

Radio Free Europe/Munich
Office of the Policy Advisor
Background Information USSR

November 19, 1959

THE PARTY AND THE PRESS (II)

I. Introduction

- I. Interview with a Soviet Official
(Saturday Review, August 1, 1959
by Norman Cousins)

p. 1

- III. Lunik II and the Unlucky Editor
(Le Monde, 14 November 1959
By M. Tatu - excerpt)

p. 12

"Comrades, I must tell you frankly that it is not easy for me to answer the question as to which journalist writings, our, Soviet, or non-Soviet, I read more. I believe that I read more of the writings of bourgeois journalists. You need not take offense, this is in our mutual interests.

"We must know well what is taking place in the capitalist world, we know what you say and write about the Soviet Union."

"Comrades, you journalists have worked well. But don't you become conceited as a result of this praise and do not think that you have, as the saying goes gripped God by the beard. There is still much dull stuff in our papers. Sometimes you take a paper, turn over the pages and put it aside. And afterwards you cannot even recall what was in that paper. I say this to stop you from becoming conceited."

N. S. Khrushchev
Moscow Tass, November 17, 1959

INTRODUCTION

In its editorial commentary on the conclusion of the first All-Union Congress of Journalists, Pravda,¹ the most important newspaper in the Soviet Union, selected the following quotation from the speech of N. S. Khrushchev to the delegates in order to define the role of the press and the men whom the Party selects to propagate the official line from Vilna to Vladivostok:

"Journalists are not only the loyal helpers (verniye pomoshchniki) but literally the assistants (podruchniye) of our Party, the active fighters for its great cause. Why assistants? Because you are always really close at the Party's hand (u partii pod rukoi). As soon as the need arises to explain and to implement any decision at all, we turn to you, and you, like a trusty transmission belt (i verny privodnoi remen) take the decision and carry it to the very heart of our people."

The simple figure of speech -- the simile of the transmission belt -- and the intentional play on words (podruchniye...pod rukoi) demonstrate Khrushchev's conscious intent to create the image of the press and the journalists as mere instruments of the Party who respond automatically to orders and pressures from above. In another, even more striking semantic exercise, the First secretary revealed with a surprising lack of inhibition how Soviet journalists had been conditioned -- over the years -- to such a Pavlovian reaction. Finding the basic premise of Marxist dialectical and historical materialism -- "Being determines consciousness" -- inadequate to explain fully an alleged change of attitude in the "capitalist" world towards "peaceful coexistence," Khrushchev took recourse to a pun -- drawn from the bitter wit of the forced labor camps -- to make his macabre point which no Agit Prop functionary could miss:²

"It is said that 'being determines consciousness' (bytiye opredelyaet soznaniye). With exaggeration some people say that 'beating determines consciousness' (bitiye opredelyaet soznaniye). I would say that the one and the other are correct. (Lively animation in the hall, applause). It seems that in this 'being' (bytii) a 'beating' (bitiye) helps some people."...

For the men who applauded, these words are the key not only to their own submission to the commands of the Party machine, but also a most trenchant presentation of their immediate and future assignments. In the literal sense many of their predecessors had indeed been "beaten" in the past to produce the desired degree of conformity; in the figurative sense, their next task is to influence the "consciousness" of their captive audience by constantly "beating" the propaganda drums of the Party.

hr

¹ Quoted by Radio Moscow, 19 November 1959.

² Radio Moscow, 18 November, 1959.

INTERVIEW WITH A SOVIET OFFICIAL

By Norman Cousins
Saturday Review
August 1, 1959

The high Soviet official looked at his watch. I realized that I had overstayed my allotted time by almost an hour; I apologized and stood up.

What I have told you is not for direct attribution, he said. You may not identify the source. I hope the material I have given you will be useful for background purposes.

His position was not unexpected, taking into account a series of recent interviews with visitors in which there had later been direct attribution. This was accompanied, Soviet officials felt, by a distortion of the government position. They were annoyed and resentful.

It was clear when I entered the room that this official was not in the buoyant, genial, comradely mood that I had been told was his manner.

I began by asking if he was pleased by the American response to the Soviet Exposition in New York.

He nodded and said nothing.

I then asked whether he didn't feel that President Eisenhower's statement about the Exposition was a constructive act that would commend the fair to American citizens.

Once again, he nodded curtly and said nothing.

I asked whether the cultural-exchange program, under which I had come to the Soviet Union, was working out well by now.

He said that on the whole, yes, the program seemed to be going well. Some difficulties, disagreements, and occasional arguments, but he felt that the program should continue.

What was important, he added, was that more and more people were able to discard their misconceptions. Consider, for example, the case of the American governors who had recently arrived in the Soviet Union. These are highly intelligent and educated men whose job it is to be well informed, he said, but they were now discovering that what they had been told about the Soviet Union in their press had deceived them.

One of the American governors had remarked to the government official that he had no idea that the Soviet standard of living was as advanced as it was. The governor was not prepared for the appearance of well-being in the Soviet people, or for the density of automobile traffic, or for the kinds of goods carried in the stores -- washing machines, refrigerators, fine cameras, all sorts of electrical equipment, jewelry, works of art -- or for the huge crowds buying all these goods.

It's the same story with most visitors from the United States, the official said. They expect to come here and find our people eating coupons instead of bread, walking around in rags, or living in terror under a police state. Instead, they find hundreds upon hundreds of new housing developments, plenty of food, people with money in their pockets, more jet planes than are to be found anywhere in the world, good wines, and workingmen in health resorts that would be beyond the reach of people in average circumstances elsewhere. They see all this and they want to know how this could be happening without their having known it.

Now, the official continued, the Soviet compares favorably with the nations of Central Europe but it is not yet up to the level of prosperity of the United States or Western Europe. Nor is the per capita production level up to that of the U.S.

He leaned forward and gripped the desk.

Let me tell you something, he said. The next two or three years we are going to put our housing problem behind us. That has right of way. Every day in Moscow, two large apartment houses or more are completed. Hundreds throughout the country. In a few years, maybe two or three, we will be caught up in housing. Then we will concentrate on other things to raise even higher the standard of living of our people.

A few years after that and our people will be able to buy automobiles. We're preparing for it right now by widening our streets and boulevards and building highways. We want cars but we don't want your congestion or your parking problems.

We've recently held a party meeting at which there was a great deal of criticism. We've been talking about our shortcomings and weaknesses and we're going to profit from such self-examination.

Your press is not doing its job, he went on. In 1953, when we owned up to our shortcomings, your press said that we were on the verge of catastrophe. That was six years ago. Mr. Hearst came here at that time and later wrote that we were only a short distance from collapse. Well, when he was

here we assured him that if he returned ten years later, he would still find us in business. Now I understand that Mr. Hearst is coming here with Mr. Nixon in connection with your Fair. (*) It will be interesting to see whether he still believes we are on the verge of collapse. He'll see some changes, I'm certain, but they'll all be for the better.

Most Americans don't seem to understand what it is to rebuild a country after war devastation, he continued. Half of our country was in ruins. Twenty million people were killed. All cattle from Leningrad to the Caucasus destroyed. Hardly any place to live. This is what an observer has to keep in mind when he measures our progress today.

Come back here in seven or ten years. See if I am right when I tell you we are going to have a standard of living as high as or even higher than you Americans. We will produce for the world markets.

I assured my host that there would be no resentment in America about the improvement in the living conditions of the Soviet people. Our aim was not to keep other people from enjoying the good things of life. Indeed, he could expect only the most genuine congratulations from the American people for any achievement in the Soviet that added to the prosperity and happiness of his people.

This was the kind of competition we are most eager to have, I added. Certainly, we feel no rancor when other people have genuine well-being. In fact, we were hopeful that the peaceful competition between the Soviet people and our own would not be confined to what each nation did for its own people. Most of the world's populations do not know what it is to have an adequate meal, or adequate education, or adequate medical care. It is what each of us can do in terms of the larger needs that should figure in the peaceful competition between our countries.

The official relaxed his grip on his desk and leaned back in his chair. Of course, he said, the Soviet Union had no intention of ignoring what was happening in the rest of the world.

Tell me, he said, his whole manner now less clipped, you have been to various parts of our country. You have been able to observe our people. How do you feel about what you have seen? If you have criticisms to make, please make them.

First of all, I replied, I was impressed, profoundly so, by the evidence of recent progress. In the last three or four years, it was apparent to me that the nation had leapt

(*) Editor's Footnote: William Randolph Hearst, Jr., also visited the Soviet Union in winter, 1956-57.

forward far beyond anything it had known before. I was struck by the high purchasing power of the average citizen. I met persons with savings of tens of thousands of rubles; young engineers with five figures in their savings-account books; hotel cleaning women whose husbands have already entered their names for private automobiles when they become available.

Also, in the South, on the Black Sea Coast, I saw row upon row of palatial health resorts, where people of modest means could enjoy luxurious vacations and comprehensive medical care at only a fraction of the actual cost.

And wherever I have gone I have seen the vast new housing projects. True, they leave something to be desired from an architectural standpoint -- they repeat themselves endlessly and seem heavy and tired even before the doors are installed. But they provide sturdy modern living space for those who need it, and that comes first. And, most of all, I noted the fact that no one I met doubted that your high production goals would be achieved.

Finally, I said, I wished to acknowledge the genuine spirit of friendliness I have met everywhere. All these things and more, as I say, made a most favorable impression.

I am glad, he said. You go back with no disappointments, then?

Not quite, I said. I have had some disappointments.

Serious ones?

I consider them as such. Let us talk about peace first. Soviet leaders have said that peace is important. No one takes exception to that statement. You have also said that the Soviet people want peace. The same is true of the American people. Yet you will forgive me for saying that it may not be particularly profound to say that both peoples want peace. People may want peace and yet their governments may pursue policies or make mistakes that lead away from peace.

One minute, the official said. Perhaps you are unaware of the fact that we have a law in the Soviet Union that makes it a crime for anyone in this country, whether a member of the government or a plain citizens, to advocate war. Wouldn't you say that we have made it as plain as it is possible to make it that our policies are for peace?

Yes, I am aware of your law against advocacy of war, I replied; but there appears to be no law against the kind of abrasive and inflammatory propaganda against a nation that turns one people against another and leads them away from peace.

The official leaned forward and gripped his desk again.

That is not true, he said. You will find no inflammatory propaganda in this country against the United States. Your General Norstad talked openly about bombing the Soviet Union, your Defense Secretary said that the United States may have to consider launching a preventive nuclear war, and one of your leading American magazines -- I believe it was the U.S. News & World Report -- published large maps with arrows pointed at the heart of the Soviet Union, showing how easy it would be for the United States to destroy the Soviet Union from its missile and bomber bases that are ringed around the Soviet Union.

What are we supposed to say to this? he continued. Are we supposed to smile and say that this is a demonstration of your peaceful intentions? How are we supposed to react to that kind of war talk? Well, I will tell you one thing. We are not going to make fools of ourselves like that before the world's people. You will hear no war talk from the Soviet Union. And, you are wrong, completely wrong, when you say that we engage in inflammatory propaganda against the United States.

I told the official that I had in mind a prominent article I had read only a few days earlier in the Moscow News. This was an article that said Americans were forcing South Koreans into slave labor and were shipping them to South America. The story also charged the United States with continuing atrocities against Koreans and said that we were planning aggression against North Korea.

Now, I said, if I were a Russian and read that article in the Moscow News, I would not be very peaceably inclined toward the United States or any country that would be guilty of these things. In any case, I said, my point is that the story in the Moscow News is not true. It is not documented. As it concerns the charge of impressing people into slave labor, surely the Soviet leaders must know that this is impossible. The American people have a particular sensitivity on this point. It happens that we fought a war, civil war, on this issue of slavery. Any American officials who were responsible today for forcing people into slavery would be impeached in a matter of days. I can imagine nothing more inflammatory than this. The story may not be an outright advocacy of war but do you not agree that this is the stuff of which war fever is made?

Are you sure that such an article appeared? he countered. He said he knew of no such story.

He rang for his secretary and said he would see if the Moscow News in fact carried the story.

I told the official that I had a copy of the issue in my bag; I handed it to him, with circles around the offending paragraphs.

He read it slowly, then looked at me. How do you know it isn't true? he asked. He asserted that he was prepared to believe the truth of what he had just read. The writer has no reason for saying what he did were it not true. None of this would have come up if you hadn't been in Korea in the first place. You had no business being in Korea in the first place. You had no business being in Korea. You should get out of Korea. You should get out of Japan, Turkey, West Berlin, and all the other places where you have military establishments near the Soviet Union. We don't have troops in Mexico, Haiti, or Latin America. If we did, you would feel your security was being threatened. Why don't you understand that this is exactly the way we feel about what you are doing?

Everyone should stay home, he continued. We said a long time ago we would be willing to withdraw our troops from Central Europe if the United States would agree to withdraw its military bases from foreign soil. That's a reasonable offer. Why surround us with your forces?

He said that the Soviet was willing to talk to the U.S. about these questions -- at the summit or anywhere else. He thought the summit might be useful because everyone knows that the foreign ministers have no real authority. Only the heads of the governments can discuss these big questions. But they were not begging for a summit conference. If the U.S. wants it, fine. If not, the Soviet leaders could wait.

There was no basic American objection a summit conference, I said. The question seemed to concern not so much the authority of the participants but their willingness to do the things that could give substance to the hopes raised by such a meeting.

I returned to the matter of the slave-labor story in the Moscow News and said that the official's readiness to believe it bothered me even more than the article itself. In fact, it troubled me more than anything that happened since I arrived in the Soviet Union. For if he, a person in a position of authority really believed such a story, then the hope for real peace might be slim indeed. The fact of the matter was that the article was untrue -- dangerously untrue. The author could offer no proof or documentation.

I had hoped in our discussion, I continued, that no attempt would be made to defend the indefensible. The aim was rather to discuss mutual approaches that might remove obstacles to peace. It was in that vein that I brought up the objectionable story in the Moscow News to illustrate my point that there may be a law against war advocacy, but there was no law against creating the kind of hatred that could prepare people for war. When an American magazine engaged in inflammatory articles or provocative war talk, surely the Soviet government realized that it was a commercial magazine and not a government that was speaking. But when an inflammatory article appeared in the Soviet press, one makes the natural assumption that it could not appear if it were inconsistent with government policy.

You will find, on the whole, the official replied, that there is a genuine attempt here to maintain a responsible and friendly press. He could give assurances, he continued, that their press exercised restraint. Consider the case of the American Exposition here in Moscow. All sorts of non-sensical objections to it were raised in the USA -- some people even saying that the paintings you intended to show were un-American and that some of the artists were Communists. We haven't said anything about this in our press here. We don't want to stir up trouble. We want your Exposition to be seen by our people. We are not afraid to have our people know about America. We are not afraid to show your frozen foods or your cars. Our people know we are catching up with America.

As for the article in the Moscow News, he continued, he said he was afraid I was attaching too much importance to a single account in a single newspaper. He said that though he had no reason to believe the author would be dealing in falsehood, he would look into the matter and find out what the evidence was behind the story. It sometimes happened that stories appeared in the Soviet press that somehow got by the editors.

Was there anything else that had disturbed me? he asked.

I referred to the matter of my talk before the Soviet Peace Committee. I was mindful of the fact that the invitation that had been extended to me to visit the Soviet Union was not withdrawn when I made clear in advance what the general nature of my talks would be. That you were willing to have me as a visitor despite my public position on the Hungarian violence, for example, was to me a welcome and important development. In fact, I had been told by correspondents and members of the diplomatic corps that I had the historic privilege of being the first foreigner to speak critically about various aspects of Soviet policy from a platform within the Soviet Union.

I did not take the privilege lightly, I continued. I felt I had an opportunity to tell what I had seen in various parts of the world, especially in Central Europe; and I wanted to speak about a structural basis for peace, one that went far beyond declarations into the specific working machinery necessary for peace.

In providing a platform for me, I said, you were you were demonstrating a willingness to accept the good faith of someone with whom you might disagree. But then, suddenly, everything went into reverse. You proceeded to demonstrate just the opposite of what the permission to speak seemed for a time to indicate. For the Soviet censors did not permit the correspondents to send out detailed stories about the talk.

This puzzled me, I continued, and it made me wonder about the contradictions that emerged from these two events.

As I spoke, the official reached for a pad and jotted down some notes. When I finished, he said: You are sure of this? You know for a fact that the story was not permitted to go out?

I said that four correspondents had informed me that their detailed stories had not been cleared. In any event, the censor's office could really supply confirmation of what I had said.

The official shook his head and said he would make inquiries and attempt to ascertain the facts. He said he could only guess at what had happened. One possibility was that the correspondents had emphasized an aspect of the talk and thus distorted it, or had used certain quotes that may have been misleading or harmful.

We try to protect our guests, he said. Our papers here frequently refer to news items in the United States. And if we inadvertently reported the distortion, that might compound the harm. Perhaps this was what had happened.

Another possibility, he continued, was that some bureaucrat just had fallen down on the job.

In any case, he would attempt to check into it.

I asked if a brief comment on both possibilities was in order. He nodded. Concerning the possibility, that the censors feared that the distortion would in some way be reflected in the Soviet press: Wouldn't the best way of handling that problem be to publish the full and undistorted text in the Soviet press itself? So far, there had not been a line about the talk in the Soviet Union.

Concerning the second possibility: namely, that a bureaucratic error was involved: Wouldn't this seem to suggest that opportunity for continuing error existed in the censor's office? How could conscientious foreign correspondents be expected to do their job under the limitations you impose?

You have opened up a big subject, he said tartly.

We are constantly amazed and troubled by what your press says about us. We have to protect ourselves as best we can. He returned to the matter of the American governors and their surprise in seeing a country far different from what they had expected. Now these governors are not clerks or fruit vendors. They are educated men. If they were lacking in knowledge it can only be because they were misinformed. And this is largely the fault of your press. What choice have we except to do what we can to guard against inaccuracies at the source?

Now, there is something else, he went on, something it is important for you to understand. When our country launched its experiment forty years ago, we did so under dreadful circumstances. Our people were poor. They were sick, many of them. They were hungry. It seemed that we were up against impossible obstacles. As if this were not enough, we were

made to feel that the rest of the world was against us. We realized that even though our revolution was over, our struggle for existence was actually just beginning.

If now we seem to you to be oversuspicious, and resentful, perhaps it is because we've come by our feelings honestly.

Surely, I replied, the Soviet Union now had every reason to forget those old resentments. It is now strong; it is developing an enormous production capacity; and its people are sharing in the better things of life -- in education, in good medical care, in education, in good medical care, in improved housing, in luxury products. Psychologically, at least, the nation should feel confident and secure. Certainly it is strong enough to do away with censorship altogether.

Yes, we have a genuine confidence, the official said. But it is difficult, nevertheless, to preserve an even temper when a newspaper like The New York Times publishes a false and harmful story as it did about the interview with Governor Harriman. Days before Governor Harriman's own account appeared, Mr. Schwartz of The New York Times wrote a so-called exclusive story saying that all sorts of dangerous threats were made to Governor Harriman -- threats of nuclear attack and so forth. That is absolute rubbish, he declared, saying he refused to believe that Mr. Schwartz got that story with Governor Harriman's authorization.

Actually the opposite occurred from Mr. Schwartz's version, he said. It was precisely because we were concerned about so much loose talk by generals in the United States and about how they would blow us up that it became necessary to say that this thing could work both ways and that it was high time an end was put to such nonsense. And now, today, in our government dispatches from abroad, I find an item that ridiculous.

He handed me a sheet on which the following appeared in French in the style used for cable communications:

4FP-133 URGENT WASHINGTON 2-- THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT ALLOW ITSELF TO BE INTIMIDATED BY THE THREATS OF MR. NIKITA KHRUCHTCHEV, (SIC) WHO SEEMS AT TIMES TO TAKE PLEASURE IN ISSUING SENSATIONAL STATEMENTS, A STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN DECLARED TODAY.

This is what we mean when we talk about irresponsible actions of your press. Here is your State Department making statements based on a false press report. We are not pleased.

I said I didn't want to seem too persistent, but I thought that this raised once again the question of the difficulties under which American correspondents were forced to work. For it is unreasonable to expect a newsman to get the news under the restrictions you impose. They are not permitted freedom of movement. The average tourist can get around much more freely. The correspondent has to request

permission to go anywhere more than a few miles beyond Moscow. True, the government organizes tours every once in a while that will enable him to see other places in the Soviet Union, and this is all to the good; but the general lack of freedom of movement has a crippling effect on his work.

Then they have to go through fairly elaborate procedures to see people in government, I added. And they are unable, for some reason, to sustain social or friendly contacts with people outside government.

In the matter of censorship, there is no clear guide, no way of knowing what will pass and what will not. And the correspondents who are on temporary visas are constantly apprehensive about whether their visas will be renewed.

It is natural for a man to reflect his personal experiences, I continued. A correspondent who has to cope endlessly with restrictions must not be blamed if what he writes reflects a restrictive society. Therefore, why not abolish censorship altogether? There are so many ways a story can be relayed, if a correspondent is eager to do it, that nothing the censor can do can help your cause. On the other hand, freedom of observation and movement might give the correspondent a better chance to develop real news.

The official replied that from time to time they had tried opening up in one form or another. It was not their aim to make things more difficult. They had a genuine problem here and were trying to face it as best they could, he said.

He looked at his watch.

There was one more point I was eager to bring up and asked for permission to do so.

Certainly, he said.

This had to do with the practice of Soviet book publishers in issuing the work of American authors without permission, royalty arrangements, or copyright clearance. I said I realized that a few American publishers were guilty of the same practice. It was an outrage, I said, whether done by Americans or Russians, and I hoped he agreed that common sense dictated that an end be put to it.

We are not resentful of your publishers who want to issue books by Soviet authors without royalties, he said. Let them do as much of it as they wished.

Apart from a very few publishers in our country, I said, there is a strong conviction among authors and publishers in the U.S. that both countries should respect the Berne Copyright Convention with regard to the works of authors in each

other's country. Certainly, American authors were justified in resenting the fact that millions of copies of their books are sold in the Soviet Union each year for which there were neither contracts nor royalties. This was a matter that Governor Adlai Stevenson had taken up with Soviet officials on his trip to the Soviet last year, and he had asked me to make further inquiries in that direction.

The Soviet official said he couldn't understand why American authors were so greedy. The fact that they were being read by other peoples should be enough of a reward. An author is no more entitled to be paid for reprintings than an architect every time someone new moves into the house, or a carpenter every time someone sits in a chair.

I told the official that I feared he was not addressing himself to the main point. A man is entitled to the fruits of his work. This principle is accepted in the case of the Soviet author by the State publishing houses. The Soviet author is paid not only for the first printing of his work, but for additional printings as well. American authors were not asking for anything that Soviet writers didn't receive. They were asking for equal rights. Whatever it was that the Soviet author received for his books, whether with respect to the first edition or the fifteenth -- this was also due the American writers, as a simple exercise in justice. And the same was also true of Soviet writers in America.

Ah, he said, but that's just the point. The Soviet publishes dozens of American writers and you publish a small handful of Soviet writers. There's no real parity here.

I replied that these were two separate issues. The question of parity in the number of writers being published had nothing to do with the fact that each writer should be the sole judge of how his works are to be used and by whom.

The official disagreed. A writer is not a carpenter. He deals with ideas. He creates a new view of reality. What he writes should be as free as the air. It should trouble the conscience of an American writer to grasp for more money when the important thing is that his creations are serving a good purpose.

Anyway, he continued, it is possible that at some time we may be able to change the present policy. We have a dollar shortage now. When we develop our trade relations and are in a position to spend dollars, we may reconsider our stand.

I expressed the hope that this might be soon. After all, writers could not be ignored in any attempt to build better relations between the two countries.

We will do everything possible to make for better relations, he replied. The main aim has to be peace between us. We have to find a way. I believe in Communism. You believe

in capitalism. But if we are sensible we will respect each other despite our differences. We will also try to lessen those differences if we can. It is absurd to suppose that we should allow these differences to result in terrible destruction that can prove nothing.

What he had just said would meet with reciprocal American sentiments, I replied. Perhaps very soon this approach might be reflected in specific measures taken to ensure the peace itself. I was thinking of the establishment of specific machinery in the United Nations for handling problems concerned with world security.

The official rose from his seat. He held out his hand and expressed the hope that the balance of my stay in the Soviet Union would be pleasant and fruitful. Then he made his stipulation that our talk be unattributed and used in a general background form.

The form of the preceding report seeks to be consistent with that stipulation.

LUNIK II AND THE UNLUCKY EDITOR

By M. Tatu
Le Monde
14 November 1959
(Excerpt)

NOT TO BE MICROFICED

...Without limiting their burning enthusiasm for the politics of the Party, the journalists have now been invited to stick more closely to reality, work more quickly and harder, especially when it is a question of information upon which commentary presents no difficulties; Tass has already been observed to react within hours to certain international events, and the editor of the newspaper Vechernaya Moskva (Moscow Evening) was spectacularly dismissed several weeks ago for having failed to announce in time the launching of the second Soviet cosmic rocket; the affair permitted Mr. Satyukov to pronounce a much appreciated comment: "Only two people in the world," he said, "didn't believe in the feat of Lunik II. Mr. Nixon and the Editor-in-Chief of Vechernaya Moskva."* That explains why the new editor of the newspaper was eager to publish a special edition in honor of Lunik III, which fell, however, upon a holiday....

* Not reported in the Pravda summary of the Satyukov speech.
(13 November 1959)