

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Karina Panyan

LGBT Rights and the Role of Mass Media in the Russian Federation and the United States

Modern discussions of civil liberties are occurring all over the world. Most of the time, the catalysts of such discussions are the citizens themselves. In Russia, the recent turmoil over LGBT rights has placed the country in a blinding spotlight. Why are the Russian people unaccepting of the homosexual people? Why has there been no evolution of LGBT rights in Russia? The lack of freedom in Russian mass media hinders the development of civil liberties for the LGBT community in Russia.

History of Mass Media and Free Speech

A functional understanding of the history of mass media in both the Soviet Union and in Russia is necessary to properly determine its effect of modern LGBT rights.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

A staple of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes is the regulation of mass media and every other aspect of public or private life. Governments, ranging from the top officials in Moscow to marionette leaders in Soviet republics, left their citizens devoid of many freedoms that are now taken for granted in democratic countries. Political scientist James Gibson explains that the "Soviet Union is in some respects the archetypal totalitarian regime, adding that 'the "Evil Empire" is evil in part due to wide-spread political repression' (938). The state controlled the radio, the newspapers, and the television, once it became popularized. Without foreign influence, the power players in Moscow were free to make public only that which flattered the ideology and regime, and keep private that which harmed it.

Soviet leaders mainly exercised control of the mass media through censorship and propaganda. Censorship took many forms, but was arguably most detrimental to literature and Soviet authors. According to the Library of Congress Archives, the Communist Party "established socialist realism as the only acceptable aesthetic -- measuring merit by the degree to which a work contributed to building socialism among the masses" (*Attacks on Intelligentsia*). Therefore, Soviet powers denied any publications that expressed contradictions to socialist realism. Novels such as George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *The Social Contract* were banned in the Soviet Union ("Banned and Censored Books Project"). Russian authors came under just as much scrutiny. For instance, *Doctor Zhivago* remained unpublished until 1988, despite its completion in 1953. Soviet powers even forced Boris Pasternak to refuse the 1958 Nobel Prize for Literature ("Banned and Censored Books Project")

Soviet author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn met a similar fate. His novel, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, explored the atrocities and terror of Stalin's labor and prison camps. This topic clearly depicts the Soviet Union and its leadership in an unfavorable light. Top officials took action to prevent the release of such blasphemous writing against the regime. They prevented the publication of the novel and expelled Solzhenitsyn from the Writers' Union, at a time when membership was "indispensable if a writer is to get his work published" (*The Economist Archive*). By preventing the publication of *A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and rescinding Solzhenitsyn's membership in the Writers' Union, the totalitarian regime effectively maintained its censorship policy and avoided mass discontent with Stalinist terror.

The Soviet Union maintained printed news as well, also under extreme censorship. The façade of truth persisted under the pretense of a variety of news publications. However, Soviet media was strictly produced by Soviet publishers. News sources included *Prava*, *Trud*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, and *Krasnaya Zvezda*, among others. The totalitarian regime had a monopoly over media, news outlets, and overall public information.

Soviet ideology not only called for control over media, but the ingenious use of propaganda to garner support. For totalitarian regimes, propaganda served as “an instrument of total policy, together with diplomacy, economic arrangements and armed forces. This propaganda was used specifically as “management of mass communications for power purposes.” (Lasswell 214).

Soviet propaganda posters served one of two purposes for the management of power: reinforcing Communist ideology or degrading other ideologies. Figure 1 depicts a bold and powerful Lenin, captioned by an excerpt from Marx and Engels. This propaganda, amongst other war-themed posters, was meant to create a “rally around the flag” effect, or to further solidify the loyalty of the Soviet peoples to the regime. Figure 2 shows the Soviet disgust for capitalism and the ruin to which it could lead. In essence, this propaganda was intended to prove the flaws and evil natures of competing ideologies, such as capitalism.

Russian Federation

Modern day mass communication has created an era of faster and easier information sharing previously thought impossible. In 1993, Gibson explains that the 90’s have brought a “revolution in information technology- making information in the modern state virtually uncontrollable” (938). He points out that there are “few corners of the Soviet Union that are not penetrated by some sort of foreign radio” (Gibson 938).

Although this might have been the case in 1993, when Gibson first published “Perceived Political Freedom in the Soviet Union”, this is a far cry from the current media situation in Russia. Figure 3 lists national and foreign Russian broadcast media, Out of the fourteen stated television and radio networks, only two are broadcast in English. Out of the 26 magazines and newspaper media sources in Figure 4, only three are printed in English. Furthermore, the magazines and newspapers written in English, two are solely focused on business and economics.

Not only is mass media almost singlehandedly dominated by the Russian language, but the media provided in English is almost for naught. According to BBC, about 81% of Russia 150 million residents speak Russian as their first and only language (BBC Languages Across Europe). Furthermore, Russian is understood by 99% of Russia’s current residents and is the majority language, amongst 100 other minority languages (Russian Embassy in London). This data suggests that English is almost negligible. Although it is more common for major city dwellers to comprehend and possibly speak English, the same cannot be said for the majority of Russia, which is characterized as rural and sparsely populated.

Very recent developments only point further at the Russian government’s monopoly over state media and mass information. Business Insider and other major news mediums reported that President Putin has initiated a major overhaul of the current Russian media:

“News agency RIA Novosti and the state-owned Voice of Russia radio will be scrapped and absorbed into a new media conglomerate called Rossiya Segodnya, according to a decree signed by President Vladimir Putin.

The move is the latest in a series of shifts in Russia's news landscape, which appear to point toward a tightening of state control in the already heavily regulated media sector.” (Weisenthal, Business Insider)

The liquidation of RIA Novosti and Voice of Russia, along with the creation of Rossiya Segodnya (not associated with Russia Today), solidifies the governmental control over Russian-language media. This significantly impedes the flow of information from English sources, as well as any possible non-governmental Russian sources. It appears that Mr. Gibson's predictions immediately after the fall of the Soviet Union are not applicable today. The movement of Russian media towards complete government control is undeniable and swift.

The Index on Censorship provides evidence that the state-control over Russian media creates an inevitable complex where the primary modes of media are usurped by the government: “The ownership structure of the Russian media market shows that the national media outlets with the highest audience reach are controlled by the state, primarily—television. Television in Russia is the leading source of information. 99 percent of Russian households have at least one TV-set, and about 94 percent of Russians watch TV on a daily basis [Vartanova]. The core of the TV market consists of 19 federal channels available to more than 50 percent of population. The top-five channels by the audience reach are: Perviy Kanal (Channel One), Rossiya 1, NTV, TNT and Pyatiy Kanal (Channel 5).” (Khvostunova, Index on Censorship)

It is logical then, to argue that Russia's main news source has been commandeered by the government. Therefore, the state-controlled media will be the most impressive of all media outlets in Russia and impose its own censored information onto the Russian public.

The main hardship of combating this media overhaul is the lack of other media outlets, or lack of accessibility. The Index on Censorship shows that “the number of Russian citizens who have access to internet hardly exceeds 50 percent”, an abysmal number in a country numbering over 145 million. Furthermore, internet is not available in all regions. Even when it is available, the most popular searches are all Russian language sites, as shown in Figure 5

The overall structure of the current Russian news, broadcast, and mass media is predominantly overseen by governmental organizations, state-run agencies, and leaders under great influence of Russian powers.

Mass Media in the United States

The media network in the United States revolves around several crucial characteristics. First and foremost, the American dialogue is protected by the First Amendment. The frontrunner of the Bill of Rights ensures several freedoms to the American people:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” (Bill of Rights)

The primary components of this amendment declare that the freedom of speech, press, and assembly are crucial rights of American citizens. Over the years, issues of free speech and press have made significant appearances in law policy. The Supreme Court often hears cases involving First Amendment rights, including *Schenk v. United States* and *Tinker v. Des Moines*.

The primary regulatory agency for free speech and press is the FCC. This committee focuses on regulation of American media, in various forms:

“The Federal Communications Commission regulates interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories. An independent U.S. government agency overseen by Congress, the commission is the United States' primary authority for communications law, regulation and technological innovation.” (FCC)

The FCC aims to promote competition in broadcast services in America and create regulations to ensure the appropriateness of media.

According to Common Cause, six major companies hold the majority of the stakes in American media. These companies include Comcast, Disney, Viacom, CBS, News Corporation, and Time Warner. These same key players are also influential in American internet media, with the addition of other moguls such as the New York Times.

Although the American media is clearly dominated by several powerhouse companies, its liberal and free speech characteristics are of utmost importance and protected in many ways. The Supreme Court ruling in 1969 in *Red Lion v. FCC* stated the following precedent:

"It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of that market, whether it be by the Government itself or a private licensee. It is the right of the public to receive suitable access to social, political, esthetic, moral, and other ideas and experiences which is crucial here. That right may not constitutionally be abridged either by Congress or by the FCC." (Common Cause)

Therefore, American media is driven by competition, which indicates economic gain for all involved parties.

Comparing Russia and US

The most important aspect of the differences between the Russian Federation and the United States in their approach to mass media is the reasoning behind these differences. Why is it that one country can monopolize media, seemingly without popular backlash or critique? How can one government remain relatively uninvolved in news distribution? The answers lie in the inherent structure of business and politics of both nations:

“The leaders of Russia are operating in a tight, supercentralized garrison-police state, while the leaders of the United States are still dispersed through government, business, education, and other relatively independent institutions. The elite of Russia is oriented toward power, and possesses a tradition of calculating power at home and abroad. In the United States the ruling elements are much less conscious of power as a predominating value, since they are more preoccupied with wealth, respect and other values.” (Lasswell 215)

According to Lasswell, the main consideration of the American players is money and respect, as power is not primarily found through the media. Their Russia counterparts, however, rely on the media as a source of power because it is centralized and remains unchecked. The same cannot be said of the American market, which is decentralized and influenced by many other independent organizations.

In order to quantify the difference between America and Russia, the Freedom House reports offer data ranking countries by their freedom index. The higher the score, the less free the press environment, amongst other aspects. The Press Freedom Score is composed by adding the country's economic, political, and legal freedom scores. The United States garnered a Press Freedom Score of 18 and is labeled as “free”. Russia received a Press Freedom Score of 81 and

was labeled “not free”. Russia maintains a 24 point economic environment, a 32 point political environment, and a 25 point legal environment. This lies in stark contrast to America’s 5 point economic environment, 10 point political environment, and 3 point legal environment. American scores were similar to those of France, Germany and Canada, while Russian scores were comparable to those of Syria, Iran, and China. When compared numerically by Freedom House standards, Russia lacks the same freedoms of economy, politics, and law that America enjoys.

Mass media effect on Liberties of LGBT Communities

The following section briefly explains the histories of homosexuality and LGBT civil rights in both Russia and the United States. The theory of media framing explains the lack of progress in Russian LGBT rights, as well as the considerable development in American LGBT rights.

Homosexuality in the USSR

Since before the Soviet Union, homosexuality was viewed as an inexplicable and sinister way of life. Soviet rule only continued this thought process and created an atmosphere in which homosexuals were not considered a part of society. This did not only apply to homosexuality, but more to the topic of sex in general:

“Widespread “sexophobia,” if not explicit homophobia, created conditions both institutional (homosexual activity was illegal from 1934 to 1993) and attitudinal that were adverse to public discussions and representations of same-sex desire.” (Baer 499)

Under Soviet rule, sex, let alone homosexuality, was considered a taboo and society therefore experienced a lack of sexual discourse and education. According to Baer, the loosening of Cold War tensions provided the major shift in Russian exposure to homosexuality:

“Already in the late 1980s “American journalists and graduate students flooded the country,” promising representations of homosexuality in Russia that were no longer restricted by the political and ideological categories that had shaped Western perceptions during much of the Cold War.” (Baer 500)

The dissolution of the Soviet Union created a vague and disorganized categorization of European countries, some under Western influence and some emerging from a lack of modernity. To explain this concept, Baer quotes historian Dan Healey who stated that a “comparatively innocent Russia” found itself between a “‘civilized’ Europe and a decidedly ‘primitive’ or ‘backward’ East”. This in turn “permits Russians to imagine their nation as universally, naturally, and purely heterosexual.” (Baer 502). Russia had maintained an image of heterosexuality, which steadily began to collapse along with the Soviet regime. The demise of the USSR led to the influx of “pornography, erotica, and talk of sex and sexuality (and homosexuality)” into mainstream media and society (Baer 502). Sex, both heterosexual and homosexual, had always been a part of the seemingly innocent Russian society and only emerged into the public sphere after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Homosexuality in the Russian Federation

Despite the emergence of sex and homosexuality into the public sphere, change came slowly or barely came at all. Baer explains that the loosening of sexual tensions did exist, but was not as radical as many might have believed:

“Enthusiastic headlines proclaiming the liberation of Russian gays were often followed by reports of the continued intolerance of Russian society and the reluctance of Russian gays and lesbians to engage in activism.” (Baer 503)

The newfound “freedom” was short-lived, as people discovered that society would not mold to new sexual ideas quickly. Activism was much less likely to draw participants and attention if it was met with intolerance and abuse.

Unfortunately, little has changed in society’s acceptance of homosexuality in the Russian Federation. The federal government enacted law no. 436-FZ of 2010-12-23 “On Protection of Children from Information Harmful to Their Health and Development” («*О защите детей от информации, причиняющей вред их здоровью и развитию*»). The law does not strictly ban homosexuality, but rather prohibits the equation of heterosexual and homosexual relationships, as well as the distribution of gay rights materials (Elder). The law passed unanimously through the Duma. Upon criticism of impeding gay rights, the Russian Federation contested that the bill was against “relations not conducive to procreation”, or an attempt to expand the country’s native population (Halper).

International criticism of Russia’s human rights abuses does not end there. Immediately after passing “On Protection of Children”, the Duma passed a law allowing for up to three years imprisonment of those “offending religious feelings”, a direct response to actions of activists such as Pussy Riot (Elder).

The culmination of these two laws sparked international outrage as all head’s turned to critique Russia’s human rights policies.

Homosexuality in the United States

The overall attitude towards homosexuality in the United States has undergone severe and notable changes in the past several decades.

For all intents and purposes, the short history of LGBT rights will begin with the passage of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) in 1996. The two main components of DOMA are Sections 2 and 3. Section 2 mandates that “states may disrespect the marriages of same-sex couples if they choose to do so as a matter of their own public policy” (GLAD 1). However, Section 3 applies strictly to the federal government and “overrides a state’s determination that a same-sex couple is married and says that they are not married for purposes of all federal laws and programs” (GLAD 2).

Robert Andersen and Tina Fetner completed an evaluation of the tolerance towards homosexuality in Canada and the United States from 1981 to 2000 using World Values Surveys. Keeping in mind that this study does not exceed past the turn of the century, the results of the study show incredible progress. They concluded that younger generations are more likely to be tolerant of homosexuality. They also discovered that Canadians are far more liberal than Americans in regards to homosexuality and LGBT rights:

Although not absolute in its rejection of lesbian and gay rights, policy in the United States is far less liberal. While antisodomy laws were struck down by a recent Supreme Court decision (*Lawrence v. Texas*, 2003), homosexuals are still legally prevented from serving in the military. (312)

The United States has seen a dramatic shift in tolerance of homosexuality since the study was completed in 2000. The previously mentioned “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” attitude of the United States Military was repealed on September 20, 2011 (Tungol). President Obama released this statement on the one-year anniversary of the repeal:

“A year ago today, we upheld the fundamental American values of fairness and equality by finally and formally repealing ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.’ Gay and lesbian Americans now no longer need to hide who they love in order to serve the country they love.”

(Tungol)

Changes in military policy are not the only visible trends in tolerance towards homosexuality. The current focus of LGBT rights in America centers on the right to marry. As of December 2013, fifteen states and the District of Columbia recognize and perform same-sex marriage. These states are California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington. Massachusetts was the first state to legalize same-sex marriage in 2003 through *Goodridge v. Department of Public Health* and brought in the beginning of a new era (“Same-Sex Marriage State-by-state, Pew)

The repeal of DOMA Section 3 in 2013 only furthered LGBT rights. The Obama Administration announced that “same-sex spouses of federal employees are now eligible for the federal employee health insurance program and other key programs”, marking a monumental step towards LGBT equality in the eyes of the federal government (Thompson).

Although the road to absolute equality is far from over, the United States has made significant progress since the initiation of DOMA. Figure 7 demonstrates the speed at which a pro-equality agenda spread over Facebook. Figure 8 reveals that, as of 2013, the majority of Americans are pro-same sex marriage.

Interpretation through Mass Media

Framing is a widely referenced theory of mass media that evaluates how people shape their opinions and from where their information is drawn. In fact, sometimes people base their opinions and changed their opinions solely on what they experience through mass media:

“The information in the mass media becomes the only contact many have with politics.

The pledges, promises, and rhetoric encapsulated in news stories, columns, and editorials constitute much of the information upon which a voting decision has to be made. Most of what people know comes to them "second" or "third" hand from the mass media or from other people.” (McCombs and Shaw 176)

McCombs and Shaw specifically examine framing as it relates to voting and the political sphere. One important distinction they make is that media does not exactly tell people what to think, but rather about what they should be thinking (177). In other words, the media is what placed crucial issues in the forefront of a campaign, for example. The media may not necessarily express a blatant opinion, but will likely influence the degree to which the public considers certain issues important. Framing is a theory that relates not only to voting and public views about politicians, but to everyday issues as well.

One study in particular observed media framing of civil liberties issue and how it affected tolerance. Nelson et al specifically altered the way in which a Klu Klux Klan rally was framed by the media to gauge the impact on the tolerance of the people exposed to said media sources:

“One framed the rally as a free speech issue, and the other framed it as a disruption of public order. Participants who viewed the free speech story expressed more tolerance for the Klan than participants who watched the public order story. Additional data indicate that frames affect tolerance by altering the perceived importance of public order values.”

(567)

Their findings resonate heavily with the current debate of LGBT rights in both the United States and the Russian Federation. The way that the two media strongholds frame the issue of gay rights inevitably leads to varied public opinions.

Taking into account American or, more generally, widespread English-language sources such as Associated Press, it is clear that the introduction of Russia's anti-gay propaganda law was viewed as a civil liberties issue. This is very much like the situation with the Klu Klux Klan rally in the study. People expressed sympathy for the Klan members when the media framed the rally as a free speech issue. The English-language media, distributed in America, placed the LGBT conflict in exactly such a context:

“Rights activists and Western governments have criticised both bills as part of an unprecedented crackdown on dissenting voices after Putin returned to the Kremlin last year.

Opponents have called the bill homophobic and so vaguely defined that it would inevitably be used arbitrarily and stir anti-gay sentiment in the country. However, it sailed through parliament and Putin had promised in advance that he would sign it.”

(FOX)

Several aspects of this article stand out. First, the content was published electronically through Fox News, a media outlet known for expressing their conservative outlook. This in and of itself is a testament of the degree to which English media covers the wide range of international events. Secondly, the description of the anti-gay propaganda bill entices sympathy from its readers because it appears as an attack on personal freedom. The article states that the approval of the bill in a monumental step towards suppressing political dissidents and abridging freedom of speech. Along with the article came a short gallery of various photographs. Some showed bloodied protestors, beaten by anti-gay promoters. Others depicted Russian riot police detaining activists. One even showed a gay Russian couple in white suits with flowers, apparently attempting to gain a marriage license in St Petersburg. These photographs are also a framing mechanism of mass media. They evoke sympathy amongst people who value freedom of speech, freedom of dissent, and the democratic process. Namely, this evokes sympathy amongst Americans, and most likely amongst other like-minded nations.

In comparison, Russia media displays the newly-enacted law in a different light:

“The Russian Foreign Ministry has expressed bewilderment at the request of U.S. senators to revise the IOC scores of the Russian law banning promotion of non-traditional sexual relations among minors and recalled that same-sex sexual relationships are still criminalized in 76 countries. On it informs RIA Novosti.

As stated in the comments of the authorized Russian Foreign Minister on Human Rights Konstantin Dolgov "said the law is not aimed at discrimination of sexual minorities, but is aimed solely at protecting children from inappropriate and harmful information in their young age. He does not violate Russia's international obligations in the human rights sphere” (Moskovskie Novosti) *original Russian text translated by the author of this paper, Karina Panyan- original Russian text can be found in the bibliographical annotations*

The article does not focus on the plight of the LGBT community, but rather defends the law. The Russian Foreign Ministry argues that same-sex relations are punishable in 76 countries around the world. Ironically enough, the information was presented by RIANovosti, the very same media outlet recently liquidated by Putin. The article goes further to quote Foreign Minister Konstantin Doglov in his explanation of the law. The media framing here evokes a different kind

of sympathy than did the American media. Doglov states that the law is not aimed at discriminating against sexual minorities, but rather protects children from information harmful to them. There is no sympathy for a crisis in freedom of expression, because that is simply not how it is portrayed. Instead, the article explicitly mentions the protection of children. Moreover, this article contained no visual stimulation and lacked that aspect of emotion-provoking content. Following the same reasoning of framing found with the KKK example, the Russian people would be exposed to this version of events, rather than the one expressing fear over human rights violations through English-language sources.

The current media framing in the Russian Federation creates a façade of “socialism with a human face”, a la Dubcek. The efforts of Alexander Dubcek in the 1968 Prague Spring professed a “determination to denounce dictatorial command methods and pledged to favor persuasion over coercion” (Tismaneanu 93). The current Russian media is creating the illusion of the same concept, portraying the governmental human rights abuses as wholehearted and altruistic attempts to protect children and the growth of the country.

It is exactly this type of framing that will hinder the growth of the Russian people and the rights of the LGBT community. Several factors will only exacerbate the current conditions. First, the near-monopolization over the Russian media will ensure that the same government-imposed message will be delivered to all of Russia, in exactly the same media framing. Second, the lack of English-language sources combined with the lack of English language knowledge will ensure that no other media or framing will be visible in the Russian Federation. The logical procession of events entails a lack of diverse media for the Russian people and a maintenance of current opinion regarding homosexuality and LGBT rights.

Future Implications

One of the numerous goals of research is providing initiatives for future research and policy analysis. The main and immediate implication of the current LGBT situation in Russia is the possible backlash at the Winter Olympic Games to be held in Sochi. The international community has expressed outrage, at the most, and displeasure, at the least, towards Russia’s disregard for human and civil liberties.

Future issues over the protection of civil liberties could result in worsening tensions between the Russian Federation and more liberal countries such as the United States, Canada, and Germany, among others.

Bibliography.

- Andersen, R., and T. Fetner. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981-2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72.2 (2008): 311-30. Print.
- "ATTACKS ON INTELLIGENTSIA: CENSORSHIP." *Library of Congress- Revelations from the Russian Archives*. Library of Congress, n.d. Web. <<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/attc.html>>.
- Baer, B. J. "RUSSIAN GAYS/WESTERN GAZE: Mapping (Homo)Sexual Desire in Post Soviet Russia." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 8.4 (2002): 499-521. Print.
- "Banned and Censored Books Project." *NUI Galway*. Irish Centre for Human Rights, n.d. Web. <http://www.nuigalway.ie/human_rights/Summer_Schools/bannedbooks.html#_edn16>.
- "Bill of Rights Transcript Text." *Bill of Rights Transcript Text*. N.p., n.d. Web. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>.
- Chokshi, Niraj. "Facebook Breaks down the Geography of a Viral Pro-gay-marriage Campaign." *The Washington Post*, 10 Dec. 2013. Web. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/govbeat/wp/2013/12/10/facebook-breaks-down-the-geography-of-a-viral-pro-gay-marriage-campaign/>>.
- Elder, Miriam. "Russia Passes Law Banning Gay 'propaganda'" *Theguardian.com*. Guardian News and Media, 12 June 2013. Web. <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/11/russia-law-banning-gay-propaganda>>.
- "Freedom of the Press 2013 Data." *Freedom House*. N.p., n.d. Web. <<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-press>>.
- Gibson, James L. "Perceived Political Freedom in the Soviet Union." *The Journal of Politics* 55.4 (1993): 936-74. Print.
- "GLAD: A Short History of the Defense of Marriage Act." *Gay & Lesbian Advocates and Defenders* (2009): n. pag. Print
- Halper, Katie. "Russia Anti-Gay Bill: Russia Passes Radical Family Values Bill While President Announces Divorce On TV." *PolicyMic*. N.p., n.d. Web. <<http://www.policymic.com/articles/48411/russia-anti-gay-bill-russia-passes-radical-family-values-bill-while-president-announces-divorce-on-tv>>.
- Khvostunova, Olga. "A Complete Guide to Who Owns Russian News Media." *Index on Censorship*. N.p., 9 Dec. 2013. Web. <<http://www.indexoncensorship.org/2013/12/brief-history-russian-media/>>.

"Languages Across Europe- Russia." *BBC News*. BBC, n.d. Web.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/languages/european_languages/countries/russia.shtml>.

Lasswell, Harold D. "The Strategy of Soviet Propaganda." *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 24.2 (1951): 66-78. Print.

McCombs, Maxwell, and Donald Shaw. "The Agenda Setting Function of Mass Media." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36.2 (1972): 176-87. Print.

Nelson, Thomas, Rosalee Clawson, and Zoe Oxley. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *The American Political Science Review*, 91.3 (1997): 567-83. Print.

"Media and Democracy." *Common Cause*. N.p., n.d. Web.

<http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG>

"МИД РФ: Закон о запрете гей-пропаганды направлен на защиту детей." *Mn.ru*. N.p., n.d. Web. <<http://www.mn.ru/politics/20131115/362709788.html>>.

“МИД РФ выразил недоумение требованием американских сенаторов пересмотреть оценки МОК российского закона о запрете пропаганды нетрадиционных сексуальных отношений среди несовершеннолетних и напомнил, что однополые сексуальные связи по-прежнему уголовно наказуемы в 76 странах мира. Об этом сообщает РИА Новости.

Как сказано в комментарии уполномоченного МИД России по вопросам прав человека Константина Долгова, «упомянутый закон не направлен на дискриминацию секс-меньшинств, а нацелен исключительно на защиту детей от неподобающей и вредной для их возраста информации. Он не нарушает международных обязательств России в правочеловеческой сфере».”

"One Black Day in the Life of Alexander Solzhenitsyn." *The Economist*. The Economist Newspaper, 11 Nov. 1969. Web. <http://www.economist.com/node/11875339>

"POPULATION DATA." *Russian Embassy in London*. N.p., n.d. Web..

<<http://rusemb.org.uk/russianpopulation/>>.

"Russia's Putin Signs 'gay Propaganda' Ban into Law." *Fox News*. FOX News Network, n.d.

Web. <<http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/06/30/russia-putin-signs-gay-propaganda-ban-into-law/>>.

Russia Newspapers - Russia Newspaper & News Media Guide." *Russia Newspapers – Russia Newspaper & News Media Guide*. N.p., n.d. Web.

<http://www.abyznewslinks.com/russi.htm>

"Same-Sex Marriage State-byState." *Religion and Public Life Project*. Pew Research, n.d. Web.

<<http://features.pewforum.org/same-sex-marriage-state-by-state/>>.

Thompson, Ian S. "Following Historic Supreme Court Decision Striking Down DOMA, Administration Acts." *American Civil Liberties Union*. N.p., 1 July 2013. Web. <<https://www.aclu.org/blog/lgbt-rights/following-historic-supreme-court-decision-striking-down-doma-administration-acts>>.

Tungol, JR. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' One-Year Repeal Anniversary: 25 Amazing Moments." *Huffington Post*. N.p., 20 Sept. 2012. Web. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/20/dont-ask-dont-tell-repeal-anniversary_n_1891519.html>.

Weisenthal, Joe. "Vladimir Putin Just Dissolved A Major State-Run Media Organization That's Been Around For Decades." *Business Insider*. N.p., 9 Dec. 2013. Web. <<http://www.businessinsider.com/ria-novosti-2013-12>>.

"What We Do | FCC.gov." *What We Do | FCC.gov*. N.p., n.d. Web. <<http://www.fcc.gov/what-we-do>>.

Appendix

Figure 1- "There is a spectre haunting Europe; the spectre of Communism."

Source: <http://russianarchives.com/gallery/posters/index.html>

*DRUM note:
Images have been removed from this
paper due to copyright restrictions.*

Figure 2- "League of Nations - Capitalists from all countries, unite!"

Source: <http://russianarchives.com/gallery/posters/index.html>

*DRUM note:
Images have been removed from this
paper due to copyright restrictions.*

Figure 3- Russian Broadcast News Media

Source: <http://www.abyznewslinks.com/russi.htm>

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 4- Russian Magazine and Newspaper News Media

Source: <http://www.abyznewslinks.com/russi.htm>

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 5: RuNet’s Most Popular Internet Websites

Source: <http://www.indexonensorship.org/2013/12/brief-history-russian-media/>

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Sources: TNS, Tasscom, March 2012

Figure 6: State-by-state Gay Marriage

Source: <http://features.pewforum.org/same-sex-marriage-state-by-state/>

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 7

Source: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/govbeat/wp/2013/12/10/facebook-breaks-down-the-geography-of-a-viral-pro-gay-marriage-campaign/>

DRUM note:

Images have been removed from this paper due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 8

Source: <http://features.pewforum.org/same-sex-marriage-attitudes/>

