

THE ORIGINS AND TRADITIONS OF THE INFORMATION POLICY IN RUSSIA

Evgeny A. Markov

*The Cherepovets State University,
Cherepovets, Russia*

<p>Article history:</p> <p><i>Received:</i> 29.05.2017</p> <p><i>Accepted:</i> 27.04.2018</p>	<p>Abstract: For a long time the activities of mass media in Russia have been largely determined, and are still being determined now, by the state authorities. The state controls the activities of the information impact subjects, considering information resources, on an equal basis with other resources, to be important links that connect the multinational people into a single unity, and to remain one of the sources of the strength and power of the country. The author of the article, showing the changes that have taken place in the interaction between the state authorities and the media during three centuries of Russian history, expresses the idea of the inevitability of the active presence and control of the government institutions of the communicative and information field of the country, being an important factor ensuring the development of Russia, which conducts an independent external and internal policy and protects its national interests.</p>
<p>About the author: Doctor of Political Science, Professor, The Cherepovets State University</p> <p>e-mail: marevgeny@inbox.ru</p>	
<p>Key words: information sphere; state control; mass media; government; society</p>	

Introduction

Modern mass media are a complex institute of a political system of a society, consisting of a number of components. If to consider the functionality of mass media, it is controversial. On the one hand, mass media are meant to disseminate complete, objective and reliable information about everything that is happening around.

On the other hand, the media may act as the defenders of the population's interests before the authorities, that is, a means of social control.

And finally, the third and the most common notion of mass media in many countries at the present time, is that they are instruments of state authorities' influence on the public.

Using the ability of the media to independently produce political information, to influence political processes and to shape public opinion, the government seeks to control the activities of the media, and has been doing this for a very long time. It is precisely the reaching of this goal, that underlies the

information policy, which has been carried out for several centuries in Russia. But in the so-called old democratic countries, the ruling elite pursues exactly the same goal, and therefore – the information policy carried out in these countries differs little from the same policy pursued in Russia.

The very idea of controlling the activities of producers and distributors of information (including the mass media) is far from new and is being realized not only in Russia. Once Napoleon Bonaparte said "... in order to control the press, we need a whip and spurs ..."¹

The experience of Napoleon was well understood by Bismarck, who "created a system of "reptilian" press that received secret subsidies from the state <...> the system of so-called official, government-bribed publications, which at one time enjoyed popularity because

¹ Радзинский Э. Наполеон: жизнь после смерти. – М., 2003. – С. 164. [Radzinsky, E. Napoleon: zhizn posle smerti (Napoleon: Life after Death). Moscow, 2003. P. 164.]

of their opposition to the state, but later turned into an instrument of its policy.”²

At the end of the 18th century the press became such an influential political institution that it was designated as part of state social system. The British politician and philosopher Edmond Burke, speaking in parliament, said that it “has three powers; but the press gallery presents the fourth power (The Fourth Estate), more significant than all of the rest.”³

“It’s amazing,” Haydon wrote in his diary in 1827, “to what extent did I become addicted to the daily news, given that I know about the lies and the fleeting whims of the editors ... The scandal that I arrange if I haven’t been brought “The Times” on time, is stronger than when I haven’t been brought my dinner from the butcher’s.”⁴

Background and scope

Modern foreign researchers have paid a lot of attention to the study of communication opportunities and their influence on the formation of the political system institutions.

For instance, the existence of some connection between the development of society and the media was expressed in the middle of the XX century by a Canadian scientist, a representative of the University of Toronto, Harold Innis. His idea is that since the early stages of development the ruling elite of all countries has controlled the information. It means that to control the process of public opinion shaping is possible with the means of communication.⁵

The ideas of G. Innis were supported and

developed by Marshall McLuhan⁶ (who stated that the needs create new communications, rather than the reverse), Walter Ong⁷, Neil Postman⁸ (the latter two, as well as M. McLuhan, can also be attributed to the founders of media ecology). By the way, M. McLuhan took full advantage of the capabilities of modern mass media, and his ideas were spread throughout the world, although the pioneer of the significance of new communications was H. Innis, but his materials remained almost unnoticed. This fact was noted by the Canadian authors V. Bahton and T. Bardini, who wrote the article about these two outstanding researchers.⁹

Russian scientists, writers, and politicians paid much attention to the analysis of the possibilities of mass media as effective means of influencing public consciousness. But some of them, contrary to the prevailing political practice, assigned the press a completely different role. The great Russian scientist M.V. Lomonosov, for example, believed that newspapers should “... set themselves the goal of a strict and correct search for the truth.”¹⁰ It was precisely in this sense that the activities of the press were seen by M. Gorky, who in 1918 wrote in *Novoye Vremya*: “We fought for freedom of speech to be able to speak and write the truth.” But even then he understood that “... telling the truth is the most difficult art of all arts, because in its “pure” form, not connected with the interests of individuals, groups, classes, nations, the truth is completely inconvenient for the use of the philistines and is unacceptable to them.”¹¹

⁶ Poe, M.T. *A history of Communications*. Cambridge, 2011.

⁷ Ong, J. Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Methuen, 1982, p. 201.

⁸ Postman, N. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. Penguin Books. 1985. Pp. 27-34.

⁹ Buxton, W.J.; Bardini, T. *Tracing Innis and McLuhan // Canadian Journal of Communications*, 2012, Vol. 37, No. 4.

¹⁰ Есин Б.И. *История русской журналистики (1703-1917)*. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2000. – С. 105. [Esin, B.I. *Istoriya russkoj zhurnalistiki (1703-1917) (The History of Russian Journalism (1703-1917))*. Moscow, 2000. P. 105.]

¹¹ Горький Максим. *Книга о русских людях*. – М., 2000. – С. 442. [Gorky, M. *‘Book about Russian Men’*. Moscow, 2000. P. 442.]

² Засурский Я. *Журналистика: от Гутенберга до Билла Гейтса // Отечественные записки*. – 2003. – № 4. [Zassoursky, Y. *Zhurnalistika: ot Gutenberga do Billa Geitsa (Journalism: from Gutenberg to Gates) // Otechestvennyye zapiski*, 2003, No. 4(13). Mode of access: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2003/4/zhurnalistika-ot-gutenberga-do-billa-geytsa/>]

³ Volkov, D. *‘Evil Empire: a Short Course’ // Otechestvennyye zapiski*, 2003. Mode of access: <http://www.stranaoz.ru/2003/4/imperiya-zla-kratkiy-kurs/>

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Innis, H.A. *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto etc., 2003. P. 76.

The research devoted to the study of mass media activities began to be intensively carried out in the second half of the 60s of the 20th century, mainly within the framework of sociology. Since the late 80-ies of the twentieth century, there emerged an opportunity to conduct independent political studies, including, inter alia, the analysis of the relationship between the government and mass media.

At the theoretical and philosophical levels, the problem of interaction between the institutions of power, the media and society was studied by AA. Zinoviev, A.S. Panarin, S.G. Kara-Murza¹²; at the political, historical and sociological levels – by M.G. Anokhin, F.D. Demidov, A.V. Kononenko, O.I. Karpukhin E.F. Makarevich, V.L. Romanov, L.N. Timofeeva¹³, at the social and psychological levels – by V.D. Popov, A.P. Fedorkina, B.A. Dushkov¹⁴.

¹² Зиновьев А. Идеология партии будущего. – М., 2003. [Zinoviev, A. Ideologiya partii budushchego (Ideology of the Future Party). Moscow, 2003.]; Панарин А.С. Искушение глобализмом. – М.: Эксмо-Пресс, 2002. [Panarin, A. Iskushenie globalizmom (The Temptation of Globalism). Moscow: Eksmo-Press, 2002.]; Кара-Мурза С.Г. Советская цивилизация. – М., 2002. [Kara-Murza, S. Sovetskaia tsivilizatsiia (Soviet Civilization). Moscow, 2002.]

¹³ Анохин М.Г., Демидов Ф.Д., Кононенко А.В. и др. Технологии в политике и политико-административном управлении. – М., 2005. [Anokhin, M.G.; Demidov, F.D.; Kononenko, A.V. and oth. Tekhnologii v politike i politiko-administrativnom upravlenii (Technologies in Politics and Political and Administrative Management). Moscow, 2005.]; Карпукhin О.И., Макаревич Э.Ф. Влияние на человека: историко-социологический взгляд. – Москва-Барнаул: Пикет, 2000. [Karpukhin, O.I.; Makarevich, E.F. Vliianie na cheloveka: istoriko-sotsiologicheskii vzgliad (Influence on Man: Historical and Sociological View). Moscow-Barnaul, 2000.]; Романов В.Л. Социальная самоорганизация и государственность. – М.: РАГС, 2000. [Romanov, V.L. Sotsialnaia samoorganizatsiia i gosudarstvennost (Social Self-Organization and Statehood). Moscow, 2003.]

¹⁴ Попов В.Д. Информациология и информационная политика. – М., 2003. [Popov, V.D. Informatsiologiia i informatsionnaia politika (Informology and Information Policy). Moscow, 2003.]; Федоркина А.П. Феномен сознания в контексте социального пси-

The necessity of effective state regulation of mass information sphere, search and construction of a new model of productive interaction between mass media and society, was the focus of the works by Popov, I.M. Dzyaloshinsky, S.V. Konovchenko, A.G. Kiselev, Yu. A. Nisnevich¹⁵.

In the following years Yu. Budantsev, A. Grabelnikov, I. Zasurskiy¹⁶ and many others researched communication processes in society, history and modern conditions of the functioning of mass media.

The problems of interaction between the authorities and the media are also studied by

хоанализа. – М.: Изд-во Рос. акад. гос. службы, 1997. [Fedorkina, A.P. Fenomen soznaniya v kontekste sotsial'nogo psikhoanaliza (The Phenomenon of Consciousness in the Context of Psychoanalysis). Moscow, 1997.]; Душков Б.А. Ноопсихология и ноосоциология народов. – М., 2001. [Dushkov, B.A. Noopsikhologiya i noosotsiologiya narodov (Noopsychosociology of peoples and eras). Moscow, 2001.]

¹⁵ Попов В.Д. Государственная информационная политика: состояние и проблемы формирования / Массовые информационные процессы в России. – М.: РАГС, 2002. [Popov, V.D. Gosudarstvennaia informatsionnaia politika: sostoianie i problemy formirovaniia (State Information Policy: the State and Problems of Formation) // Mass Information Processes in Russia. Moscow: RAGS, 2002.]; Дзялошинский И.М. СМИ, власть и гражданское общество в регионе. – М.: Пульс, 2002. [Dzialoshinski, I.M. Mass Media, Power and Civil Society in the Region. Moscow: 2002.]; Коновченко С.В.; Киселев А.Г. Информационная политика в России. – М.: Изд-во РАГС, 2004. [Konovchenko, S.V.; Kiselev, A.G. Informatsionnaia politika v Rossii (Information Policy in Russia). Moscow: RAGS, 2004.]; Нисневич Ю.А. Информация и власть. – М.: Мысль, 2000. [Nisnevich, Y.A. Informatsiia i vlast (Information and Power). Moscow: Mysl, 2000.]

¹⁶ Budancev, Y.P. Systematic in the study of mass information processes. Moscow, 1986.; Грабельников А.А. Русская журналистика на рубеже тысячелетий. Итоги и перспективы. Монография. – М., 2000. [Grabelnikov, A.A. Russkaia zhurnalistika na rubezhe tysiacheletii. Itogi i perspektivy. Monografiia. – M., 2000.]; Засурский И.И. Масс-медиа второй республики. – М.: МГУ, 1999. [Zassurski, I.I. Mass-media vtoroi respubliki (Mass Media of the Second Republic). Moscow: MGU, 1999.], other authors are also included in Bibliography of the article.

young authors who consider this issue to be very important and relevant. It is possible to note the works of the following researchers: O. Kozlova, K. Mutylina, M. Poberezhskaya¹⁷, etc.

Great attention of the Russian authors to this problem is quite understandable, since the processes of change in the social and economic spheres are far from being completed, and, therefore, the interest of researchers to modernization processes will only increase.

This work is devoted to the description of the factors that influence the formation of effective communication and relations between the state and society, the authorities and the media. In our opinion this research is very relevant, since it is aimed at solving the problem of shaping public opinion on this subject.

This research reflects a brief history of the interaction of the power institutions and the media in Russia at various stages of social development. Such an analysis has been carried out in order to substantiate a scientific hypothesis, the confirmation of which is the task posed by the author.

Our hypothesis is as follows. Genetic (state) nature of modern Russian mass media has prevailed after a quarter of a century turn in the spiral of development and operating in the system of relations “power-media-society,” which objectively proves the inevitability of the active presence of power institutions in the communicative and information sphere of the country. Russian mass media, having started their way as a self-acting political institution, returned to the initial information and communication function, acting as an instrument of influencing public opinion on the part of the authorities. It is the trend that in many ways determines the development of the

processes of transformation of communicative and information relations in the “state-media-society” system.

Materials and Methods

The entire history of establishing and development of the print media and publishing business in Tsarist Russia was accomplished by the will and the blessing of the monarchs who personified power. Since the times of Peter the First, who founded the first official Russian newspaper *Vedomosti* in 1702, the state has regulated and developed printing and book publishing, contributing to public education and the development of the mass media themselves.

As a result, during the reign of all the emperors, printing and publishing were under the watchful eye of censorship, which became a special state institution.

It should be noted that censorship is a foreign invention. The need of censorship emerged in Western Europe in the XV century because of the ongoing conflict on religious grounds. The first censors – the clergy – had to suppress the spread of the ideas contrary to the official doctrine. It should be noted that in European countries censorship also existed. Prussian King Friedrich the Second credited with the following expression: “If you want a newspaper to be interesting, then you must not command it!” Although during the reign of this King of Prussia, the first censors appeared in editorial headquarters.

The reigns of Russian emperors alternated, the attitude to censorship also changed, and it was manifested in policies. Every new emperor either introduced more liberal rules or, on the contrary, toughened the regulations concerning the press. And, nevertheless, the state did not let the processes of production and dissemination of information get out of its control.

The end of the monarchical government in February 1917 allowed to establish the freedom of the press. By its resolution “On Press” dated 27 April 1917, the Provisional Government abolished censorship and granted everyone the right to publish a periodical or to establish a printing house. The same resolution abolished General Administration

¹⁷ Козлова Д.А. Проблемы взаимодействия органов государственной власти и СМИ // Экономика и социум. – 2016. – № 4 (23). – С. 784-788. [Kozlova, D. Problemy vzaimodeistviia organov gosudarstvennoi vlasti i SMI (Problems of Interaction between State Authorities and Mass Media) // *Ekonomika i Sotsium*, 2016, No. 4 (23), pp. 784-788.]; Mutylina, K.O. Contemporary Media Action: Where the Pendulum Leans? // *Politics, Economics and Innovation*, 2016, № 5(7); Poberezhskaya, M. Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda / *Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda*. 2015. Pp. 1-167.

of Press, which had its committees in all provincial cities in Russia.

But the freedom of the press existed in Russia only for a few months. At the end of 1917, due to the Bolsheviks coming to power, it was replaced by a new ideological and political dictatorship – the dictatorship of the Soviet regime, which lasted until 1990.

Having seized the power, the Bolsheviks took emergency measures by issuing “Decree on the Press” (27.10.1917), and because of it, they closed all periodicals that determined the Bolsheviks coming to power as a coup and urged the population to disobedience and resistance to the new government of workers and peasants. Such newspapers ceased to exist, and publishing houses were given to the Bolshevik authorities. For the period from October 1917 to June 1918 about 470 opposition newspapers stopped their activity because of the Decree. The Bolsheviks announced those measures to be temporary and promised that “As soon as the new order is strengthened, any administrative influence on the press will be abolished; the press will be granted full freedom to the limits of liability before the court, according to the widest and most progressive in this respect law.” The Bolsheviks didn’t fulfill their promise to grant freedom to the press in the near future, on the contrary, they tightened the sanctions (up to execution) against the mass media and journalists that did not support the policy of the new government. Moreover, in 1922 the censorship body, which became known as General Directorate for Literature and the Press (Glavlit) was established in the country.

In a totalitarian regime the Soviet mass media were integrated into the system of state propaganda and, and were used as the instruments of direct impact on the society. Through this channel the state broadcast its will, its attitudes, its understanding of the current events, which the state inspired by itself.

In the late 80-ies of the past century in the USSR major changes, called “perestroika” and “glasnost”, began. The Soviet law adopted in 1990 and the Russian law “On Mass Media” adopted in 1991 stated the rights and freedom of mass media, and abolished prior censorship in the form of such organization as Glavlit (General Directorate for Literature and the

Press). Russian media means were transformed from the means of ideological influence into an independent political institution, and actively participated in the process of political and social change. Moreover, at the same time the mass media turned into spiritual leaders that occupied such an important place in the life of the society that some journalists become incredibly popular public figures: V. Korotych, O. Latsis, E. Yakovlev, O. Poptsov, I.A. Laptsev. The hosts of such popular television programs as “Vzglyad” (V. Listjev, A. Lyubimov, D. Zakharov, A. Politkovskaya), “600 Seconds” (A. Nevzorov), “The Fifth Wheel” (B. Kurkova) became national heroes, and almost all of the above, on the basis of their popularity, were elected to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

An indication that the media ruled the hearts and minds of the citizens, was fantastically huge circulation of the newspapers: *Arguments and Facts* – 33 million copies – a record noted in the Guinness Book of Records; *Komsomolskaya Pravda* – 17 million copies; Labour – 15 million copies; The News – 12 million copies; Soviet Russia – 8 million copies. Social, political and literary magazines, such as *Spark*, *New World*, *Banner*, *October*, *Neva*, *Friendship of Peoples*, etc. also had million copies of newspaper circulation.

“Romantic” period in the history of the Russian mass media as an independent institution of the political system did not last long, just as much as the time necessary for the representatives of the new political elite to gain a foothold in power and proceed to the distribution of state property. As long as the interests of the members of the new elite, striving for power and the state assets, and the media associations willing to get independence, coincided, they continued their interaction. But as soon as the mass media fulfilled their task, having provided the new elite with the necessary legitimacy in coming to power, the media became a commodity in the market conditions.

With the beginning of economic reforms and the transition to a market economy, Russian mass media gradually lost the role of objective sources of information taking part in public opinion shaping. Due to dramatically increasing financial costs of their maintenance,

the mass media got initially into economic, and a little later, into political dependence either from the authorities who managed to preserve their participation in the media market, or business, which provided for them and defined their role as the conductors of its interests. But if to consider that business in modern Russia is hardly controlled by the authorities, it is quite possible to say that modern Russian mass media's state nature prevailed and was expressed in the restoration of dependence on the power or capital.

Does Russian mass media have any prospect to be released from political and economic dependence? We have to say that this process, even if supported "from above," will be difficult, and in any case an evolutionary, rather than revolutionary. There are a whole set of objective reasons for that.

In fact, in those countries that consider themselves to be old democracies, power actually successfully controls the activity of the media and uses them for its own benefit. There are a lot of examples of that. In 1999 European and American media justified the bombing of Serbia, giving one-sided information, telling nothing about the tragedy of the Serbian people. The same mass media justified the military intervention of the USA and its allies in Iraq, Libya. You may recall how difficult it was for objective information about the events of 08.08.08, in Georgia to made its way to the European and American TV. Moreover, mass media which with the help of new information technologies and the Internet received an incredible opportunity for the dissemination of information to large numbers of people in different countries at the same time, are used by the power as information weapons. After all, the so-called "color" revolutions that have taken place in recent years in different countries around the world, including neighboring Ukraine, were accompanied by propaganda support in the media, based on the use of biased information.

With the development of Russia as a strong and independent state, which also has to play the role of protecting the interests of a number of countries, the role and importance of information resources, including mass media is growing. Power cannot solve the

most important strategic tasks without the use of mass media opportunities. First of all, it is because mass media are not the only the source of information, but also an important communication channel between the government and society. Second, mass media have again become, to some extent, a means of ideological influence, daily and tirelessly participating in forming of public opinion to solve a significant task – implementation of a survival strategy, which consists in the necessity of development of the country as a strong state. Third, the state control in the production and dissemination of information is necessary also because the information is an important hoop, which provides the state with integrity, stability and information security. This means that the state influence in media activities will remain.

Can Russian mass media express not only the interests of the government officials, but also the interests of the majority of the population under these circumstances? Of course, the media that belong to private capital will, first of all, defend the interests of their respective owners. But the state-controlled media, getting financial support from the budget, formed by taxpayers, should protect the interests of not only officials, but the whole society and individual citizens. Ideally, it should be like that. After all, the state should be interested that the media carry out their activities for the benefit of the state and in the public interest, respecting the existing legislation. And mass media themselves cannot be absolutely independent from their state, from its civil society, from promoting the interests of their country, from the provisions of the Constitution, which guarantees the protection of the rights and freedom of citizens.

To accomplish such an important task as to express the interests of all the institutions of the political system, including civil society, the state should regulate the information processes, implementing certain information policy. Not only officials but also representatives of political parties, professional organizations, non-commercial organizations, academic institutions and citizens who have their proposals, should participate in the formulation of the principles of information policy.

When the information policy is being formed and carried out spontaneously, in

response to emerging challenges and threats, mass media credibility is decreasing. To support it, there are some data of sociological surveys.

If in 1989 general level of public creditability to mass media was high (the proportion of those who fully trusted mass media and those who did not completely trust them, is almost equal; on the whole they account for 80% of all respondents), then by 1992 the level of public trust dropped to about 25% of the respondents. The subgroup of respondents entirely distrusting mass media was close to 20%, and a relative majority (in total exceeding two above groups) was formed by those who hesitated in the media evaluation, both trusting and distrusting their information.¹⁸

The assessment picture characterizing the degree of trust / mistrust of the population to the media was formed by 1992-1993 and thereafter remained almost unchanged. According to the survey conducted in June 2005 by VTSIOM, one in four respondents (27%) did not trust any information source¹⁹.

In November 2010, (the data of *the Levada Center*), only 29% considered Russian media objective.

The study of the organization, held in January 2014, made it clear that if in 2010, 46% of the citizens believed that Russian press is “completely free” or “mostly free”, then in January 2014 only 39% of the respondents announced it.²⁰

To sum it up, the state should control the information sphere and, in particular, the activities of mass media, but from the use of direct policy, it should pass to the policy of reconciling of the interests of all participants in information activities. And mass media,

in this case, can provide the society with the opportunity of communication with authorities on all significant public issues.

Results and discussion

In the conditions of Russia's development as a strong and independent state, which, moreover, has to play the role of a center for the protection of the interests of a number of countries, the role and importance of information resources, including the media, will increase significantly. The authorities will not be able to solve the most important strategic tasks without using the capabilities of mass media. It is, firstly, because the media is not only a source of information, but also an important communication channel between the government and society. Secondly, the media will have to become, to some extent, a means of ideological influence again, tirelessly and daily participating in the public opinion shaping to solve a significantly important task – the implementation of a survival strategy, consisting in the need to develop the country into a strong state. This means that state control of the press will remain. True, if in the tsarist and soviet times the press operated under conditions of complete dependence on the authorities (represented by censorship bodies or ideological services), at present the dependence of the press on the authorities is not so unambiguous, but more complex, multilayered and sometimes not noticeable, but all the same stable.

In short, the state will not release the levers of influence on the media from its hands, and that will be carried out through: the system of financial support; providing information only to mass media which “justify the confidence” of the state authorities, etc. After all, the essence of power, after all, is “... the ability of the subject to influence the object. If the subject does not possess this ability, he has no power. The ability to influence an object is an indispensable element of power, one of its specific properties.”²¹

The state authorities have an urgent need for the organization of communicative and

¹⁸ Дубин Б.В. Медиа позднесоветской и постсоветской эпохи: эволюция функций и оценок населения // Пути России: Двадцать лет перемен. – М., 2005. – С. 251. [Dubin, B.V. ‘Media of Late Soviet and post-Soviet era: the Evolution of Functions and Population Estimates’, *Puti Rossii: dvadtsat' let peremen* : materialy Mezhdunar. simp. Moscow, 2005, p. 251.]

¹⁹ VTSIOM Presented the Results of a Survey of Russians Trust the Media. Mode of access: <http://www.dela.ru/news/other/5719/>

²⁰ Wiew GIPP. Less and Less Russians Consider the Domestic Press Free. Mode of access: <http://www.gipp.ru/opennews.php?id=39902/>

²¹ Ледяев В.Г. Власть: концептуальный анализ // Полис. – 2000. – № 1. [Ledyayev, V.G. Power: Conceptual Analysis // *Polis*, 2000, No. 1.]

informational interaction with the society with the direct participation of the mass media.

To fulfill this important task, it is necessary to create conditions for different mass media to carry out their activities, mass media reflecting both public and political interests, the struggle of opinions, ideas and points of view existing in the society. The higher the level of information competition, the higher the level of democracy and the institutions of civil society. In turn, the lack of information competition leads to the emergence of information barriers between the government and society, and these barriers might curb civil initiative and activity and slow the socio-economic development of the country.

Conclusion

At the junction of the 20th and 21st centuries, Soviet, and then Russian media, faced a difficult problem of finding their place in the reformed state, since the previous historical experience of the coexistence of the media and the authorities was not suitable in the new conditions.

The transformations initiated in the country, brought into play new political forces that involved mechanisms aimed at a gradual renovation that did not meet the modern concepts and demands of the political elite. In the modernized political and economic system, representatives of the new elite had the opportunity to gain access to power and to its resources. As a result of the process of glasnost initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev, there was an information explosion of freedom of opinion and emergence of new information in the media that received freedom, which was previously inaccessible to the general public in the conditions of the totalitarian regime. It would seem that Russian media found their place in the reformed system and became an important public institution that largely influenced the formation of public opinions and views, and which opinion the audience listened to and trusted. But the processes of so-called glasnost, which caused an information explosion, became possible only because the interests of the new political elite that came to power and the interests of the media community that sought independence and received freedom of speech,

converged for some time. This convergence of interests and uniting efforts in many ways determined the success of representatives of the new political forces and, at the same time, predetermined the future of the Russian mass media.

At first inconspicuous, but gradually growing political dependence of the media on the new political elite, developed and deepened, and subsequently became transformed into economic dependence.

Mass media fulfilled their role, ensuring the new elite coming to power and giving this process the necessary legitimacy. With the beginning of economic transformations, which were reduced to the introduction of market relations in the economy, the Russian media could not retain its function as objective sources of information that directly participate in public opinion shaping. They were not ready for action under the new conditions. Because of the dramatically increased financial costs, Russian media came first in the economic, and later in political dependence, either from authorities that retained their participation in the media market, or from the business that supported the media, and defined it as a guide and protector of their interests. Only a few media have remained independent players in the information market of the country, but at the same time they have largely lost their social weight and importance, having turned into specialized commercial publications.

Thus, genetic (state) nature of modern Russian mass media has prevailed.

References:

- Anohin, M.G.; Demidov, F.D.; Kononenko, A.V. and oth. Tekhnologii v politike i politiko-administrativnom upravlenii (Technologies in Politics and Political and Administrative Management). Moscow, 2005.*
- Budancev, Y.P. Systematic in the study of mass information processes. Moscow, 1986.*
- Buxton, W.J.; Bardini, T. Tracing Innis and McLuhan // Canadian Journal of Communications, 2012, Vol. 37, No. 4.*
- Dubin, B.V. 'Media of Late Soviet and post-Soviet era: the Evolution of Functions and Population Estimates', Puti Rossii: dvadtsat' let peremen : materialy Mezhdunar. simp. Moscow, 2005, pp. 250-263.*
- Dushkov, B.A. Noopsikhologiya i noosotsiologiya narodov (Noopsychosociology of peoples and eras). Moscow, 2001.*
- Dzialoshinski, I.M. Mass Media, Power and Civil Society in the Region. Moscow: 2002.*
- Esin, B.I. Istoriya russkoj zhurnalistiki (1703-1917) (The History of Russian Journalism (1703-1917)). Moscow, 2000.*

- Fedorkina, A.P.* Fenomen soznaniya v kontekste sotsial'nogo psikhooanaliza (The Phenomenon of Consciousness in the Context of Psychoanalysis). Moscow, 1997.
- Golovko, B.N.* Informatsionnyi menedzhment massovoi kommunikatsii (Information Management of Mass Communication). Moscow, 2005.
- Gorky, M.* 'Book about Russian Men'. Moscow, 2000.
- Grabelnikov, A.A.* Russkaia zhurnalistika na rubezhe tysyacheletii. Itogi i perspektivy (Russian Journalism at the Turn of the Millennium. Results and Prospects). Moscow, 2000.
- Innis, H.A.* The Bias of Communication. Toronto etc., 2003. P. 76.
- Kablukov, E.V.* Deformatsiia realnosti v sovremennom rossiiskom mediadiskurse (Deformation of Reality in the Modern Russian Media Discourse) // *Izvestiya Ural Federal University. Series 1: The Problems of Education, Science and Culture*, 2015, Vol. 138. No. 2, pp. 43-51.
- Kara-Murza, S.* Sovetskaia tsivilizatsiia (Soviet Civilization). Moscow, 2002.
- Karpuhin, O.I.; Makarevich, E.F.* Vlianie na cheloveka: istoriko-sotsiologicheskii vzgliad (Influence on Man: Historical and Sociological View). Moscow-Barnaul, 2000.
- Konovchenko, S.V.; Kiselev, A.G.* Informatsionnaia politika v Rossii (Information Policy in Russia). Moscow: RAGS, 2004.
- Kozlova, D.* Problemy vzaimodeistviia organov gosudarstvennoi vlasti i SMI (Problems of Interaction between State Authorities and Mass Media) // *Ekonomika i Sotsium*, 2016, No. 4 (23), pp. 784-788.
- Ledyayev, V.G.* Power: Conceptual Analysis // *Polis*, 2000, No. 1.
- Mass Media and American Politics. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1995. Pp. 27-34.
- Mutilina, K.O.* Contemporary Media Action: Where the Pendulum Leans? // *Politics, Economics and Innovation*, 2016, № 5(7), p. 4.
- Nisnevich, Y.A.* Informatsiia i vlast (Information and Power). Moscow: Mysl, 2000.
- Ong, J. Walter.* Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. New York: Methuen, 1982, p. 201.
- Panarin, A.* Iskushenie globalizmom (The Temptation of Globalism). Moscow: Eksmo-Press, 2002.
- Poberezhskaya, M.* Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda / Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda. 2015. Pp. 1-167.
- Pochepcov, G.* Classical Media Theories: Garold Innis / *Media sapiens*. Mode of access: http://osvita.mediasapiens.ua/ethics/manipulation/klassicheskie_mediateorii
- Poe, M.T.* A history of Communications. Cambridge, 2011.
- Politicheskie kommunikatsii (Political Communications) / Ed. A.I. Soloviev. Moscow, 2004.
- Popov, V.D.* Gosudarstvennaia informatsionnaia politika: sostoianie i problemy formirovaniia (State Information Policy: the State and Problems of Formation) // *Mass Information Processes in Russia*. Moscow: RAGS, 2002.
- Popov, V.D.* Informatsiologiia i informatsionnaia politika (Informiology and Information Policy). Moscow, 2003.
- Postman, N.* Amusing Ourselves to Death. Penguin Books. 1985.
- Prohorov, E.P.* Journalism and Democracy. Theoretical Essays. Moscow, 2001.
- Radzinsky, E.* Napoleon: zhizn posle smerti (Napoleon: Life after Death). Moscow, 2003.
- Romanov, V.L.* Sotsialnaia samoorganizatsiia i gosudarstvennost (Social Self-Organization and Statehood). Moscow, 2003.
- Shkondin, M.V.* Ekonomicheskie faktory transformatsii SMI (Economic Factors of the Transformation of Russian Media). Moscow, 1999.
- Sistema SMI Rossii (The System of Mass Media of Russia) / Ed. Y.N. Zassurski: Moscow State University M.V. Lomonosov. Moscow, 1996.
- Svitich, L.G.* Zhurnalizm v sisteme globalnykh informatsionno-kreativnykh protsessov (Journalism in the System of Global Information and Creative Processes). Doctoral dissertation: Dr of Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2002.
- Tertichni, A.A.* Rassledovatel'skaia zhurnalistika (Investigative Journalism). Moscow, 2002.
- The Russians Do not Consider Domestic Press Free. Mode of access: <http://www.gipp.ru/opennews.php?id=39902>
- Timofeeva, L.N.* Vlast i oppozitsiia: vzaimodeistvie, vzaimoogranichenie, vzaimokontrol, kommunikatsiia (Power and Opposition: Interaction, Mutual Limitation, Mutual Control, Communication). Moscow, 2004.
- Uzvishin, I.I.* Osnovy informatsiologii (Fundamentals of Informiology). Moscow, 2000.
- Varustin, L.E.* Pressa i vlast (Press and Power). Saint Petersburg, 1995.
- Vlast i pressa v Rossii: k istorii pravitel'stvennogo regulirovaniia otosnenni: (1700-1917): Khrestomatiia (The Power and the Press in Russia: On the history of Legal Regulation of Relations (1700-1917)). Moscow, 1999.
- Volkov, D.* 'Evil Empire: a Short Course' / Otechestvennyye zapiski, 2003. Mode of access: <http://www.stranaoz.ru/2003/4/imperiya-zla-kratkiy-kurs>
- Zassoursky, Y.* Zhurnalistika: ot Gutenberga do Billa Geitsa (Journalism: from Gutenberg to Gates) // *Otechestvennyye zapiski*, 2003, No. 4 (13). Mode of access: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2003/4/zhurnalistika-ot-gutenberga-do-billa-geitsa>
- Zassurski, I.I.* Mass-media vtoroi respubliki (Mass Media of the Second Republic). Moscow: MGU, 1999.
- Zemlianova, L.M.* Zarubezhnaia komunikativistika v preddveriinformatsionnogo obshchestva (Foreign Communicativistics in the Run-up to the Information Society. Explanatory Dictionary of Terms and Concepts). Moscow: 1999.
- Zinoviev, A.* Ideologiya partii budushchego (Ideology of the Future Party). Moscow, 2003.

Литература:

- Budancev, Y.P.* Systematic in the study of mass information processes. Moscow, 1986.
- Buxton, W.J.; Bardini, T.* Tracing Innis and McLuhan // *Canadian Journal of Communications*, 2012, Vol. 37, No. 4.
- Innis, H.A.* The Bias of Communication. Toronto etc., 2003. P. 76.
- Mass Media and American Politics. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1995. Pp. 27-34.
- Mutilina, K.O.* Contemporary Media Action: Where the Pendulum Leans? // *Politics, Economics and Innovation*, 2016, № 5(7), p. 4.
- Ong, J. Walter.* Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. New York: Methuen, 1982, p. 201.

- Poberezhskaya, M.* Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda / Communicating Climate Change in Russia: State and Propaganda. 2015. Pp. 1-167.
- Pochepcov, G.* Classical Media Theories: Garold Innis / *Media sapiens*. Mode of access: http://osvita.mediasapiens.ua/ethics/manipulation/klassicheskie_mediateorii
- Poe, M.T.* A history of Communications. Cambridge, 2011.
- Postman, N.* Amusing Ourselves to Death. Penguin Books. 1985.
- The Russians Do not Consider Domestic Press Free. Mode of access: <http://www.gipp.ru/opennews.php?id=39902>
- Volkov, D.* 'Evil Empire: a Short Course' / *Otechestvennyye zapiski*, 2003. Mode of access: <http://www.stranaoz.ru/2003/4/imperiya-zla-kratkiy-kurs>
- Анохин М.Г., Демидов Ф.Д., Кононенко А.В.* и др. Технологии в политике и политико-административном управлении. – М., 2005.
- Варустин Л.Э.* Пресса и власть. – СПб., 1995.
- Власть и пресса в России: К истории правительственного регулирования отношений: (1700-1917): Хрестоматия. – М., 1999.
- Головкин Б.Н.* Информационный менеджмент массовой коммуникации. – М.: СПб.: Изд. Михайлова, 2005.
- Горький Максим. Книга о русских людях. – М., 2000.
- Грабельников А.А.* Русская журналистика на рубеже тысячелетий. Итоги и перспективы. Монография. – М., 2000.
- Дзядлошинский И.М.* СМИ, власть и гражданское общество в регионе. – М.: Пульс, 2002.
- Дубин Б.В.* Медиа позднесоветской и постсоветской эпохи: эволюция функций и оценок населения // Пути России: Двадцать лет перемен. – М., 2005. – С. 250-263.
- Душков Б.А.* Ноопсихология и ноосоциология народов. – М., 2001.
- Есин Б.И. История русской журналистики (1703-1917). – М: Флинта: Наука, 2000.
- Засурский И.И.* Масс-медиа второй республики. – М: МГУ, 1999.
- Засурский Я.* Журналистика: от Гутенберга до Билла Гейтса // *Отечественные записки*. – 2003. – № 4.
- Землянова Л.М.* Зарубежная коммуникативистика в преддверии информационного общества: Толковый слов. терминов и концепций. – М.: 1999.
- Зиновьев А.* Идеология партии будущего. – М., 2003.
- Каблуков Е.В.* Деформация реальности в современном российском медиадискурсе // *Известия Уральского федерального университета*. Серия 1: проблемы образования, науки и культуры. – 2015. – № 2. – С. 43-51.
- Кара-Мурза С.Г.* Советская цивилизация. – М., 2002.
- Карпухин О.И., Макаревич Э.Ф.* Влияние на человека: историко-социологический взгляд. – Москва-Барнаул: Пикет, 2000.
- Козлова Д.А. Проблемы взаимодействия органов государственной власти и СМИ // *Экономика и социум*. – 2016. – № 4(23). – С. 784-788.
- Коновченко С.В.; Киселев А.Г.* Информационная политика в России. – М.: Изд-во РАГС, 2004.
- Ледаев В.Г.* Власть: концептуальный анализ // *Политис*. – 2000. – № 1.
- Нисневич Ю.А.* Информация и власть. – М.: Мысль, 2000.
- Панарин А.С.* Искушение глобализмом. – М.: Эксмо-Пресс, 2002.
- Политические коммуникации / под ред. А.И. Соловьева. – М., 2004.
- Попов В.Д.* Государственная информационная политика: состояние и проблемы формирования / Массовые информационные процессы в России. – М.: РАГС, 2002.
- Попов В.Д.* Информациология и информационная политика. – М., 2003.
- Прохоров Е.П.* Журналистика и демократия. – М., 2001.
- Радзинский Э.* Наполеон: жизнь после смерти. – М., 2003.
- Романов В.Л.* Социальная самоорганизация и государственность. – М.: РАГС, 2000.
- Свищич Л.Г.* Журнализм в системе глобальных информационно-креативных процессов. Дисс. на соиск. ст. д.филолог.н. Москва, 2002.
- Система СМИ России / ред. Я.Н. Засурский, МГУ. – М., 1996.
- Тертычный А.А.* Расследовательская журналистика. – М., 2002.
- Тимофеева Л.Н.* Власть и оппозиция: взаимодействие, взаимоограничение, взаимоконтроль, коммуникация. – М.: Изд-во РАГС, 2004.
- Федоркина А.П.* Феномен сознания в контексте социального психоанализа. – М.: Изд-во Рос. акад. гос. службы, 1997.
- Шкондин М.В.* Экономические факторы трансформации СМИ. – М., 1999.
- Юзвизиш И.И.* Основы информациологии. – М.: 2000

DOI: 10.24411/2221-3279-2019-10005

ИСТОКИ И ТРАДИЦИИ ИНФОРМАЦИОННОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ В РОССИИ

Евгений Алфеевич Марков

*Череповецкий государственный университет,
Череповец, Россия*

<p>Информация о статье: <i>Поступила в редакцию:</i> 29 мая 2017 <i>Принята к печати:</i> 27 апреля 2018</p>	<p>Аннотация: Деятельность российских средств массовой информации в России на протяжении длительного времени в значительной мере определялась и определяется органами власти. Государство контролирует деятельность субъектов информационного воздействия, полагая, что информационные ресурсы, наравне с другими, – это важные скрепы, соединяющие многонациональный народ в единое целое, это один из источников силы и могущества страны. Автор статьи, показывая трансформации, происходившие во взаимодействии органов власти и масс-медиа за три века российской истории, высказывает идею о неизбежности активного присутствия и контроля властных институтов коммуникативно-информационного поля страны, как важного фактора, обеспечивающего развитие России, проводящей самостоятельную внешнюю и внутреннюю политику и защищающей свои национальные интересы.</p>
<p>Об авторе: д.полит.н., профессор, кафедра связей с общественностью, журналистики и рекламы, Гуманитарный институт, Череповецкий государственный университет e-mail: marevgeny@inbox.ru</p>	
<p>Ключевые слова: информационная сфера; государственный контроль; масс-медиа; правительство; общество</p>	

Для цитирования: Markov, Evgeny A. The Origins and Traditions of the Information Policy in Russia // *Сравнительная политика*. – 2019. – № 1. – С. 70-80.

DOI: 10.24411/2221-3279-2019-10005

For citation: Markov, Evgeny A. The Origins and Traditions of the Information Policy in Russia// *Comparative Politics Russia*, 2019, No. 1, pp. 70-80.

DOI: 10.24411/2221-3279-2019-10005