

National Research University  
Higher School of Economics

*Manuscript copyright*

Sopova Anastasia Petrovna

**LEGAL REGULATION OF THE PRESS IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AT  
THE BEGINNING OF THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY**

Dissertation summary  
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree  
Doctor of Philosophy in Law

Academic supervisor:  
Tumanova Anastasia Sergeevna,  
Doctor of Science, professor

Moscow – 2021

The thesis was completed at the School for Theory of Law and Cross-sectoral  
Legal Disciplines of the Faculty of Law of the National Research University  
"Higher school of Economics"

The text of the thesis is deposited and available  
on the website of the Higher School of Economics: <https://www.hse.ru/sci/diss>

12.00.01 – Theory and history of law and state;  
history of law and state doctrines

**Research rationale.** The present dissertation studies the effects and significance of the introduction of the freedom of speech and of the press in the Russian Empire during the constitutional reform of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The assessment of the legal status of periodicals is a key element of the current scholarly discussion of the history and nature of Russian constitutionalism. Moreover, the problem of the acceptability of state interference in the domain of mass media remains topical today. As periodicals were the main source of information of public interest in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the study of the legal regulation of this domain highlights its key theoretical and practical problems, whose essence has not changed today despite all the technological progress. Such key problems include the search for effective legal guarantees of the freedom of speech and the free dissemination of information, the adequate relation between administrative and judicial means of regulating media, and the problem of identifying the adequate boundaries of administrative discretion in controlling the dissemination of information.

**Research area:** social relations involving the public regulation of the legal status of periodicals in the Russian Empire in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Research topic:** lawmaking and enforcement practices with respect to periodical publications by government agencies of the Russian Empire in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Chronological framework:** from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century to 1914. The state of the press before and after the reform of 1905 is analyzed. The upper limit of the study is the beginning of World War I in 1914, which had a direct impact on the legal regulation of periodicals.

**Previous scholarship.** The history of censorship has traditionally interested scholars from different fields of knowledge. Before the Russian Revolution, many leading specialists of police (administrative), state (constitutional) and criminal law studied the problem of censorship and freedom of the press. Different aspects of the legal regulation of the press were treated by K. Arsenyev, E. Berendts, I. Gessen, V. Gessen, A. Gradovsky, V. Deryuzhinsky, A. Yelistratov, V. Ivanovsky, S. Kotlyarevsky, N. Lazarevsky, V. Nabokov, V. Novikov, N. Novombergsky, A.

Nolde, N. Polyansky, V. Rozenberg, N. Rozin, N. Tagantsev, I. Tarasov, Y. Tarnovsky, P. Tolstoy, I. Foyntsky, B. Chicherin, V. Shirkov, G. Shtilman and others.

Analytical and statistical articles about the results of the censorship reform of 1904–1906 were published in broadsheets at the time. The reform of the legal status of the press was also covered in detail by specialized legal publications. During the pre-Revolutionary period, major steps were taken towards analyzing legislation and developing a legal doctrine of the freedom of the press. The conclusions of pre-Revolutionary jurists have been largely overlooked by contemporary scholars of the history of censorship. This is largely due to the quasi-total rejection of the traditions of liberal jurisprudence during the Soviet period, which dismissed the pre-Revolutionary concept of the freedom of the press as “bourgeois.”

The relatively rare Soviet studies of the legal regulation of the press in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (A. Berezhny, I. Novozhilova and E. Letenkov) primarily focused on the development of the Bolshevik press. However, from the late 1970s on, scholars also began to pay attention to the non-Bolshevik press. Still, even during this period, specialists such as B. Yesin, S. Makhonina and S. Smirnova examined the impact of the legal regulation of the press on the functioning of periodicals and their quantitative and qualitative makeup rather than the regulations as such.

Today, scholars of the development of Russian law and the state in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century tend to focus on the internal heterogeneity of the bureaucracy and the impact of institutional practices on decision making. A lot of progress has been made in studying the development of constitutionalism in Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the problem of human rights in pre-Revolutionary legal science, and the impact of liberal legal doctrine on the legislative activities of the government and political parties (B. Ananyich, D. Aronov, T. Borisova, R. Ganelin, V. Demin, I. Kravets, A. Medushevsky, E. Pravilova, A. Remnev, A. Safonov, K. Solovyov, A. Tumanova, V. Shelokhaeva and others). The quality and quantity of publications on the history of censorship has also grown considerably. Numerous conferences and conference proceedings give a good idea of the current research agenda. Textbooks on the

history of Russian censorship have also appeared (G. Zhirkov's textbook *Istoriya tsenzury v Rossii XIX–XX vv.* [History of censorship in Russia, 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries], P. Reyman's course *Tsenzura v dorevolyutsionnoy, sovetskoy i postsovetskoy Rossii* [Censorship in pre-Revolutionary, Soviet and post-Soviet Russia]). Dissertations by A. Ambrosyev, A. Beloborodova, R. Burlakova, V. Blokhin, K. Ilnitsky, A. Ostashovsky, M. Pavlov, T. Polusmak, M. Pshenichnaya, I. Sizova, and S. Yachevsky have examined pre-Revolutionary censorship.

In particular, the publications of N. Patrusheva have made a key contribution to the study of censorship in Russia. In her D.Sc. dissertation *Tsenzurnoye ведомstvo v gosudarstvennoy sisteme Rossiyskoy imperii vo vtoroy polovine XIX – nachale XX veka* [The censorship department in the government system of the Russian Empire in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the early 20<sup>th</sup> century] (2014), Patrusheva examined the structure and operation of the Main Directorate of the Press of the Ministry of the Interior, the main agency in charge of censorship policy at the time. Some important aspects of the history of press law in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century have also been treated by A. Likhomanov. The evolution of censorship law is studied in several monographs on legal history, including Gorbachev, I.G., & Pechnikov, V.N. (2004). *Institut tsenzury v Rossiyskom zakonodatel'stve XVI – XIX vekov* [The institute of censorship in Russian law of the 16<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> centuries] and Potapov, Y.A. (2020). *Rossiyskoe zakonodatel'stvo o tsenzure. XVIII – nachalo XX veka* [Russian censorship law from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries].

In conclusion, we should note that the early 20<sup>th</sup> century is the least studied period of the history of the legal regulation of periodicals in the Russian Empire. Studies by legal scholars mostly present surveys with very broad timeframes. The lack of a comprehensive analysis of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century hinders the study of law enforcement practices and prevents scholars from assessing trends in the legal regulation of the freedom of the press in 1906–1914.

**Research goal:** identifying the key elements of the system of legal regulation of the press in Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and the areas of development of

lawmaking and enforcement activities of government agencies of the Russian Empire in the domain of the press before 1914.

To attain this objective, we shall pursue the following **targets**:

1. Describing the system of laws and regulations defining the status of the press in Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and identifying the factors that had an impact on the makeup and content of periodicals

2. Reconstructing and analyzing the main stages of the 1904–1906 reform and determining the legislative trends of the government and the role of the State Duma in the legislative process in the press domain in 1906–1914

3. Describing the content of the system of legal regulation of the press in Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, assessing the effectiveness of its operation during the political crisis of 1905, and analyzing the key changes in press law and in the practice of its enforcement

4. Analyzing the statutes of the criminal and criminal procedure codes of the Russian Empire relating to the press, describing the procedure of prosecuting press leaders and journalists, and identifying the main trends in court practice in 1906–1914

5. Defining the role and meaning of legislation on the exclusive status of the press in the system of legal regulation in 1906–1914

Our **sources** include a broad range of published and unpublished works. We examine a series of statutes and regulations included in the Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire and the Digest of Laws of the Russian Empire: the 1890 Statutes of Censorship and the Press (vol. XIV of the Digest of Laws), laws and regulations on censorship and the press promulgated from the late 1860s on, the statutes of the censorship reform of 1904–1906, and criminal and criminal procedural statutes relating to states of emergency. In addition to official sources, we make use of unofficial law digests, including collections of laws with interpretations and practical commentaries by pre-Revolutionary jurists.

We also worked with the collections of three archives: the Russian State Historical Archive (RGAI), the State Archives of the Russian Federation (GA RF),

and the Central State Archive of the City of Moscow (TsGAM). Archival materials were particularly important for studying different aspects of lawmaking and enforcement practices.

Among the published sources, documents of different government departments played an important role. We made extensive use of the shorthand minutes of the State Duma and the records of the Council of Ministers. Court practice was analyzed by studying the collections of decisions of the Criminal Court of Cassation of the Governing Senate. One of the key published sources was the collection of circular notes by the Main Directorate of the Press published by N. Patrusheva and I. Fut in 2016. We also made use of digests of documents of different types relating to the activities of P. Stolypin and the published documents of political parties of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Private sources provided additional support for conclusions made on the basis of official documents. We made use of the memoirs of a number of statesmen and public figures, including A. Belgard, S. Witte, I. Gessen, V. Gurko, V. Dzhunkovsky, M. Kovalevsky, V. Kokovtsov, V. Maklakov, A. Mosolov, V. Obolensky, A. Sidorov, and N. Tagantsev.

As to press publications, we drew upon materials from the legal periodicals *Pravo* (Law), *Vestnik prava* (Law Herald), *Zhurnal ugolovnogo prava i protsessy* (Journal of Criminal Law and Procedure), and *Zhurnal Ministerstva yustitsii* (Journal of the Ministry of Justice). We also made use of selected legal publications from the journal *Vestnik Yevropy* (Herald of Europe) and the newspapers *Kiyevlyanin* (Citizen of Kiev) and *Rech'* (Speech).

**Research methodology.** The dissertation takes a systemic approach. We examine the legal regulation of the press as part of the legal system as a whole, while government policy in this domain is analyzed in the context of the general development of the political system of the Russian Empire. Our methodology is based on a notion of legal regulation as a cyclic process with the following stages, as expounded by Y. Tikhomirov: (1) emergence of a legal understanding, (2) design and planning of the development of law, (3) lawmaking, (4) law enforcement

through administrative and judicial practice of different forms, and (5) monitoring and assessment of the corresponding results.<sup>1</sup> The choice of methodology for the dissertation was conditioned by our striving to examine the process of legal regulation of the press in early 20<sup>th</sup>-century Russia as a complex phenomenon that includes all the aforementioned stages. We made use of formal legal, comparative historical, comparative legal and statistical approaches.

**Research novelty.** The dissertation analyzes in detail the specifics of the lawmaking process and the procedures of systematizing law, their impact on the content of press law, and different aspects of law enforcement practices. It reconstructs different episodes of the lawmaking process in 1905–1914 that have not been examined by scholars up until now, including the process of drafting press legislation in 1908–1910. It classifies the models of legal regulation of the press and identifies, analyzes and publishes new data about the scope of legal proceedings and administrative sanctions against the press in 1905–1914. The statutes of the censorship reform are examined in the context of both press law and criminal and criminal procedural law in general. We also analyze statutes and regulations on states of emergency and their application to the press.

**Principal results of the study to be defended before the dissertation committee:**

1. We take a comparative legal approach to classifying models of legal regulation of the press on the basis of the criterion of the scope of application of administrative discretion. We identify four models: (1) the system of prior censorship, (2) the system of administrative discretion, (3) the system of legal liability with the use of administrative measures for dispensing justice, and (4) the system of legal liability without the use of special administrative measures. We argue that prior censorship, administrative measures for dispensing justice, and a system of administrative discretion co-existed in the Russian Empire from the 1860s, in contrast to Western European countries where these models succeeded each other.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tikhomirov, Y.A. (2008). *Pravovoye regulirovaniye: teoriya i praktika* [Legal regulation: Theory and practice]. Moscow, 2008, p. 58.



The political system of the Russian Empire was marked in general by overlapping old and new institutions that partially contradicted each other, which was also true for press law.

2. The status of the press in the Russian Empire in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was regulated by the 1890 Statutes on Censorship and the Press, which comprised the 1828 Statutes on Censorship and numerous temporary laws adopted since the 1860s. Their content was conditioned by the specific nature of Russian lawmaking and codification procedures that hindered the development of a new press law while permitting the introduction of amendments to the existing Statutes using a simplified procedure. The archaism, heterogeneity and inner contradictions of the Statutes hindered their practical application and enhanced the role of circular notes of the Minister of the Interior in the day-to-day practice of censorship. The ambiguity of censorship regulations prevented the government from elaborating a unified practice and encouraged the application of administrative discretion. As a result, the censorship system proved ineffective during the 1904–1905 political crisis.

3. The reform of censorship law began with the Decree of December 12, 1904. Although the reform program was considerably expanded in 1905 under the impact of the political crisis, its main stages were implemented using traditional bureaucratic lawmaking procedures: the introduction of individual amendments to the Statutes on Censorship by decrees of the Committee of Ministers and the State Council (December 1904 – May 1905), the work of the Special Council for Developing New Press Statutes (February – December 1905), the elaboration of a final project of temporary regulations for the press by the Council of Ministers and its discussion by the unreformed State Council (October 1905 – April 1906), and the systematization of changes and their incorporation into the Digest of Laws (second half of 1906). This process led to major changes in the legal regulation of the press. Nevertheless, one failed once again to make an in-depth reform of press law. Yet another set of temporary regulations was promulgated instead of new press statutes, while the Statutes on Censorship and the Press of 1890 remained in force.

4. The main result of the 1904–1906 reform was the introduction of the fundamental principles of the freedom of the press into Russian law. The new legislation made it possible to register new periodicals without prior permission and guaranteed the non-interference of the government in their activities before publication. The system of administrative penalties for “harmful tendencies” was replaced by legal liability for acts defined as crimes by the law. Nevertheless, some archaic elements of prior censorship remained. While the main task of censors continued to be the prevention of the diffusion of criminal publications, they had to implement it in the conditions of the limitation of their powers and the rapid growth of the number of periodicals. The contradictory rules for the seizure of periodicals made administrative practices complicated. The new regulations unambiguously stipulated that a print run of a periodical could be seized only after it began to be distributed and only if legal action was simultaneously taken against its editor. At the same time, the legislation lacked reliable guarantees of legal protection against unlawful seizure. This led to the widespread administrative practice of the seizure of issues of newspapers and magazines without providing effective measures against the diffusion of radical periodicals.

5. The temporary press regulations of 1905–1906 did not aim to reform the system of criminal liability for press activities and only introduced several new offences into criminal law for bridging gaps in areas that had previously been handled administratively. Thus, criminal law in the domain of press activities continued to be provisional and contradictory even after the reform of 1904–1906. The Criminal Code of 1903 had eliminated special “press crimes” and set down general rules for the complicity of press workers instead of the earlier presumption of guilt of the editor-in-chief that had been borrowed from French law. However, insofar as the Criminal Code did not come fully into effect, the general statutes of the Punishment Code of 1885 continued to be applied in press cases. Both the Criminal and Punishment Codes set down very severe penalties for press workers. The amendments made to criminal procedural law in 1905–1906 were fragmentary and did not introduce procedural guarantees for the freedom of the press.

6. The main trend in judicial practice in press cases in 1906–1914 was the rapid growth of criminal processes against representatives of the legal press. On average, over 200 judicial verdicts were promulgated against press editors annually. Nevertheless, about 30% of these editors were absolved, while those who were found guilty of the most serious political offences were mostly given softer sentences than the law prescribed. The preservation of the presumption of guilt of the editor-in-chief in criminal law led to the widespread practice of dummy editors, which helped periodicals survive in the conditions of the rapid growth of judicial proceedings and of the increasing severity of criminal sentences.

7. The government's striving to find more or less lawful means of counteracting the revolutionary stances of the press led to the broad use of emergency measures regulated by the Directive "On measures for protecting..." of August 14, 1881. They made it possible to temporarily limit the establishment of newspapers and magazines without prior permission and create a new system of administrative penalties for violating local government ordinances as an alternative to court proceedings. The scope of application of these penalties kept expanding until 1914, greatly surpassing the number of penalties imposed before the 1905 reform. This new administrative practice was decentralized and marked by ambiguity and the discretionary nature of administrative powers. This led to the reemergence of preventive prohibitions on discussing certain issues in the press and the persecution of newspapers magazines for "harmful tendencies" rather than violations of the law. Nevertheless, penalties for violating ordinances were imposed on individuals in the form of fines and seizures without shutting down the periodicals altogether. Oppositional periodicals managed to adapt to the new regime and continue their activities despite the large fines. Moreover, the government recognized that extraordinary measures could not be applied indefinitely in the context of the rule of law and planned to abrogate them after the promulgation of a new press law that would be more integrated than the provisional regulations of 1905–1906.

8. The legislative activities of the government in 1906–1914 moved in two different directions. First of all, in 1908–1910 while P. Stolypin was prime minister, an attempt was made to draft a moderately liberal bill that would reduce administrative control over the press. Secondly, in 1912–1913 a bill was drafted by the Ministry of the Interior that greatly intensified administrative pressure on the press. Although the State Duma was unable to pass laws guaranteeing the freedom of the press, the necessity of submitting every bill to the legislature served as a hindrance to the adoption of more severe statutes. At the same time, the radical attitudes of the State Duma made it impossible to bring the moderately liberal reform to its conclusion. Although the bill of the Ministry of the Interior of 1913 was greatly amended by the Duma committee to assure certain press guarantees, oppositional factions were opposed to its half-way nature. The outbreak of World War I prevented the State Duma from discussing the bill at its general session, allowing the government to return temporarily to the practice of the administrative closure of newspapers in the conditions of wartime.

The **theoretical and practical significance** of the dissertation lies in its new results and its comprehensive analysis of press law and its application. A number of documents and statistics are published for the first time. Our analysis and conclusions provide a basis for the further study of the process of guaranteeing and regulating individual rights and freedoms in Late Imperial Russia and for teaching courses and writing textbooks in the field.

**Presentation of research results:** 11 academic papers with a total of 7.35 printer's sheets have been published on the subject of the dissertation; the author's personal contribution was 7 printer's sheets. The most important results of the dissertation were presented in talks at conferences and other academic events.

### **Main contents of the dissertation**

The **Introduction** presents a rationale of the study, indicates its area, topic and timeframe, and makes a detailed analysis of past scholarship. Proceeding from the gaps in existing scholarly works, we formulate the goal and targets to be attained in the dissertation. We describe in detail the sources that we use to solve the posed

problems and characterize our methods and methodology. We present the main conclusions of the dissertation and show their scholarly novelty.

**Chapter 1: Development of Press Law in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century** describes the history of legislation regulating the legal status of the press in the Russian Empire.

*Section 1.1: System of Press Statutes and Regulations in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century* shows the heterogeneous and contradictory nature of the Statutes on Censorship and the Press of 1890. An analysis of lawmaking and codification procedures uncovers three historical layers in the Statutes that formed under the impact of different ideological trends and historical circumstances.

*Section 1.2: Reform of Press Law in 1904–1906* contains a detailed analysis of the stages of the development and implementation of the reform of press law from the promulgation of the decree of December 12, 1904, to the introduction of amendments to the Digest of Laws in 1906. In this section, we propose our own periodization of the reform of press law and use a broad range of archival sources to reconstruct in detail the process of drafting the Temporary Rules of November 24, 1905.

*Section 1.3: Problem of the Press in the Legislative Process in 1906–1914* presents a general description of the legislative activities of the government and Duma factions with regard to the press in 1906–1914. In particular, several sources are used to reconstruct the moderately liberal bill on the press drafted by the government in 1908–1910. We also consider the reasons why this bill was not adopted and, in particular, examine the views of Emperor Nicholas II on the freedom of speech and the press. We also analyze in detail the process of drafting the press bill by the Ministry of the Interior in 1913 and its discussion by a Duma committee in 1913–1914. Bills drafted by Duma factions are also considered.

**Chapter 2: System of Administrative Control over the Press in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century** examines the evolution of the administrative regulation of the press before and after the reform of 1904–1906.

*Section 2.1: Prior censorship and Other Forms of Administrative Control of the Press before 1905* analyzes the models of the legal regulation of the press that existed in the Russian Empire on the eve of 1905. We present our own classification of these models and describe them theoretically. We then identify the regulations and institutes in the Statutes on Censorship and the Press that correspond to each model. We show that priority was given in practice to applying institutes involving broad administrative discretion, while the judicial procedure of considering press cases set down by law in the 1860s lost its practical import. We analyze the operation of different institutes of censorship in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by studying the circular notes issued by the Ministry of the Interior.

*Section 2.2: Operation of the System of Administrative Control during the Political Crisis of 1905* presents a description of the main trends in the practice of censorship during this period and tries to explain the reasons for the ineffective functioning of censorship in 1905. The section shows that, while the Censorship Department had unlimited powers of applying administrative penalties, it used them very sparingly in the conditions of political crisis and imposed quite restrained penalties, if any.

*Section 2.3: The Temporary Rules of November 24, 1905, and March 18, 1906, and Administrative Practice* analyzes the key changes in the system of administrative control of the press due to the reform of 1904–1906. It shows that the institute of administrative penalties was eliminated from law, while the institute of prior censorship lost its practical meaning, as it could be applied only to periodicals in rural areas. We show that rules permitting the establishment of newspapers and magazines without prior permission led to the rapid growth of the number of periodicals. This ever-greater body of periodicals was reviewed by the same number of censors. The only instrument at the disposal of censors for preventing crimes committed with the printed word was to seize an issue of a periodical while transferring the case to the prosecutor who would initiate court action.

**Chapter 3: Criminal and Administrative Liability of Press Workers in 1905–1914** analyzes the relation between judicial and administrative measures taken against the press after the reform.

*Section 3.1: Development of Court Practice in Press Cases* examines the main results of the transition to judicial liability in press cases. The section describes the criminal law statutes regulating the procedure for persecuting crimes committed with the use of the press. Our discussion takes into account the transitional nature of criminal law in the Russian Empire. We show that the Criminal and Correctional Punishment Code of 1885 and the Criminal Code of 1903 regulated “press crimes” in different ways. This section also analyzes procedural law and shows that it was not reformed to provide better guarantees for the freedom of the press. Moreover, we analyze a number of court cases relating to the most commonly applied statutes as well as statistical data collected by the Ministry of Justice from November 24, 1905, to November 1, 1908, and from January 1, 1911, to January 1, 1912. These figures are published for the first time.

*Section 3.2: Law on States of Emergency and Its Application to the Press* analyzes the role and meaning of the law on states of emergency in the system of legal regulation of the press in 1906–1914. It makes a brief survey of the main statutes in this domain and examines the relation between statutes on censorship and the press and statutes on states of emergency. A comparison of several sources is used to show that states of emergency were increasingly introduced in 1906–1914, leading to the decentralization of censorship.

The **Conclusion** sums up the dissertation and formulates its key results.

The **Appendix** to the dissertation consists of three parts with statistics about criminal and administrative persecutions of press editors in 1905–1914. These data are published for the first time.

The main conclusions of the research are presented in publications with a total volume of 7.35 printer's sheets.

**Articles in periodicals included in the list of HSE recommended scientific journals:**

1. Sopova A.P. Problems of Reforming Legislation on Periodicals in Russia at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century // Proceedings of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS. 2020. No. 6. Pp. 190-222.

2. Sopova A.P., Tumanova A.S. «As for the works of our Conference, an unexpected metamorphosis took place with them...». Letters to A.F. Koni about drafting of the new Temporary Rules for periodicals in 1905 // Historical Archive. 2018. No. 3. Pp. 146-157.

3. Sopova A.P. The Pravo Newspaper and Censorship in the Late 19th– Early 20th Century // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika. 2018. No. 1. Pp. 104-126.

**Publications in scientific journals recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation:**

4. Sopova A.P. Discussion on the Procedure for Establishment of Periodicals in the Course of the Development of the Press Law Bill in 1905// History of State and Law. 2018. № 2. Pp. 76–80.

5. Sopova A.P. Public Role in the Development of Legislation on the Press in 1905 // Civil Society in Russia and Abroad. 2017. № 1. Pp. 25–29.

6. Sopova A.P. Conception of Freedom of Speech in the Russian Liberal Legal Thought of the End of XIX – Beginning of XX Century // Civil Society in Russia and Abroad. 2016. № 2. Pp. 10–14.

**Other articles:**

7. Sopova A.P. The Activities of Censorship Agencies in Russian Empire in 1905-1914 // The History of Russian state. Reports of the International Scientific Conference dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Professor N. P. Eroshkin. Moscow, December 19, 2020 – Moscow: RSUH, 2021. – Pp. 262–268.

8. Sopova A.P. Functioning of the censorship control system in the conditions of the political crisis of 1905 // Socio-political thought of Russian liberalism in the



middle of the XVIII – early XX centuries: materials of the International Scientific Conference on October 9-10, 2019, XII Muromtsev readings. – Orel: OSU named after I.S. Turgenev, 2020. – Pp. 98–106.

9. Sopova A.P. The Bill on Responsibility for the Glorification of Crimes in the State Duma of the Second and Third Convocations // Russian Liberalism and the State Duma of Russia: 1906-1917: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference on October 11-12, 2019 – Orel: Orlik Publishing House, 2019. – Pp. 176–185.

10. Sopova A.P. Dispute about Law: the Discussion of K. K. Arsenyev and L. A. Tikhomirov on Freedom of the Press on the Pages of the "Vestnik Evropy" and "Russkii Obozrevatel" in 1896 // Materials of the scientific and practical conference "Days of Science of the Faculty of Law of the Higher School of Economics 2017". Appendix to the annual collection of the Faculty of Law "Law. Citizen. Society. Economy". – Moscow: Prospekt, 2018. – Pp. 67–71.

11. Sopova A.P. Press Censorship as an Instrument of Russia's National Policy in the Second Half of the XIX – early XX century // Proceedings of the Faculty of Law. Vol. VII: Law in National and Multinational States: Problems of Theory, History and Practice. – St. Petersburg: Polytechnic University Press, 2017. – Pp. 259–268.