

**Presentation date:** September, 2020, **Date of acceptance:** November, 2020, **Publication date:** January, 2021

10

## PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SATIRE IN THE EARLY STAGES OF SOCIALIST REALISM

### PROBLEMAS EN EL DESARROLLO DE LA SÁTIRA EN LAS PRIMERAS ETAPAS DEL REALISMO SOCIALISTA

Gulshan Agabey<sup>1</sup>

E-mail: [gulshen\\_71@mail.ru](mailto:gulshen_71@mail.ru)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1009-8913>

<sup>1</sup> Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University. Azerbaijan.

#### Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Agabey, G. (2021). Problems in the development of satire in the early stages of socialist realism. *Revista Conrado*, 17(78), 80-86.

#### ABSTRACT

The goal of this work is to analyze the problems of the development of satire in Azerbaijan in the early stages of socialist realism between the 20-30s in the XX century. It is shown that the national poetic idea, which historically prefers a poetic-lyrical way of thinking (and also a form of expression!), Has a completely new content in the awakening and formation of the national consciousness at the beginning of the 20th century. However, this process did not last long, and with the change of political power in the country in 1920, the satire that had undergone almost half a century of artistic development, was impeded by administrative means and entered a period of restriction. The application of censorship of fiction and the press, for some time impeded the development of the genre, conditioning a change in its path and direction. This confirms that there was a great obstacle to satire in the early stages of socialist realism so that, during this period, satire did not develop in the same upward trend. However, it cannot be said that the satire remained static at this stage because, although the satire did not function deeply in the social context in the stage of socialist realism, it underwent a certain development and created a gallery of new satirical images, portraits and characters. that expressed the character of the time.

#### Keywords:

Socialist realism, satire, Azerbaijan, method, development.

#### RESUMEN

El objetivo de este trabajo es analizar los problemas del desarrollo de la sátira en Azerbaiyán en las primeras etapas del realismo socialista entre los años 20-30 del siglo XX. Se demuestra que la idea poética nacional, que históricamente prefiere una forma de pensar poético-lírica (¡y también una forma de expresión!), tiene un contenido completamente nuevo en el despertar y formación de la conciencia nacional a principios del siglo XX. Sin embargo, este proceso no duró mucho, y con el cambio de poder político en el país en 1920, la sátira que había sufrido casi medio siglo de desarrollo artístico, fue impedida por medios administrativos y entró en un período de restricción. La aplicación de la censura de la ficción y la prensa, durante algún tiempo impidieron el desarrollo del género condicionando un cambio en su camino y dirección. Esto confirma que hubo un gran obstáculo a la sátira en las primeras etapas del realismo socialista por lo que, durante este período, la sátira no se desarrolló en la misma tendencia ascendente. Sin embargo, no se puede decir que la sátira permaneciera estática en esta etapa pues, aunque la sátira no funcionó profundamente en el contexto social en la etapa del realismo socialista, experimentó un cierto desarrollo y creó una galería de nuevas imágenes satíricas, retratos y personajes que expresaban el carácter de la época.

#### Palabras clave:

realismo socialista, sátira, Azerbaiyán, método, desarrollo.

## INTRODUCTION.

Satire is usually regarded as 'unserious,' and thus not deserving of an analysis in the context of nationalist ideology. This ideology is supposedly included in more serious publications, like programmatic articles, party manifestos, legal, and historical treatises, where one can observe the development of a conceptual apparatus and ideological representation. Nevertheless, the analysis of satirical production can be productive for several reasons. Existing social norms are challenged, the corporeal and animal 'nature' of human beings is emphasized, and the world is turned upside down, thus relativizing the existing order. The collective nature of carnival practices is important: common laughter creates a certain type of community, which differs and exists separately from the rigidly hierarchical order of official politics (Ījabs, 2019).

Early Soviet interest in a political culture of satire influenced popular art forms and media, from literature to painting and music, from theatre to cinema and the circus. But its most pervasive visual expression was without a doubt print culture, as satire became ubiquitous in broadsheets, posters, periodicals, and books that disseminated mass propaganda in the early years of the regime. Print culture had been harnessed to mould public opinion and collective self-image for centuries in Russia as elsewhere and in Soviet Russia, the mass reproduction of images and text was understood as a tool that could play a considerable role in popular mobilization and acculturation (Gérin, 2018).

Although socialist realism was formalized as a method in the early 1930s, steps had been taken since the 1920s to manage the literary process and literature, and to pursue a new literary policy. First of all, the freedom and liberty of press, which began in the early twentieth century, was being put to an end, and work was done in the direction of proletarian literature. Critical realism was forced to end its life and it could not be otherwise, because where there is censorship, there is no criticism, no exposure, but there is a legitimate criticism. In fact, critical realism, which reached its peak at the beginning of the century, could have entered a new phase if it had not been prevented administratively.

However, with the change of the political system, everything was cut in half, and satire fell into decline. Despite the fact that during the existence of social realism, the ruling ideology decided to create conditions for the development of so-called satire, satire did not reach the previous level of development. The dominant ideology believed that satire was needed in Soviet society to criticize the

"remnants of the exploiting classes," the "class enemies" of the proletariat, the "reactionary ideologues" and the "modern elements".

Mammadov (1965), agreed with the role given to satire by the ruling ideology and wrote: *"Satirical works greatly helped the party, the government, and the Soviet people. In those years, satire became popular as a means of criticism and propaganda, as a literary and artistic method. This period is becoming a period of satirical stories, leaflets and small and large-scale comedies, both quantitatively and qualitatively."* (p. 160)

For a long time, this attitude of literary criticism and literary criticism to satire, led to the gradual withdrawal and weakening of satirical pathos from literature. It should be noted that the approach of literary criticism from this point of view stemmed from the interference of the existing official ideology in literature and art. Taking this into account the goal of this paper is to analyze the problems in the development of satire in Azerbaijan in the early stages of socialist realism.

## DEVELOPMENT

If in the early 1920s the theater "Criticism-Propaganda" (*"Satire-Agit"*) was established and the function of criticism of the past and the promotion of the new was launched, however towards the end of the 1920s the attitude to satire became more acute. Soviet critics and theorists began to speculate about the futility of satire. According to those who had already argued that satire was useless in Soviet society, with the strengthening of Soviet power, the withdrawal of satire was inevitable. Proponents of this view believed that as the enemy cleared the political scene, the object of satire disappeared, and therefore the need for satire diminished. Of course, there were various reasons for this attitude to satire and many of these reasons stemmed from existing ideology.

Thus, after the Bolsheviks came to power, satirical exposure gave way to pathos and propaganda. Especially in the first years of Soviet rule, satire as a genre completely retreated. It was thought that the purpose of satire was to radically change the existing structure and if the structure had already changed, then it had completed its function. What is true here is that satire has historically been accompanied by ups and downs in world literature. In other words, at different stages of history, satire has sometimes grown and sometimes receded.

Between 1920s and 1950s, there was a period of decline in satire, and even it was banned. Theorists at that time had difficulty in determining the attitude of satire to the social structure (and to the government). Then, finding a

certain way to do it, government tried to present satire as a struggle against antiquity, as a weapon. This was an excuse to mean that satire had no place in the life events and social relations of the modern society. Kazimov(1987), wrote about the attitude of the time to satire: *“Those who opposed the method of laughter and whipping had difficulty in determining what satire and satirical literature would serve in the new social order. However, the leading writers, who had an open view of life, opposed those who simplified and falsified it, and showed that it is impossible to build a new one without exposing the old ones”* (p. 39).

The existing ideology tried to use satire as a tool for its own purposes. One of the theorists of the existing ideology, Lunacharsky (1935), often wrote articles on the social nature of satire, trying to define its functionality in the new era. Lunacharsky (1935), theoretically defined the position of satire as follows: *“Great satire appears only when there is a certain ideal in the satirist and the people he represents. In order to do this, they must encounter obstacles in practice, and the forces that hinder them must be culturally far below satire. Nevertheless, let the exposed and humiliated force win as a matter of fact”* (p. 6). According to the theorist, satirical laughter did not always win because it was not ideal in the existing society. In his opinion, the object of satire and precisely where it was headed should be known.

But in the 1920s and 1930s, satire theorists were united on one issue. Ideologists and theorists of the time, as a rule, expected a certain result from satire, and tried to use it as a weapon against the past, rather than today. This meant that in the new era there would be no Gogols, Shedrins, Sabirs. Guralnik (1961), wrote that laughter for the first time was not to destroy, but to help to build, create and fight: *“For the first time in human history, laughter has come not to destroy, but to strengthen the foundations of existing social order, to fight its enemies and adversaries”* (p. 5). Undoubtedly, in the essence of laughter at all times, laughing at the past and the old plays a key role. But laughter meant directing satire only to the past, limiting its function. It turns out that laughter and satire are only to criticize or create outdated events. However, it is impossible to separate the critical goals of laughter and satire, to attribute it to a separate group or class. Laughter and satire are for society as a whole and do not choose people or groups, they belong to everyone.

Lunacharsky (1937), tried to define the function of satire in the new era in his articles and researches “Theater and Revolution”, “About laugh”, “Classical Russian literature” and others. In his opinion, satire could not play its previous role in the new society. There were some discussions about this in Moscow and in the central press. The

emergence of the works of V. Mayakovsky, D. Bedny, I. Ilf, Y. Petrov, M. Zoshchenko and the public pathos of satire became the practical basis of its existence in the new period.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the attitude to satire like “do we need satire?” led to discussions. This, in general, meant questioning the existence of satire. In general, these discussions in Moscow ended in favor of satire. That is, the existence of satire was theoretically accepted and appreciated. However, this did not mean that satire would survive in the fertile conditions for the next period of social realism. Until the end of social realism, the ban imposed on satire by the existing ideology continued in one way or another.

Even in the 1930s, the attitude to satire and humor did not change fundamentally, and even the weight of the qualities of satire and laughter in the literature is slightly reduced. Theorists and critics, on the one hand, spoke positively about the existence of satire, and on the other hand, defined a “red line” for its framing. Those who crossed the “red line” were punished. There was no consensus on laugh at “what” and “who” in satire.

At times, satire and laughter was praised. Linguist Damirchizade (1935), in her article “Laughing and charlatans” is very important both in terms of approach to the problem, as well as in terms of objectivity. In the weakest period of laughter and satire in the literary process, the linguist expressed optimism about its future: *“It is necessary to laugh. It is inappropriate to think about it, to argue about it, because laughter is the sharpest form of criticism. Laughter can avoid ridicule”* (p. 4). Of course, at a time when no satirical magazine was published in the republic, his idea required great courage. But the linguist’s justification was still based on an ideological position. According to him, in the socialist era, laughter is necessary because: *“to laugh at those who are lazy in construction, those who are left behind, those who want to hinder our work, to sing the victory anthem, to laugh at the ridicule of class society, to laugh for the last time - the proletariat succeeded”* (Damirchizade, 1935, p. 4). This is where the problem arose, the question of “to whom” and “how to laugh” remained one of the biggest problems of the satire of the new era. Because when there were harsh, sharp criticisms, the author was labeled anti-Soviet, described as going against the existing structure, and certain measures were taken against him. Sometimes these measures could even decide the fate of the artist.

The author of satirical stories, Rahman (1938), also stressed the importance of the development of satire and spoke about the need to create a satirical magazine for

this although only seven years after the closure of Molla Nasreddin magazine the alarm bell rang. This was due to his correct assessment of the social nature of satire as a writer. In his article, Rahman (1938), took the speech of the Russian satirist Mikhail Koltsov at the First Congress of Soviet Writers as a reference point. In his speech, M. Koltsov quite justified the problem of the importance of satire and based on this the writer said: *“Koltsov’s example shows that humor-satire is the greatest weapon in the fight against bad habits, depravity, remnants of the past, especially in the fight against the enemies of socialism, and even the most depraved branches, which killed one man per head, trembled with fear when the name ‘Molla Nasreddin’ was mentioned”*. (p. 3)

It is true that Rahman (1938), did not intend to reduce “Molla Nasreddin” or satire to the level of struggle with small targets, but simply tried to emphasize the need to republish a magazine like “Molla Nasreddin”. According to him, the path of humor and satire is at the forefront of the struggle. Therefore, he justified the publication of a magazine that could gather all the good people around him and wrote: *“It is very important for Azerbaijan to create such a magazine and will lead to the development of this very backward part of this genre of our literature”*. (p. 3).

In assessing satire in the context of social realism, it is necessary to mention that in both, Russian and Azerbaijani literature, new examples of satirical stories began to appear in 1930s. In Russian literature, M. Zoshchenko, I. Ilf and Y. Petrov, and in Azerbaijani fiction, the satirical stories of M. Jalal and Sabit Rahman are sufficient for the existence of satirical pathos in this genre. In their work, the new system of satirical relations in society becomes the object of artistic research. However, it is clear that although satirical prose developed to some extent in both Russian and Azerbaijani literature, it is impossible to say the same about satirical poetry. Therefore, a new generation of satirical poets does not grow up in these years. One of the main reasons for the low prevalence of satirical poems compared to stories was that the poems were of a social nature and demanded more commitment. Although the new ideology highly valued M. A. Sabir and appreciated his creativity, it did not approve of the emergence of new Sabirs. This showed that satirical poetry with a social content had no place in the context of the new social realism. The most striking example of this was the magazine “Molla Nasreddin” in which proletarian-minded literary thought could not stand the publication of the only non-proletarian magazine and created the conditions for its closure.

The essence of the attitude to satire over the years can be summed up as follow: theoretically satire was recognized

and its importance for the new society was stated but in practice, the field of satire and laughter was narrowed. Writer Mirza Ibrahimov, well aware of the importance of satire, noted that it is the best weapon for criticizing social shortcomings. “In such periods of social development, there are so many shortcomings in society that it is impossible to destroy them with weapons and violence. At the same time, the representatives of the ruling tendency attack the dead enemy with a fierce satire in order to eliminate him decisively. This satire is powerful because it is the expression of a dominant, historically progressive and true voice. This laughter reveals the inner emptiness and emptiness of the enemy by exposing all his moral depravity and wickedness” (Ibrahimov, 1940). By defining the place and function of laughter and satire in society, the writer showed that it was an “invaluable tool of struggle and education.”

Throughout his career, Arif (1958), also tried to defend laughter and satire as much as possible, and spoke about its development and features. The critic not only noted the affirmative pathos of fiction, one of the principles of social realism, but also appreciated its critical pathos. He believed that in our literature, *“works that expose and criticize our shortcomings with a deep passion should not be ignored”* (p. 441). In this case, artistic thinking is far removed from life. According to him, artistic thinking is not just a confirmation and he even wrote, based on the method of social realism, to prove this point: *“If socialist realism requires an accurate reflection of life in revolutionary development, there must be criticism as well as affirmation”* (Arif, 1958, p. 442). In a later article, “Laughter is Beauty” of 1970, he wrote: “Laughter is the main weapon of satire, laughter is the blood of ugliness!”. The critic who defined its educational purpose said that laughter may be different: *“There is laughter that only moves our lip muscles; there is laughter that affects our hearts and brains; there is such laughter that it does not continue its influence, not only to the door of the theater, but even from one replica of the artist to another; there is such laughter that we laugh involuntarily when we remember it even after leaving the theater. There is laughter that only makes us laugh, and there is laughter that makes us think, regret, get excited, not be blind to our own shame, and be ashamed”*. (Arif, 1970, p. 196)

The critic was absolutely right; sometimes examples were written that were entertaining, only ridiculous with descriptions of hand gestures. Such works did not depict social events, so laughter had no effect. Sometimes satire was replaced by light humor. All this happened because the method of social realism did not accept satire, which has a deep social basis. The thought-provoking laughter in

satire stems from the writer's ability to think, to look at life events and human relationships from the highest positive ideal level as a thinker.

On the way from romantic Fuzuli lyrics to satirical Sabir satires, the post-Sabir poetic stage expresses new ideals in terms of content. Prominent literary critic Y. Qarayev writes about the M.A. Sabir stage of poetry: *"However, that stream of critical realism is already overflowing with the Sabir River of poetry. Beyond this channel, the shores and horizons of a new type of realism are already visible"* (Garayev, 1979, p. 45). Of course, the power of Sabir's satire was in its essence, in its social functionality, in its penetration into life. His satire is also inspired by these factors and *"tried to adapt the smelly, stale environment to the ideal, to create an environment, another world, by revealing its shortcomings"* (Garayev, 1979, p. 49)

The fact that literature, as a social ideal, expresses the future and freedom of the people, inevitably brings to the fore the tandem of the citizen-poet. The predominance of socio-political satire and realistic imagery in this process determines the true role of art and the artist. The national-aesthetic ideal of M.A. Sabir's satire is not limited to a certain stage, but also determines the ways of development of the next satirical poem. The work of J. Mammadguluzadeh, a citizen-poet who puts the happiness of the people and the freedom of the homeland above all ideals, takes a progressive position in the assessment of social events, in the description of the people's sufferings. At a time when the real task of art and the artist is to tell the truth to the people, both advisers have mastered this task, even laying the foundation for a school of unparalleled heroism and courage to tell the truth to the people.

M.A. Sabir, in addition to continuing the best traditions of the previous stage of satirical poetry (which can also be called the enlightening stage of satirical poetry), also laid the foundation for a new type of public satire. In other words, M.A. Sabir determined the peak of satirical poetry, regardless of the period, environment and ideological tendencies. He developed a new direction of poetry, taking advantage of the tradition of both lyrical and satirical poetry laying the foundation of public satirical poetry by destroying the established methods, rules and forms of existing satirical poetry. Those who came after him, whether lyrical, epic or satirical, remembered him and enjoyed his creative power to one degree or another. Interestingly, many twentieth-century satirical poets (Ali Nazmi, Mammad Said Ordubadi, Ali Razi, etc.) considered this path as a school for themselves. Almost all of Sabir's contemporaries and those who came to literature after him (whether lyrical or satirical!) appreciated the path of the poet and accepted the inaccessibility of the summit he

defined. However, all the poets who wrote during this period either dedicated poems to Sabir or, based on Sabir, periodically criticized their period, environment, or various shortcomings of society. This is a very important fact because poets who wrote in the satirical style of the Soviet era stood on the Sabir tradition and wrote satirical poems in his honor. The fact that there was so much interest in the work of the greatest representative of critical realism in poetry during the Soviet era is thought-provoking because critical realism was not so positive in that time.

During this period, being with the people, writing the truth and the ideals it was wanted to see in life, were more prominent in the works of U. Hajibeyov, A. Hagverdiyev, A. Muznib, A. Gamkusar, A. Nazmi. In fact, this period can be called the stage of satire in our literature, or the period of formation of the epoch of citizenship in literature and art. Literature and art, as in satire and critical realism, were not so close to each other, and one did not complement the other with such reality. For the first time, the satire reflected the social ideals, wishes and desires of the people in all their reality and sharpness. Just as literature has the power to describe social processes satire not only criticized individual shortcomings, but also tried to portray life as a whole in a realistic way, opposing the existing socio-political structure. Even the phenomenon of M.A. Sabir in poetry acted as a great means of influence in the socio-political struggle.

However, historically, satire did not have the same influence in different periods of society; its dominant role in society was conditioned by the stages of history and socio-political processes. Therefore, the critical pathos and power of satire has often been associated with a specific time and place. From this point of view, it is possible to observe that in different periods the trajectory of satire goes with swells and contractions and the satirical swell observed in Russian literature during the 19th century conditioned a similar development in Azerbaijani literature. Nevertheless, there were other factors that determined the development of satire in the process of its formation, and these factors had a significant impact on the further development of Azerbaijani literature.

In addition, the difference between the peoples living in a democratic society and the peoples living under severe socio-economic and certain political censorship should not be overlooked. Thus, satire, in a sense, manifests itself as a regularity of development of society and is aimed at accurately reflecting the period and environment. However, sometimes the dominant ideology, even for a certain period of time, manages to change the direction of satire, or literature in general, or to direct it in the desired direction. In the 1920s, the Bolsheviks took certain steps to change the direction of satire. For this reason, satire,

which developed at the beginning of the century with the creativity of representatives of critical realism, experienced a period of decline due to changes in the political system, and then went through a new and unique path of development.

At all times, the main task of real literature has been to show life objectively, to give clear answers to the questions of the time about society and its various problems. However, this task was carried out under the new political conditions of social realism. At this stage, as in satirical critical realism, it is doomed to write under the dictates of the ruling ideology, rather than listening to the voice of his own heart. In this sense, since the 1920s, satire has entered a new phase. Public satire, which began to take shape in the early twentieth century, is not able to directly influence the satirical poetry of the 20th century. During this period, the work of satirists developed in such a different way. There are objective and subjective reasons why the representatives of critical realism do not continue the tradition of Sabir satire in the new stage:

First, the ruling ideology was able to create the impression that the problems that formed the basis of realist satire (oppression, slavery, uprooting or changing the existing social structure) were already being solved in a new structure.

Second, the socio-political system that changed under the name of the workers 'and peasants' revolution turned literature, as well as the whole culture and press, into the mouthpiece of the ruling ideology. Just as the pluralism of opinion in society was prevented, the same was carried out in literature and a "corridor of description" was defined. Artists who went beyond this "corridor" were punished.

Third, the ancient principle of satire, "every denial must be for the sake of the ideal," is not fulfilled. The principle of "denial-ideal" is violated when there are no goals of criticism and exposure in life, or when it is framed in any satirical way. The Soviet satirist, deprived of an ideal, inevitably looked for targets of exposure (family life, love between old and young, marital relations, etc.). During the Soviet period, satire had to continue in a completely new historical context compared to N.V. Gogol, S. Shadrin, J. Mammadguluzadeh, M. Sabir. Soviet critics sometimes saw this as an innovative development of the realist satirical tradition in the new historical context. Critic I. Kiselyov, referring to the problem of innovation in satire, wrote: *"The innovation of Soviet comedy is conditioned by the fact that if the satire of Gogol, Shadrin, Ostrovsky struck from the heart of the old world, Soviet authors show the positive aspects of our life, the leading elements of the epoch"*

(Kiselev, 1957, p. 121). This may be a reason why literary critic Bepalov (1930), did not include satirical literature in defining the tasks of new literature.

The whole essence of Soviet satire is revealed here; satire was intended to confirm the pathos of the new era, rather than to criticize and expose social flaws. The ban on satire, unlike realist satire, serves to strengthen the "socialist" social structure, and this feature is considered its innovation. In other words, "while all the dead are sent to the realm of shadows, and at the same time requires the intervention of a new life" (S. Shadrin) Soviet satire should reflect the revolutionary development of life and describe the struggle of innovation against antiquity. In addition to exposing, it was necessary to create a new type of gallery of positive images. It is clear that the targets and contours of satire are drawn here, and even the tendency to create positive images in satire begins. However, in satire, the positive ideal should manifest itself not in the essence of the satirical ideal, but through positive images. These are the most prominent factors in the decline of satire in the new era. However, there are features in the development of satire in different genres, each of which needs to be addressed separately.

In Soviet times, there was a fundamental error in the view of satire, which applied only to outdated events. Marxist-Leninist theorists tried to influence the development of satire by focusing on this basic feature of laughter. The existence of laughter and satire in the Soviet era was sometimes met with harsh reactions. They wondered what structure satire should turn its weapon against now. Sometimes, drawing attention to the magnitude and grandeur of what was happening, they asked, "is it time to laugh now?" In the socialist approach to satire, laughter is divided into two parts: the complete "destruction" of hostile elements and the "correction" of non-enemy elements. During this period, the use of laughter as an artistic tool was largely based on these arguments.

Even the great Russian satirists I. Ilf and Y. Petrov, at the beginning of "Golden Calf", tried to insure themselves, to find answers to what they wrote, by asking such questions in a colloquial language like "are you crazy or what?" The approach lasted for several decades, during the Soviet era. But in theory, even as these approaches continued, laughter and satire, albeit weak, continued to emerge. Nevertheless, some Soviet theorists, with a few exceptions, praised its functionality, considering that laughter and satire would continue in the new era. Lunacharsky (1924), defended laughter and satire as a sign of strength in the 1920s: *"Laughter is a bee sting in the body of an ominous witch who has just been killed but wants to snore again. Laughter is a strong nail in the black coffin of*

*the past ... Laughter is a great sanitarian. Laughter is courageous, rebellious, laughter shoots its poisonous arrows accurately, strikes hard and kills*" (pp. 59-60). Apparently, one of the regime's most prominent aesthetics and theorists, Lunacharsky, also defended laughter (not satire!). However, he called it a "nail in the black coffin of the past" and framed the targets of criticism.

As a result of this socialist-theoretical-methodological approach to satire and laughter, there was a threat to the existence of the satirical press. Thanks to the "growing demands of the Soviet people", the 25-year life of Molla Nasreddin, the only satirical magazine that did not do a "commendable" job in creating new content and form of literature regulated by party decisions came to the end. Deprived of the satirical press, satire appears in parallel in prose, drama and poetry in the form of any element, pathos and conflict. However, in the 1930s, satire, humor, and comedy almost disappeared in artistic thought and only in some stories of S. Rahman and M. Jalal it manifested itself to one degree or another.

During the Soviet period, satire in Azerbaijani poetry as a whole, experienced a period of decline, but this period did not follow the same path of development at all stages, sometimes weakened, and sometimes completely retreated. This is due to the fact that in different periods of social realism, the attitude to satire itself was ambiguous. If in the first years of Bolshevik rule the satirical tradition continued, albeit weakly, after a while satire in poetry was completely withdrawn. In the late 1920s, the central press asked, "do we need satire?" During the discussion, it was argued that the abolition of satire was not necessary for the new society however the magazine "Molla Nasreddin", which had been working tirelessly for 25 years, was closed and the national press, so to speak, was left without a satirical press. Only in the 1930s, satirist and playwright Sabit Rahman published an article entitled "We need a comedy magazine", but for nearly two decades, the Azerbaijani literary environment continued without satire. Of course, this does not mean that satire was completely removed from Azerbaijani literature during this period, although satire in some ways retained its existence in fiction and drama, there was simply no satirical press in poetry to continue the Sabir tradition with previous inertia.

## CONCLUSIONS

Although Azerbaijani satirical poetry could not continue the realist-critical satirical tradition in the period of socialist realism, satirical poetry with a new content changed according to the means of idea, description and expression. As the satirical poem moved away from M.A. Sabir, the ways and forms of using his art also changed, gaining a new form

and new content. Therefore, it would not be correct to look for the satire of the new era, the organic connection in the Sabir tradition, in terms of theme, style, idea and content. This connection and closeness, first of all should be sought in the artistic nature of satire. Because the new era was different from the Sabir era, it required a different approach. Strange as it may seem, the satire of M.A. Sabir's contemporary Ali Nazmi, M.S. Ordubadi, J. Jabbarli couldn't maintain its previous sharpness. Although S. Mansur and A. Vahid acted as a follower of the previous tradition of public satire in the 1920s, it was framed in terms of themes and problems. It is true that there were poems that went beyond this framework, but it was limited the opportunities for these poems to be published.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Arif, M. (1958). *Literary critical articles*. Azerneshr.
- Arif, M. (1970). Laugther is beauty. *Azerbaijan*, 5(9), 192-197.
- Bespalov, I. (1930). On the new tasks of proletarian literature. *Revolution and Culture*, 7, 30-32.
- Damirchizade, A. (1935, Mar. 1). Laughter and charlatans. *Literary*, 5.
- Garayev, Y. (1979). *Poetry and prose*. Writer.
- Gérin, A. (2018). *Devastation and laughter : satire, power and culture in the early Soviet state, 1920s-1930s*. University of Toronto Press.
- Guralnik, U. A. (1961). *Laughter is the weapon of the strong*. Nauka.
- Ibrahimov, M. (1940). Satire in our literature and art. *Literary*, 4.
- Ijabs, I. (2019). Learning to laugh: satire and political thought in the Latvian 'National Age'. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 50(2), 163-181.
- Kazimov, G. (1987). *Methods of comedy in fiction*. Maarif.
- Kiselev, I. (1957). Conflicts and characters. *Soviet Writer*, 12(18), 342-345.
- Lunacharsky, A. (1924). Theater and revolution. *Theater and Revolution*, 4(6), 59.
- Lunacharsky, A. (1935). On laughter. *Literary critic*, 4(3), 3-9.
- Lunacharsky, A. (1937). *Classics of Russian literature*. Sovet.
- Mammadov, M. (1965). *In the ways of life and art*. Azerneshr.
- Rahman, S. (1938). We need a comedy magazine. *Literary*, 7.