23.5	24.6	25.0	16.3	52.1	43.7
Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967	24.1	2.4	2.9	3.6	1.6	1.6	2.7	0.5	0.7	36.6	18.7	26.0	14.3	24.6	25.0	18.8	52.1	43.7
Ehrenburg, 1960-1965	13.6	2.4	2.9	9.9	1.6	1.6	3.7	0.5	0.7	35.4	18.7	26.0	23.1	24.6	25.0	12.6	52.1	43.7
Solzhenitsyn, <i>One Day</i>, 1962-1969	15.8	2.4	2.9	6.1	1.6	1.6	2.0	0.5	0.7	35.4	18.7	26.0	25.2	24.6	25.0	15.5	52.1	43.7
Iashin, 1963	22.5	2.4	2.9	2.5	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.5	0.7	30.0	18.7	26.0	30.0	24.6	25.0	15.0	52.1	43.7
Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963	21.2	2.4	2.9	7.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	0.5	0.7	39.4	18.7	26.0	21.2	24.6	25.0	9.1	52.1	43.7
Tvardovskii / Vuchetich, 1965	32.1	2.4	2.9	9.9	1.6	1.6	3.8	0.5	0.7	32.8	18.7	26.0	16.8	24.6	25.0	4.6	52.1	43.7
Kardin, 1966	31.1	2.4	2.9	16.2	1.6	1.6	2.7	0.5	0.7	36.5	18.7	26.0	6.8	24.6	25.0	6.8	52.1	43.7
<i>Pravda</i>, 1967	32.8	2.4	2.9	23.4	1.6	1.6	4.7	0.5	0.7	17.2	18.7	26.0	12.5	24.6	25.0	9.4	52.1	43.7
Dement'ev / <i>Ogonek</i>, 1969	19.7	2.4	2.9	15.9	1.6	1.6	1.5	0.5	0.7	42.4	18.7	26.0	14.4	24.6	25.0	6.1	52.1	43.7
AVERAGE	18.1	2.4	2.9	8.6	1.6	1.6	3.0	0.5	0.7	35.3	18.7	26.0	21.3	24.6	25.0	13.5	52.1	43.7

Analyzed in Tables 9 and 10, the geographic distribution of *Novyi mir*'s letter writers suggests that the journal was read all over the Soviet Union and in all types of localities, from the capitals to the smallest villages. Categories such as "large cities," "smaller towns" or "the countryside," which I adopted for this analysis, are approximations rather than rigorous absolutes. The population benchmark of 100,000, chosen here to distinguish large cities from smaller towns, is arbitrary. Yet again, for all its arbitrariness, this method makes it possible, at least to some extent, to see the journal's readership on the country's map.

Nationwide as it was, readers' response to the journal was disproportionate to the population breakdown. The three largest cities, Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, while making only about 5% of the country's population, generated on the average 30% of responses nationwide. This large concentration of sophisticated and active readers in the capitals comes as no big surprise. This is what we could expect, judging by a multitude of anecdotal evidence and literary reflections the intelligentsia has produced. At the same time, the intellectual pre-eminence of the capitals over the provinces should not be exaggerated. The myth that "liberal" intellectual currents had no circulation whatsoever in the country outside the narrow circle of *intelligenty* in Moscow and Leningrad – and that intellectual life took place mainly in the capitals, whereas the provinces were passive, silent, stagnant, and could at best follow suit – is a distortion of reality. Tables 9 and 10 suggest that Moscow and Leningrad did not come even close to dominating *Novyi mir*'s active audience, except rarely in the mid- to late 1960s. Over the entire period of 1948 through 1969, the largest numbers of readers' responses to the journal came from outside the capitals.

It was the provincial readers, mainly those from large regional urban centers (Gorky, Kharkiv, Khabarovsk, Sverdlovsk, etc.), who contributed the greatest share of letters to *Novyi*

mir. The intensity of these responses (percentages of letter writers from those cities measured against the cities' share in the country's population) was somewhat lower than in Moscow, Leningrad, or Kiev. Nonetheless, the urban provinces responded to literature very intensely, often almost as actively as the capitals. In smaller urban centers the intensity of response was lower, except occasionally. The countryside did read *Novyi mir* and did respond to the journal's publications as well, but with yet lesser intensity than the cities and towns.

Overall, with the journal *Novyi mir* the literary life of the Thaw reached a very broad geographical range of locations, from the capitals to villages nationwide. The intensity of readers' reaction was largely commensurate with the scale of places where literary publications resonated. Response in the capitals was most intense, followed by a more leveled but strong reaction in large provincial cities, a somewhat less energetic reaction in smaller towns, and an even less intense, although noticeable, response from rural areas. The active audience of *Novyi mir* was primarily urban and to a great extent provincial. "Provincial" here is precisely a geographical rather than qualitative characteristic: to stress this again, letters from the provinces were in no way less sophisticated than those from Moscow or Leningrad. This, however, is a separate topic that I examine elsewhere in my work on the Soviet intellectual life of those years.

Table 11. Occupations of *Novyi mir*'s Letter Writers, 1948-1969

Numbered columns stand for: 1 – Identified occupations (Soviet citizens); 2 - Azhaev, 1948-1949; 3 - Trifonov, 1950-1952; 4 – Pomerantsev, 1953-1954; 5 – Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965; 6 – Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967; 7 – Ehrenburg, 1960-1965; 8 - Solzhenitsyn, *One Day*, 1962-1969; 9 – Iashin, 1963; 10 – Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963; 11 – Tvardovskii /Vuchetich, 1965; 12 – Kardin, 1966; 13 – *Pravda*, 1967; 14 – Dement'ev / *Ogonek*, 1969; 15 – Total.

1 Occupations	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15 Total
Party and komsomol functionaries, propagandists	5	0	0	5	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	20
Government and trade union administrators	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
KGB and MVD officers and staff	2	0	0	1+ ⁷³	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	11+
Military servicemen, rank unspecified	4	7+	4	25+	76	5	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	130+
Privates and NCOs	4	8	1	42+	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	58+
Cadets of military schools	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Officers unspecified	1	6	1	13+	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	25+
Junior officers	12	1	2	4	2+	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23+
Senior officers	4	1	3	3+	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	17+
Retired cadre officers	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	2	1	2	0	1	18
Generals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Total military	27	25+	11	91+	82+	14	15	2	3	4	7	0	1	282+
Undergraduate students at universities and institutes	5+	18+	56+	50+	8	11	31	3	1	6	1	2	5+	197+
Graduate students	1	0	4	2	0	0	0+ ⁷⁴	2	0	0	1	1	1+	12+
College-level faculty	0	1	2	10	2	6	5	1+	7	8+	7	1	2	52+
Scientists; researchers; specialists trained as researchers	1	0	3	21+	5	11	23	3	6	22	11	18	5	129+
Secretarial and support staff	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Unspecified employees of	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	7

research and academic institutions														
Total academia and sciences	9+	19+	65+	90+	15	28	61+	10	15	36+	20	22	13+	403+
Teachers	2	3	3	51+	9	21+	28	1	21	10	2	5	4	160+
Retired teachers	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	0	1	1	0	0	1	20
Kindergarten employees	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Secondary school students	18+	4+	1	8+	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36+
Unspecified employees in secondary education ⁷⁵	0	2	0	17+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19+
Lawyers	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Librarians	6	2	4	19+	1	6	7	1	1	2	1	2	3	55+
Archivists	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Journalism and publishing: editors, journalists, staff in periodicals and publishing houses	1	0	4	11	3	7	9	1	1	0	4	1	3	45
Arts and literature: writers; actors; artists; employees of literary and artistic unions	2	1	2	6	82+	8	15	2	1	11	3	2	5	140+
Popular culture: lecturers, cultural activists, club workers, etc.	1	1	0	3	0	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	15
Senior industrial and technical administrators; chief specialists; senior engineers	2	0	1	9	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Engineers	4	1	0	69	5	33+	20	5	3	21	7	16	11	195+
Other technical specialists with higher education	3	0	0	6	0	3	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	19
Junior technical specialists, usually without higher education	0	0	0	11	1+	4	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	29+

Unspecified technical staff; teams of technical and industrial employees ⁷⁶	0	0	0	15+	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	1	0	25+
Inventors	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Workers	5	1	0	30	5	14	17	2	2	4	3	0	18+	101+
Total industry, construction, services, trade	14	2	1	162+	11+	54+	56	9	8	27	13	19	33+	409+
Kolkhoz chairmen and sovkhoz directors; staff of procurement agencies; other local agricultural administrators	0	0	1	2+ ⁷⁷	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4+
Agronomists, accountants, technicians, and other specialists working in agriculture	0	1	0	5	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	13
Collective farmers, rank-and-file and unspecified	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	13	0	1	0	1	0	22
Total agriculture	0	1	1	9+	2	3	6	14	0	1	0	1	1	39+
Doctors	0	0	0	15	4	5	10	0	2	3+	1	0	3	43+
Other health care professionals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	11
Pensioners with unidentified previous occupations ⁷⁸	0	0	0	7	7	11	37	2	6	3	8	0	3	84
Convicts ⁷⁹	0	0	0	2	0	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Unaffiliated: housewives, permanently disabled	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Total letter writers with identified occupations, USSR	89+	61+	96+	507+	222+	181+	307+	45+	64+	100	59	53	70+	1854+

Foreigners with identified occupations	0	0	0	2	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	10
Unidentified occupations	33	7	39	301+	88+	264+	269+	26+	29	91+	36	36	70	1289+
TOTAL	122+	68+	135+	810+	313+	445+	579+	71+	94+	191+	96+	89	140+	3153+

Table 12. Selected Occupations among the Letter Writers, %

Percentages are calculated from the numbers of Soviet letter writers with identified occupations. Numbers of columns stand for: 1 – Identified occupations (Soviet citizens); 2 - Azhaev, 1948-1949; 3 - Trifonov, 1950-1952; 4 – Pomerantsev, 1953-1954; 5 – Dudintsev, 1956-59 and through 1965; 6 – Pasternak, 1958-1959 and through 1967; 7 – Ehrenburg, 1960-1965; 8 - Solzhenitsyn, *One Day*, 1962-1969; 9 – Iashin, 1963; 10 – Solzhenitsyn, short stories, 1963; 11 – Tvardovskii /Vuchetich, 1965; 12 – Kardin, 1966; 13 – *Pravda*, 1967; 14 – Dement'ev / *Ogonek*, 1969; 15 – Total.

1 Occupations	2 Azhaev	3 Trifonov	4 Pomerantsev	5 Dudintsev	6 Pasternak	7 Ehrenburg	8 Solzh. <i>ODID</i>	9 Iashin	10 Solzh. stories	11 Tvard. Vuch.	12 Kardin	13 Pravda	14 Dem.	15 Total
Military	30.3	41.0	11.5	17.9	37.0	7.7	4.9	4.4	4.7	4.0	11.9	0.0	1.4	15.2
Engineers, incl. senior technical specialists	6.7	1.6	1.0	15.4	2.3	18.2	8.5	11.1	4.7	21.0	11.9	30.2	15.7	11.5
Undergraduate college students	5.6	29.5	58.3	9.8	3.6	6.1	10.1	6.7	1.6	6.0	1.7	3.8	7.1	10.6
Scientists, researchers, college faculty	1.1	1.6	5.2	6.1	3.2	9.4	9.1	8.9	20.3	30.0	30.5	35.8	10.0	9.8
Teachers, including retired	2.2	4.9	3.1	10.5	5.4	13.8	11.7	2.2	34.4	11.0	3.4	9.4	7.1	9.7
Workers	5.6	1.6	0.0	5.9	2.3	7.7	5.5	4.4	3.1	4.0	5.1	0.0	25.7	5.4
Collective farmers, rank-and-file	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.0	28.9	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.2

Tables 11 and 12 show that the readers of *Novyi mir* came from a wide variety of occupations and social groups. As Table 11 suggests, educated professionals contributed the lion's share of responses, but were by far not the only readers of the journal. Soldiers, high school students, technicians, workers, housewives, collective farmers, camp and prison convicts also responded in large numbers.

Although most letter writers belonged to the intelligentsia (broadly understood here as professionals with higher education), few were highbrow intellectuals. Most letters came not from university professors, established scholars, artists or writers, but rather from engineers, lower-ranking researchers, military servicemen, schoolteachers, college students, librarians, and doctors. Bearing in mind that highly educated readers were better versed in expressing ideas on paper, the journal's overall audience, as opposed to its active part, may have been even more "common."

Readers of different occupations reacted with different intensity, depending on the publication and the historical moment. The letter writers' occupational profile also changed over time. Table 12 shows the main occupations of *Novyi mir*'s active audience in 1948-1969. Thus, the military formed one of the largest groups of letter writers to the journal during the late Stalin years, but during the Thaw responses from the military gradually declined in numbers, and by 1970 they had practically disappeared. From the mid-1960s soldiers, non-commissioned officers, and junior commissioned officers effectively stopped writing to the journal. On the other hand, senior officers, and especially retired ones, still wrote occasionally.

The military in Soviet society, as elsewhere, was among the most disciplined and tightly controlled groups of population. Much of the decline in its response apparently came from the changing attitudes of the armed forces' command to *Novyi mir* and to the general practice of the servicemen's involvement in literary life. Prior to the mid-1960s, the Main Political Directorate

of the armed forces continued its pre-World War II practices of bringing up the servicemen's loyalty and consciousness through "political enlightenment." Literature played an important part in the army as a "school of socialism," offering a powerful venue for propaganda. In particular, soldiers' letters to literary periodicals enabled political officers to demonstrate the effectiveness of their work.⁸⁰ (There is no reason, though, to dismiss letters from the military as products of wholesale indoctrination. Most such letters to *Novyi mir* were individually rather than collectively written, and more importantly, were textually unique. Many of them also expressed sympathies with the journal's line).

However, by the 1960s literature had become a stage for increasingly controversial and politically challenging discussions. The military command no longer thought it safe to expose the servicemen to just any literary publications indiscriminately. The peak of enmity came in 1966, when the Main Political Directorate, under General Aleksei Epishev (1908-1985, head of the Directorate in 1962-85), instructed the heads of its district and fleet sub-sections to exclude the journals *Novyi mir* and *Iunost'* from the subscription lists of military libraries for 1967.⁸¹ Later, subscription was discouraged as well. Much of the decline in response from the military, especially from junior servicemen, probably owed to these sanctions. Senior officers, on the other hand, were considerably freer in expressing their opinions, and continued to do so.

College students reacted to *Novyi mir* with far-less-restricted enthusiasm than the military. Students were a significant support group for the journal throughout the entire Thaw. However, their support had its own dynamic. During the early Thaw (the 1950s) student participation in politics via reactions to literature was grounded in the ideas and practices originating in the Stalin epoch. The peak of student letter writing came in 1953-54 (Pomerantsev's "On Sincerity), whereas later the proportion of their responses, compared to other groups of readers, would consistently decline. This decline could have at least two major

explanations – largely the same as the reasons for the overall “aging” of *Novyi mir*’s audience in those years. On the one hand, people of other ages and backgrounds began responding to the journal more actively. On the other hand (and the two explanations are not mutually exclusive), with the diversification of Soviet culture in the 1960s younger people may have increasingly distanced themselves from the customary Soviet forms of literature-centered political and intellectual life. New opportunities for socialization, such as television, foreign literature and music, bard songs, underground art, escapist travel, etc., may have decreased youth’s interest in legitimately published literature.⁸²

Among other occupations, academics and scientists became perhaps the most visible group of letter writers to *Novyi mir* in the 1960s – the most loyal supporters of the journal in its time of troubles. Engineers also responded actively, and their response also increased at the time. During the mid- to late 1960s, engineers, researchers, and university faculty together comprised anywhere from 40 to 65% of the total number of letter writers. It was then that *Novyi mir* came closest to being what it is often remembered – a journal of the academic and technical intelligentsia.

At the same time, *Novyi mir* was never an exclusively intelligentsia periodical. Workers did read and write to the journal, although with occasional surges or lapses of interest. The workers’ response was proportionately smaller than their share in the population, but they still comprised one of the most numerous groups of the journal’s letter writers. Occasionally the share of their reactions would skyrocket – such as in the Dement’ev – *Ogonek* debate of 1969, which to a large extent revolved around the image of the worker in Soviet literature and press.

Unlike workers, collective farmers responded to *Novyi mir* quite rarely. The countryside, on the average, produced about 13.5% of letter writers to the journal from 1948 to 1969, much less than its share in the Soviet population at the time. Also, most of the letter writers from the

countryside were not ordinary collective farmers, but belonged to the educated strata – local schoolteachers, village librarians, doctors, kolkhoz agronomists, or military servicemen stationed in rural areas.

There were certainly fewer educated people accustomed to reading literary journals and writing letters in the villages than in the cities. Subscription and delivery were also more difficult in the countryside than in urban areas. Yet, important as these educational and logistical factors were, they may not be enough to explain either the imbalance between urban and rural readerships or the variations among their responses to specific *Novyi mir* publications. One needs to take into account the actual literary texts, the unique circumstances of reading and letter writing, and the degree to which peasants did or did not perceive a connection between the literature of the Thaw and their own lives.

To give an example, many current or former collective farmers vigorously supported Aleksandr Iashin's December 1962 *Vologda Wedding*, a journalistic sketch that graphically described the poverty of kolkhoz peasants in the Vologda region. A record 29.3% of Iashin's correspondents came from the countryside, and most of them (13 out of 17) were peasants. Collective farmers also comprised, in Iashin's case, 28.9% of letter writers with identified occupations. Ten years earlier, in 1952-54, several rural (if not always peasant) readers had also reacted energetically to *Novyi mir's* publications of Ovechkin, Fedor Abramov, and Tendriakov, which dealt with the problems of the countryside.⁸³ On the other hand, collective farmers seemed rather indifferent to Solzhenitsyn's 1963 *Matrena's House*. Although Solzhenitsyn described the material deficiencies of peasant life even more graphically than Iashin, it does not look as if the readers in the countryside were all too impressed by his image of Matrena. For one thing, a key distinction between Iashin's and Solzhenitsyn's depictions of village life was that Iashin criticized the peasantry's abhorrent living standards in order to urge their swift

improvement, while Solzhenitsyn used the same theme of poverty and desolation to applaud Matrena for living an allegedly spiritual life, disinterested in material well-being. Quite a few peasant letter writers supported Iashin, but I yet have to locate peasant letters appreciating Matrena's image. Evidently, it was the (mostly urban) intelligentsia who proved receptive to Solzhenitsyn's retrospectivist and moralizing portrayal of the peasantry, celebrating *Matrena's House* and romanticizing its female protagonist.

Rather than altogether ignoring *Novyi mir* or completely lacking access to the journal, peasants did manage to obtain and read it, occasionally, and their responses were often favorable. However, they seem to have responded primarily not to fiction but to critical journalism, especially (and unsurprisingly) to the works that focused on the countryside. This picture looks not very different from peasant ideas about literary writing in the 1920s.⁸⁴ Similarly to their predecessors, the peasants of the 1950s and 1960s were an audience prone to a realist perception of literature and chose to identify with those writings whose agendas they saw as relevant and meaningful for their world. This, however, is a theme that requires a separate research project.

- ¹ Vasiliĭ Azhaev, "Daleko ot Moskvy," *Novyi mir* (hereafter *NM*), nos. 7-9 (1948); RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 7, ll. 1-121ob.
- ² Yurii Trifonov, "Studenty," *NM*, no. 10 (October 1950): 56-175; no. 11 (November 1950): 49-182; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 27, ll. 50, 55-55ob; d. 40, ll. 8-99ob; d. 41, ll. 146-146ob, 166-170, 174-175, 275, 276-277; d. 54, l. 148.
- ³ Vladimir Pomerantsev, "Ob iskrennosti v literature," *NM*, no. 12 (December 1953), 218-245; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 72, ll. 1-148ob; d. 80, ll. 1-2; d. 85, ll. 86-88ob; d. 88, ll. 1-144; d. 89, ll. 1-154ob; d. 90, ll. 78-84; d. 91, ll. 1-133; d. 92, ll. 1-152; d. 93, ll. 1-88.
- ⁴ Vladimir Dudintsev, "Ne khlebom edinyim," *NM*, no. 8 (August 1956), 31-118; no. 9 (September 1956), 37-118; no. 10 (October 1956), 21-98; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 240, ll. 1-150; d. 241, ll. 1-135; d. 242, ll. 1-134; d. 243, ll. 1-143; d. 244, ll. 1-140; d. 245, ll. 1-148; op. 8, d. 10, ll. 1-20; d. 11, l. 1-35; d. 127, ll. 1-242; d. 128, ll. 1-49; d. 129, ll. 1-177; d. 130, ll. 1-161; d. 131, ll. 1-90; d. 132, ll. 1-126; d. 133, ll. 1-135; d. 134, ll. 1-84; d. 135, ll. 1-131; d. 136, ll. 1-122; d. 137, ll. 1-13; d. 267, ll. 1-10; d. 268, ll. 1-86; d. 279, ll. 1-30; d. 404, ll. 1-16; d. 405, ll. 1-6; op. 9, d. 82, ll. 32-33ob, 144-145; d. 167, ll. 13-18ob, 27-30; d. 176, ll. 19-20; d. 178, ll. 7-16ob, 52, 79-79ob; op. 10, d. 3, ll. 4-7, 18; d. 74, ll. 14-14ob, 44-53; d. 75, ll. 7-14ob, 69-70ob; d. 78, ll. 94-113ob; d. 83, l. 55, 191-192; d. 173, ll. 136-136ob; d. 250, ll. 64-67.
- ⁵ *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 25 October 1958; "Ot redkollegii," *NM*, no. 11 (November 1958), i-ii; "B.L. Pasternaku," *ibid.*, iii-xvi; RGALI, f. 634, op. 4, d. 1903, ll. 1-7; d. 2117, ll. 1-121; d. 2118, ll. 1-21; d. 2119, ll. 1-90; family archive of Evgenii Pasternak (AEP); RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 269, ll. 1-110; d. 631, ll. 4-5, 8, 14; d. 632, ll. 5ob, 9, 41, 79; op. 9, d. 82, ll. 79-82, 118-119ob; d. 167, ll. 4, 79-79ob, 95-96, 110-111ob; d. 176, ll. 4-5; d. 255, ll. 5-6; d. 178, ll. 7-16ob; op. 10, d. 1, ll. 106-110; d. 82, l. 6; d. 166, ll. 83-85, 234-234ob; d. 251, l. 45; d. 252, ll. 10-14, 65, 66.
- ⁶ Ilya Ehrenburg, "Liudi, gody, zhizn'," *NM*, no. 8 (August 1960): 24-60; no. 9 (September 1960): 87-136; no. 10 (October 1960): 7-51; no. 1 (January 1961): 91-152; no. 2 (February 1961): 75-121; no. 9 (September 1961): 88-153; no. 10 (October 1961): 124-157; no. 11 (November 1961): 126-162; no. 4 (April 1962): 9-63; no. 5 (May 1962): 96-154; no. 6 (June 1962): 106-152; no. 1 (January 1963): 67-112; no. 2 (February 1963): 107-143; no. 3 (March 1963): 116-139; no. 1 (January 1965): 103-125; no. 2 (February 1965): 7-65; no. 3 (March 1965): 77-129; no. 4 (April 1965): 29-83; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 528, ll. 2-69; d. 631, ll. 2-80; d. 632, ll. 1-89ob.; d. 735, ll. 3-175; op. 9, d. 82, ll. 25-27ob, 74-75ob; 79-82, 83-86, 88-88ob; d. 176, ll. 1-2ob; d. 177, ll. 87-92ob, 130-130ob; d. 178, ll. 7-16ob, 40, 47-51, 61-76, 84-84ob; op. 10, d. 74, ll. 44-53; d. 75, ll. 3-4, 65; d. 78, ll. 3-8, 69-71, 82, 84, 118-121ob; d. 80, ll. 69-71; d. 81, ll. 68-68ob; d. 82, ll. 1-119; d. 83, ll. 1-256; d. 84, ll. 7, 16, 35; d. 167, l. 4; d. 171, l. 49; d. 173, ll. 67-68ob, 77-79; d. 250, ll. 13-14, 48, 115-116; d. 251, l. 18, 34, 51, 88; d. 252, ll. 1, 2, 10-14, 56-58, 65, 66, 77; d. 253, ll. 50-51.
- ⁷ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha," *Novyi mir*, no. 11 (November 1962): 8-74; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 80, ll. 91-92; d. 81, ll. 2ob-2, 5-6, 20-29, 60-61; d. 82, ll. 135-135ob, 144-145; op. 9, d. 102, ll. 32-38, 54-54ob; d. 139, ll. 13-14ob; 43-43ob; d. 167, ll. 4, 62-64, 98-98ob, 110-111ob; d. 168, ll. 39-41, 59-67; d. 171, ll. 50-59; d. 176, ll. 19-20; d. 177, ll. 94-107; d. 178, ll. 7-16ob, 23-23ob, 28-35, 42, 84-84ob; d. 222, ll. 8-14, d. 223, ll. 62-64; d. 255, l. 8, 10, 47-48ob, 55-56ob; d. 258, ll. 30-31; d. 259, ll. 58-59ob; d. 260, ll. 3-5; d. 262, ll. 5-8, 56-59; d. 263, ll. 9-10, d. 290, ll. 8-8ob; d. 329, ll. 56-60; d. 331, ll. 65-66, 87-96, 115-116; op. 10, d. 1, ll. 1-131; d. 2, ll. 1-169; d. 3, ll. 2-117; d. 73, ll. 1-95; d. 74, ll. 1-90ob; d. 75, ll. 1-122ob; d. 76, ll. 7-149ob; d. 77, ll. 1-80; d. 78, ll. 1-137ob; d. 79, ll. 1-94ob; d. 80, ll. 74, 75; d. 81, ll. 23-28ob, 35-39; d. 82, ll. 53-55, 60-61; d. 83, ll. 52-53, 61, 202-204; d. 84, l. 16; d. 166, ll. 1-238ob; d. 171, ll. 1-10, 28-29, 31, 42, 48-49; d. 172, ll. 12-13, 16-17; d. 173, ll. 77-79, 87-87ob, 136-136ob; d. 248, ll. 53-54, 55-56, 85-86, 89-94, 112; d. 249, ll. 27-29, 40-45; d. 250, ll. 8-9, 13-14, 41-49, 54-67, 102-105, 109-116; d. 251, ll. 18, 43; d. 252, ll. 10-14, 65, 66, 82; d. 253, ll. 41-44, 50-51, 67-69, 78-80, 84, 142-142ob; d. 317, ll. 4, 19; d. 396, ll. 28-36; d. 397, ll. 1-10.
- ⁸ Solzhenitsyn, "Sluchai na stantsii Krechetovka," *NM*, no. 1 (January 1963): 9-42; *idem*, "Matrenin dvor," *NM*, no. 1 (January 1963): 42-63; *idem*, "Dlia pol'zy dela," *NM*, no. 7 (July 1963): 58-90; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 167, ll. 110-111ob; d. 168, ll. 27-31; d. 176, ll. 41-41ob; d. 222, ll. 8-14; d. 223, ll. 62-64; d. 262, ll. 27-31, 45-47, 56-59; d. 329, ll. 56-60; op. 10, d. 76, ll. 6-11ob; 15-18; d. 79, ll. 37-38, 55-70ob, 95-97ob; d. 80, ll. 1-128; d. 81, ll. 1-68ob; d. 166, ll. 45-55, 62-62ob; d. 249, ll. 27-29; d. 250, ll. 41-44, 64-67; d. 251, ll. 18, 75-76; d. 252, ll. 56-58, 65; d. 253, l. 84; d. 317, ll. 4, 23; d. 396, ll. 28-36; d. 397, ll. 7-7ob.
- ⁹ Aleksandr Iashin, "Vologodskaia svad'ba," *NM*, no. 12 (December 1962): 3-26; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 222, ll. 8-14; op. 10, d. 80, ll. 69-71; d. 84, ll. 1-91; d. 252, ll. 56-58, 82; d. 253, ll. 31.
- ¹⁰ Aleksandr Tvardovskii, "Po sluchaiu iubileia," *NM*, no. 1 (January 1965): 3-18; Evgenii Vuchetich, "Vnesem iasnost'," *Izvestiia*, no. 88, 15 April 1965; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 167, ll. 1-113; d. 168, ll. 1-132; d. 171, ll. 1-124; d. 175, ll. 1-32; d. 176, ll. 1-1a, 41-41ob; d. 178, ll. 79-79ob, 84-84ob; op. 10, d. 214, ll. 124-125ob; d. 248, ll. 1-135; d. 249, ll. 1-79; d. 250, ll. 1-120; d. 251, ll. 27-29, 32; d. 252, l. 82.

- ¹¹ V. Kardin (the pseudonym of Emil' Kardin), "Legendy i fakty," *NM*, no. 2 (February 1966): 237-250; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 212, ll. 29-38; d. 221, ll. 1-73; d. 222, ll. 1-109; d. 223, ll. 2-61; d. 224, ll. 1-69; d. 225, ll. 1-41ob; d. 259, l. 29; d. 330, ll. 64-68, 84-87ob; d. 331, ll. 65-66, 124-147.
- ¹² "Kogda otstaiut ot vremeni," *Pravda*, 27 January 1967; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 259, ll. 1-59ob; d. 260, ll. 2-62; d. 261, ll. 2a-46; d. 262, ll. 5-10ob, 15, 21-31, 38-39, 43-47, 52-53, 56-59, 67-68; d. 263, ll. 1-72.
- ¹³ Aleksandr Dement'ev, "O traditsiakh i narodnosti (Literaturnye zametki)," *NM*, no. 4 (April 1969): 215-235; RGALI, f. 1702, op. 9, d. 324, ll. 1-101; d. 325, ll. 2-103; d. 326, ll. 1-94; d. 327, ll. 4-107; d. 328, ll. 9-141; d. 329, ll. 1-91; d. 330, ll. 5-117; d. 331, ll. 1-147.
- ¹⁴ For the sources for all tables henceforth, see the preceding endnotes.
- ¹⁵ Hereafter, unless otherwise indicated, the dates in the tables refer to the chronology of responses, not actual publications.
- ¹⁶ Numbers in parentheses refer to letters responding specifically to a particular publication, excluding references to it in letters on other subjects.
- ¹⁷ In addition, one letter to Trifonov, from a certain Aleksandr, could be viewed as semi-anonymous, raising the share of anonymous responses from 2% to 4%. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 40, ll. 13-14.
- ¹⁸ Numbers in parentheses show the letters written specifically in response to a particular publication. Numbers that precede them include mentions of that publication in letters on different topics.
- ¹⁹ See also Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 186-87; idem, "Signals from Below: Soviet Letters of Denunciation of the 1930s," *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 68 (December 1996), 856-858, esp. 857. Fitzpatrick, though, refers to denunciations, which could be different from readers' letters in the rationale and conventions of letter writing.
- ²⁰ Donald Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and De-Stalinization: The Consolidation of the Modern System of Soviet Production Relations, 1953-1964* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 9, 159-160, 182-188, 204-205, 230-240; Filtzer, "Women Workers in the Khrushchev Era," *Women in the Khrushchev Era*, ed. Melanie Ilič, Susan Reid, and Lynne Attwood (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 29-51, esp. 34, 44, 46; Melanie Ilič, "Women in the Khrushchev Era: An Overview," *ibid.*, 5-28; Michaela Pohl, "Women and Girls in the Virgin Lands," *ibid.*, 52-74; Susan Reid, "Women in the Home," *ibid.*, 149-176; Lynne Attwood, "Housing in the Khrushchev Era," *ibid.*, 177-202. Susan Reid, "Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev," *Slavic Review*, vol. 61, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 211-252.
- ²¹ Numbers in parentheses refer to readers responding specifically to a particular publication, rather than mentioning it in a letter on a different topic. Gender counts are based on the totals rather than net numbers in parentheses.
- ²² Calculated from: *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda. SSSR (svodnyi tom)* (Moscow: Gosstatizdat TsSU SSSR, 1962), 49; *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1970 goda*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Statistika, 1972), 13. For archival sources, see notes 1-13.
- ²³ On this, see Juliane Fürst, *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-War Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Thomas Lahusen, *How Life Writes the Book: Real Socialism and Socialist Realism in Stalin's Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 171; Elena Zubkova, *Poslevoennoe sovetskoe obshchestvo: politika i porvedennost', 1945-1953* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2000), 136-154.
- ²⁴ Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Kristin Roth-Ey, *Moscow Prime Time: How the Soviet Union Built the Media Empire That Lost the Cultural Cold War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011).
- ²⁵ Interview with Igor' Ivanovich Vinogradov, recorded 19 July 2002.
- ²⁶ One letter came from A. Makarov, a military pilot who wrote it on behalf of "a group of friends." RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 129, ll. 60-60ob.
- ²⁷ "Tat'iana," without a last name, and an engineer L. Kizima, both from Tbilisi. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 134, l. 76; *ibid.*, d. 137, ll. 1-13.
- ²⁸ Ol'ga Fominichna Gress, a pensioner from Sukhumi. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 78, l. 19.
- ²⁹ G. A. Poberezkin, whose father was a German political émigré. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 83, l. 42.
- ³⁰ A. I. Ianushevich, a professor of biology at the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences. RGALI, f. 634, op. 4, d. 2117, ll. 74a-78.

- 31 D. Bil'chun, a worker from Liepaia; I. S. Starozhitskaia, an employee of an agricultural field research station in Riga, and G.A.Ratushnyi, a military serviceman from Riga. See, respectively, RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 128, ll. 21-22, 6; f. 1702, op. 8, d. 130, l. 76; f. 1702, op. 6, d. 243, l. 111.
- 32 A KGB Lieutenant Colonel M. A. Ershov from Rezekene; also Mikhailovskii, a teacher from Dagda. Both wrote on behalf of several colleagues. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 243, ll. 27, 73.
- 33 Ingrida Sokolova, a philologist from Riga, and a letter writer from the same city with an illegible signature. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 83, ll. 161-161ob, 176-179ob.
- 34 V. D. Rakoshi, a military serviceman from Vilnius. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 127, ll. 225-228.
- 35 Galina Stankovskaia, a ninth-grade high school student from Bel'tsy. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 40, ll. 43-45.
- 36 Konstantin Vladimirovich Dvorzhak, a pensioner from Kishinev. In addition, one telegram was signed as "the Moldovan admirers of Dudintsev." RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 241, ll. 56-57, 73-74; d. 242, l. 125.
- 37 Two letters written by A. Kuliev and I. Il'in on behalf of the members of the Turkmen unions of composers and artists and the employees of the Turkmen State Museum of Art. RGALI, f. 634, op. 4, d. 2118, ll. 1-3, 18.
- 38 Two letters on behalf of entire workplaces: one signed as "The employees of the Zaporozh'e Oblast' Gorky Library"; the other signed by "The editorial board of the newspaper *Stalin's Soldier* [*Stalinskii voim*], military unit 18876 (tank)." RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 7, l. 108, 110.
- 39 Anonymous letter.
- 40 E. Iaroshevskii, a student of the Odessa State University, and G. Sadovskii from Kharkov. Respectively, RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 72, l. 20 and 65.
- 41 Maia Nemtsovich, a student at the Literature Department of the Tashkent Pedagogical Institute. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 40, ll. 38-40ob.
- 42 Eduard Pavlovich Zorin, a schoolteacher from Iangi-Iul', Tashkent oblast', Uzbekistan. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 88, ll. 82-94.
- 43 Most commonly, these letter writers came from classified enterprises or military units that had post office boxes (*p/ia*) or military mail codes (*p/p* or *v/ch*) instead of regular addresses.
- 44 E. Nikomarova, an instructor at the Azerbaijan State Conservatory, Baku. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 80, l. 126-126ob.
- 45 Zolotnitskii, Uzhgorod; Garri Ivanovich Zubris, physician, Chaplynka, Kherson Oblast; a letter writer with an illegible signature. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 80, ll. 115, 76, 127-128.
- 46 Sources: *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda. SSSR (svodnyi tom)*, 206-208; *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1970 goda*, vol. 4 (Moscow: Statistika, 1973), 12-15, 152, 223, 263, 284, 306. For archival sources, see notes 1-13.
- 47 The total for each republic minus the letter writers under "?"
- 48 RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 7, ll. 70-70ob, 95-96, 98-98ob.
- 49 Ibid., d. 93, ll. 54-54ob.
- 50 Ibid., d. 240, ll. 19-31; d. 245, ll. 113-117.
- 51 Ibid., op. 8, d. 528, ll. 36-37; d. 631, l. 65; d. 632, ll. 35, 37-38.
- 52 Ibid., op. 10, d. 83, ll. 202-204; d. 3, ll. 43-44ob; d. 83, l. 42.
- 53 Ibid., op. 8, d. 631, ll. 2-5.
- 54 Ibid., op. 10, d. 3, ll. 43-44ob; d. 75, ll. 27-29; d. 73, ll. 12-14; d. 166, ll. 32-36; *ibid.*, d. 78, ll. 129-131.
- 55 For the concept of titular nationalities, see Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 10-12.
- 56 On this, see Amir Weiner, "The Empires Pay a Visit: Gulag Returnees, East European Rebellions, and Soviet Frontier Politics," *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 78, no. 2 (2006): 333-376.
- 57 Calculated from: *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda. SSSR (svodnyi tom)*; *Istoriia Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuzna. Atlas* (Moscow: Institut marksizma-leninizma pri TsK KPSS, 1976), 122.
- 58 On this, see also Miriam Dobson, *Khrushchev's Cold Summer: Gulag Returnees, Crime, and the Fate of Reform after Stalin* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 77, 199.
- 59 Numbers in parentheses indicate Soviet readers, with foreigners excluded.
- 60 USSR only, foreigners excluded (see numbers in parentheses in the previous column).

- 61 The numbers of younger letter writers are taken from table 4, columns 3, 4, and 10.
- 62 In addition, two foreign communists, the journalist Martin Nag from Oslo, Norway, and Ugo Piocentini, a professor of literature and philosophy from Savona, Italy, sent their letters condemning Pasternak to *Novyi mir*. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 269, ll. 3-24, 26-26ob.
- 63 In addition, at least three letter writers had been party members in the past. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 78, ll. 118-121ob; d. 1, ll. 126-127; d. 2, ll. 6-15ob.
- 64 In addition, one reader indicated that she had been a Komsomol member previously. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 248, ll. 55-56.
- 65 According to the 1959 census, there were 55,004,605 people aged 15 through 29 in the USSR. In the 1970 census, their number was 52,874,857. At roughly the same times, Komsomol membership stood, respectively, at 18,092,500 (April 1958) and 27,028,300 (May 1970). See *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi 1970 goda*, vol. 2, 12-13; *Istoriia Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Atlas*, 123. Ideally, this analysis would require including the age of 14 (the entrance age of Komsomol membership) and excluding the age of 29 that was already above the upper Komsomol age of 28. The data, however, does not allow for this degree of precision.
- 66 Boris Grushin, *Cetyre zhiżni Rossii v zerkale oprosov obshchestvennogo mneniia. Ocherki massovogo soznaniia rossiian vremen Khrushcheva, Brezhneva, Gorbacheva i El'tsina*, vol. 2 (*Zhiżn' 2-ia. Epokha Brezhneva*), part 1 (Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia, 2003), 59-135, esp. 85-89.
- 67 *Ibid.*, 87.
- 68 For responses to each publication, percentages are calculated on the basis of identified locations within the USSR – that is, columns 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 taken together as 100%. The percentages are separate for the numbers of letters and letter writers, as those differed from each other.
- 69 “Large cities” denotes localities with population above 100,000.
- 70 Both foreigners and Soviet citizens working abroad ended up in this column. However, I did not encounter foreigners’ letters to *Novyi mir* earlier than 1956. The first such letters came in response to Dudintsev’s *Not by Bread Alone*.
- 71 In parentheses are the totals of letters/letter writers from identified locations within the USSR.
- 72 Sources: *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda. S.SSR (svodnyi tom)*, 12, 17, 30; *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1970 goda*, vol. 1, 61; *ibid.*, vol. 2, 5-7, 114, 118, 172. For archival sources, see notes 1-13.
- 73 Numbers followed by a “+” include letter writers speaking on behalf of several unnamed colleagues.
- 74 One letter came from an associate professor and 21 undergraduate and graduate students of literature in the philology department of Saratov University. She is counted under “faculty,” while her students appear separately in this row. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 10, d. 73, ll. 94-95.
- 75 Usually a letter was signed by “the collective of school no. XYZ” – likely, mostly teachers.
- 76 In these letters, only the name of a plant/factory/company was stated, rather than the letter writers’ specific jobs.
- 77 One letter from “the collective of the Viaz’ma State Farm Trust” did not bear specific signatures. RGALI, f. 1702, op. 8, d. 130, l. 42.
- 78 Pensioners with identified previous occupations are counted within their respective professions.
- 79 Individuals imprisoned at the moment of letter writing, rather than former Gulag prisoners.
- 80 For analysis of enlightenment practices in the prewar Red Army and the metaphor of the army as a “school of socialism,” see Mark von Hagen, *Soldiers in the Proletarian Dictatorship: The Red Army and the Socialist State, 1917-1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 95-99, 106-114, 269, 279-287. Roger Reese also mentions the educational efforts of the Main Political Directorate in the 1920s and 1930s, although he emphasizes the need-based nature of these efforts and takes issue with von Hagen as to their effectiveness. See Reese, *Stalin’s Reluctant Soldiers: A Social History of the Red Army, 1925-1941* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996), 80-82, 98-99.
- 81 RGALI, f. 5. op. 58, d. 46, ll. 78-95..
- 82 See Petr Vail and Aleksandr Genis, *60-e: mir sovetskogo cheloveka*, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2001); Roth-Ey, *Moscow Prime Time*.
- 83 RGALI, f. 1702, op. 6, d. 54, ll. 44, 55; *ibid.*, op. 8, d. 9, l. 8; *ibid.*, op. 6, d. 80, ll. 1-2, 4-8. Unfortunately, the archive contains very few readers’ letters about these seminal publications by Ovechkin, Abramov, or Tendriakov.
- 84 Régine Robin, “Popular Literature of the 1920s: Russian Peasants as Readers,” in *Russia in the Era of NEP: Explorations in Soviet Society and Culture*, ed. Sheila Fitzpatrick, Alexander Rabinowitch, and Richard Stites (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 253-267, esp. 264-265; Dobrenko, *Formovka sovetskogo chitatelia*, 121-122.