

"STYLE MANUAL" FOR THE SPECIAL REPORTS BRANCH, FBID

(Note: Our basic reference book on punctuation, etc. is the Government Style Manual. The following pages are primarily concerned with points that the Government Manual does not cover; they also deal to some extent with points in the Government Manual which are in practice often overlooked.)

A. BASIC OBJECTIVES

1. Inconspicuousness.....	1
2. Simplicity.....	1
3. Accuracy.....	1
4. Freshness and Variety.....	1

B. STYLE IN GENERAL; WHAT TO AVOID

1. Too Long Sentences.....	2
2. Unfamiliar or Academic Words; "Federalese".....	2
3. Flowery Writing.....	3
4. Conspicuous Colloquialisms.....	4
5. Cablese.....	4

C. WORDING

1. Natural Word-Groups.....	4
2. When to Use "The".....	5

D. GRAMMAR

1. Number.....	6
2. Tenses.....	7
3. Split Infinitives.....	7
4. Dangling Participles.....	7

E. COMMAS

1. Separating Natural Thought-Units.....	7
2. Non-Restrictive Clauses.....	8
3. Not Between Subject and Verb.....	8

F. OTHER QUESTIONS OF PUNCTUATION

1. Quotation Marks.....	9
2. Quotes in Relation to Commas, etc.....	10
3. Parentheses and Dashes.....	10
4. Hyphens.....	10
5. Ellipses.....	11

G. CAPITALIZATION

1. Official Names of Groups.....	12
2. Books and Periodicals.....	12

H. SPELLING

1. Checking Names and Places.....	13
2. Russian Names.....	13
3. Abbreviations.....	13

I. CITATIONS

1. Identification of Broadcasts.....	14
2. Dates.....	14
3. References to Previous Reports.....	15

J. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Errors in Translated Material.....	15
2. Authorities on Usage.....	15
3. Responsibility of Analyst.....	15
4. Responsibility of Editor.....	16
5. Responsibility of Typist.....	16
6. Responsibility of Proofreader.....	17

A. BASIC OBJECTIVES

1. Inconspicuousness

Our most general objective with regard to "style" is to keep our readers from being aware of it. The method or mechanics of writing should never distract attention from the subject-matter. Anything that "stops" the reader even momentarily, and distracts him from complete concentration on the content of the material, is undesirable.

Some illustrations of things that might "stop" the reader: (a) a difficult or unfamiliar word, where a simple one would do just as well; (b) a colloquial expression of a sort that is rare in semi-formal government writing; (c) anything that anyone--even fussy readers--would consider ungrammatical; (d) a long or involved sentence that needs to be studied out in order to get its meaning clearly; (e) anything that sounds self-consciously grammatical--e.g., some alternatives to a split infinitive, such as "Moscow continues vehemently to denounce." The most natural way of saying something (if it is also grammatical) is nearly always the best.

2. Simplicity

The need for simplicity is partly a matter of inconspicuousness of style, partly a matter of time-saving (our readers are very busy people), and partly a matter of clarity. Any needless details or any needlessly involved form of expression may detract from the clearness of the main facts we want to put across.

3. Accuracy

The accuracy of the essential facts and generalizations which we present is of course far more important than any other single objective. As a group we will be judged in the long run primarily by our accuracy in "big things." But because accuracy in big things is so important, we will be judged partly also by our accuracy in little things. Carelessness in even such trivial, intrinsically unimportant things as grammar and the spelling of names will raise in some readers' minds the suspicion that we may also be careless or inaccurate in big things, and on that account it should be scrupulously avoided.

It is also worth while to take the time that is often necessary in order to figure out how to say exactly what we mean. Misunderstandings (such as occurred in ORE with regard to what we were saying about Soviet and Satellite broadcasts on Germany) are always possible when what we have to say is rather complicated, and no pains should be spared in working over our initial statement of a point in order to forestall such misunderstandings.

4. Freshness and Variety

Our material naturally involves a high degree of repetition from week to week. (The Soviets would be poor propagandists if they did not continually repeat themselves.) This means that we are in constant danger of boring our readers by repetition. Freshness and variety in forms of expression are desirable--although

- 2 -

of course they are far less important than inconspicuousness, simplicity, and accuracy. Our job is to present facts plainly and compactly, not to entertain our readers; but if, in addition to presenting facts plainly and compactly, we can keep our readers keenly interested, so much the better.

A constant search for the precisely accurate word will in itself guarantee a considerable amount of variety. If Ehrenburg is sometimes trenchant, sometimes satirical and sometimes ironic, our effort to take into account such fine distinctions will more or less automatically guarantee that we do not bore our reader by using the same word three times. Also, if we are continually alert to what is significantly new in the data, we are unlikely to bore our reader by saying too often "Moscow rehearses the familiar line on such-and-such." If we go beyond this and make variety an end in itself, there is a real danger that we will merely distract our readers by using an odd expression, or a self-consciously rhetorical one, where a simple and familiar one would do fully as well. Nevertheless, there is no harm in having in the backs of our minds the general desirability of variety. Other things being equal it is better to be interesting than to be dull.

B. STYLE IN GENERAL; WHAT TO AVOID

Too Long Sentences

A major factor in simplicity is shortness of sentences. Any sentence that is more than, say, three lines long should be examined to see whether it can be broken up into shorter sentences with no loss of meaning or of smoothness in style. Notice the shortness of Ehrenburg's sentences, and the punch that this gives to his style.

Long parenthetical clauses should be avoided in general, since they require the reader to hold one uncompleted thought in the back of his mind while paying primary attention to another one. If thought B intervenes between the beginning of thought A and the completion of A, and if B is at all long or complicated, the reader may lose track of A. In such a case, it is usually possible to make B into a separate short sentence, or perhaps to finish A and add B as an independent clause, separated from A by a semicolon.

In general, a semicolon is nearly equivalent to a period. What matters is that the reader should not be given too much to assimilate in one mental effort; a semicolon separating independent clauses marks the end of one "mental effort" almost as well as a period does.

The same reasoning calls for a fairly consistent use of commas between clauses (not phrases or adverbial expressions). Any clause except a restrictive clause (which constitutes an integral part of the noun it modifies) represents a more or less separate mental effort; and commas help the reader to break up the material into manageable, easily assimilable units, no one of which calls for unduly complicated mental processes during one "mental effort."

Unfamiliar or Academic Words; "Federalesse"

In addition to shortness of sentences, the Flesch index of readability includes shortness of words, or, more specifically, fewness of prefixes and suffixes.

- 3 -

Complicated compound words tend to go with abstractness of thought, and abstractness decreases readability.

Our readers are considerably above the average newspaper-reader in intellectual level, and there is no need to "talk down" to them in any respect. Also, accuracy requires that many of our major generalizations should be qualified in ways that are sometimes rather complicated. But the very complexity of the content of what we say requires that we should avoid needless complexity in the mere form of its presentation, including the choice of words. There is also the danger that a use of rare or academic-sounding words will strike some of our readers as pretentious. Our Survey has been praised for its freedom from "gobbledygook" or "Federalese"--the very common tendency in government reports to confuse official-sounding writing with good writing. It is up to us to deserve this praise. When a simpler or more familiar word is just as accurate as a longer or less familiar one, it should always be chosen. For instance:

<u>Federalese</u>	<u>Plain English</u>
subsequent to	after
prior to	before
termination*	end
initiation	beginning
therefrom	from it

Any word so unusual that even ten percent of our readers probably would not recognize it should ordinarily be avoided. For instance: denigrate, excoriate, animadversion. If a rare word such as these expresses your meaning more precisely than a familiar word, use it; but not otherwise.

The same avoidance of what sounds academic, stilted or artificial applies to things other than word choice. For instance, it is all right to end a sentence with a preposition. (See Fowler's "Modern English Usage.")

5. Flowery Writing

We don't want our readers to think that we are trying to be "literary" either. Figures of speech should be used where they really seem to express our meaning better than anything else, but not otherwise.

Metaphors are often useful, but if used indiscriminately they may sound as if we are trying to be literary. Indiscriminate use may also lead to mixing them; for instance:

"The 'definite Nazi smell exuding from Western Germany' is again catapulted into the foreground...." (Smells exude, but they are not catapulted.)

"The theme of unity rings uppermost...." (Ringing can be loud or loudest, but not uppermost.)

* There are of course some contexts in which "initiation" would be a more accurate word than "beginning," and "termination" a more accurate word than "end." This illustrates the point which has just been made: a simpler word should be preferred only at those points where it is "just as accurate as a longer or less familiar one."

There are also some words which, though perfectly intelligible, have an archaic or bookish flavor which makes them not suited for frequent use in our kind of writing. For instance: lauds, decries, to wit, chides, amongst, albeit, erst-while.

4. Conspicuous Colloquialisms

Some words and phrases which seem natural in informal conversation do not seem natural in businesslike writing; in view of the general principle of inconspicuousness, they should therefore be avoided. For instance: "Moscow really goes to town on the subject of..."; "the editorial lands on certain coal pits in the Kuzbas for not having fulfilled their targets." "Did not" is better than "didn't" "a quotation" is better than "a quote." Other examples: quite some, pretty much, phony, goings-on, not a bit, quite a bit, up to snuff.

5. Cablese

Another specialized style that is conspicuous and should usually be avoided is the condensed, telegraphic style of newspaper headlines. In our headlines compactness should be considered, but not at the cost of a reasonably natural wording.

"Aim of Secret Meeting To Destroy Communism" (Insert the word "is" after "Meeting." There is room enough for it. On the other hand, articles can usually be omitted in headlines. For instance, in the above headline it is all right to say "aim" instead of "the aim.")

In the body of our writing, where compactness is not as important as inconspicuousness of style, we should not omit articles where they would be natural in ordinary speaking. There is no need to adopt the clipped TIME-magazine style in this respect. We can say "the well-known commentator Elmer Davis" instead of "well-known commentator Elmer Davis."

C. WORDING

1. Natural Word-Groups

A verb and its object usually form a natural thought-unit which is destroyed when there are several intermediate words. For instance:

"The British came back in 1945 only to make, with the help of the Americans, Greece economically and politically dependent on foreign imperialists."
(Some awkwardness is unavoidable here, but it could be minimized. The natural thought-unit is "to make Greece dependent"; the word "make" has no real meaning until it is completed by the words "Greece" and "dependent." It can be brought nearer to these words by making the sentence read as follows: "The British came back in 1945 only--with the help of the Americans--to make Greece economically and politically dependent on foreign imperialists.")

Similarly, there are many other natural word-combinations, the completion of which cannot be delayed too long without making the whole construction awkward. For instance, the article "the" should not be separated from the noun which it modifies by too many intermediate words.

"The to-be-announced but not yet definitely settled upon date of the Congress will be some time in March." (Here there are nine words between "the" and "date." The intervening words can nearly always be made into a subordinate clause following the noun: "The date of the Congress, which is to be announced but has not yet been definitely settled upon, will be some time in March.")

"Propaganda plans are discussed to use the occasion to mobilize opinion..." (The natural unit here is "plans to use." It would be better to say "There is discussion of plans to use...")

Other instances in which a natural word-group has had its completion postponed by a needlessly large number of intervening words:

"Moscow gets finally around to discussing..." (The natural word group is "gets around to." Change to "Moscow finally gets around to discussing.")

"American companies have also control of..." (Change to "also have control of...")

"Praise is heard of the increase in cattle-breeding..." (Change to "there is praise of...")

"The Saar question comes also in for attack." (Change to "The Saar question also comes in for attack.")

2. When to Use "The"

the U.S.
the U.N.
the USSR

PRAVDA
IZVESTIA
TRUD

the NEW YORK TIMES
the WASHINGTON POST
the NEW YORK DAILY COMPASS

L'HUMANITE
LAND OG FOLK
SOZIALDEMOKRAT
NEUES DEUTSCHLAND

the LITERARY GAZETTE

NEW TIMES
CULTURE AND LIFE
RED STAR

the Netherlands
the Ukraine
the Vietnam Republic

Vietnam

the U.S. economy
the French economy

ECOSOC
UNESCO
OEEC

the WFTU
the WFDY
the Cominform
the Moscow radio

Comisco
Radio Moscow

The sole criterion here is inconspicuousness; we should follow common usage at all points, and if usage changes we should change with it. The question is too unimportant to warrant the application of any other criterion that might conflict with usage.

When in doubt about usage, however, we can often apply one criterion which usage has sanctioned: the word "the" is usually used before an adjective which is followed by a noun. Terms like the United States, the United Nations, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Vietnam Republic, and the NEW YORK TIMES have this structure. The meaning is restrictive: there is more than one Republic, but we are now talking about the Vietnam Republic; there is more than one TIMES, but we are now talking about the NEW YORK TIMES. This generalization also justifies "the U.S." and "the WFTU," since they are abbreviations of longer terms to which the generalization applies directly. It also justifies "the LITERARY GAZETTE"; there is more than one gazette, but we are now talking about the LITERARY GAZETTE. NEW TIMES is a borderline case; usage probably favors omitting the article in this case, and there is some logic in it, since it is not a new version of an earlier TIMES magazine; it is simply the title of a magazine, as CULTURE AND LIFE is. (The Russian title gives us no help on this point, since the Russian language contains no articles, even where a good English translation clearly calls for them.)

Publications with foreign titles which are unintelligible to the ordinary reader should not be preceded by "the." For instance, we can say "BERLINER ZEITUNG," and not "the BERLINER ZEITUNG," even though this might seem analogous with "the NEW YORK TIMES."

D. GRAMMAR

1. Number

Be careful that the number of a verb agrees with the number of its actual subject, and not with some words which intervene between it and the subject.

"This week the brunt of Moscow's attacks are borne..." (Change "are" to "is." The subject is "brunt," not "attacks.")

"The number of mass disturbances and incidents are increasing." (Change "are" to "is." The subject is "number," not "incidents.")

The word "data" is properly plural: "the data are extensive," not "the data is extensive." But many readers who are used to "data is" would be stopped by "data are." The only way to avoid this dilemma is to use another word such as "facts" or "evidence."

2. Tenses

Use present tense ordinarily, for anything broadcast during the week which is being covered; "Moscow says," not "Moscow said." Use past tense where an earlier broadcast is contrasted with a later one; "On 3 January Moscow said...., but a 6 January commentary says..."

3. Split infinitives

Some readers are stopped by any split infinitive; they would never be caught saying "to needlessly avoid." On the other hand many other readers would feel that "needlessly to avoid" sounds artificial and over-grammatical. Sometimes this dilemma can be avoided by putting the adverb after the verb: "to fight courageously" instead of either "to courageously fight" or "courageously to fight." And sometimes it can be avoided only by recasting the whole sentence: "a needless avoidance of...", or "a courageous battle." In any case, try to avoid both split infinitives and any unnatural alternative to a split infinitive.

4. Dangling Participles

A participle like "accusing" makes the reader start watching for the name of the person who does the accusing; if he doesn't find it he is likely to be momentarily perplexed. For instance:

"Accusing the imperialists of allotting to Africa the role of spring-board in their aggressive plans against the Soviet Union, Britain and America are denounced for terrorizing and oppressing the native population."
(Here the writer apparently started off intending to use the word "Moscow" as the main subject of the sentence, but forgot about this and put the main part of the sentence in the passive voice--"are denounced"--without saying either who does the accusing or who does the denouncing. If the sentence is taken literally it means, of course, that Britain and America did the accusing.)

E. COMMAS

1. Separating Natural Thought-Units

As indicated above, one major reason for commas is the same as the reason for shortening sentences--to break up the material into natural units, each of which is short enough to be easily assimilated. For instance:

"The Free Greece radio, on the other hand, broadcasts a vitriolic attack on the care-taker Government declaring that it consists of 'smugglers, generals, and monarcho-fascist dignitaries...the darkest countenances of the monarcho-fascist world...with the Prime Minister, the well-known collaborator Theotokis.'" (Insert a comma after "Government." Here the comma is desirable in order to give the reader a chance to catch his mental breath before the new long thought which begins with the word "declaring"; and it is desirable also to prevent confusion. Without it, the reader may at first think that the word "declaring" goes with "Government" and that the Government has been declaring something.)

By the same token, however, it is usually not necessary to use commas to set off smaller thought-units, such as phrases or adverbial expressions. This is a matter on which wide legitimate differences of preference exist, but probably a majority of contemporary writers would usually omit commas around expressions such as "this week," "in this connection," and "in the first place."

2. Non-Restrictive Clauses

Some things about commas are a matter of personal preference: whether to use one between two clauses connected by "and," or whether to use them around such an expression as "this week." On the other hand, one thing which is very often overlooked is not a matter of preference but a matter of definite right and wrong: the use of a comma to set off a non-restrictive clause. It is incorrect to omit the comma in this case--according to the Government Style Manual and every other authority we have consulted. Yet this continues to be by far the most frequent technical mistake in the work of the Special Reports Branch. It is urged, therefore, that all analysts make sure they understand the distinction and consistently try to observe it.

The basic rule is: always use a comma to set off a non-restrictive clause. A non-restrictive clause is one that does not restrict the scope of the noun that is modified, but merely adds a new comment about it. Take the sentence "There are the inevitable comparisons with capitalism where 'millions are doomed to penury and hunger.'" In this case the word "where" introduces a non-restrictive clause. It adds a new comment about capitalism without restricting the scope of the noun, capitalism, that is being discussed. Therefore there should be a comma after "capitalism."

A ~~corollary~~ of the basic rule is: always use a comma between a singular proper name and the clause that follows it. This is true because a clause following a singular proper name is always a non-restrictive clause. For instance: "The evidence presented to Congress is ignored by Moscow which tends to confine its references to..." Here there should be a comma after "Moscow," which is a singular proper name.

3. Not Between Subject and Verb

There should be no comma between the subject of the sentence and its verb, even when the subject contains several words:

"But what really came of these pseudo-elections, was the gratifying realization that..." (Take out comma after "pseudo-elections.")

"That the American imperialists mean war, is brought out even more explicitly..." (Take out comma after "war".)

"The recent amendment which passed the House of Representatives to suspend aid to Britain until Ireland is unified, is picked up by Moscow." (Take out comma after "unified.")

Of course this does not apply when parenthetical or non-restrictive material, set off by two commas, intervenes between subject and verb.

F. OTHER QUESTIONS OF PUNCTUATION

1. Quotation Marks

Since quotation marks (like commas) attract a certain amount of attention each time they are used, they become a mere distraction if they are used needlessly. This problem is a recurring one in our material, since we are continually passing back and forth from quoted material to our own wording. The general rule is that everything which is actually quoted from the text of a given week's Soviet broadcasts should be put in quotes. (Material from summaries should never be put in quotes.) On the other hand:

a. Continually recurring words or phrases such as "reactionary" and "democratic" do not need to be put in quotes when they are used in a paraphrase by us:

"According to Moscow, the 'democratic' forces in Greece are continuing their 'struggle' against the 'monarcho-fascists.'" (Eliminate quotes around 'democratic,' 'struggle,' and 'monarcho-fascists.')

This applies especially to the main heads in the table of contents. Familiar Soviet terminology does not need to be put in quotation marks, if the wording of the heading as a whole shows that we are paraphrasing a Soviet theme. For instance:

"U.S. Affairs: The 'Advancing Crisis'; Ehrenburg's 'American Superman'I l" (Eliminate quotes around "Advancing Crisis," since it is a familiar thought and the choice of words is of no special interest; leave them around "American Superman," since it is not familiar and there is some point in making it clear that these were Ehrenburg's exact words.)

b. Quotation marks generally should not be used around a word merely because it is a colloquialism or because we want to disclaim responsibility for its accuracy. For instance:

"Comment on the Coplon-Gubichev trial appears only in the form of 'factual' news reports." (This might create momentary doubt as to whether the Soviet radio itself had used the word "factual"--since our quotation marks nearly always do imply that we are quoting the Soviet radio. In this case we do not want to dignify the colored news item by calling it "factual" ourselves; it would be better, then, simply to call them "news reports" or "TASS reports.")

c. After the source of a given quotation has once been identified, it is unnecessary and undesirable to break into it with expressions such as "he says," or "he continues."

2. Quotes in Relation to Commas, etc.

Always place the quote (single or double) outside the comma or period:

The Government will be formed of "extreme reactionary elements."

In presenting his five "demands," he laid down the official Soviet line.

(This isn't logical, but it seems to be the generally accepted usage in the NEW YORK TIMES, the WASHINGTON POST, etc.)

On the other hand, quotes should be inside a semicolon:

The step is described as "splitting Germany"; no other comment is made.

3. Parentheses and Dashes

Long parenthetical parts of a sentence, especially if they have commas within them, sometimes need to be clearly seen as units, and in such cases separating them from the rest of the sentence by commas may not be enough. Dashes or parentheses can then be resorted to; they are more conspicuous than commas, and clearly set off, from everything else, the words that lie between them. Dashes are particularly conspicuous; they do not, like parentheses, more or less imply that what is enclosed is of minor importance.

But, by the same token, neither dashes nor parentheses should be used needlessly. For instance:

"One (anonymous) commentator asserts..." (Remove parentheses and don't insert commas; the word "anonymous" isn't separate enough or important enough to be worth stopping the reader at all.)

"Another broadcast--to Rumanian listeners--brings in the idea of..." (If there is a reason to think that there was special significance in broadcasting it to Rumanian listeners and not to others, this reason should be made explicit or suggested in some way. If not, the whole phrase should probably be omitted.)

4. Hyphens

Where two words function together as if they were a single adjective, they should be linked by a hyphen; this aids the reader by giving a cue as to the natural grouping. For instance: right-wing Socialists, the West-German population, the so-called democracy of the West. The hyphen is apparently obligatory, or almost obligatory, in cases where the second word is a noun: a three-line report, mass-destruction methods, the post-war Five-Year Plan. As an exercise, use your own judgment as to which of the following expressions do not call for inserting a hyphen:

- 11 -

An Albanian language broadcast
 The two camp concept
 The poverty stricken Egyptians
 Coal production plan
 Publicly owned industries
 All Union Radio Committee
 Working class organizations
 Recent specific instances
 A 400 word article

Strike breaking organization
 A follow up of last week's charge
 Long term trade agreement
 The money collecting campaign
 Modern production methods
 A two faced policy
 Dyed in the wool pro-fascists
 Unheard of iniquity
 Monarcho fascism

There should be a hyphen in the expressions: Albanian-language, two-camp, poverty stricken, dyed-in-the-wool, unheard-of, etc. The three cases above which should not have a hyphen are "recent specific instances" "modern production methods," and "publicly owned industries."

Chinese names regularly call for a hyphen between the second and third words, with a lower-case letter as the initial of the third word: Mao Tse-tung, Chiang Kai-shek, Chou En-lai, Sun Yat-sen. But this does not apply to Indo-chinese names (Ho Chi Minh) or Korean names (Kim Il Sung).

(There are even Chinese exceptions; Aw Boon Ha, Tan Kah Kee.)

Expressions like "anti-Wall Street" or "United States-inspired" should be avoided. The reader's eye is likely to be caught first by the incongruous combination "anti-Wall" or "States-inspired." Wherever two words (such as Wall Street) normally appear in combination without a hyphen between them, it is slightly incongruous to attach one of the words to another word or prefix by means of a hyphen, and leave the other unattached. But it would be just as bad to say "anti-Wall-Street," inserting a hyphen where it is normally absent. Wherever possible, the sentence should be recast: "opposed to Wall Street," "inspired by the United States," etc.

5. Ellipses

End of Sentence: "The Ruhr concerns all of Germany...."

Beginning of Sentence: "...the Conference proposed to support China's labor unions."

Within Sentence: "The Conference sent a note... asking that steps be taken."

Between Sentences: "The labor situation in China was brought up as a question for special discussion. ... The Kuomintang has refused to recognize bona fide labor unions in China."

End of, and between Sentences: "The labor situation in China was brought up.... The Kuomintang has refused to recognize bona fide labor unions in China."

- 12 -

G. CAPITALIZATION

1. Official Names of Groups

Capitalize the official, self-accepted name of any group or movement, e.g., Communism (as a movement), Fascism (in Italy, referring to the Fascist Party). Do not capitalize a name that is not official (e.g., the "monarcho-fascists" in Greece), or the name of a political system or technique (e.g., communism as a stage following socialism, fascism as a tendency found in countries other than Italy).

Many persons capitalize Socialism and Communism uniformly, regardless of whether they refer to a group or a system, but we have the sanction of the Government Style Manual for our more consistent and logical usage.

There are borderline cases of semi-official titles, such as Western Germany, Western Europe, and East vs. West. In these cases we put them up. Other instances:

West-German	democracy
West-European	imperialism
the Satellites	fascism (in general)
the Satellite sphere	monarcho-fascists
People's Democracies (note position of apostrophe)	
Western Powers	
Nazism	capitalism
Socialists (Party or group)	socialism (contrasted with capitalism)
anti-Nazi	communism (stage following socialism)
right-wing Socialists	
Communism (Party or movement)	
Communist	
Fascism (in Italy)	
Second World War	
the Government (in any specific country)	

Books and Periodicals

Our procedure is to capitalize all letters of the name of a book or periodical: NEW TIMES, PRAVDA, NEW YORK TIMES, FOR A LASTING PEACE, FOR A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY, etc. Russian names (with the exception of PRAVDA, IZVESTIA, and TRUD) are translated: KRASNAYA ZVEZDA becomes RED STAR, NOVOYE VREMYA becomes NEW TIMES, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA becomes LITERARY GAZETTE, etc.

Where possible, the party alignment of a newspaper should be mentioned in parentheses: L'HUMANITE (Communist), LAND OG FOLK (Communist), etc. This does not apply to the DAILY WORKER or to Russian publications. But where it is relevant identify the professional group, etc. associated with the publication, even if it is Russian.

City names which are necessary for identification should also be up: LONDON TIMES, WASHINGTON POST, NEW YORK DAILY WORKER.

H. SPELLING

1. Checking Names and Places

If you aren't sure of the spelling of any word, especially an unfamiliar place or person's name, look it up. If it isn't in any book in the office, call the Technical Information Section. If any exceptions to this procedure occur, they should certainly not occur in the Summary. The number of readers of the Summary is probably much greater than the number of readers of any one article in the body of the Survey; it should therefore be absolutely accurate.

The accuracy of the Summary (and of the table of contents) takes precedence over any question of self-consistency. If an error has somehow occurred in the body of the Survey and is discovered before the Summary or Table of Contents is written, it should be corrected in the latter, even though this means that a very careful reader may discover that we have been inconsistent.

2. Russian Names

Here the only criterion is inconspicuousness (i.e., common journalistic and governmental usage), rather than "correctness." Tentatively, the following spellings are recommended:

Vishinsky	not	Vyshinsky
Andreev	"	Andreyev
Fadeev	"	Fadeyev
Leontiev	"	Leontev or Leontyev
Sergeeva	"	Sergeyeva
Beria	"	Beriya
Belorussia	"	Byelo-Russia
Politburo	"	Politbureau

When a Russian name is spelled both with a ye and with an e, and where you are in doubt about which is commoner, use e. In Russian this is pronounced "ye," but the Government Style Manual and Library of Congress use e.

3. Abbreviations

Omit periods after initial letters if there are more than two: U.S., U.N., but USSR, AFL, CIO, WFTU. In the case of any abbreviation with which the reader may not be familiar, the full name should be written out the first time it is used in a given article, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses: e.g., World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), NEW CHINA NEWS AGENCY (NCNA).

I. CITATIONS

1. Identification of Broadcasts

Our readers are usually not much concerned with the precise date or language of a given broadcast. To include these in the body of the text is therefore, as a rule, needlessly time-consuming and distracting. The longer or more important quotations (especially those which are indented) should ordinarily include beam and date (e.g., "in English to North America, 6 January 1950"), but it should be placed at the end, so that the reader who is not interested in it can get the habit of skipping it and going on immediately to the content which interests him. It is then available if for any reason he is interested in the beam, or wants to compare our version with the version in the Daily Report, or has some reason to be interested in the precise date of the broadcast.

When something is broadcast in several languages, that fact can be indicated by stating the number of languages, without listing them.

If the analyst sees any reason why the beam may be of interest, he should make explicit his reason for thinking so (and not be content with merely calling attention to the beam) in the text of his article.

If transmitter is Moscow, identify language, (beam, if relevant), and date.

In other words, continues Orlov, "the Americans wished to prevent the security of the economic bases of the Three-Year Plan." (in Hungarian, 18 August 1947)

If transmitter is some other station than Moscow, identify transmitter, language (beam, if relevant), and date.

(Khabarovsk, in Russian to the Soviet Far East, 18 August 1947)

Moscow's domestic broadcasts:

(Soviet Home Service, 18 August 1947)

TASS:

(TASS, in English Morse to North America, 18 August 1947)

(TASS, in Russian at Dictation Speed to the Soviet provincial press, 18 August 1947)

(TASS, in Russian Hellschreiber, Abroad, 18 August 1947)

2. Dates

Use military style--e.g., 18 August 1950.

Spell out names of months.

3. References to Previous Reports

In general, use the following condensed form: (SURVEY, 11 July, A 1-3)

Include the year--11 July 1949--only if it differs from the current year, or if the context does not make it clear that the current year is implied.

J. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Errors in Translated Material

It is legitimate to correct obvious errors of grammar, etc. in translated material; they are a needless distraction to the reader, and in all probability they are the fault of the translator rather than of the original writer. TASS material in English, however, should rarely be tampered with.

2. Authorities on Usage

For the things which it covers (usually the simpler points of punctuation, etc.) we consult the Government Style Manual. On the finer points Fowler's "Modern English Usage" is very useful. If there is any controversy over whether to accept Fowler, or if there is a point he doesn't cover, our court of final appeal is common usage in such familiar publications as the NEW YORK TIMES, the WASHINGTON POST, and the publications of CIA and the State Department. Since our chief principle of usage is inconspicuousness, we don't want to depart from what our particular group of readers is used to, unless there are particularly good reasons for doing so.

Of these various publications used as criteria of common usage, our own DAILY REPORT is of course the most important. We should consult with the editor on all points of difference and try to arrive at an agreed policy; in case of doubt, and if they have not yet been consulted, we should conform with their usage unless there is an especially good reason for not doing so.

3. Responsibility of Analyst

It is the analyst's responsibility to make his copy as nearly perfect as he reasonably can. This ordinarily means rereading it once with a concentration on technical points--i.e., with a proofreader's attitude--and at the same time with an eye to smoothness of style. This may seem like a waste of time, in view of the fact that editor, typist, and proofreader stand between the first draft of the copy and its final publication. But it saves a lot of the editor's time (which he thinks is valuable); it makes things pleasanter for both editor and typist; and it proves to the editor that the analyst is qualified to fill his shoes in a pinch. (Ideally, every analyst should be competent to edit every other analyst's copy if necessary.)

The time-saving advantage is especially important in matters of style and sentence-construction. Putting in commas is easy, but changing the whole construction of a sentence is hard, and an editor always hates to do it, especially if he is in a hurry, and especially if he knows the analyst is sensitive about changes in his copy. Both time and emotional wear-and-tear are saved if the analyst makes it unnecessary for the editor to recast his sentences or reorganize his paragraphs.

4. Responsibility of Editor

It is the editor's job to make the copy just as nearly perfect as he can, within limits of common sense in terms of time-expenditure and the danger of irritating the analyst by changing his copy needlessly. Where an alternative way of saying something seems only slightly better, the wise editor will save his own time (and the feelings of the analyst, and the time that might later be lost in arguing the point) by letting the copy stay as it is. But wherever something seems definitely incorrect, or wherever he thinks an alternative way of putting it would be decidedly better, it is his responsibility to change it.

Anything which involves changing the meaning of the copy, or making clear a point which was initially ambiguous, should go back to the analyst for his approval before it is typed. If the analyst wishes, he can also have the privilege of seeing all of his copy before it is typed, so that he can challenge the editor's judgment on smaller points. But--especially if a deadline is near--the wise analyst will try to save his own and the editor's time by letting little disagreements go. And even if he has what he thinks is a major disagreement, he will not prolong an argument with the editor. He will make his point briefly, and if the editor does not agree with it he will accept the editor's judgment without further protest. Prolonged arguments are a needless waste of time; in order to avoid them it must be decided beforehand that someone's judgment is final; and in the nature of things that one can be only the editor.

It should also be clear that the editor's responsibility includes questions of style, as well as technical points such as grammar and punctuation. If he sees an alternative way of expressing something, which in his judgment is definitely smoother or clearer or more forceful or more compact than the original, and if he is willing to take the time to work out the alternative form of expression, this is part of his legitimate and necessary role. It is inevitable that this will often irritate the analyst, who will often continue to prefer his original way of putting it. On that account, as indicated above, the wise editor will restrict his changes (on matters of personal preference) to those that he thinks will make a very definite improvement. But the analyst on his part should do his best to accept the changes philosophically and without resentment, recognizing that the editor feels obligated to put the excellence of the product ahead of personal feelings, and recognizing also that the editor necessarily relies in the last analysis on his own judgment as to what is excellent and what is not.

5. Responsibility of Typist

Our typists are almost our last line of defense against errors and inaccuracy. They cannot be expected to catch many errors which the writer and editor have both missed, but if they do notice anything that seems questionable for any reason, it is their responsibility at least to raise the issue with an editor or analyst. (If they feel sure that the thing is an error, they can correct it without consulting anyone.)

6. Responsibility of Proofreader

Our actual last line of defense is of course the proofreader. He should be meticulous in picking up any item, no matter how small, that is definitely incorrect. On the other hand, where something (such as the insertion of a comma or changing of a word) is a matter of legitimate personal difference of opinion, or where the advantage to be gained by a change, although clear, is only slight in degree, he should let well enough alone. The typist's labor in changing the final copy is a good deal more than the editor's labor in changing the first draft, and there is also the chance that a last-minute proofreader's change may be contrary to the considered judgment of the editor. In such a case the proofreader should consult the editor, and of course that takes time.

The case is somewhat different in the proofreading of the Summary. The need to have the Summary letter-perfect is considerably greater than the need to have the body of the report letter-perfect. If time permits, it is therefore worth while for a proofreader of the Summary to consult the editor on any point at all, no matter how trivial or controversial, that he thinks might improve it.