Patriotism and the Soviet Empire: Ukraine Views the Socialist States of Eastern Europe, 1956-1985

Zbigniew Wojnowski

UCL

PhD in History

Zbigniew Wojnowski

<u>Declaration</u>

I, Zbigniew Wojnowski, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

....

Date   Signature

Zbigniew Wojnowski

Abstract

This thesis explores the repercussions of the establishment of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe in the USSR itself, especially Ukraine. In order to trace the changing character and claims of national and supra-national identities in the different regions of Ukraine, I identify various 'official' contexts in which Soviet citizens discussed and observed developments in the satellite states. I argue that Soviet portrayals of Eastern Europe were inconsistent and even contradictory, shaped as they were by complex interactions between party officials in Moscow, Kyiv, and the provinces. From the Hungarian uprising in 1956 to the Solidarity crisis in the early 1980s, CPSU leaders perceived ethnic diversity as a threat to Soviet stability. They sponsored various images of the people's democracies to promote Soviet patriotism, which they mobilised to bridge or even obliterate ethnic divisions in the USSR. Yet they never agreed upon a common definition of the Soviet 'patriot', outlining various roles which workers, non-Russian intellectuals, and west Ukrainians would play in the unified 'Soviet' community. Influenced by events in the people's democracies, they variously framed 'Soviet' identity in ethnically exclusive East Slavic terms or in the rhetoric of 'working class solidarity'. My thesis demonstrates that the 'diffusion' of ideas across borders, alongside modernisation and social mobilisation, was a crucial factor which contributed towards the rise of Soviet patriotism in Ukraine. Through contrasting a homogeneous 'Soviet nation' to other peoples of Eastern Europe, party leaders inadvertently encouraged Soviet Jews, Poles, Hungarians, and Ukrainians to protect their linguistic and cultural interests more vigorously. However, with 'official Ukrainianness' increasingly confined to the sphere of low-culture, most residents of the republic downplayed their ethnic identities and identified themselves as 'Soviet'. Thus, they sought to ease access to information and obtain material benefits from the state.

Zbigniew Wojnowski

Table of Contents

Zbigniew Wojnowski

<u>Acknowledgments</u>

Zbigniew Wojnowski

<u>Note on Spelling and Transliteration</u>

I use the Library of Congress transliteration system for Russian and Ukrainian. Czech, Hungarian, Polish and Slovak terms have been anglicised to exclude diacritics.

For the sake of consistency, all place names in Ukraine are given in the Ukrainian version. They therefore differ from some well-established forms which the English reader may be accustomed to: I have, for example, chosen to write Kyiv, L'viv and Odesa rather than Kiev, L'vov and Odessa.

Wherever the sources allow me to ascertain that a particular individual lived in Soviet Ukraine, I cite names, patronymics and surnames in the Ukrainian form. I thus refer to Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi rather than Vladimir Shcherbitskii. In ambiguous cases, such as the member of the CPU Central Committee in Kyiv Mykola Pidhornyi who then became better known as Nikolai Podgornyi after moving to the CPSU Central Committee in Moscow, I provide both versions.

Zbigniew Wojnowski

List of Abbreviations

CDSP – *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*

CPC – Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

CPSU – Communist Party of the Soviet Union

CPU – Communist Party of Ukraine

CPWU – Communist Party of Western Ukraine

DAKO – Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kyivs'koi oblasti (State Archive of Kyiv Oblast)

DALO – Derzhavnyi arkhiv L'vivs'koi oblasti (State Archive of L'viv Oblast)

DAOO – Derzhavnyi arkhiv Odes'koi oblasti (State Archive of Odesa Oblast)

DSUP – *Digest of the Soviet Ukrainian Press*

GARF – Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation)

KhTS – *Khronika tekushchikh sobytii* (Chronicle of Current Events)

MS – *Materialy samizdata* (Samizdat Materials)

PUWP – Polish United Workers' Party

RGANI – Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (Russian State Archive of Contemporary History)

SDS – *Sobranie dokumentov samizdata* (Collection of Samizdat Documents)

SWPW – Stowarzyszenie wspolpracy Polska-Wschod (Union for Cooperation between Poland and the East)

TsDAHO – Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromads'kykh ob''ednan' Ukrainy (Central State Archive of Social Organisations of Ukraine)

Introduction

The establishment of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe had far-reaching and unexpected consequences in the USSR itself, especially the western borderlands. Between the mid-1950s and the mid-1980s, as the people's democracies diverged from the Soviet model and yet remained close 'socialist' allies of the USSR, they provided a testing ground for Soviet policies and ideas, as well as an example of socio-political innovation which, as Roman Szporluk puts it, 'subverted the position of the Soviet Union as the one prototype of the socialist future of mankind'.[1] In this way, the 'outer empire' inspired diverse attitudes towards the Soviet regime among the population of the USSR and, more broadly, gave rise to different notions of what it meant to be Soviet.

Eastern Europe helped to imbue the concept of Sovietness with undertones of power and international prestige. As early as the 1940s, the Soviet media began to claim that the people's democracies were grateful to their Soviet 'liberators', with foreign workers admiring the Soviet social system and Stalin.[2] After the mid-1950s, the rising mass media coverage of the socialist camp, the emerging ideology and practices of international travel and the celebration of particular historical anniversaries fostered a widespread sense of Soviet superiority. Official narratives stressed the importance of the 'Soviet people' in guiding Eastern Europe on the path of progress, protecting the satellite states from 'west German revanchism' and 'American imperialism', as well as rebuking 'anti-Soviet' opinions and attitudes which arose in the outer empire. They thus depicted the countries of the Warsaw Pact as reliant on the USSR for ideological guidance, economic help and military security. The authorities implied that the USSR was more powerful, stable and advanced than its junior partners from the socialist camp.

At the same time, however, events and developments in the outer empire undermined the image of a united, Soviet-led Eastern Europe. Periods of unrest in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia raised doubts about attitudes towards the

---

[1] R. Szporluk, 'Introduction' in Roman Szporluk (ed.), *The Influence of Eastern Europe and the Soviet West on the USSR* (New York, 1976), 2. This was especially because, as Hodnett and Potichnyj point out, communist ideology was assumed to have international validity. G. Hodnett and P. Potichnyj, *The Ukraine and the Czechoslovak crisis* (Canberra, 1970), 116.

[2] J. Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!: Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton, 1999), 192-196.

USSR in the socialist 'near abroad', prompting some Soviet citizens to ponder the nature of the 'empire' and the opposition to Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe, particularly in the aftermath of the military interventions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Furthermore, the rise of reformist movements within the communist parties of Eastern Europe in 1956 and 1968, as well as the appearance of a 'workers' opposition' in Poland during the 1970s and the early 1980s, exposed residents of the USSR to new ideas for change and innovation.

The politics of empire and the crises of 1956, 1968 and 1980-81 should not just be seen as political events but also as a window into popular opinion in the USSR. Official propaganda and other sources of information about the satellite states compelled many people to look at and ultimately to take a stand on issues of Soviet foreign policy, socio-economic problems in the socialist bloc, political reform, and the role of nations under socialism. While party activists encouraged citizens to speak in public about both the benefits of international socialist cooperation and the 'foreign' threat to Soviet integrity and stability, the growth of international tourism and the availability of East European mass media in the Soviet Union facilitated the spread of ideas across borders. As a result, numerous residents of the USSR expressed opinions about the satellite states in such different contexts as public agitation meetings, written reports compiled upon returning from foreign trips, private letters, and informal conversations with friends, colleagues, and foreign tourists.

Because of geographical and linguistic proximity, family ties, and memories of a common history, debates about the outer empire acquired a particularly large scope in Soviet Ukraine.[3] They fit into complex social, regional and national dynamics in the republic, exposing overlapping fault lines between Russian and Ukrainian speakers, ethnic minorities, as well as various generational and occupational groups. Closely intertwined with evolving popular ideas about the role of nations under socialism, perceptions of the 'near abroad' also underpinned notions of Soviet

---

[3] B. Lewytzkyj, 'Political and Cultural Cooperation Between the People's Republic of Poland and The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic' in P. Potichnyj (ed.), *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present* (Edmonton, 1980), 209; E. Teague, *Solidarity and the Soviet Worker: The Impact of the Polish Events of 1980 on Soviet Internal Politics* (London, 1988), 140; A. Bromke, 'Ukraine and Poland in an Interdependent Europe' in Potichnyj, *Poland and Ukraine*; Z. Gitelman, 'The Diffusion of Political Innovation: From East Europe to the Soviet Union' in Szporluk, *Influence*, 38; R. Solchanyk, 'Polska a sowiecki zachod', *Suchasnist: Zeszyt w jezyku polskim* 1-2 (1985), 93.

patriotism among the population of Ukraine.[4] The republic thus provides an interesting case study illuminating how the monitoring of events and developments in the outer empire shaped a wide range of attitudes towards Soviet foreign and domestic policy.

This thesis explores the evolution of national identities and Soviet patriotism in Ukraine through the lens of residents' perceptions of three satellite states: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland.[5] Focusing on the changing role of agitation meetings, mass media, international travel, and historical commemoration, I trace the development of popular opinion about Eastern Europe between the Hungarian uprising of 1956, the Prague Spring of 1968, and the rise and fall of the Solidarity trade union in Poland in the early 1980s.

I. **Popular Opinion**

Scholars have employed various concepts to refer to views held by people in modern societies. These notions have different implications for the understanding of the relationship between 'opinion', 'civil society' and the 'public sphere'. While the idea of 'public opinion' is normally used in reference to open and democratic societies, it presents particular challenges when applied to the Soviet Union and the attitudes adopted or publically expressed by its citizens.

For Jürgen Habermas, public opinion emerged gradually with the growth of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe, particularly after the French Revolution.[6] Fusing the physiocrats' idea of rational public discussion with the notion of an irrational *bon sens* of the people, which Rousseau believed to challenge the power of enlightened

---

[4] John Breuilly suggests that individuals are encouraged to define and pursue their collective aims and values as nations when they observe other communities that advance their interests as nations too. J. Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Manchester, 1993), 380; Likewise, Bloom points out that 'the appropriation and manipulation of images of the international environment can be used for nation-building'. W. Bloom, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), 149.

[5] I focus on these three countries in part due to their geographical proximity to Ukraine and in part due to their historical and political significance. Unlike Yugoslavia and, to some extent, Romania, these countries remained close allies of the USSR throughout most of the post-war period, and yet experienced major crises and turning points which undermined official Soviet visions of Eastern Europe and socialism.

[6] J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, 1989), 89-102.

bureaucrats, private citizens, possessing the capacity to overcome their own ignorance and alienation, used public spaces to engage in critical debate. According to Habermas, this gave rise to public opinion, as subjects used the force of the better argument 'to test validity claims to truth and normative rightness in discourses' and thus to shape legislation.[7] While his critics accuse him of idealising the nineteenth-century public sphere, pointing out that it excluded large sections of European societies,[8] Habermas himself suggests that 'a communicative network of a public made up of rationally debating private citizens has [now] collapsed'.[9] For contemporary societies, he distinguishes between 'informal, personal, non-public opinion' and 'formal, institutionally authorised opinion'.[10] The former is not '"tested out" in the argumentative crossfire', for it expresses the private interests of people who relate to the state not through political participation but by adopting an individualised attitude of demand.[11] As such, 'non-public opinion' may well adopt the form of the Hegelian 'common sense', 'dispersed among people in the form of prejudices [and] not true knowledge'.[12] Meanwhile, the concept of 'authorised opinion' reflects Habermas' belief that, as Luke Goode puts it, 'politics is now something you see and read about, rather than something you debate'.[13] It brings to mind C.W. Mills' notion of 'mass opinion', which arises when '"far fewer people express opinions than receive them …, [t]he communications that prevail are so organised that it is difficult or impossible for the individual to answer back immediately or with any effect …, [t]he realisation of opinion in action is controlled by authorities who organise and control the channels of such action … [and] [t]he mass has no autonomy from institutions"'.[14] While public opinion – understood as a product of rational-critical debate – remains an ideal for Habermas, it is unclear

---

[7] L. Thomassen, *Habermas: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London, 2010), 31; Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 99; L. Goode, *Jürgen Habermas: Democracy and the Public Sphere* (London, 2005), 12 Calhoun, 17. In this way, Habermas holds, individuals seek to maximise technical control over objective nature, mutual understanding, and individual 'autonomy in the sense of being in control of the conditions under which one lives'. Thomassen, *Habermas*, 29.

[8] Thomassen, *Habermas*, 48-50.

[9] Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 247. For Habermas, as Luke Goode puts it, politics is now something you see and read about, rather than something you debate. Goode, *Jürgen Habermas*, 24.

[10] Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 245.

[11] Goode, *Jürgen Habermas*, 24.

[12] C. Calhoun, 'Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere' in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere: Conference Papers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), 19-20; J. Habermas, 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere' in Calhoun, *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, 440-441.

[13] Goode, *Jürgen Habermas*, 24.

[14] Quote after Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 249.

whether it is in fact possible to formulate, express and measure such public opinion, even in the context of liberal democracies.

Needless to say, the Soviet system did not allow for the rise of public opinion understood in Habermas' framework. Reflecting in part Marx's disdain of public debate as a mask for 'bourgeois class interests',[15] the regime left few spaces for the open exchange of ideas. Instead, it sought to shape opinion and to eliminate dissenting views. In some ways, it is useful to distinguish between 'non-public opinion' and 'mass opinion' in the USSR. Unable to participate in free public debate, citizens still articulated 'non-public opinions' when they commented on their personal life experiences in such different forums as informal conversations with friends and colleagues, letters, and agitation meetings.[16] In this vein, for example, individuals spoke about their family's living standards and complained about problems at work. Meanwhile, the notion of *obshchestvennoe mnenie* (public opinion), which resurfaced in official rhetoric under Khrushchev, was akin to Mills' 'mass opinion', for it referred to those views that the regime recognised as 'correct'.[17] However, in contrast to 'mass opinion or 'authorised opinion', Soviet *obshchestvennoe mnenie* had an added dimension: inhabitants of the USSR had to manifest publicly their adherence to official slogans. The authorities adopted a range of unconventional methods to test not only the extent to which citizens toed the line, but also, particularly before 1968, the degree to which they 'understood' the regime's pronouncements. Top Party apparatchiks displayed great concern to organise 'explanatory' discussion meetings for citizens and to outline official views in the mass media in a consistent and convincing way. In this sense, the Soviet *obshchestvennoe mnenie* resembled Jacque Necker's and Jacque Pechet's eighteenth-century notion of public opinion, which Keith Michael Baker describes as a 'political invention' 'endowed with the rational characteristics of absolute power': it 'implied acceptance of open public discussion on the one hand, but … was seen as an

---

[15] Calhoun, 'Introduction', 19.

[16] As Peter Kenez argues for the 1920s, the regime destroyed genuine debate and prevented 'the formation and articulation of alternative points of view'. Consequently, '[t]he success of propaganda was the ever-increasing atomisation of society'. P. Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilisation, 1917-1929* (Cambridge, 1985), 252, 254.

[17] J. Plamper, 'Beyond Binaries: Popular Opinion in Stalinism' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009), 72. As Marcin Kula demonstrates for the People's Republic of Poland, the first centre for investigating public opinion was originally supposed to monitor only official radio broadcasts. M. Kula, 'Poland: The Silence of Those Deprived of Voice' in Corner, *Popular Opinion*, 149-150.

alternative to a politics of contestation and compromise on the other'.[18] Paradoxically, citizens were expected to engage in rational, public debate, whilst also being compelled to arrive at the 'correct' conclusions.

Yet the division of Soviet views and attitudes into 'non-public opinion' and 'mass opinion' is in fact of limited usefulness. For one, many dissidents explicitly rejected official ideas of *obshchestvennoe mnenie*, but claimed that their views should become the new 'public' norm. Moreover, the individual's reflections upon his or her personal relationship to the regime acquired a public significance, to the extent that everyone was expected to display an understanding of the 'correct' views about life in the USSR. Indeed, the authorities endeavoured to monitor all forms of communication, praising citizens who articulated 'correct' views and expressing alarm about 'incorrect' opinions voiced in both formal and informal contexts. All citizens' attitudes – whether expressed in public or in private – were, therefore, a matter of public concern. Most evidently, arguments and opinions surrounding the notion of Soviet patriotism and national identities automatically assumed a public dimension in the USSR, for the regime pressured its citizens to develop a common view of their collective identities.[19]

In this thesis, I use the term 'popular opinion' to refer to a process of communication involving Soviet citizens and the government which does not easily fit into the categories of 'authorised' or 'mass' opinion on the one hand, or atomised, individualised 'non-public opinion' on the other. Although no official Soviet category corresponds to this notion of popular opinion, the term encompasses what official surveillance reports normally described as 'moods' (*nastroeniia* and *nastroi*), 'reactions' (*reagirovaniia*, *reahuvannia*, *otkliki*, and *vidhuky*), 'views' (*vzgliady* and *pohliady*), and 'voiced opinions' (*vyskazyvaniia* and *vyslovlennia*). On one level, popular opinion thus refers to the attitudes of citizens who explicitly expressed their alienation from the Soviet system and official *obshchestvennoe mnenie*. However, following Jacques Derrida's idea that language is too opaque to allow any two parties to arrive at a mutual understanding, as well as Jonathan Culler's criticism of

---

[18] K.M. Baker, 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas' in Calhoun, *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, 192, 197-198.

[19] As Luke Goode argues in reference to Western societies, discourses of nationalism have encouraged subjects to attempt to 'find a "natural" coincidence between private and universal interests, rather than public interest simply reflecting compromise and negotiation between private antagonistic interests'. Goode, *Jürgen Habermas*, 17.

Habermas' distinction between communication aimed at achieving a purpose and communication aimed at mutual understanding,[20] I also argue that popular opinion often consisted of the same terms and slogans as *obshchestvennoe mnenie*, all the while encompassing differing ideas about life in the USSR. For example, individuals who participated in reproducing official slogans expected perks and privileges in return for their conformity. From this perspective, my notion of popular opinion includes the claims that people made on the basis of the fact that they embraced the 'correct' point of view. Furthermore, Soviet subjects invested official slogans with a range of meanings, seeking thereby to obtain power (in Michel Foucault's sense): they sought 'access to knowledge and language, which confer the ability to classify ideas, behaviours, and experiences and impose that classification, as norms, on others'.[21]

In sum, popular opinion existed in a dynamic exchange with the norms embodied in *obshchestvennoe mnenie*, with individuals' opinions ranging from expressions of consent for the system, through mild criticism and even to outright dissent. My analysis thus includes views that can be classified into three broad groups: those Soviet officials labelled as 'negative' (*otritsatel'nye* and *nehatyvni*), 'hostile' (*vrazhdebnye* and *vorozhi*), and 'anti-Soviet' (*antisovetskie* and *antyradians'ki*); those attitudes that Party apparatchiks considered problematic but classified in less radical terms, referring to 'incorrect' (*nepravil'nye* and *nepravyl'ni*) opinions and cases of panic (*panika*) among citizens; and finally, those views which surveillance reports categorised as 'correct' (*praviln'ye* and *pravyl'ni*), or as expressions of 'support' (*podderzhka* and *piddtrymka*) for the Soviet state and its policy. (In some cases, popular opinion can be defined in negative terms, as in those instances when local officials assured their superiors that they had registered no undesirable views among the population.) Far from signifying simple consent, expressions of 'correct' and 'supportive' views offer an insight into more complex social dynamics in Soviet Ukraine.

---

[20] Thomassen, *Habermas*, 65.
[21] In this sense, they were similar to the Tsar's subjects who engaged in debates about the meaning of 'hooliganism'. See J. Neuberger, *Hooliganism: Crime, Culture and Power in St. Petersburg, 1900-1914* (Berkeley, 1993), 13.

a) <u>Beyond Support and Resistance</u>

Though most studies of Soviet popular opinion to date focus on the 1930s, they provide an important conceptual framework for the understanding of post-war Soviet society. Historians suggest that Soviet citizens held diverse, perhaps even self-contradictory attitudes towards the regime and its ideology, occasionally questioning the legitimacy of the Soviet system, developing different ideas about how the Soviet state and society should function, and articulating a range of personal goals and values.

With possibilities to conduct research in the USSR severely limited before 1991, and Western academia largely divided along the totalitarian-revisionist lines, scholars hardly explored the nature of Soviet popular opinion. On the one hand, advocates of the totalitarian school took it for granted that residents of the USSR were either brainwashed or else secretly longing for Western-style democracy. On the other hand, the 'revisionists', whilst demonstrating that the state sought to satisfy citizens' needs and expectations, implied that the pursuit of material and status benefits was the main source of stability in the Soviet Union.[22] As Linda Cook points out, this approach was 'based on the belief that what the Soviet state delivered was precisely what its society most valued', leaving little room to explore how people defined their goals.[23]

Only after the opening of post-Soviet archives in the 1990s did scholars truly move beyond the totalitarian-revisionist dichotomy. Adopting various methodological approaches to the study of newly accessible sources, historians began to explore Soviet popular opinion. On one level, they argue that citizens questioned the officially propagated aims and values, invoking various 'unofficial', non-Soviet ideas to evaluate the performance of the regime. In this vein, Sarah Davies examines secret police surveillance reports and documents of the Party and Komsomol information departments. Davies holds that the reports reveal 'an independent current of popular opinion' in the USSR: people selected those aspects of official rhetoric which 'corresponded with their beliefs and rejected others', all the

---

[22] For a discussion of the totalitarian-revisionist dichotomy, see S. Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off the Masks!: Identity and Imposture in Twentieth Century Russia* (Princeton, 2005), 9; J. Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions* (London, 2000), 78.

[23] L. Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract and Why It Failed: Welfare Policy and Workers' Politics from Brezhnev to Yeltsin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), 4.

while drawing on a range of rival discourses such as nationalism, anti-Semitism, and populism.[24] Lynne Viola likewise suggests that 'we glimpse the persistence of autonomous or semi-autonomous cultures, subcultures, and identities surviving within the hegemonic political culture of Stalinism'.[25] In this way, she points to the importance of examining active and passive resistance in the USSR.

In contrast, other scholars suggest that people rarely questioned the legitimacy of Stalin's rule, because they did not retain an 'outside frame of reference' in assessing Soviet policies and ideas.[26] According to Igal Halfin, the 'official discourse had the power to determine not only what a Soviet citizen said but also (at least in part) what he desired'.[27] Similarly, examining personal diaries from the 1930s, Jochen Hellbeck argues that people felt powerless to overturn the 'revolutionary current' which 'claimed nothing short of a monopoly on the future'.[28] Pointing out that individuals did at times invoke ideas that they regarded as 'non-Soviet', Hellbeck claims that they sought to purge themselves of those 'private' thoughts and attitudes which did not correspond with their 'public' Soviet personae.[29] Hellbeck implies thereby that popular attitudes towards the regime were paradoxical: people believed that they should believe in official Soviet ideology, drawing on Bolshevik ideas of self-improvement and seeking to develop a revolutionary consciousness, but they sometimes also felt that they had not fully rid themselves of non-Soviet or pre-Soviet ways of thinking. This raises important questions about how citizens fit their personal life stories into the revolutionary master narrative. Not only did individuals hide certain facts about themselves from public view, Hellbeck suggests, but they also identified various possible interpretations of official rhetoric, hoping to find

---

[24] S. Davies, *Popular Opinion in Stalin's Russia: Terror, Propaganda, and Dissent, 1934-1941* (Cambridge, 1997), 7, 13, 183-186.
[25] L. Viola, 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s: Soliloquy of a Devil's Advocate' in Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist and Marshall Poe (eds), *The Resistance Debate in Russian and Soviet History* (Bloomington, 2003), 92.
[26] Hellbeck, 'Fashioning', 104.
[27] I. Halfin, *From Darkness to Light: Class, Consciousness, and Salvation in Revolutionary Russia* (Pittsburgh, 2000), 9-12, 37.
[28] J. Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia' in David-Fox et al, *The Resistance Debate*, 112, 123, 134.
[29] Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out', 123, 129; Hellbeck, 'Fashioning', 95.

ways to present themselves as reliable Soviet citizens. At times, people even challenged the regime's pronouncements on who was properly 'Soviet'.[30]

From this perspective, it appears that people conjured up their own role in the wider Soviet community by invoking official slogans and ideas. Indeed, the conviction that the Soviet system and ideology were forward-looking seems to have encouraged some citizens to outline their views on how the regime should operate. As Sheila Fitzpatrick puts it, inhabitants of the USSR tried to 'decode the regime's pronouncements'.[31] Firm in the belief that real social advance was only possible in the USSR, she claims, people discussed how the Soviet state could best fulfill its promise to improve their lives: they acted as loyal Soviet citizens concerned about the future of their homeland, employing the language of rights written into the Soviet constitution, taking an active interest in foreign affairs, and even sending letters to Soviet leaders offering opinion and advice on policy.[32] In order to understand the mechanics governing popular opinion in the USSR, Fitzpatrick implies, it is necessary to explore how citizens grew to understand the meaning of socialism and Sovietness.

At the same time, however, without denying that official rhetoric structured the way in which most citizens spoke in public and even in private, some historians question the extent to which the population 'believed' in Soviet socialist ideology. These scholars do not see popular opinion as shaped by individuals weighing up 'Soviet' and 'non-Soviet' ideas, or as a function of citizens' understandings of Sovietness and socialism; instead, they explore how people employed official language instrumentally with the aim of strengthening their social position in the USSR. Stephen Kotkin claims that formulaic surveillance reports do not permit the historian to establish the extent to which people 'accepted' or 'rejected' the regime. As a result, he remains ambiguous about the extent to which inhabitants internalised Marxist-Leninist ideals during the Stalin era. On the one hand, he writes that Stalin's

---

[30] In 1933, for example, the diary author Stepan Podlubnyi was uncertain about the criteria which the regime would use to classify enemies, hoping that the authorities would disregard his social origin and take account of his current work performance, thus allowing him to escape the Party purge. Furthermore, after the arrest of his mother in 1937, he accepted that Trotskyism was a punishable offence, but refused to believe that 'Mama is a Trotskyite'. Hellbeck, 'Fashioning', 85, 102, 109-111.

[31] S. Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times, Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York, 1999), 188.

[32] Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism*, 85, 170-179, 225; See also Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out', 112.

subjects eagerly 'spoke Bolshevik' and suggests that some people attached real meaning to official rhetoric, using 'certain of the officially promoted ideals to challenge regime policy'.[33] On the other hand, Kotkin maintains that a 'private' sphere survived whilst people behaved 'as if they believed' in public.[34] In this way, he implies that some citizens at least thought of themselves as self-interested individuals, repeating official slogans to manipulate the system to their 'minimum disadvantage'.[35]

In a similar vein, Jeffrey Brooks develops the concept of 'performance': citizens found it difficult to maintain 'separate personal and public understandings of "the facts of life"',[36] he holds, but also paid little attention to the referential meanings of what they said. Instead, individuals focused on the performative role of speaking 'correctly'. Fixed and repetitive, official language did not lend itself to multiple interpretations but offered a means through which citizens manifested their dedication to the state: well aware that they had to repeat certain slogans to survive and to achieve their goals and ambitions under Soviet-style socialism, people learnt to articulate their interests within a 'stylised, ritualistic, internally consistent public culture'.[37] Staging consent without necessarily attaching real meaning to socialist slogans, people responded perhaps to the material incentives which the regime offered in return for obedience, operating in what Kevin McDermott tentatively describes as a 'neo-populist dictatorship'.[38] In order to gauge citizens' ambitions and views on how Soviet society should work, it would seem, the historian must focus on what they hoped to achieve through speaking 'correctly' rather than investigating what they meant by the words they used: in this sense, the context in which people spoke is potentially more important for understanding popular opinion than what was actually said.

Although victory in the Great Patriotic War and Stalin's death marked crucial historical breaks in the development of Soviet popular opinion, the modes of self-

---

[33] S. Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilisation* (Berkeley, 1995), 220-221.
[34] Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, 220.
[35] Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, 237.
[36] Brooks, *Thank You*, 243.
[37] Brooks, *Thank You*, 69, 246-247.
[38] K. McDermott, 'Stalinism "From Below"?: Social Preconditions of and Popular Responses to the Great Terror', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8:3 (2007), 613. See also J. Hessler, 'Cultured Trade: The Stalinist Turn to Consumerism' in Fitzpatrick, *Stalinism: New Directions*.

expression that scholars identify for the 1930s can still be distinguished in the post-war period: citizens articulated explicitly 'non-Soviet' ideas, argued about the meaning of Sovietness and socialism, and expressed public support for the regime. Nationalism and populism framed what might be called 'anti-Soviet' views after 1945. On the one hand, many historians have argued that the incorporation of the western borderlands at the end of the war created a breeding ground for nationalist dissent in the USSR. In western Ukraine, separatist nationalism seems to have been especially widespread among the creative intelligentsia, members of ethnic minorities, and the faithful of the illegal Greek Catholic Church, which survived in the underground despite the official ban in 1945.[39] Some residents of the borderlands retained a regional identity which made them reluctant to identify themselves as 'Soviet', scholars claim, ascribing these alternative loyalties to Habsburg legacies, memories of exclusion from Russian and Soviet rule, and the impact of the civil war that had waged in the region until the early 1950s.[40] On the other hand, such expressions of 'resistance' in the western borderlands (and in other parts of the USSR) do not necessarily establish other citizens' dissatisfaction with the Soviet system or the appeal of anti-Soviet nationalisms. Rather, as Vladimir Kozlov claims, they often exposed popular frustration with local bureaucrats and economic shortages, but also a deep-seated attachment to the Soviet state and its professed goals and values. According to Kozlov, during the late 1950s and the 1960s, threats to 'hang communists' or to 'stage a second Hungarian uprising in Ukraine' were underpinned by passionate 'anti-statist' attitudes amongst volatile sections of society, as well as a wider belief in the need to rectify what some citizens saw as political mistakes or abuses of power that prevented the Soviet state from delivering

---

[39] The Greek Catholic Church, also known as the Uniate Church, had helped to fuel Ukrainian national identity in western Ukraine since the nineteenth century. See B. Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)* (Toronto, 1996); J. Himka, 'The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772-1918', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8:3-4 (December 1984); Magosci, *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (Toronto, 2002); S. Plokhy, 'In the Shadow of Yalta: International Politics and the Soviet Liquidation of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church' in Serhii Plokhy and Frank E. Sysyn (eds.), *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton, 2003).

[40] R. Szporluk, 'The Soviet West- or Far Eastern Europe?', *East European Politics and Societies* 5:3 (1991), 472-477; Z. Gitelman, 'Ethnopolitics and the Future of the Former Soviet Union' in Zvi Gitelman (ed.), *The Politics of Nationality and the Erosion of the USSR: Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Harrogate, 1990* (London, 1992), 8; Solchanyk, 'Polska', 82; Y. Bilinsky, *The Second Soviet Republic: the Ukraine after World War II* (New Brunswick, 1964), 85, 97.

a decent standard of living for its citizens.[41] In this way, as Lynne Viola puts it, people fixed 'a dichotomy of state and society' from below, articulating 'a subaltern view of domination'.[42]

Moreover, whereas Jochen Hellbeck claims that bottom-up attempts to 'redefine the objective revolutionary narrative' were ultimately unsuccessful under Stalin,[43] it seems that the war and de-Stalinisation allowed citizens more latitude both to reconcile diverse personal life stories with notions of Sovietness and to invest official slogans and ideas with new meanings. Amir Weiner argues that the war paved the way for people to advance conflicting visions of who was properly 'Soviet'. With ordinary citizens invoking the myth of war as an 'autobiographical point of reference', social origin became considerably less important for classifying reliable citizens and enemies than it had been before 1941.[44] In this way, Weiner suggests, the myth of war facilitated the articulation of 'particularistic identities': Red Army veterans, former partisans, and members of various ethnic communities struggled to prove that their groups had made the most important contribution to the war effort.[45]

More importantly, perhaps, sweeping changes in policy following the death of Stalin encouraged people to articulate diverse ideas about the shape that Soviet society should take. As Polly Jones and Cynthia Hooper show, people argued about the Stalinist past and their post-Stalinist futures, probing thereby the nature and limits of reform. These debates acquired a particularly large scope and public dimension in 1956, when Khrushchev's Secret Speech was read out during primary party meetings.[46] Gradually, however, the authorities established a clearer vision of how Soviet citizens should speak in public, providing for more short-lived and

---

[41] V.A. Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the post-Stalin Years* (London, 2002), 154-155.

[42] Viola, 'Popular Resistance', 100-101. See also S. Davies, '"Us against Them": Social Identity in Soviet Russia, 1934-41' in Fitzpatrick, *Stalinism: New Directions*, 47-67.

[43] Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out', 134-135.

[44] A. Weiner, *Making Sense of War: the Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton, 2001), pp. 20-21. 59.

[45] Weiner, *Making Sense*, 9, 59, 68, 84, 385.

[46] C. Hooper, 'What Can and Cannot be Said: Between the Stalinist Past and New Soviet Future', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008), 320; P. Jones, 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005), 7.

superficial discussion, especially after the Twenty-Second Party Congress in 1961.[47] Although some members of the 'liberal intelligentsia' continued to use official channels to publicise diverse ideas about how Soviet society should operate, invoking principles of socialism to justify the need for social and cultural reform, such debates now involved fewer people and, especially after Brezhnev's crackdown on 'permitted dissent' in 1966,[48] were confined to informal conversations and *samizdat*.[49]

In clamping down on public debate, the authorities also outlined a set of 'correct' views which citizens should invoke to show loyalty to the regime. With Stalin gone, according to Alexei Yurchak, there was no 'external voice' to distinguish between 'correct' and 'incorrect' interpretations of Sovietness and socialism. As a result, residents of the USSR engaged in increasingly 'fixed, predictable, citational, and cumbersome' ideological rituals and routine practices of everyday life, but also, for the most part, paid little attention to the 'literal' meanings of the slogans and ideas which they articulated in public: they were the *svoi*, as distinct from dissidents and some party activists who interpreted ideology as either true or false.[50] In contrast to Jeffrey Brooks, who argues that people could not escape certain frames of thinking promoted by Soviet propaganda,[51] Yurchak claims that members of 'the last Soviet generation' (that of the Brezhnev era) wrote, spoke and behaved in the 'correct' manner precisely because this 'enabled creative productions of "normal life" that went beyond, though did not necessarily in opposition to, those that these rituals and texts described'.[52] Assuming that the Soviet system would last forever, people did not question its legitimacy or the need to participate in the 'performance'; still, they remained 'outside' (*vnye*), neither simply supporting or opposing the system, but

---

[47] P. Jones, 'From the Secret Speech to the Burial of Stalin: Real and Ideal Responses to de-Stalinisation' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 42, 53, 59.

[48] See D. Spechler, *Permitted Dissent in the USSR:* Novyi Mir *and the Soviet Regime* (New York, 1982), xv-xvi.

[49] See P. Reddaway, 'Policy towards Dissent since Khrushchev' in T. Rigby et al (eds.), *Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR* (London, 1980); K. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the post-Stalin Era: Myth, Symbols, and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (The Hague, 1980), 207-212; D. Zisserman-Brodsky, *Constructing Ethnopolitics in the Soviet Union: Samizdat, Deprivation, and the Rise of Ethnic Nationalism* (New York, 2003); H. Kasianov, *Nezhodni: ukrains'ka intelihentsiia v rusi oporu 1960x-80x rokiv* (Kyiv, 1995); V. Markus, 'Religion and Nationality: the Uniates of Ukraine' in Bohdan R. Bociurkiw and John W. Strong (eds.), *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (London, 1975).

[50] Yurchak, *Everything*, 13-14, 284, 287-288, 291-292.

[51] Brooks, *Thank You*, 246-247.

[52] Yurchak, *Everything*, 277-278.

rather developing diverse personal ambitions, social networks, subcultures and ideas about what life should be like under the Soviet regime.[53] Inspired by Alexei Yurchak's idea that citizens '[used] words to achieve actions in the world', I call these 'correct' ways of speaking and behaving 'staging consent'. The term refers to what Yurchak describes as 'mass participation in the reproduction of the system's authoritative forms and representations, enabling the emergence of various forms of meaningful, creative life that were relatively uncontrolled, indeterminate, and "normal"'.[54]

b) Popular Opinion and Eastern Europe

Eastern Europe had a crucial impact on the claims and nature of Soviet popular opinion in the post-Stalin period. Citizens' perceptions of the outer empire helped to fuel different concepts of 'resistance', inspired debates about the meaning of Sovietness and socialism, and facilitated the practices of 'staging consent' for the Soviet regime and its policies.

During the 1950s and the 1960s, official depictions of the satellite states in the USSR were varied and even contradictory, shaped as they were by complex interactions between party apparatchiks in Moscow, republican capitals and the provinces. Internal party correspondence, instructions issued to agitators who delivered speeches about international affairs in the regions of Ukraine, and plans for mass media coverage of the satellite states reveal that CPSU officials did not outline clear boundaries between dissent and 'counterrevolution' on the one hand, and legitimate reform that did not threaten the foundations of Soviet-style socialism on the other. Although many scholars have demonstrated that the authorities were concerned about the potential spill-over of dissent and opposition from the outer empire into Ukraine, strengthening censorship and sponsoring large-scale propaganda campaigns to condemn East European unrest,[55] top CPSU apparatchiks

---

[53] Yurchak, *Everything*, 295.
[54] Yurchak, *Everything*, 285.
[55] S. Yekelchyk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford, 2007), 169; V. Baran, *Ukraina: Novitnia Istoriia* (L'viv, 2003), 283; R. Solchanyk, 'Polska', 98; A. Weiner, 'Déjà Vu All Over Again: Prague Spring, Romanian Summer, and Soviet Autumn on Russia's Western Frontier', *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006), 173; Teague, *Solidarity*, 143-144; Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 79.

also retained ambiguous attitudes towards reform and innovation instigated by communist leaders in the outer empire. They even suggested that some East European innovations, particularly in the economic sphere, were progressive and could be copied in the USSR.[56] Official reports further reveal inefficiencies of the censorship machine, as well as the apparent incompetence of local party activists responsible for organising agitation meetings, which also helped to mould the parameters of Soviet debates about Eastern Europe.

Moreover, international travel within the socialist bloc and East European media, which often reached Soviet Ukraine, facilitated the spread of competing, non-Soviet voices in the republic between the 1950s and the 1980s. Upon encountering Soviet citizens, residents of the people's democracies sometimes informed them about East European ideological and institutional innovations, as well as expressing a range of opinions about the USSR.[57] Particularly in the western oblasts, travel thus helped to expose residents to outright criticism of the 'socialist' system, but, more often, face-to-face encounters between Soviet citizens and their 'socialist brothers' simply raised questions about alternative ways of resolving socio-economic, political and ideological questions in Soviet-style regimes. Likewise, mass media from the people's democracies helped to spread different ideas about socialism among the population of Ukraine. Apart from tuning in to Western radio stations broadcasting into the USSR,[58] residents of the republic eagerly read the comparatively less censored socialist publications from Eastern Europe and, especially in the western borderlands, followed the news from Polish, Romanian, and Czechoslovak radio and television.[59] Not only did many people understand broadcasts in other Slavic languages, but the population could also access Ukrainian-language press and radio created for the Ukrainian minorities in Poland and Czechoslovakia. As Roman Szporluk puts it, East European media provided 'a window to the world which

---

[56] This was especially because, as Baran argues, the Soviet leadership followed economic debates and developments in Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia in 1956 to prepare and force through their own economic reform. Baran, *Ukraina*, 185; Similarly, as some Soviet leaders saw the need to tinker with their own economic structure, they gave a positive evaluation to the Hungarian economic reform of the 1960s and did not consider it necessary to publicly condemn it. Z. Gitelman, 'Diffusion', 48.

[57] See A.E. Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers: Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe' in A.E. Gorsuch and D. Koenker (eds.), *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca, 2006).

[58] See W. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (Basingstoke, 1997).

[59] Z. Gitelman, 'Diffusion', 38.

neither the Kyiv nor the Moscow press could offer'.[60] Though diverging from Soviet sources of information, news from the satellite states could not easily be labelled 'anti-Soviet': indeed, internal Party reports suggest that Soviet officials were reluctant to block East European media from reaching Ukraine, afraid as they were of discrediting the idea of international 'socialist unity'.[61] At the same time, mass media from the satellite states certainly did expose the Soviet population to different models of socialist development, with the authorities struggling to answer citizens' questions and define an official point of view on such 'unorthodox' ideas as calls for cultural and national 'liberalisation' and intra-Party democracy. Consequently, events and developments in Eastern Europe acted as 'the bearers of otherwise unacceptable … ideas and mechanisms' in the USSR.[62]

At the same time, however, the authorities gradually created fixed ways of describing socialism and the USSR's relationship with the outer empire. For one, agitation meetings devoted to Eastern Europe became increasingly ritualised after 1956. Although the mass media allowed citizens to learn about foreign affairs in the privacy of their homes,[63] debates about the outer empire retained a crucial communal aspect: citizens were encouraged to speak in public and behave in a manner which proved that they both trusted the Soviet media and rejected alternative sources of news, including press, television and radio from the people's democracies. Unlike during the Stalin period, when the authorities disdained silence as inherently suspicious and counterrevolutionary,[64] 'going through the motions' and simply participating in agitation gatherings was now also a means of manifesting one's 'correct' attitudes.

The emerging ideology and practices of international travel further helped to ground formulaic ways of speaking and writing about the 'near abroad'. The status and demands placed on Soviet travellers who visited the people's democracies

---

[60] R. Szporluk, 'The Role of the Press in Polish-Ukrainian Relations' in Potichnyj, *Poland and Ukraine*, 219-220.

[61] Hodnett and Potichnyj show that, in 1968, Czechoslovak media 'voiced ideas which Soviet editors did not wish or dare to approve, but which nevertheless could not expediently be labelled "counter-revolutionary" when expressed through officially-approved media in a fraternal "socialist" country'. Hodnett and Potichnyj, *Ukraine*, 117.

[62] Gitelman, 'Diffusion', 33.

[63] See K.J. Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home for Television in the USSR, 1950-1970', *Slavic Review* 66:2 (2007).

[64] Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out', 128.

required increasingly ritualised forms of speech, writing, and behaviour. When compiling official reports, addressing other citizens at public gatherings, and publishing articles in the press, many residents of Ukraine described their experiences of travel in fixed, repetitive ways. Reliable citizens were not to question what they saw, or to invent new ways of improving Soviet relations with the people's democracies, but rather to participate in rituals that reaffirmed the superiority of the USSR in the socialist camp, as well as the Soviet people's commitment to 'helping' their 'socialist brothers'. This allowed Soviet leaders to weave official narratives about the people's democracies, which presented the USSR and Soviet people as more experienced and sophisticated than those in the satellite states.

As political propaganda focused increasingly on the past, rather than promises of a better future,[65] history provided another increasingly important prism through which citizens described the satellite states. Participating in numerous anniversary commemoration ceremonies, many people invoked in public a mythological version of World War II and the 'Soviet liberation' of Eastern Europe, but also memories of 'Polish exploitation in western Ukraine' and Russian and Ukrainian conflicts with other states and nations in the region. In this context, a large number of Ukraine's residents spoke about how the USSR guided other states towards socialism and sometimes highlighted national divisions in the Soviet bloc. History was thus a crucial means to discredit East European departures from the Soviet model as a relevant 'external commentary' on Soviet values and practices, for it implied that unrest and reforms in the people's democracies were underpinned by backward, 'non-Soviet' and 'non-socialist' traditions.

The polyphony within the portrayals of the satellite states in Ukraine evoked a wide range of responses among the population. Because Soviet propaganda as well as some foreign radio stations informed citizens about the rise of 'anti-Soviet' forces in the outer empire, the ideas of 'dissent' and 'rebellion' became more tangible and propitious than they had been in the 1930s.[66] Admittedly, the *svodki* or summaries compiled by the KGB both projected and concealed certain forms of resistance to

---

[65] G. Hosking, *Rulers and Victims: The Russians in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), 329.
[66] Active resistance occurred in the Stalinist USSR with peasant revolts common during the early years of collectivisation. Viola, 'Popular Resistance', 69-102.

Soviet authority: encumbered by the questions asked and standardised forms of classifying 'dissent', they do not reflect accurately the motivations and beliefs which underpinned non-conformist views about the outer empire. The term 'bourgeois nationalists' was particularly problematic. While it probably did reflect the continuing popularity of 'anti-Soviet' nationalism among some citizens, it also appears to have become a catchall phrase to classify any 'incorrect' views and attitudes adopted by individuals who had been convicted for 'nationalist' crimes in the past. Equally, the widespread use of the label 'bourgeois nationalists' may well signify the officials' own prejudice against certain groups of citizens, including members of ethnic minorities, former activists of Ukrainian nationalist movements, and the faithful of the illegal Greek Catholic church. Still, numerous KGB reports about popular reactions to disturbances in the outer empire strongly suggest that some Soviet citizens expressed support for East European 'uprisings', articulating ideas which they conceived of as 'national resistance' in such various contexts as conversations with friends and colleagues, private and anonymous letters, encounters with foreign tourists, and illegal pamphlets.

Similarly, 'hooliganism' was an ambiguous category originating in the early twentieth century and frequently used to classify crime in the 1920s and the 1930s, and it became increasingly popular after 1956.[67] A formal crime, hooliganism covered behaviours ranging from using foul language to knife fighting. As Brian LaPierre demonstrates, it also became 'a flexible catchall category that could be ratcheted up or watered down to fit any occasion or action no matter how small or non-serious'.[68] As a result, '[p]etty hooliganism was not only used to make debatable and borderline behaviours deviant …, [but] could also be used to transform major crimes into minor offenses'.[69] It is therefore conceivable that the term 'hooliganism', though sometimes used in reference to unacceptable behaviours allegedly evoked by political crises in Eastern Europe, denoted anti-social behaviour which militia officers and law-makers sought to categorise as a crime but which was not necessarily ideological in nature. It is also possible, however, that some references to 'hooliganism' masked cases of a more principled opposition to Soviet policy. More

---

[67] Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 1-4, 280-281; N.B. Lebina, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' sovetskogo goroda: normy i anomalii, 1920-1930 gody* (St. Petersburg, 1999), 67-68.
[68] B. LaPierre, 'Making Hooliganism on a Mass Scale: The Campaign Against Petty Hooliganism in the Soviet Union, 1956-1964', *Cahiers du monde russe* 47:1-2 (2006), 349-351.
[69] LaPierre, 'Making Hooliganism', 360.

broadly, it seems that hooliganism was employed to describe individuals who disrupted social harmony and thus threatened to undermine the official vision of a 'united Soviet community'.[70] Whereas it was used in the 1920s 'to define the "respectable" proletarian worker and to stigmatise disruptive and non-productive behaviours',[71] the term was often linked in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev era to alcoholism and domestic violence, turning the story of hooliganism into a 'story of negotiating the boundary between the public and the private'.[72] Indeed, my sources do not refer to the kind of 'hooligan uprisings' and 'mass hooliganism' described by Vladimir Kozlov,[73] but rather to examples of individual misdemeanour which were deemed to be a matter of 'public' concern to the extent that they disrupted the harmony of Soviet society. Cases of hooliganism described in my sources included drunken outbursts in which individuals criticised Soviet policy, fist-fights, as well as the destruction of state insignia and other instances of vandalism.

Apart from fuelling some 'anti-Soviet' views and hooligan behaviour, perceptions of Eastern Europe inspired many residents of the USSR to articulate opinions about the benefits and dangers of reform in Soviet-style regimes. In 1956 and, to a lesser extent, in 1968, the 'near abroad' provided a kind of 'external commentary' on Soviet discourse, precisely that which Yurchak argues disappeared with the death of Stalin. Periods of unrest in the satellite states exposed residents of Ukraine to conflicting ideas about how Soviet-style regimes should operate, compelling people to take a stance on divergent interpretations of socialist ideology. Despite Yurchak's assertion that people did not really care about the meaning of ideological slogans,[74] many citizens who spoke in public rallied behind varying visions of 'socialism' and criticised the authorities for their failure to define a clear 'Soviet' stance on important events in the socialist bloc. Meanwhile, senior Party apparatchiks were

---

[70] In contrast, Joan Neuberger's study of the late Tsarist era suggests that hooliganism was a cultural construct which expressed popular notions of socially unacceptable conduct, turning into 'an evocative symbol of social disintegration and cultural differences and decay'. See Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 4.

[71] Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 280. See also Lebina, *Povsednevnaia zhizn'*, 63.

[72] B. LaPierre, 'Private Matters or Public Crimes: The Rise of Domestic Hooliganism in the Soviet Union, 1939-1966' in Lewis H. Siegelbaum (ed.), *Borders of Socialism: Private Spheres of Soviet Russia* (New York, 2006); P. Solomon, *Soviet Criminologists and Criminal Policy: Specialists in Policy Making* (London, 1978), 81-82.

[73] Kozlov claims that these uprisings resulted in large-scale destruction and casualties among state officials in the late 1950s and the early 1960s. Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings*, 11, 30.

[74] A. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006), 14.

obsessed about the need to establish a clear and coherent narrative to explain why crises took place in Soviet-style regimes.

Eventually, however, the ritualisation of public rhetoric undermined the position of the people's democracies as a laboratory of ideas and policies. Between the mid-1950s and the mid-1980s, and particularly after the Prague Spring of 1968, Ukraine's inhabitants increasingly repeated officially approved slogans about the outer empire in various public forums. Indeed, by the early 1980s, party activists involved numerous inhabitants in ceremonial affirmations of Soviet superiority in Eastern Europe, which, at least in public, discouraged residents from discussing the example of foreign developments as an 'external commentary' on socialism. During the rise and fall of Solidarity, most inhabitants of Ukraine whose views were registered described foreign 'deviations' from the Soviet model as a sign of anti-Soviet nationalism.

As Soviet narratives about the inherent superiority of the USSR and its citizens gained ground at the height of the Czechoslovak crisis of 1968, a rising number of citizens went to great lengths to manifest their support for this vision of the world, but also paid little attention to the literal meaning of the words and slogans they used. Permitting individuals to establish their credentials as reliable Soviet citizens, the ability to stage consent enabled them to claim privileges in return, and sometimes even emboldened people to criticise Soviet authorities. In this sense, it was the rising importance of the 'national' in Soviet portrayals of the outer empire which allowed many inhabitants of Ukraine to act as, in Yurchak's term, *svoi*.

Although citizens did not openly question the superiority of Soviet practices over the unstable states and nations of Eastern Europe, or indeed deny that excessive 'liberalisation' weakened the Soviet camp, they nonetheless made diverse and even contradictory statements in public. The imaginary Eastern Europe functioned much like Yurchak's 'imaginary West', providing a Soviet 'internal elsewhere': just as it was possible – depending on one's perspective and purpose – to represent the wearing of jeans as 'bad cosmopolitanism' or 'good internationalism',[75] inhabitants of the USSR could also speak about economic complaints as legitimate demands voiced by people who worked hard for the benefit of their 'socialist brothers' abroad

---

[75] Yurchak, *Everything*, 164.

or panic-mongering which exposed the population to harmful influences from Eastern Europe. Similarly, residents could portray Ukrainian cultural autonomy as vital protection against Polish expansionism or as a nationalist deviation which played into the hands of backward forces in the outer empire. As a result, the act of speaking or behaving in a particular way mattered more than what was actually said, as citizens who staged consent could give a different spin to the same formulaic slogans about the outer empire.

Popular notions of 'legitimate' and 'hostile' views, as well as the imagined boundaries of permitted debate emerged from complex interactions between top state and Party apparatchiks who defined the 'official' line on the outer empire, journalists, censors, and agitators who interpreted instructions from the top, and individual citizens who drew on various sources of news about the satellite states. Overarching notions of conformity and dissent are therefore of limited usefulness in defining the range of views which citizens articulated in various public and private contexts. In order to understand the mechanics governing Soviet popular opinion about the outer empire, the historian should rather explore how citizens construed both the meaning of and their relationship to official rhetoric.

c) Popular Opinion and Sources

My sources reveal attempts by the state to shape opinion, as well as popular responses to events and developments in Eastern Europe. In order to analyse the evolution of official portrayals of the outer empire, I have examined not only newspaper reports, but also correspondence between party officials in Moscow, Kyiv, and oblast centres, journalists and agitators, and local activists of the Party and Soviet friendship societies with foreign countries. This archival paper trail allows me to trace the complex dynamics which shaped the nature of agitation meetings devoted to foreign affairs, mass media depictions of Eastern Europe, and international travel within the socialist camp. Furthermore, reports compiled by Glavlit officials and local Party apparatchiks offer an insight into the mechanics of information control in the USSR, exposing inefficiencies of the censorship machine, concerns about the popularity of foreign mass media, and the spread of samizdat publications in Ukraine.

To explore the range of popular opinion, this thesis has had to rely largely on reported opinion. With the exception of a few samizdat documents, which reflected the first-person views of Soviet dissidents and, at times, their assessment of what the broader public thought, I have relied on official Party and KGB sources to gauge how broader segments of the population reacted to events in Eastern Europe. The most important documents are informational reports (often labelled *informatsiia*, *spravka*, *dovidka*, *zapiska* or *zapyska*) compiled for obkom officials and senior Party bureaucrats at the CPSU and CPU Central Committees. Their authors ranged from heads of primary party organisations, through raikom and gorkom bureaucrats, to obkom leaders and first secretaries of the CPU. The stated aim of such reports was to assess popular reactions to major events and developments in the Soviet bloc in the regions of Ukraine and, while this was not always made explicitly clear, to judge the effectiveness of agitation work and propaganda. Documents compiled at different levels of the Party hierarchy naturally varied in the amount of detail they provided, but sources signed by senior apparatchiks did not seem to alter the general tone and conclusions of lower-level reports. As a rule, Party documents defined the scope and nature of 'correct', 'incorrect' and 'hostile' views voiced during primary party meetings and official agitation gatherings, citing a few participants word-for-word as well as providing a list of questions asked. Moreover, I have examined dozens of KGB surveillance reports, most of which were produced by senior officers for the use of obkom secretaries and apparatchiks at the CPSU and CPU Central Committees. Based on the small number of published KGB sources concerning popular reactions to the Prague Spring in Ukraine, it appears that these documents did not differ in content and format from the summaries produced for internal KGB use.[76] Surveillance reports normally described the results of KGB work in a particular geographical region, citing a handful of individuals verbatim in order to illustrate the nature of 'hostile' and 'incorrect' attitudes. Other important sources for my analysis are compilations (*svodki*) of readers' letters that newspaper editors sent to top CPSU officials, in which they summarised the content of both signed and anonymous letters received from readers. They normally included extracts of letters which the officials deemed most significant or interesting.

---

[76] O. Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna" u dokumentakh Galuzevoho derzhavnoho arkivu Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008).

Because I rely on official sources to gauge popular opinion, the picture of what people said about Eastern Europe may be distorted by the Soviet apparatchiks' own prejudices and vested institutional interests. This is especially problematic because my sources do not explain who commissioned surveillance reports or clarify what use was made of them. As Terry Martin argues, the KGB often focused on monitoring those people who had already been considered suspicious.[77] Consequently, their reports may well construct certain groups and individuals as 'hostile'. This problem is partly alleviated by the fact that the KGB also made attempts to assess the spread of 'hostile' and 'incorrect' opinions, and consequently outlined a whole range of attitudes expressed by seemingly random individuals in various public sites. Still, as Sarah Davies suggests, it is conceivable that secret police reports devoted disproportionate attention to opinions that the regime considered problematic, while Party reports may have hidden problems that the bureaucrats encountered in their areas of jurisdiction.[78] Moreover, Soviet apparatchiks may have assigned official categories to an otherwise broader range of views, creating a false impression of uniformity and conformity.

Furthermore, though some official sources never make this clear, it appears that most reported statements were expressed in such public forums as official agitation meetings, letters, informal discussions between friends and colleagues at work, as well as conversations and brawls at railway stations and market places. In this sense, the popular opinion analysed in this thesis was 'public', and people quite possibly spoke in different ways in the privacy of their homes, where they were unlikely to be overheard by Soviet officials.[79] Vladimir Kozlov's study of mass disturbances in the USSR shows that there was a growing rift between Soviet citizens' public, 'conformist' personae and their private selves after the early 1960s, which he links to a progressive loss of faith in the Soviet project. Nevertheless, people still recognised that 'friendship with the state' could be an 'extraordinarily profitable occupation',

---

[77] This refers to Terry Martin's unpublished work cited in S. Fitzpatrick, 'Popular Opinion in Russia under Pre-war Stalinism' in Corner, *Popular Opinion*, 20.

[78] Davies, *Popular Opinion*, 9.

[79] Cynthia Hooper suggests that, by the Brezhnev era, the state sanctioned a separate 'private' sphere, with Soviet romantic comedies mocking overzealous party activists who tried to interfere in people's family lives. C. Hooper, 'Terror of Intimacy: Family Politics in the 1930s Soviet Union' in C. Kiaer and E. Naiman (eds), *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia: Taking the Revolution Inside* (Bloomington, 2006), 83.

even if they no longer found it meaningful to express their grievances and concerns in public by invoking socialist slogans as they had before.[80]

Despite these limitations, official reports reveal particular patterns of response to events in Eastern Europe. Opinions voiced in public at times of East European crises in 1956 and 1968 reflected a continuing struggle to make sense of socialist ideas and to understand what it meant to be Soviet (as opposed to Czech, Hungarian, Polish or Slovak). Reports from public gatherings compiled by regional party leaders, as well as information about citizens' attitudes towards reform and innovation in the outer empire provided by KGB officials, imposed official categories of 'correct', 'mistaken' and 'hostile' opinions on what was probably a more diverse range of views. Nevertheless, combined with *samizdat* materials, they suggest that citizens adopted diverse attitudes towards ideas of reform and innovation. Official sources for subsequent years become formulaic and often frustratingly boring, as they mostly described how citizens manifested their support for the 'correct' vision of Eastern Europe. While these reports do not allow the historian to assess levels of genuine belief, they nevertheless expose complex social dynamics in Soviet Ukraine. They outline the ways in which citizens described the role of various social, regional and national groups in strengthening Soviet influences in Eastern Europe, as well as specifying who got to speak about and travel to Eastern Europe. In this way, they show which categories of citizens were most successful at manifesting the 'correct' point of view, improving thereby their social standing in the USSR and claiming material benefits and other perks from the Soviet state.

---

[80] Kozlov shows that mass disturbances became increasingly politicised in the early 1960s, turning 'spontaneous urban riots' into 'anti-Soviet uprisings'. Paradoxically, this was possible to the extent that participants in such unrests believed in communist ideology and thought that the Soviet state was forward looking: after all, they hoped to improve the Soviet system. By contrast, under Brezhnev's rule, as rebelling under the old banners no longer made sense, the regime was encouraged to enter 'a path of economically unsound but pleasing handouts to the basic social groups in Soviet society, which encouraged citizens to reaffirm their loyalty to the Soviet state in public (although Kozlov admits this was a less effective policy outside Russia). Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings*, 154, 162, 174, 305. Paul Corner's analysis of popular opinion in totalitarian regimes suggests some possible reasons why citizens in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev era may have grown disillusioned with the Soviet system: not only did people judge the regime on the basis of the results that it delivered rather than promises of a better future, but the relative permeability of borders also allowed competing ideologies to spread among the population. P. Corner, 'Introduction' in Corner, *Popular Opinion*, 8-10.

II. <u>Soviet Patriotisms</u>

The few existing studies of Soviet interactions with Eastern Europe concentrate on non-conformist views about East European unrest, which fuelled radical demands for 'liberalisation' in the USSR. Historians mostly focus on dissident reactions to the Prague Spring in 1968, showing that some brave Soviet citizens articulated unadulterated support for Dubcek's vision of 'reform socialism', despite the increasingly repressive policy of the Soviet state. Mark Kramer points out that 'leading proponents of democratic change such as Andrei Sakharov publicly hailed the Prague Spring and called on the Soviet leadership to halt its pressure against Czechoslovakia'; Kramer also underlines that some Soviet university students contemplated the possibility of replicating Czechoslovak experiences in the USSR.[81] Likewise, Volodymyr Dmytruk demonstrates that a surprisingly large contingent of the Soviet Ukrainian population criticised the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, which leads him to the rather sweeping conclusion that 'Ukraine was not silent'.[82]

While these scholars show that popular opinion about Eastern Europe was diverse, providing a plethora of fascinating examples, they also perpetuate a false dichotomy between conformity and dissent. They do not analyse why citizens expressed support for foreign reforms or which aspects of change they hoped to imitate in the USSR. Although Dmytruk states that the authorities distinguished between 'hostile' views and 'misunderstandings' about the Prague Spring in 1968, he does not explore the claims inherent in these different non-conformist views.[83] This approach also prevents historians from examining the spread of 'unorthodox' opinions, which may even create the misleading impression that criticism of Soviet policies in Eastern Europe and sympathy towards dissidents and reformists in the satellite states were the dominant views in Soviet Ukraine. Indeed, some recent studies rely very heavily on KGB reports about popular reactions to foreign crises, thus inevitably highlighting the views which the authorities considered

---

[81] M. Kramer, 'The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine' in Carol Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker (eds.), *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge, 1998), 142-143. Kramer also writes about protests against the invasion of Hungary in 1956. M. Kramer, 'Soviet Policy during the Polish and Hungarian Crises of 1956: Reassessments and New Findings', *Journal of Contemporary History* 33:2 (1998), 196.

[82] V. Dmytruk, *Ukraina ne movchala: Reaktsiia ukrains'koho suspil'stva na podii 1968 roku v Chekhoslovachchyni* (Kyiv, 2004).

[83] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 38.

problematic.[84]

In fact, however, discussions surrounding East European unrest fuelled the development of more complex attitudes towards the Soviet state and the prospects of reform. Opinions about events and developments in the satellite states cannot be classified as simply 'pro-' or 'anti-Soviet'. Rather, they reflected and shaped notions of how Soviet-style regimes should work. Following Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the Twentieth Party Congress, Soviet citizens were particularly keen to assess the claims of reformist forces in the outer empire in late 1956. Excited and apprehensive about the prospect of change in the socialist camp, residents of Ukraine voiced radically different opinions about Gomulka's policies in Poland, as well as reflecting upon the underlying problems which had led to the outbreak of violence in Hungary. Commenting on the dramatic events abroad as a consequence of Khrushchev's 'liberalisation', they sought not only to gauge the nature and limits of 'permissible' reform, but also to assess Moscow's new policies. Apart from illegal pamphlets and informal conversations with friends and colleagues, citizens discussed the need for and the dangers of reform in Soviet-style regimes during primary party cell meetings and agitation gatherings for non-party members.

Subsequently, during the late 1950s and the 1960s, the authorities promoted more rigid ways of describing reform and innovation in the outer empire. CPSU apparatchiks exerted pressure on party activists, artists, writers, academics, educated professionals and leading workers to compile official reports and write newspaper articles about their travels in the socialist camp. As a result, members of these groups scrutinised minor technical innovations in industry and farming, analysed how East European regimes promoted culture and organised party work, and described the functioning of the mass media and universities in the Soviet bloc. Kenneth Farmer claims that Ukrainian intellectuals who traveled to Eastern Europe in the 1950s and the 1960s 'were undoubtedly influenced by the more open and experimental

---

[84] O. Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi v Ukraini u khodi chekhoslovats'koi kryzy 1968 roku za donesenniamy radians'kykh spetssluzhb', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008); O. Bazhan, 'Zovnishn'o-politychni aktsii SRSR u 50-80-ti rr. ta ix vplyv na rozvytok opozytsiinoho rukhu v Ukraini', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000); V. Dmytruk, 'Nelehal'na informatsiina merezha v Chekhoslovachchyni ta ii vplyv na formuvannia opozytsiinykh nastroiv v Ukraini (kinets 60x – pochatok 70-x rr.), *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000); V. Dmytruk, '"Praz'ka vesna" i Ukraina', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008).

atmosphere that prevailed there, and brought these influences back with them'.[85] However, while citizens did at times suggest that some foreign ideas could be incorporated in the USSR itself, it seems that most inhabitants of Ukraine who described Eastern Europe in public were more critical of innovative, non-Soviet practices embraced by foreign journalists, artists, engineers, academics and party leaders. They tended to stress that well-established Soviet ways were superior to new ideas emerging from the satellite states, criticising in particular the 'cultural experimentation' and 'unorthodox' views propagated in East European mass media. Whether such views represented people's 'genuine beliefs' cannot be established, their function was to promote in public a general suspicion of reform and innovation.

In 1968, the Prague Spring compelled a larger number of Soviet citizens to define clearly the difference between 'legitimate' and 'illegal' attitudes towards reform. In this sense, the Czechoslovak crisis constituted a crucial breaking point in the development of popular notions of Sovietness. To be sure, in commenting on the reforms pursued by Czechoslovak communist leaders, some residents of Ukraine engaged in debates with friends and colleagues, wrote anonymous letters to party bureaucrats, corresponded with Czechoslovak citizens, and produced *samizdat* publications. However, the authorities cracked down on dissent and vigorously engaged a large number of Ukraine's residents in very formulaic agitation gatherings, during which speakers condemned Dubcek's policies, corrected 'mistaken' views about the unfolding developments, and rejected alternative visions of socialism as propagated by East European mass media and Soviet dissidents. CPSU leaders thus sought to define and promulgate a properly 'Soviet' outlook on political, social, and economic questions, which they contrasted with 'foreign' ideological diversions. As Jeremi Suri shows, this was especially important because the authorities, while wary of allowing the reformist impulses from Czechoslovakia to fuel resistance to Soviet authority, wanted to avoid jeopardising the 'modernising and reforming claims of "developed socialism"'.[86] Condemning the excesses of Dubcek's reformism, including the relaxation of censorship and intra-party democracy, Brezhnev still wanted citizens to believe that gradual economic reform and limited intellectual and cultural openings could reinvigorate decaying socialist

---

[85] Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 82.
[86] J. Suri, 'The Promise and Failure of "Developed Socialism": The Soviet 'Thaw' and the Crucible of the Prague Spring, 1964–1972', *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006), 156.

institutions without undermining strong state control over society.[87] Therefore, the authorities wanted inhabitants of Ukraine to distinguish between Soviet 'gradualism' and Czechoslovak ideological diversions.

Citizens were expected to express pride in the USSR's achievements all the while distancing themselves from 'unreliable' foreigners in Eastern Europe. In this way, popular reactions to events in Eastern Europe were supposed to be imbued with a sense of Soviet patriotism. Notions of Soviet patriotism can be traced back to the 1930s. As Terry Martin argues, the concept was then 'most frequently used in discussions of the need to resist potential foreign aggression'.[88] The regime demanded that citizens manifest loyalty to their 'socialist motherland' in word and in deed, both through hard work and bravery in battle.[89] After the war, in Benjamin Tromly's words, patriotism 'served functions that nationalism has performed at other places and times', providing a point for self-identification and shaping political and social conflicts.[90] Partly because of Cold War tensions and partly because inhabitants of the USSR contrasted their country with other nominally 'socialist' states, 'socialism' was no longer a sufficient marker of loyalty to the system but merely one aspect of being Soviet. This made 'Sovietness' and 'Soviet patriotism' into central categories for identity formation, as many people sought to define what made Soviet citizens distinct from inhabitants of other countries. Playing on Stephen Kotkin's notion of 'speaking Bolshevik', I suggest here that citizens also learnt to 'speak Soviet': whereas before the war it had been important to behave 'as if one believed' in socialist slogans, people who sought to prove their loyalty to the system after 1945 found it even more important to voice support for the Soviet state and its foreign policy.[91] Indeed, it seems plausible that, like the East German intellectuals described by Thomas Lindenberger, many Soviet citizens believed that their social and material status, professional careers and personal happiness were intimately linked to

---

[87] Suri, 'The Promise', 138, 148, 150-153.

[88] T. Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939* (Ithaca, 2001), 450.

[89] D. Hoffmann, 'Was There a Great Retreat from Soviet Socialism?' *Kritika* 5:4 (2004), 653.

[90] B. Tromly, 'Soviet Patriotism and its Discontents among Higher Education Students in Khrushchev-Era Russia and Ukraine', *Nationalities Papers* 37:3 (2009), 300; Sheila Fitzpatrick further demonstrates that, after the war, suspicions of 'national' treason and contacts with foreigners replaced suspicions of class disloyalty, turning the Soviet community into a crucial source of identity making. Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off*, 24.

[91] Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, 220.

the vicissitudes and survival of their country.[92]

Yet official and popular views of patriotism were not necessarily the same. While Tromly argues that official notions of Soviet patriotism stressed the need for people to rally behind the state to protect Soviet achievements from external enemies,[93] popular understandings of what it meant to be a Soviet patriot in the post-war period were more diverse. Some people thus appropriated the idea of patriotism and Sovietness to portray themselves as autonomous citizens who deserved respect and recognition for their contribution to the 'motherland' and who consequently had the right to judge the authorities as representatives of an imagined 'Soviet people'. As Ethan Pollock suggests, war veterans in particular spoke of their dedication to the Soviet homeland as distinct from loyalty to 'communism', Stalin or the Party.[94] Moreover, as Soviet identities were often defined in relation (and sometimes in opposition) to the satellite states, important aspects of patriotism became much less Russocentric than before the war.[95] Official narratives stressed, for example, the contribution that the western republics had made to protecting the Soviet community from East European nationalisms and strengthening Soviet power throughout the region.

Commenting on events and developments in Eastern Europe, many citizens argued about the future of the USSR and the meaning of Soviet patriotism.[96] During the 1950s and the 1960s, residents of Ukraine often debated the dangers and benefits of reform in Soviet-style regimes. While some citizens argued that the countries of the socialist camp needed to change, many more condemned reformist ideas and suggested that the Soviet state suppress deviations from well-established political, economic and social practices, both at home and abroad. I have broadly categorised these views as 'reformist patriotism' and 'conservative patriotism'. Far from denoting coherent sets of attitudes, these terms provide useful ideal types for

---

[92] T. Lindenberger, 'Tacit Minimal Consensus: The Always Precarious East German Dictatorship' in Corner, *Popular Opinion*, 210-211
[93] Tromly, 'Soviet Patriotism', 302.
[94] E. Pollock, '"Real Men Go to the Bania": Postwar Soviet Masculinities and the Bathhouse', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 11:1 (2010), 52.
[95] Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire*, 452.
[96] Soviet patriotism became an increasingly prominent category in official Soviet rhetoric, especially under Brezhnev. D. Epstein, 'Soviet Patriotism: 1985-1991' in E. Jahn (ed.), *Nationalism in Late and Post-Communist Europe. Volume 1: The Failed Nationalism of the Multinational and Partial National States* (Nomos, 2008), 214; Tromly, 'Soviet Patriotism', 299.

classifying a very diverse set of opinions expressed in different contexts and settings. They do not refer to any clear social divisions in Soviet Ukraine, as it is conceivable that individuals voiced multiple, perhaps even contradictory views, both over time and in different contexts. In other words, in writing about conservative and reformist patriotism, I do not mean to imply that there were easily identifiable conservative and reformist patriots, though some individuals likely did conform more closely to the one or the other ideal type.

Central to both conservative and reformist patriotisms were various understandings of the USSR's role as the centre of the socialist camp. In expressing ideas of conservative patriotism, citizens generally contrasted the peaceful and 'cultured' Soviet people to more unreliable and backward foreigners in other socialist states. They articulated a sense of 'imperial' pride by insisting that Moscow should at all costs preserve its hegemony in Eastern Europe, cracking down on deviations from the well-established Soviet model. Conversely, reformist patriotism generally held that excessive interference in the domestic affairs of other countries prevented CPSU leaders from implementing far-reaching reform at home, albeit within the framework of Soviet socialism. Reformist patriotism reflected a sense of 'imperial' responsibility: its proponents first highlighted that the USSR should guide the satellite states towards 'democratisation', and then increasingly maintained that the Kremlin must prove more tolerant of and responsive to progressive ideas emanating from the satellite states.

Reformist patriotism was at its peak in 1956, when some university students and members of the creative intelligentsia articulated support for Wladyslaw Gomulka's reforms in Poland and, to a lesser extent, condemned Soviet intervention in Hungary. Many seemed to believe that Khrushchev's 'liberalisation' should be taken further, both in the USSR and in the outer empire. Yet proponents of reformist patriotism did not develop a common outlook on reform in 1956. Their claims ranged from relatively mild demands for more cultural freedom, through more systemic complaints against censorship, to very radical statements condemning the system of collective farming (the last were largely in response to the reversal of the collectivization of agriculture in Poland). In subsequent years, as the space for the articulation of critical views grew narrower, expressions of reformist opinions became increasingly rare, but also more coherent and concentrated in *samizdat*. In

effect, much of reformist patriotism was excluded into the political wilderness of outright dissidence. Commenting on Dubcek's policies in 1968, a small number of citizens thus complained about repressive policies of the Soviet state at home and abroad, calling for open debate and freedom of information. These demands were underpinned by concerns about the lack of intra-party democracy, censorship, and national tensions in Soviet Ukraine. Even as such proponents of reformist patriotism gradually developed a 'dissident' consciousness, therefore, and were well aware that the authorities would persecute their ideas and actions, some still remained committed to preserving the Soviet state and its institutions. For this reason, I include these views within the category of reformist patriotism. By contrast, after 1968, a larger proportion of dissidents concluded that the system as a whole was unreformable and articulations of reformist patriotism all but disappeared after Brezhnev's crackdown on dissent in the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

The relative scarcity of reports concerning reformist views may partly be attributed to the fact that citizens had every reason to fear accusations of 'treason' and reprisals should they call for a more tolerant policy towards the 'forces of change'. However, positive perceptions of reform were clearly overshadowed by conservative concerns. A growing number of Ukraine's inhabitants, party activists and war veterans prominent among them, voiced support for the Kremlin's repressive measures in the outer empire. As advocates of conservative patriotism, they wanted Moscow to maintain control over the satellite states, condemning foreign deviations from the Soviet model of socialism. Dmitry Epstein suggests that these attitudes were particularly widespread among the *nomenklatura*, who saw Soviet patriotism as a 'willingness to act in defence of the country', the definition of which they extended to the entire Warsaw Pact with the exception of Romania.[97] Seweryn Bialer goes even further as he argues that 'the primary dimension of the Soviet relationship with Eastern Europe [was] the legitimisation of Soviet internal rule', and claims that the USSR's domination of the socialist camp was popular

---

[97] Epstein, 'Soviet Patriotism', 208-210. Similarly, Bonin argues that 'the territory that was the object of Soviet patriotism cannot be clearly demarcated; for some, it extended well beyond the actual state borders. This was surely due to the particularly unclear significance of state borders in Russia no less than to an awareness of a trans-national socialist commonwealth of states'. P. Bonin, 'Failures Compared: The State Nationalisms of Non-National States in Socialist Europe' in Jahn, *Nationalism in Late and Post-Communist Europe. Volume 1*, 194.

among the population.[98] Indeed, while articulations of support for Soviet foreign policy no doubt reflected top-down pressures, many Soviet citizens also seemed to harbour an emotional attachment to the idea of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe. Somewhat unexpectedly from the authorities' point of view, however, conservative concerns about preserving Soviet influences abroad sometimes even fuelled criticism of Moscow's foreign policy. As war veterans underlined that they had personally contributed towards the liberation of the people's democracies from Nazi occupation, and other citizens often claimed that East Europeans should be grateful to the USSR for economic subsidies and continued protection from 'west German revanchism', for example, they criticised the authorities for what they perceived as excessive 'leniency' vis-à-vis 'anti-Soviet', 'nationalist' and 'counterrevolutionary' forces abroad. These opinions exposed a sense of superiority that many inhabitants of Ukraine felt towards foreigners from the satellite states, but also popular fear of war and instability: residents often stressed that the USSR must exert strong influences in Eastern Europe in order to maintain peace in the region.

The spectre of instability underpinned conservative distrust of reform in the USSR, too. Many citizens feared the outbreak of war and the spill-over of unrest from the outer empire into the USSR, which inspired criticism of 'liberalisation' in general, particularly in late 1956. Most inhabitants of the republic whose views about Eastern Europe were recorded suggested that Soviet authorities should reject the Polish and Hungarian trajectory of reform, instead maintaining strong hierarchical control within the CPSU and in society as a whole in order to assure economic stability and security. They also defended the system of censorship and, at times, articulated a sense of nostalgia for Stalin's strong rule. The Prague Spring caused less alarm and controversy, but, as Amir Weiner demonstrates for the western borderlands, prominent members of Ukrainian society (and KGB officers in particular) still feared that 'de-Stalinisation' would encourage 'slanderous and hooligan' elements to turn against the Soviet elite, which was what they believed to have happened in Czechoslovakia.[99] This encouraged some very impassioned denunciations of Dubcek's reforms from among the population of Ukraine.

---

[98] S. Bialer, 'The Solidarity and the Soviet Union' in Steve Reiquam (ed.), *Solidarity* and *Poland: Impacts East and West* (Washington, D.C., 1988), 22.
[99] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 178.

Moreover, the military intervention in Czechoslovakia made inhabitants of Ukraine very reluctant to speak about the possibility of reforming socialist regimes. This was because, as Jeremi Suri suggests, few Soviet citizens took seriously the promise of internal reforms in the socialist camp, with the Prague Spring undermining 'the claims of "developed socialism"'.[100] Because numerous citizens were afraid of being branded 'hostile' or 'wrong' in their assessment of Dubcek's policies, they condemned 'reform socialism' in its entirety. They spoke of 'democratisation', relaxation of censorship, and the opening of borders as inherently 'non-Soviet', rallying thereby behind a conservative vision of Sovietness. It is difficult to assess the extent to which residents of Ukraine believed what they said during the highly formulaic agitation meetings, or indeed what they thought whilst 'going through the motions' and listening silently to aggressive speeches about Czechoslovak deviations from the Soviet model. However, it appears that the bulk of Ukraine's inhabitants chose to manifest their loyalty to the CPSU and the Soviet state, all the while accepting that the USSR was unreformable.

As proponents of conservative and reformist patriotism argued about the directions in which the USSR should steer the socialist camp, they also reflected more broadly upon Soviet values and practices. Comparing the USSR to other states and nations in Eastern Europe, they defined Sovietness itself in a national framework and consequently retained a significant degree of loyalty towards the Soviet state. They sought to pursue their goals within existing state structures and in the name of a 'Soviet people'. For this reason, the notion of patriotism is itself central to this thesis: citizens cared about the future of their homeland and, for this very reason, sometimes asserted their right and their duty to criticise the authorities.

III. The New 'Big Deal'

As the authorities stifled public debates about the need to reform Soviet-style regimes, residents learned that Soviet leaders expected them to condemn foreign reforms and voice support for continuing Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe, particularly during the Czechoslovak crisis of 1968. With citizens increasingly engaged in practices of staging consent to display these 'correct' opinions,

---

[100] Suri, 'The Promise', 157-158.

conservative patriotism became the primary 'legitimate' standpoint that people invoked to manifest their loyalty to the CPSU and the Soviet state. Articulations of conservative patriotism acquired thereby a strong performative role but at a noteworthy cost: even as they allowed citizens to demonstrate their patriotic credentials, they also emboldened them to demand perks and privileges from the authorities in return. Consequently, staging consent had a major impact on the making of social identities in Ukraine, helping to give rise to a new 'big deal' between the regime and what I call the Soviet 'middle class', but also encouraging some citizens to demand that the big deal be extended to Soviet society as a whole.

During the late Stalin period, Vera Dunham argues, the authorities struck a 'big deal' with the educated strata of Soviet society: the regime effectively created a 'middle class' by bestowing material incentives on certain groups of specialists in return for their political conformism, 'loyalty to the leader, unequivocal nationalism, reliable hard work, and professionalism'.[101] While Dunham suggests that it was the devastation of the Great Patriotic War that pushed the authorities to pamper productive and skilful individuals,[102] effectively building on the system established in the 1930s of awarding privileges to the 'new elite',[103] citizens' increasing exposure to developments in Eastern Europe after the death of Stalin changed the mechanics governing the big deal. There was now a large and growing group of citizens who claimed that they made a special contribution to strengthening Soviet influences in the outer empire. They thus portrayed themselves as superior both to foreigners in the satellite states and to 'average' inhabitants of the USSR. As more citizens participated in reproducing canonical depictions of the socialist camp, membership in this middle class was progressively extended. In this way, the post-Stalin regime forged a new 'big deal' with a large number of citizens, who, by staging consent for the USSR's domination over Eastern Europe, claimed material rewards and other perks in return.

To be sure, using the term 'middle class' is inherently problematic in reference to the USSR. The post-Stalin middle class was not a class in the Marxist sense, for it had little to do with a relation to the means of production. Moreover, it was not an

---

[101] V. Dunham, *In Stalin's Time: Middleclass Values in Soviet Fiction* (Durham, 1990), 13-14, 17.
[102] Dunham claims that the leadership now valued skill, productivity and performance over ideological orthodoxy. Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 5.
[103] See Hoffmann, 'Was There a Great Retreat?'.

imagined community, as its members did not use any collective name to describe themselves and it is doubtful whether they developed any coherent group identity. The notion of middle class likewise does not correspond to the official Soviet tripartite division of society into workers, agricultural workers, and the intelligentsia. While many members of the middle class were indeed the Soviet intelligentsia, the post-Stalin elite was more heterogeneous than Sheila Fitzpatrick's generation of *vydvizhentsy* and considerably larger than Dunham's middle class of High Stalinism.[104] Apart from Party activists,[105] engineers, writers, and artists, the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe provided a new means to reward war veterans, workers with some managerial responsibilities (such as *brigadiry*), as well as citizens who received various official titles and state awards, such as 'shock workers' (*udarniki* or *udarnyky*).

Following Vera Dunham, therefore, I use the term middle class to refer to the 'embouregoisement of Soviet manners, values, and attitudes' which 'partly crosscuts differences of position, of occupation and of income and which is, therefore, somewhat amorphous and difficult to anchor in any one sharply defined social group'.[106] Dunham was primarily interested in fiction and representations, however, and it is clearly more difficult to define middle class in relation to real people and popular opinion. Nevertheless, there was an important social dimension to the growth of middle class in the post-war period. As Moshe Lewin points out, the expansion of Soviet bureaucracy, rising party membership, urbanisation, and the increasing number of Soviet citizens with secondary and higher education put pressure on the Soviet leaders to bridge the gap between citizens' growing aspirations and the still relatively primitive working conditions and quality of life.[107] The new big deal provided a means to mark and reward ambitious citizens, helping

---

[104] S. Fitzpatrick, 'Stalin and the Making of a New Elite, 1928-1939', *Slavic Review* 38:3 (1979), 377-402. Dunham argues that the concept of middle class excluded workers to the benefit of professional groups during high Stalinism. However, she also claims that, after 1953, the Big Deal facilitated 'the upward mobility of more and more people, a way out of the peasant or worker milieu and into the establishment'. Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 15, 244.

[105] The term encompassed members and candidate members of gorkoms, raikoms, obkoms, the CPU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee, as well as revision commissions.

[106] Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 4.

[107] M. Lewin, *The Soviet Century* (London, 2005), 320-321, 325.

to shape a middle class elite in a society where party membership in itself was no longer a sufficient indicator of status.[108]

At the same time, citizens aspiring to a 'special' status in Soviet society had to actively seek public recognition, and one key mechanism was staging consent. They thus participated in official delegations that visited the people's democracies and compiled official reports which highlighted their special contribution to strengthening Soviet influences in Eastern Europe. They also displayed their 'correct' opinions and attitudes and more general 'reliability' by speaking at public meetings, especially during the Prague Spring. Surprisingly, perhaps, the middle class was very prominent in the western borderlands, because local residents had more opportunities to manifest their contribution to 'helping' the satellite states than other citizens. In this sense, there was a significant performative dimension to the Soviet middle class.

Most importantly, perhaps, my notion of middle class refers to an 'activist' norm of socio-political identity: citizens aspiring to middle class status claimed to guide the rest of Soviet population and the outer empire on the path of progress. The term which comes closest to encapsulating the aspirational and elitist attributes of the middle class is *obshchestvennost'*,[109] which the 1958 Academy of Sciences dictionary defined as 'the advanced portion of society'. As Jeffrey Brooks argues for the 1930s, the Soviet *obshchestvennost'* 'did not in any sense approximate "a new class" or an actual social grouping', but was rather 'a fanciful construction that served … to express a wishful image of the body politic', with a range of figures from 'stakhanovites and minor officials to government leaders, who were united in the creative imagining of the politically active community itself, mediated by newspaper staffs'.[110] The post-war middle class was likewise an idealised propaganda image of the 'active public': the mass media and official reports described certain groups of citizens as key actors who strengthened Soviet influences in the socialist bloc, aiming thereby to provide a model of how all citizens should speak and behave. However, the protagonists of these propaganda campaigns came

---

[108]T.H. Rigby, 'Soviet Communist Party Membership under Brezhnev', *Soviet Studies* 28:3 (1976), 319-320, 322, 327, 330.

[109] However, the authors of Party reports which I have examined never used it, resorting instead to simply listing all the achievements and titles of the 'prominent' individuals who spoke about the satellite states or travelled to Eastern Europe.

[110] J. Brooks, 'Socialist Realism in Pravda: Read All About It!', *Slavic Review* 53:4 (1994), 986-987.

to resemble a class, not only because they boldly invoked their supposedly high level of 'advancement' to claim perks and privileges from Soviet state, but also because other citizens began to resent and challenge their elite status.

Whereas Dunham shows that the model middle class citizen of the late 1940s was encouraged to take pride in professional success, wealth and personal happiness, with neither the regime nor its citizens interested in ideology,[111] staging consent about Soviet policies in Eastern Europe projected in official rhetoric a different kind of elite. Residents claiming this privileged status still stressed their commitment to hard work, but they now suggested that they not only strove for personal prosperity, but also helped to maintain Soviet supremacy in Eastern Europe. As notions of status became intimately linked with a sense of pride in Soviet achievements abroad, people who wanted to be recognised as more reliable and privileged than 'ordinary' citizens – in other words, the aspirational middle class – also presented themselves as more ideologically committed, modest, and cultured than the 'frivolous' and 'unstable' East Europeans.

These norms and narratives shaped the nature of the claims asserted by the aspirational middle class through staging consent. On the socio-economic level, by manifesting their commitment to spreading Soviet influences abroad, many citizens sought improved access to consumer goods and perks associated with international travel. Moreover, professing to foster the 'correct' opinions and attitudes towards Eastern Europe among 'ordinary' citizens, members of the middle class often criticised Soviet mass media. They not only demanded better access to news and information for themselves, but they also pointed to gaps and inconsistencies in official coverage of international affairs, arguing that they could lead to the rise of malicious rumours and misunderstandings among 'ordinary' residents of Soviet Ukraine. These claims, therefore, had strong paternalistic undercurrents, all the while reflecting growing concerns about the potentially unstable 'masses'. Indeed, alarmed about the potential spill-over of unrest from Eastern Europe into the USSR, members of the aspirational middle class became increasingly aware of the need to control popular moods and attitudes.

---

[111] Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 17-18.

In order to integrate the 'masses' into the wider Soviet community, the authorities also created opportunities for more residents to stage consent and thereby to distance themselves from the people's democracies. The practices of staging consent evolved between 1968 and the early 1980s. Most inhabitants of Ukraine who participated in ritualised agitation meetings about the Prague Spring in 1968 and 1969 remained silent, manifesting thereby their loyalty to the state but also helping to perpetuate the impression that party activists and educated individuals who actually spoke during the gatherings constituted an 'elite'. This was largely because the speakers still needed to manifest a significant level of political skill as they rejected the claims of 'reform socialism'. In contrast, during the early 1980s, the authorities encouraged a larger number of Ukraine's inhabitants to speak about the Polish events. Commenting on the rise and fall of Solidarity during public gatherings, but also in informal conversations at workplaces, outside shops, and on public transport, many 'ordinary' citizens highlighted their distrust of 'anti-Soviet Poles'. Making references to national divisions in Eastern Europe, they presented themselves as full-fledged members of the Soviet community. In other words, by reproducing simplistic portrayals of national conflicts in Eastern Europe which had grown increasingly widespread under Brezhnev, a rising number of Ukraine's inhabitants sought to strengthen their social standing in the USSR. This reflected the growing ambitions of post-war Soviet society as described by Katerina Clark, who argues that most of the working population 'endeavoured to comport themselves as was deemed fit for a person of their standing' precisely because they 'sought to rise in the hierarchy of status and enjoy a higher standard of living'.[112] Creating opportunities for a large number of citizens to manifest the 'correct' point of view about the outer empire, the authorities inadvertently emboldened some blue-collar workers and collective farmers to challenge the elitist claims of the aspirational middle class and to demand that the new big deal be extended to Soviet society as a whole.

The egalitarian claims inherent in the mechanisms of staging consent further stimulated the rise of economic populism in Soviet Ukraine. After 1956, class returned as an 'operational category', legal changes 'reinforced long-standing patterns of shop-floor bargaining between workers and managers' and, as Christine Varga-Harris shows, people pursued 'individualistic aims' and demanded that

---

[112] K. Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Bloomington, 2000), 197.

'officials enter into dialogue with them and assist them, sometimes vividly illuminating the failings of the Soviet system'.[113] As these developments encouraged Soviet citizens to demand that the authorities assure a decent standard of living for the population, perceptions of events and developments in Eastern Europe helped to shape the scope and nature of such economic claims. In 1956, when numerous citizens feared the spill-over of unrest from the outer empire into the USSR itself, their material expectations of the state remained relatively modest. Inhabitants of Ukraine were primarily concerned about the need to maintain basic stability in the face of what seemed like an impending threat of war. Consequently, local officials managed to satisfy material demands of the population by improving the supply of basic food products and fuel: they thus proved the state's ability to maintain stability in the republic, restoring popular faith in conservative patriotism. Furthermore, in 1968, public debates about the Prague Spring actually made it easier for party activists to keep economic populism under control. The elite articulators of conservative patriotism who spoke during public agitation meetings claimed that Soviet people remained united during such a tumultuous period and underlined that the USSR was more economically advanced than Czechoslovakia. Consequently, staging consent did not permit inhabitants of Ukraine to articulate material expectations of the Soviet state: in fact, citizens who spoke in public about the Prague Spring condemned economic complaints among the population of Ukraine as a sign of 'anti-Soviet' attitudes.

Conversely, as many more people were able to claim the status of reliable citizens by staging consent during the Solidarity crisis in Poland, they articulated more systemic complaints about poor living standards. Highlighting their alienation from the foreigners in Poland, many residents of Ukraine condemned Soviet economic subsidies to the 'ungrateful Poles' and demanded that the authorities pay more attention to the economic needs of 'patriots' at home. Articulating the idea of Soviet supremacy in Eastern Europe, citizens conceded that they should work more efficiently to give a good example to their 'socialist brothers' abroad, but they also

---

[113] C. Varga-Harris, 'Forging Citizenship on the Home Front: Reviving the Socialist Contract and Constructing Soviet Identity during the Thaw' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 111; A. Weiner, 'Robust Revolution to Retiring Revolution: The Life Cycle of the Soviet Revolution, 1945-1968', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008), 224; D. Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and de-Stalinisation: The Consolidation of the Modern System of Soviet Production Relations, 1953-1964* (Cambridge, 1992), 232-233.

drove home the idea that they had earned the right to live well themselves. In that sense, by highlighting their commitment to conservative patriotism during the height of the Solidarity crisis, people located themselves within well-established social practices, which led the 'elites' and the 'masses' to renew the 'social contract'.[114] Afraid that labour unrest might spread from Poland into Ukraine, top CPSU leaders and party activists in the regions of Ukraine decreased work norms and made a more concerted effort to respond to the economic needs and demands of the population.[115]

Despite the ritualisation of public rhetoric and a major crackdown on dissent, Soviet patriotism remained a potent force during the Brezhnev era. By condemning East European diversions from the Soviet model of socialism and thus voicing ideas of conservative patriotism, citizens implicitly demanded that the authorities live up to their promises that the 'Soviet political and economic order was uniquely suited to create modern civilisation, replete with industry, a welfare state and a disciplined, educated, hygienic and otherwise "cultured" populace'.[116]

IV. National and Regional Identities

The evolution of conservative and reformist patriotism had further implications for national and regional identities in Ukraine. By constructing narratives about the USSR's relations with Eastern Europe, CPSU apparatchiks fuelled various ideas about the role that Ukraine would play in the USSR and the socialist camp as a whole. They thereby helped to facilitate differing expressions of Ukrainian national identity in the republic, to change popular perceptions of the western borderlands, and to alienate the republic's Hungarians, Jews and Poles.

The fact that Moscow allowed the satellite states to pursue their own 'roads to socialism' acquired a particular significance in Ukraine, for it encouraged republican leaders to raise in public the issue of Ukrainian rights.[117] When the 'attempt to

---

[114] The Soviet 'social contract' thesis states that the Soviet authorities tried to improve the population's material wellbeing to prevent citizens from taking up political issues and challenging the regime. Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract*, 19.

[115] Teague, *Solidarity*, 140; Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract*, 77.

[116] Tromly, 'Soviet Patriotism', 301-302.

[117] Republican state and party structures were crucial for the promotion of Ukrainian national identities. R. Kaiser, *The Geography of Nationalism in Russia and the USSR* (Princeton, 1994), 378. This became most pronounced after Stalin's death and, in Ukraine, manifested itself 'in the growing

reconcile the agendas of the CPU and the national intelligentsia reached its zenith during the tenure of Petro Shelest' in the 1960s, Party officials created various contexts in which residents of the republic could articulate Ukrainian identities.[118] Official narratives about Eastern Europe helped to reinforce these Ukrainisation policies: Kyiv presented Ukrainians as a separate nation by encouraging Soviet visitors to Eastern Europe to speak about both Soviet and Ukrainian cultural cooperation with the people's democracies and by sponsoring articles about Ukrainian relations with the satellite states in the republican press. More surprisingly, perhaps, even after the pace of Russification picked up in the early 1970s,[119] CPU apparatchiks continued to outline a special role for Ukraine and Ukrainians in Eastern Europe. In particular, they instructed historians to write about common Russo-Ukrainian resistance to Polish exploitation, suggesting thereby that Ukrainian people could best defend their national interests within the USSR and in close alliance with Russia. While urbanisation and the decrease in native language

---

"Ukrainisation" of political leaders'. H. Kuromiya, *Freedom and Terror in the Donbas: a Ukrainian-Russian Borderland, 1870s-1990s* (Cambridge, 1998), 316. The extent to which republican leaders promoted a sense of Ukrainian national identity was, of course, limited. As Yuri Slezkine points out, the Kremlin drew distinctions between the desirable and unacceptable forms of national sentiment, and '[t]he failure to recognise Moscow as "the citadel of the international revolutionary movement and Leninism" … was a nationalist deviation'. Y. Slezkine, 'The USSR as Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism', *Slavic Review* 53:2 (1994), 434. This was facilitated by the fact that Ukrainians and Byelorussians could be defined as ethnic sub-groups of a larger Russian (*russkaia*) nationality. Hosking, *Rulers and Victims,* 233-234.

[118] I. Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), 349-350.

[119] During the early 1960s, the party leadership in Ukraine was surprised by levels of resistance to Russification and attempts to curtail the rights of the republics. In order to avoid an open confrontation with dissidents and to increase their own autonomy from Moscow, some party officials sought legitimacy within their republic by presenting themselves as Ukrainian national leaders. With Petro Shelest at the helm of the CPU, members of the creative intelligentsia enjoyed a revival of Ukrainian culture. Between 1963 and 1972, Shelest defended Ukrainian economic interests, lobbied for subsidies from Moscow and investment in Ukrainian mining, and elevated Ukrainian culture and language. At the same time, Shelest remained committed to Soviet integrity and communist ideology, distinguishing between progressive and anti-Soviet forms of national sentiment. However, the security apparatus and large segments of Ukraine's bureaucracy envisioned a different role for republican institutions which was at odds with Shelest's policies. Led by Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi, they supported the centralization of economic management which followed the abolition of Khrushchev's economic reforms, and attached less importance to the cultivation of a distinct ethno-cultural identity in Ukraine. With Moscow's growing alarm at the encouragement of national feeling in Ukraine leaving Shelest increasingly vulnerable to accusations of nationalism, Shcherbyts'kyi took over as the CPU first secretary in 1972. B. Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine, 1953-1980* (Edmonton, 1984), 95, 100, 134, 150; Yekelchyk, *Ukraine*, 159; Prizel, *National Identity*, 349-350; Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 213; J. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism* (Englewood, 1990), 234.

education promoted linguistic assimilation in the Soviet Union,[120] formulaic portrayals of East European history helped the bureaucrats in Kyiv to develop a discrete and progressive role for 'Ukrainians' in official rhetoric.[121]

These official notions of Ukrainianness implicitly excluded significant parts of the republic's population, perpetuating long-standing ethno-national stereotypes. By placing a strong emphasis on the need to maintain Soviet unity despite 'instability' in Eastern Europe, the authorities made ethnicity into a key category for defining internal enemies in Soviet Ukraine. As Kate Brown argues, nation-building projects in the republic were used to create a uniform, homogenous space intended to overshadow the multi-faceted identities of the borderlands.[122] Indeed, because Party officials became concerned about the potential impact of East European crises on Hungarians, Jews and Poles in Ukraine, particularly in the western oblasts, they encouraged the practice of naming and shaming members of ethnic minorities as 'outsiders'. As Soviet media both condemned 'Zionists' and 'revanchist western German forces' for problems that arose in the satellites and associated reformist and opposition movements abroad with anti-Soviet, anti-Russian and anti-Ukrainian nationalism, they fuelled the notion that reliable Soviet citizens were Eastern Slavs.[123] The rising stress on Soviet unity vis-à-vis foreign threats also helped to reinforce negative depictions of Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalism' in official rhetoric, which the authorities presented as a tool in the hands of Polish and German nationalists seeking to break up the USSR and Russo-Ukrainian friendship.

At the same time, however, the ritualisation of public rhetoric helped to change official narratives about the western borderlands. Though sharing top officials'

---

[120] D. Gorenburg, 'Soviet Nationalities Policy and Assimilation' in Dominique Arel and Blair A. Ruble (eds.), *Rebounding Identities: The Politics of Identity in Russia and Ukraine* (Washington, D.C., 2006), 280-281.

[121] This process had already been evident under Stalin. As Serhii Yekelchyk's study of historical memory demonstrates, Ukrainian bureaucrats and intellectuals deciphered ideological currents to rehabilitate Ukrainian national heroes and redefine 'Ukrainian history'. S. Yekelchyk, *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto, 2004), 5, 6-9, 19.

[122] K. Brown, *A Biography of No Place: From Ethnic Borderland to Soviet Heartland* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004), 230; Kuromiya likewise demonstrates that nation-building projects aimed to undermine regional and class identities in the Donbas. Kuromiya, *Freedom and Terror*, 297.

[123] T. Garton-Ash, *The Polish Revolution: Solidarity* (New Haven, 2002), 102; Solchanyk, 'Polska', 89; Hosking, *Rulers and Victims*, 271. This tendency was especially strong due to anti-Semitic prejudice among CPSU leaders, which gained a new momentum after the Six Days War of 1967. E.R. Drachman, *Challenging the Kremlin: The Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990* (New York, 1991), 32.

concerns that the west was most exposed to 'harmful' influences from across the border,[124] local Party activists also attempted to challenge the idea that the borderlands were somehow less 'Soviet' than other parts of Ukraine. With this aim, they invoked formulaic portrayals of national conflict in Eastern Europe to suggest that local inhabitants had made a unique contribution to the wider east Slavic community. They organised special anniversary commemorations and worked with local artists, historians and museum directors in order to show that residents of western Ukraine had always resisted Polonisation, cultivated a Ukrainian identity, and strove for reunification with Russia. In comparison with other regions of Ukraine, they also created more opportunities for local residents to express their alienation from the 'foreigners' in Eastern Europe, including numerous agitation meetings, where citizens manifested their conservative opinions about the satellite states, as well as ritualised practices of foreign travel, where citizens enacted and described imperial hierarchies.

The increasingly formulaic ways of describing Ukraine's relationship with Eastern Europe fuelled a wide range of responses among the population. In line with the broader emphasis on national dissent in the western borderlands, analyses of Ukrainian perceptions of the socialist camp have mostly focused on exploring the rise of 'anti-Soviet' Ukrainian nationalism. Like Roman Szporluk, who pioneered the study of transnational interactions between Ukraine and the Soviet satellite states, many historians stress that ideas from Eastern Europe propelled national dissent and opposition in Soviet Ukraine.[125] They argue that interactions between Soviet and East European dissidents increasingly inspired Ukrainian demands for outright independence, especially because, as Timothy Snyder demonstrates, Polish dissidents assured their Ukrainian counterparts that Poland would not seek to redraw its borders with independent Lithuania, Belarus, and Ukraine.[126]

---

[124] T. Kuzio and A. Wilson, *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence* (London, 1999), 57.

[125] R. Szporluk, 'The Making of Modern Ukraine: The Western Dimension', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25:1-2 (2001).

[126] T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven, 2003), 218; Prizel, *National Identity*, 353; G. Grabovych, 'Model *Kultury*', *Krytyka* 10:1-2 (2006), 3; Bromke, 'Ukraine and Poland', 334-335; I. Zaitsev, 'Pol's'ka opozytsiia 1970-80-kh rokiv pro zasady ukrains'ko-pol's'koho porozuminnia' in Iurii Slyvka (ed.), *Deportatsii ukraintsiv ta poliakiv: kinets 1939- pochatok 50-kh rokiv* (L'viv, 1998), 57.

Indeed, perceptions of Eastern Europe did help to propel 'anti-Soviet' nationalism in western Ukraine, especially in the 1950s and the 1960s. Commenting on Ukraine's relationship with the satellite states, some former activists of Ukrainian nationalist organisations and activists of the illegal Greek Catholic Church questioned the legitimacy of Soviet rule in the republic and spoke of East European 'national' resistance to Soviet rule. Discussing in particular violent unrest in Hungary, they claimed that both the people's democracies and Ukraine would eventually overthrow Soviet or Russian power. Furthermore, although official reports may well exaggerate the spread of 'anti-Soviet' views among ethnic minorities and former activists of Ukrainian nationalist organisations, reflecting thereby the officials' own prejudices and expectations, it seems that many Hungarians, Jews and Poles felt alienated from the rest of the Soviet community and articulated 'anti-Soviet' views when they commented on events and developments across the border.[127]

Nevertheless, interactions with and perceptions of Eastern Europe also facilitated the rise of other notions of Ukrainianness, which were more compatible with Soviet patriotism. During the 1960s, the example of 'national roads to socialism' in Eastern Europe helped to inspire some party activists and members of the creative intelligentsia to call for increasing Ukrainian cultural autonomy in the USSR. Quoting the example of independent satellite states, they suggested that Ukraine could also enjoy more autonomy without betraying socialist ideals, arguing in particular that the authorities should improve Ukraine's cultural contacts with the satellite states. To use Kenneth Farmer's expression, they thereby posed a 'reformist challenge' to Soviet leaders.[128] Their demands were echoed by some members of ethnic minorities, particularly among Jews, who also called for a more 'liberal' nationalities policy in the USSR. While some used Eastern Europe as an example of a more tolerant approach towards Jewish culture, urging Soviet leaders to follow the

---

[127] As Amir Weiner demonstrates, expressions of antagonism towards the Soviet state resounded among ethnic minorities and Gulag returnees in western Ukraine, particularly in 1956. Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 180-184.

[128] Kenneth Farmer describes two main types of Ukrainian national dissent in the USSR. Firstly, he writes about 'reformist' challengers to the Soviet status quo, such as Ivan Dzyuba, who 'criticised the Russification of Ukrainian language and culture from a strictly Marxist-Leninist viewpoint'. These often sought a better implementation of Leninist nationalities policy in the USSR. Secondly, he describes 'revolutionary' challengers to the USSR, such as Valentyn Moroz, who believed that the nation should only be governed by itself, thus rejecting any authority of Moscow over Ukraine. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 208-209.

people's democracies in this respect, others spoke about anti-Semitic practices in the outer empire to prove that Soviet-style regimes oppressed the Jewish minority. These ideas fit into the wider framework of reformist patriotism, for their proponents sought change in the Soviet Union, calling for the restoration of the principles of 'Leninist nationalities policy'.[129] While these appeals were sometimes voiced in public, particularly in 1956, they were then increasingly confined to the *samizdat* like other forms of reformist patriotism.[130] Numerous advocates of reformist patriotism were convinced that the Soviet state was not responsive to their national demands.

Meanwhile, many citizens increasingly projected visions of Ukraine within the framework of conservative patriotism: during agitation meetings as well as private conversations registered by the KGB, they described East European 'nations' as a threat to the (imagined) Ukrainian and Soviet communities alike. They suggested thereby that most residents of the republic remained loyal to the CPSU and the Soviet state, all the while contrasting Ukrainian people with residents of the satellite states and turning expressions of Ukrainian identity into a means of staging consent. Articulating support for Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe as a form of protection against 'anti-Soviet' and 'anti-Ukrainian' forces, these citizens also implied a broader distrust of 'liberalisation' which, they claimed, could destabilise the socialist camp.

Popular reactions to events and developments in Eastern Europe do not fit the stereotypical divide into an 'anti-Soviet' west and 'pro-Soviet' east, for it was especially in the western borderlands that many residents drew an explicit link between Ukrainian national identity and conservative Soviet patriotism. On one level, because of geographical proximity to the satellite states, inhabitants of the borderlands feared the outbreak of war and discussed the possibility of a foreign take-over of western Ukraine more often than other citizens. As Amir Weiner demonstrates, this was especially evident in 1956, when many locals remained extremely suspicious of Khrushchev's new policies, which they blamed for the escalation of violence abroad, the rising threat to Soviet territorial integrity, and the

---

[129] They referred to the 1920s as a period when official policies of *korenizatsiia* helped to protect the rights of nationalities in the Soviet Union. See Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire*, 3.

[130] Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 8; B. Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society*, 100.

'chaos' brought about by returning 'nationalist' Gulag prisoners.[131] Furthermore, it was also in the west that many Soviet citizens took advantage of the opportunities to participate in staged political events probably in order to defend themselves against accusations of disloyalty levelled against them. In both 1956 and 1968, they often denounced in public ethnic minorities and 'bourgeois nationalists' as potential troublemakers who exposed Ukrainian people to the 'Polish menace'. Rather than seeing western Ukraine as the least Soviet part of the republic, therefore, it is more accurate to describe it as the most conflicted region where residents expressed radically different visions of Sovietness and Ukrainianness.

West Ukrainian articulations of conservative patriotism then took on a new dimension in the early 1980s. Drawing on the official historical narratives about East Slavic conflict with Poland, many local residents asserted that they had made a special contribution to protecting Russians and Ukrainians from foreign nationalism in the past, as well as forming a bulwark against the threat of Solidarity in the present. In particular, they emphasised that they rejected harmful, anti-Soviet views voiced by Polish tourists who visited the region en masse. In this way they not only undermined the image of western Ukraine as 'unreliable', but actually turned their regional identity into a positive marker of Sovietness.

Commenting on Soviet relations with the outside world, inhabitants of Ukraine developed different understandings of their ethno-national identities. Apart from the relatively rare demands for Ukrainian independence and the rejection of Soviet identities among some members of ethnic minorities, notions of nationhood reinforced a sense of Soviet patriotism in the republic. Stressing that the USSR was superior to other nations in Eastern Europe, the authorities pointed to the importance of nations under socialism. This fuelled reformist demands for increasing Ukrainian cultural autonomy in the USSR, especially before the early 1970s. Meanwhile, portrayals of Eastern Europe also encouraged some conservative-minded citizens to speak in public about the importance of Russo-Ukrainian unity vis-à-vis foreign threats, thus propagating in official rhetoric the idea that Ukrainians were a separate

---

[131] A. Weiner, 'The Empires Pay a Visit: Gulag Returnees, East European Rebellions, and Soviet Frontier Politics', *The Journal of Modern History* 78:2 (2006), 333; Weiner, 'Robust Revolution', 230; As Miriam Dobson demonstrates, Gulag returnees often met with a hostile reception upon return. See M. Dobson, *Khrushchev's Cold Summer: Gulag Returnees, Crime, and the Fate of Reform after Stalin* (Ithaca, 2009).

nation that contributed to the growth of the USSR. This emboldened some citizens to challenge the widely held notion that Ukrainians, and particularly residents of the western borderlands, were somehow less 'Soviet' or more 'unreliable' than other citizens.

V. <u>Overview</u>

The thesis combines a chronological and thematic structure. Chapters one, three and five provide its backbone, examining the evolution of popular opinion and Soviet patriotism in Ukraine. They analyse the range of popular reactions to the dramatic events in the Soviet camp, which unfolded in 1956, 1968, and 1980-1981. Chapter one shows that Wladyslaw Gomulka's reforms in Poland and the Hungarian uprising inspired very heated debates about 'liberalisation' and 'democratisation', as well as fuelling anti-Soviet nationalism, particularly among former Gulag prisoners. Unsure about the nature of Khrushchev's 'de-Stalinisation', citizens who commented on the unfolding events expressed a wide range of views about foreign and domestic policy which could not easily be classfied as either 'correct' or 'dissenting'. Twelve years later, with the state establishing a clearer script about the limits of reform both at home and in the satellite states, opinions about the Prague Spring were more clearly polarised along the axis of reformist patriotism, now considered 'illegal', and conservative patriotism, which formed the 'correct' point of view. Chapter three thus analyses the impact of the Czechoslovak crisis among the population of Ukraine, exposing debates about reform, tracing the evolution of anti-Soviet nationalism, as well as analysing the implicit claims on the state that citizens made through staging consent. Finally, chapter five examines how the increasing ritualisation of public rhetoric under Brezhev conditioned Ukrainian responses to the Solidarity crisis during the early 1980s. It shows that while some citizens staged consent to claim a special status in Soviet society, others invoked formulaic portrayals of Ukrainian people's resistance to Polish oppression to challenge these elitist claims and demand material benefits from the state.

In order to understand the different claims that citizens made through speaking about unrest in the outer empire, chapters two and four trace the development of official narratives between 1956 and 1991. Chapter two explores the role of the

ideology and practices of travel in establishing ritualised ways of describing Eastern Europe in Ukraine. In particular, it focuses on the impact of international travel on the concept of a Soviet middle class, which proved pivotal in the formation of popular attitudes towards the Prague Spring. Chapter four turns to historical memory: as it became an increasingly important element in official narratives about the socialist camp, it fashioned Poland as Ukraine's national nemesis and raised the importance of national themes in official Soviet rhetoric. Ukrainian party leaders employed official images of East European past to outline a special role which Ukraine, Ukrainians and residents of the western oblasts would play in the Soviet community, as well as highlighting the role of the 'masses' in Soviet history. This facilitated the rise of egalitarian claims during the Solidarity crisis in the early 1980s.

In this way, the thesis analyses the claims and nature of Soviet patriotism and national identities in Ukraine. The conclusion then briefly considers how Soviet and Ukrainian identities evolved during the 1980s and beyond.

Chapter One

De-Stalinisation and Soviet Patriotism: Ukrainian Reactions to East European Unrest in 1956

The Polish and Hungarian unrest of 1956 could not have caught Moscow at a more fragile time. Khrushchev's not-so-Secret Speech at the Twentieth Party Congress in February had raised troubling questions about the 'cult of personality' and the excesses of Stalinism. With the country unsettled by waves of returning Gulag prisoners and the dramatic shifts in state policy in the years following Stalin's death, the future seemed uncertain.[1] As party members in particular argued about the need to engage society at large in the process of reform, some advocated extending debate about the Stalinist past and Soviet future beyond the Party, whereas 'others wanted to keep the wider society ignorant'. Indeed, as Cynthia Hooper argues, a 'small group of party members questioned the very mechanics of truth and deception in the Soviet dictatorship', though senior apparatchiks often labelled the latter view as 'mistaken' or even 'hostile'.[2] For their part, non-party citizens were also pushing the boundaries of freedom of expression. They complained about shortages of information in Soviet mass media, openly admitted to listening to foreign radio stations, and publicly criticised Khrushchev's policies at home and abroad.

The dramatic events in the Soviet satellite states of October and November 1956 had been propelled by Khrushchev's reforms. In Poland, the Secret Speech was distributed very widely and it triggered popular complaints about the economy, the suppression of national culture, and Polish-Soviet relations. Rejecting Khrushchev's rhetoric about the 'cult of personality', many Poles condemned the entire CPSU and Stalinist-era Polish communist leaders.[3] Top Warsaw apparatchiks sought out new sources of legitimacy, especially after the bloody workers riots in Poznań in June 1956. Elected to serve as the first secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party on 19 October 1956, Władysław Gomulka announced a new Polish 'way to socialism', halting collectivization of agriculture and allowing (at least temporarily) a greater

---

[1] M. Dobson, *Khrushchev's Cold Summer: Gulag Returnees, Crime, and the Fate of Reform after Stalin* (Ithaca, 2009), 100; C. Hooper, 'What Can and Cannot be Said: Between the Stalinist Past and New Soviet Future', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008), 320; P. Jones, 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005), 7.
[2] Hooper, 'What Can and Cannot Be Said', 316.
[3] Machcewicz, *Polski Rok 1956* (Warsaw, 1993), 13-27.

degree of freedom of expression. The Soviet army came close to invading, and the Soviet press raised alarm about the rise of anti-Soviet moods in Poland, but Khrushchev eventually accepted the new leadership in Warsaw.[4] The Secret Speech also triggered heated debates about the need to reform the regime in Hungary. In contrast to Edward Ochab in Poland, who assisted the reformer Gomulka, the Hungarian leader Matyas Rakosi was succeeded by a fellow hard-liner, Erno Gero. Historians have suggested that a more liberal leader might have been able to prevent the escalation of violence, thereby preventing the Hungarian Revolution.[5] As it was, however, fighting broke out on the streets of Budapest on 23 October and, after a brief Soviet military intervention, Imre Nagy took over the reins of the Hungarian Party. As he made chaotic attempts to end the violence and to restore the authority of the Hungarian Party, Moscow grew concerned that his reforms went too far; new political parties appeared and Hungary announced that it was going to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact.[6] On 4 November, Soviet armies moved in to Budapest again to crush the popular uprising, resulting in bloodshed on both sides. Hungarian resistance was crushed by 10 November, and the new Soviet puppet government destroyed all forms of public opposition within the next two months.[7]

In the Soviet Union itself, these events were seen and judged as a direct consequence of Khrushchev's 'liberalisation'. Many scholars who explore Soviet citizens' attitudes towards reform and 'de-Stalinization' in 1956 focus on reactions to the Secret Speech and changes in the USSR itself. However, this story of 1956 is incomplete, for the crises in the 'outer empire' also shaped popular perceptions of Khrushchev and his reforms. On one level, inhabitants of Ukraine judged Khrushchev as an international leader, widely discussing his policies vis-à-vis the socialist satellites. More importantly, Poland and Hungary were regarded as a testing ground for reform, and observation of the dramatic events inspired Soviet citizens to argue about the extent to which it was possible to liberalize Soviet-style regimes without inducing violence and instability. To be sure, top CPSU leaders in Kyiv and Moscow were well aware that the foreign crises reverberated in the USSR, particularly in the borderlands. After the cataclysm of the Secret Speech, when

---

[4] W. Roszkowski, *Najnowsza Historia Polski 1945-1980* (Warsaw, 2003), 339-347.
[5] J. Granville, 'Poland and Hungary, 1956: A Comparative Essay Based on New Archival Findings', *The Australian Journal of Politics and History* 48:3 (2002), 376.
[6] Granville, 'Poland and Hungary', 388-390.
[7] G. Hosking, *A History of the Soviet Union* (London, 1990), 341-342.

public debates slipped out of control,[8] they were determined to constrain discussion surrounding the Polish and Hungarian events more effectively. In order to communicate the party line and keep people under control, they sought to outline clear rules about how to conduct special agitation meetings for workers, collective farmers, as well as rank-and-file party members.

In this chapter, I examine dozens of reports about these public explanatory gatherings to gauge attitudes towards Eastern Europe in 1956. Most date from October and November 1956, with some carrying on well into 1957.[9] They were produced by raikom, gorkom, and obkom officials across Ukraine and summaries were compiled by top apparatchiks in Kyiv. The reports cannot provide unmediated access into popular opinion, of course. Not only did residents of Ukraine control what they said in public, but low-level officials were liable to hide some problems which arose in their areas of jurisdiction when they wrote to their superiors. An additional source for my analysis is the information which party officials obtained about 'private' conversations, anonymous letters, and illegal pamphlets which cropped up in different regions of Ukraine. Such accounts of 'informal' opinions were often embedded in longer reports about the public meetings, and it is difficult to determine how representative these views were of wider trends in Soviet Ukraine in 1956. Many 'unofficial' conversations may have gone unnoticed, but equally importantly, by their very nature, reports about opinions expressed outside the context of explanatory meetings devote disproportionate attention to 'hostile' attitudes. Indeed, most were provided by the KGB. Though both kinds of sources are defined by the context of their production, they provide a rich and exciting prism through which to analyse people's attitudes to the crisis. The categories used in describing the developments and posing questions about Poland and Hungary reveal deep-seated divisions in Ukrainian society, as well as different patterns of response to the example of reform in the outer empire.

People's responses to the crisis in Eastern Europe do not fit into the simple dichotomy of support and opposition to Khrushchev's 'liberalisation', but range between conservative patriotism, which was most common, and reformist patriotism.

---

[8] Jones, 'From the Secret Speech to the Burial of Stalin: Real and Ideal Responses to de-Stalinisation' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 43.

[9] Little evidence suggests that Soviet citizens talked extensively about the workers' riots in Poznan in June 1956, at least not in any public forum.

On the one hand, conservative patriotism included support for Moscow's repressive policies in Hungary and a belief in a strong state, perhaps even a Stalin-nostalgia. Its proponents criticised Khrushchev for taking de-Stalinization too far and losing control over the outer empire. At the same time, however, conservative patriotism was underpinned by a notion of economic entitlement. In line with the 'broader populist commitments' of de-Stalinisation, which meant 'renewed attention to citizen welfare',[10] many residents of Ukraine complained about economic shortages, pointing out that the Soviet state should assure peace and stability at home and in the socialist camp as a whole. It is in this context that we should understand the frantic attempts of Soviet officials to improve the supply of certain basic products to keep the population quiet in the aftermath of the East European unrest. On the other hand, advocates of reformist patriotism sought to pursue further 'democratisation' through engaging in public discussion about Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, they also looked towards a strong and stable Soviet state to provide information and an organisational framework for such debates, as well as economic stability. Hence, they were disturbed by the apparent rise of violence and Moscow's seemingly declining authority in the aftermath of Khrushchev's Secret Speech. They were distinct, therefore, from many former members of Ukrainian nationalist organisations and the illegal Uniate church who saw the Polish and Hungarian events as 'the writing on the wall for the Soviet Union itself', a feeling made more poignant by the belief that, in Amir Weiner's words, 'the simultaneous initiatives to accelerate the indigenisation of local cadres and the administrative reorganisation [were] inseparable and decisive steps in the dissolution of the union'.[11] Proponents of conservative and reformist patriotism also differed from some members of ethnic minorities, including Jews, Poles, and Hungarians, who typically commented on the unfolding crises to underline their status as 'outsiders' in the USSR.

Discussions about Eastern Europe exposed overlapping fault lines in Ukrainian society: social, economic, generational, geographical, and ethnic identities conditioned popular responses towards the crises. This may go some way towards explaining why citizens harboured complex, even self-contradictory attitudes towards the Soviet state and its policies, drawing on the various discourses of

---

[10] Jones, 'The dilemmas', 8.

[11] A. Weiner, 'Robust Revolution to Retiring Revolution: The Life Cycle of the Soviet Revolution, 1945-1968', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008), 216.

'imperial' pride and responsibility, economic populism, 'liberalism', and nationalism. The aspirational Soviet middle class, encompassing such 'privileged' members of Ukrainian society as party activists, engineers, agricultural specialists, and university lecturers, appeared to be the most prominent supporters of the USSR's repressive policies in Eastern Europe. In contrast, some young people, especially university students, hoped that Polish reforms would be emulated in the USSR itself. On another level, as the authorities used economic incentives to ensure peace and stability in Ukraine, they encouraged many residents of the republic to identify themselves as 'claimants', distinct from the local bureaucrats and party apparatchiks who they expected to satisfy their material needs. Not surprisingly, the borderlands proved to be the most conflicted region in the republic. Nevertheless, the stereotypical division into an anti-Soviet west and a 'pro-Soviet' east is misleading and simplistic; rather, conservative patriotism, 'economic populism', reformist patriotism, and ethnic nationalism found their most stark representation in the western oblasts, exposing divisions in the region and, perhaps, the logically incoherent attitudes of its individual inhabitants.

The chapter begins by analysing how official Soviet portrayals of Poland and Hungary evolved between June 1956 and January 1957, exposing the tensions between officials at different levels of the party bureaucracy. It then examines the meaning of conservative patriotism and 'economic populism' in the context of late 1956, contrasting them with Soviet reformist patriotism. The chapter concludes by exploring the claims and the appeal of ethnic nationalisms in the republic, with a particular focus on the western oblasts.

I. <u>Getting the Story Straight</u>

Between October 1956 and January 1957, obkom and gorkom apparatchiks in Ukraine urged low-level party officials to conduct mass 'explanatory work' for Soviet citizens. Ever since Khrushchev's Secret Speech, primary party cell meetings were an important means of examining and influencing the public mood.[12] As Polly Jones demonstrates, discussion was often chaotic and unpredictable, but by the latter

---

[12] Jones, 'From the Secret Speech', 42-44.

half of 1956 the centre grew more confident in 'defining, and then anathematising and excluding anti-Soviet conduct' during the gatherings, coming up with clearer statements 'if not on the increasingly vexed question of the Stalinist past, then at least on the regulations governing public opinion in the present'.[13] The Bolsheviks were now 'exhorted from above to keep subsequent disagreements within the Party and to present a united front to the rest of society'.[14] Indeed, with the outbreak of unrest in Eastern Europe in late October, top Party officials were ever more determined to outline a clear distinction between 'acceptable reform' and 'counterrevolution', relying on party activists as guides of popular opinion. They sent special letters and telegrams to raikom and obkom officials throughout the USSR, on the basis of which they were expected to prepare a coherent explanation of the recent developments for rank-and-file party members, as well as non-party students, workers, collective farmers, and members of the intelligentsia. They also instructed agitators to refer to the Soviet press when addressing their audiences, and even to read out newspaper articles during the actual meetings. However, before the end of December, the Party failed to outline a clear point of view about the limits of 'liberalisation' in Eastern Europe, which reflected Moscow's own ambiguous attitudes towards reform and 'de-Stalinisation'. This created tensions between the top party bureaucrats and activists in the regions, whilst leaving most residents of Ukraine confused about Moscow's attitudes towards Poland and, to a lesser extent, Hungary.

The Soviet press published the first news of unrest in Poland on 30 June. Coverage of the Poznan riots in *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* was to set the tone for debates surrounding the Polish and Hungarian crises in the autumn. It echoed Moscow's concerns about the unity of the socialist camp, as well as a renewed commitment to improving living standards in the USSR and the Soviet empire as a whole. The press blamed 'international reactionary forces' for the outbreak of violence, underlining that 'workers' supported the pro-Soviet political leaders in Warsaw, but it also pointed to 'bureaucratic distortions' which aggravated economic shortages in Poland.[15] More broadly, official reports from Poland reflected a tension between the

---

[13] Jones, 'From the Secret Speech', 47, 44.

[14] Hooper, 'What Can and Cannot', 317.

[15] CDSP 8:26, 8 August 1956: 'Hostile provocation by imperialist agents in Poland', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 30 June 1956; 'Polish people brand organizers of provocation', *Pravda*, 1 July 1956; CDSP

perceived need to find new sources of bottom-up support for the Soviet satellite regimes, and the desire to preserve Moscow's top-down control in Eastern Europe. When *Literaturnaia gazeta* bemoaned the fact that Polish writers confused the 'distortions and dogmas caused by the cult of the individual for the genuine ideas and principles of socialist realism',[16] it reflected the concerns of the Soviet leaders who hoped both to extend discussion about 'de-Stalinization' and to control its outcomes.

This apparent paradox goes some way towards explaining why Moscow did not articulate a clear Soviet point of view about the changes taking place in Poland during September and October 1956. As the Polish debates about reform gained momentum during the autumn, the CPSU Central Committee Presidium received reports about the publication of anti-Soviet materials in the Polish press,[17] but there seemed to be no consensus about how the Soviet media should react to this.[18] *Pravda* printed the news of Gomulka's take-over on 20 October 1956, and informed its readers that Polish enemies of socialism who had previously 'disguised themselves by claiming that they were exposing the consequences of the "cult of the individual"' were now explicitly 'renouncing Lenin and Marx'.[19] However, Khrushchev remained reluctant to define the Kremlin's attitude towards the new leadership in Warsaw. On 21 October, he informed the Presidium that no statement about the Polish situation should yet be sent out to party organisations.[20] It was not until 23 October that the CPSU Central Committee began to draft a letter about the situation in Poland, which was supposed to be read out alongside Gomulka's speech outlining his new policies in the obkoms and raikoms throughout the USSR three days later. Even then, the authorities sought to limit the flow of information from Poland, instructing obkom officials to read the letter to raikom bureaucrats but not to leave

8:29, 29 August 1956: 'International forces of peace, democracy and socialism are growing and gaining in strength', *Pravda*, 16 July 1956; 'Report by Erno Gero at plenary session of Hungarian Workers' Party Central Committee', *Pravda*, 20 July 1956; 'On Political and Economic Situation and main tasks of PUWP', *Pravda*, 21 July 1956.

[16] CDSP 8:39, 7 November 1956: V. Ozerov, 'Ideas vs. Dogmas', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 30 September 1956.

[17] A. Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS 1954-1964: chernovye protokol'nye zapisi zasedanii, stenogrammy, postanovleniia: v 3 tomakh* (Moscow, 2003-2008), Volume Two: Document 74.7.1, 449-451.

[18] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume One: Document 74, 170; Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 74.7.2, 452; Document 74.7.3, 454.

[19] CDSP 8:40, 14 November 1956: 'Antisocialist pronouncements in the Polish press', *Pravda*, 20 October 1956.

[20] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume One: Document 77, 175.

any copies with them. Khrushchev also made it clear that Gomulka's speech was not to be printed in the press.[21] Meanwhile, *Pravda* continued to produce contradictory images of Gomulka's Poland over the next two weeks or so, informing its readers about the influence of 'nationalistic' and 'reactionary' forces in the country, but also writing about 'working class unity' and successful Soviet-Polish cultural cooperation.[22] Senior bureaucrats were likewise vague when they outlined the 'correct' response to the Polish crisis which agitators should promote during informational meetings: while some of Gomulka's ideas were 'undoubtedly correct', others were 'questionable', and others still were 'outright incorrect', they wrote in a special report about shortcomings in propaganda work.[23] With Gomulka attacked by the Soviet press and yet ultimately accepted as the new leader of Poland, Moscow's attitudes towards the new 'Polish way to socialism' remained unclear.

By contrast, news reports from Hungary were much less ambiguous, as the official mass media left no doubt that the crisis amounted to a full-blown counterrevolution. On 25 October 1956, *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* wrote about a 'counterrevolutionary rebellion' in Budapest, organised by 'reactionary underground organizations'.[24] After some initial approval of Imre Nagy and reports to the effect that Budapest was returning to 'normal life',[25] Soviet readers were informed on 31 October that the events had turned much more violent and complicated.[26] *Pravda* also wrote about Austrian and German aircraft delivering soldiers to Hungary,[27] pointing to the supposed links between the 'fascist' rebellion in Hungary and German revanchism. Finally, on 3 November, the CPSU Central Committee sent out a telegram to republican leaders and local officials at the obkoms, which stated that Nagy's government had prepared the way for 'reactionary forces' which sought to

---

[21] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume One: Document 78, 177.

[22] CDSP 8:41, 21 November 1956: 'The Working Class must resolutely rebuff alien slogans – Newspaper *Trybuna ludu* urges the working people to be vigilant', *Pravda*, 24 October 1956; 'Pure Stream and Dirty Scum – Editorial in *Trybuna ludu*', *Pravda*, 25 October 1956; 'From the resolution of the eighth plenary session of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party "On the current political and economic tasks of the party"', *Pravda*, 28 October 1956; 'This is Warsaw', *Pravda*, 29 October 1956; 'Soviet musicians perform in Poland', *Pravda*, 30 October 1956; 'Appeal of Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 3 November 1956.

[23] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.

[24] *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, Volume 8:41, 21 November 1956: 'The Downfall of an antipopular venture in Budapest', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 25 October 1956.

[25] CDSP 8:41, 21 November 1956: K. Petrov, 'Organisers of the counterrevolutionary putsch in Hungary miscalculated', *Izvestiia*, 28 October 1956; 'Situation in Hungary', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 30 October 1956.

[26] CDSP 8:42, 28 November 1956: 'Situation in Hungary', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 31 October 1956.

[27] CDSP 8:43, 5 December 1956: 'Situation in Hungary', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 3 November 1956.

re-establish the capitalist system in Hungary. At the same time, despite Molotov's opposition,[28] the telegram included a condemnation of the 'Rakosi-Gero clique' and thus criticised Hungarian leaders for their reluctance to introduce reform after 1953.[29] In line with this, on 5 November, the editorial in *Pravda* stated that 'the Hungarian Revolutionary and Peasants Government … requested the Soviet troops to help the people smash the dire forces of reaction and counterrevolution'. Meanwhile, it also emphasised that the new Hungarian government established under Soviet protection would pursue a programme of reform, 'ensuring the country's national independence', 'raising the standard of living of the working people' and 'establishing indestructible fraternal ties with the socialist states'.[30] Popular acquiescence would be achieved through granting economic concessions to the Hungarian workers, and preserving a degree of Hungarian autonomy within the socialist camp.

Through thus shaping their portrayals of Poland and Hungary, the official media suggested that Soviet-style regimes had firstly to strengthen top-down control to prevent the rise of 'counter-revolutionary forces', and secondly to concentrate on economic reform to gain mass legitimacy. The Soviet authorities made a concerted effort to transmit this message to residents of Ukraine through the means of agitation meetings. In the last week of October, party officials in the localities organised special explanatory gatherings about the situation in Poland and Hungary, where press articles were read out and discussed. Reports from the agitation meetings started flooding into the CPU Central Committee around 25 October. The meetings were tailored for the broader public, rather than just party members, and the authorities paid special care to address industrial workers, collective farmers, students and young people, the intelligentsia, and residents of the western oblasts.[31] In L'viv alone, they held large meetings at the bus, bicycle, and agricultural machinery factories; teachers and students from the medical institute attended a special lecture at the opera house; and high school students participated in a gathering at the Zan'kovets'ka theatre.[32] Throughout the first half of November, each

---

[28] Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS*, Volume One: Document 84, 202.

[29] Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS*, Volume Two: Document 84.0.1, 478.

[30] CDSP 8:43, 5 December 1956: 'Hungarian Working People will defend their socialist achievements', *Pravda*, 5 November 1956.

[31] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 51-58, 79-86, 87-98, 99-112.

[32] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 30-31.

obkom produced a few reports about the repercussions of the East European crises, informing the CPU Central Committee about the conduct of agitation meetings which they held at large industrial enterprises and collective farms, and passing on information obtained from the local KGB branches. In Sumy, for instance, the local leaders wrote about the moods amongst 'workers' on 5 November,[33] closely followed by another report discussing popular reactions to the formation of the new pro-Soviet government in Budapest on 6 November.[34] Kyiv summarised the effects of the agitation work in the localities for the CPSU Central Committee on 3 November, 12 November, and 16 November.[35]

Before the CPSU Central Committee issued the telegram about Hungary on 3 November, it seems that agitators had to rely exclusively on the official Soviet media in preparation for the meetings.[36] During this time, obkom officials in Zhytomir blamed their superiors in Kyiv and Moscow for providing insufficient information, as they requested clearer top-down instructions about how to deal with news and agitation on the local level. Some party secretaries and communists even telephoned the Zhytomir obkom to enquire whether the CPSU Central Committee had sent any letters concerning the crises and, in the absence of clear information in the mass media, complained about the appearance of 'malicious rumours'.[37] For their part, top officials in Moscow and Kyiv reprimanded local party organisations throughout Ukraine for their lack of 'flexibility', charging that they failed to use the Soviet press promptly to organise 'explanatory work' about the East European crises. For example, they claimed that despite the supposedly clear coverage in the press, many party officials simply 'shrugged their shoulders' when asked why Gomulka ascended to power in Poland.[38] Meanwhile, obkom bureaucrats were not satisfied with the work of their subordinates in charge of organising agitation work on the ground. The harshest criticism of all resounded in L'viv, where senior apparatchiks chastened bureaucrats from the Vynnykivs'kyi raion who had no idea about popular moods in the region, and who had failed to prepare for the 39th anniversary of the Great

---

[33] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 90-93.
[34] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 124-131.
[35] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77, 156-165, 227-235.
[36] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.
[37] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 86-89.
[38] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.

October Revolution.[39] Party apparatchiks were also very alarmed that debates amongst students escaped the confines of the official agitation meetings, which they blamed on the incompetence of low-level officials. Party organisations at universities did not react to negative opinions promptly enough, the authorities in L'viv complained.[40] In fact, it seems that similar accusations were grounded in reality. Obkom inspectors from Kyiv discovered that halls of residence in the city were poorly supplied with newspapers and journals, whilst the 'red corner' ('*chervonyi kutok*') in hall number two was cluttered with old furniture, and as such it could not possibly host agitation meetings. The authorities were alarmed that members of primary party organisations from Kyiv universities, as well as lecturers and deans, had failed to visit halls of residence recently.[41]

By issuing their special telegram on 3 November, the Presidium hoped to improve the quality of agitation work about Eastern Europe. They explicitly instructed local officials that the 'state and party *aktiv*' should be informed about the situation in Eastern Europe first; only then should they organise 'explanatory work' at factories, collective farms, and other institutions. At the same time, local agitators and lecturers were still encouraged to study official newspapers in preparation for the gatherings.[42] However, it is not entirely clear whether all agitators were in fact familiar with the telegram and, in any case, it appears that they failed to control popular opinion to the satisfaction of officials in Moscow. In the second half of November, the Kremlin adopted more decisive measures to improve agitation work. On 21 November, the Presidium of the Central Committee in Moscow began to compose 'an extremely harsh and impatient letter' to all party organizations down to the level of primary cells, in which they chastised low-level party officials for failing to root out 'negative reactions' to Khrushchev's de-Stalinization and the East European crises amongst the creative intelligentsia, academics, Gulag returnees, 'bourgeois nationalists', and others.[43] The letter had gone through several drafts before being sent out on 19 December, as top officials discussed how to infuse Ukraine's inhabitants with the 'correct' understanding of the East European crises,

---

[39] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 23-27.
[40] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, 99-112.
[41] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 30-31.
[42] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 84.0.1, 478.
[43] A. Weiner, 'The Empires Pay a Visit: Gulag Returnees, East European Rebellions, and Soviet Frontier Politics', *The Journal of Modern History* 78:2 (2006), 362-363.

rather than just punishing those individuals who expressed undesirable views. While the letter instructed party organisations to pay special attention to Gulag returnees,[44] adding that 'every communist must fight against provocation' and hostile foreign propaganda,[45] it also stressed that the Party should find new sources of legitimacy to maintain calm and stability in the USSR. Local officials were to improve safety standards at workplaces and combat 'bureaucratism' to satisfy the Soviet *trudiashchiesia*,[46] hold meetings with workers and engineers in the spirit of 'healthy criticism and self-criticism',[47] and – while making sure that writers accept state control over the arts and ascribe to 'Leninist principles' – avoid the vulgarity of Stalinist interventions in literature.[48] Party officials were explicitly instructed not to employ 'administrative measures' against ideologically immature and 'lost' (*zabluzhdaiushchiesia*) citizens, who must not be confused with 'hostile elements'.[49]

Exactly one month after sending the letter, on 19 January 1957, the CPSU Central Committee evaluated how its resolutions were implemented in the regions. They still complained about the quality of public lectures in the USSR, claiming that the agitators who explained party and state policy to 'the masses' were often immature, unprepared, and sometimes even untrustworthy.[50] However, local party cells had increased their efforts to guide popular opinion in January 1957, mainly through introducing stricter discipline amongst rank-and-file members. Feedback from the regions suggested that the letter had increased party members' 'alertness', creating an 'atmosphere of intolerance' towards 'anti-Soviet, hostile' opinions, at least within party organisations. Sometimes this happened retrospectively: the director of a Zakarpattian lumberjack collective and a party member, comrade Kapusta, had previously attacked the Soviet army for killing children in Hungary and claimed that the USSR crushed a popular revolt against tyrannical governments. Whereas the lumberjacks' party organisation had ignored this at the time, they remembered Kapusta after reading the Presidium's letter in December. Only then did they pass a resolution condemning his statements.[51] Exclusion from the party was one means of

---

[44] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 509.
[45] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 509-510 and 507-508.
[46] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 503.
[47] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 506-507.
[48] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 498 and 501.
[49] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 93.0.2, 503-504.
[50] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.79, ll. 1-7.
[51] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.79, ll. 1-7.

keeping discipline after 19 December. The party organisation at the train carriage factory in Debal'tsevo excluded an employee who, apart from 'systematically listening to the Voice of America and the BBC', 'praised the capitalist way of life' in the presence of other *rabochie*.[52] Similarly, party organisations in Odesa conducted 'closed meetings' to discuss the letter. At the genetics institute, the party cell 'sharply condemned' the 'anti-party' behaviour of a third year postgraduate student who had criticised Soviet policies in Hungary and he was expelled from the CPSU.[53]

Thus, public discussion about the East European crises was most lively between late October and mid-December 1956, and it became more constrained by early 1957. Using the press and agitation gatherings to control popular opinion, party apparatchiks suggested that the regimes in Eastern Europe and the USSR itself would tolerate a limited degree of open discussion about living conditions and economic shortages, as well as the excesses of 'bureaucratism' in the socialist camp. By the very act of organising informational gatherings, they encouraged citizens to talk about foreign affairs and to demand more information from Party leaders. At the same time, top officials made it increasingly clear that the authorities would impose stricter controls over public debates, undermining the influence of international 'counterrevolutionary forces' and 'correcting' the views of anyone who questioned the leading role of the CPSU and its sister parties in the socialist camp. This amounted to a somewhat confused and paradoxical approach towards the East European crises: public discussion was simultaneously encouraged and restricted, and the need to reform Soviet-style regimes clashed with calls for re-establishing order. Consequently, the Polish and Hungarian events produced contradictory responses among the population of Ukraine.

II. <u>Conservative Patriotism</u>

Some citizens were clearly disturbed by the deficiencies and contradictions in public rhetoric. Many members of the Soviet middle class found it difficult to understand why Moscow allowed the situation to escalate to the point of violent confrontation, a sentiment echoed among other social groups, particularly in western

---

[52] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.79, ll. 16-23.
[53] DAOO, f.P11, op.15, s.467, ark. 1-2.

Ukraine, where the 'Hungarian putsch' opened fresh wounds and inflamed popular fears of war. This situation propelled the rise of conservative patriotism. Articulating a sense of 'imperial' pride and expressing support for the idea of a strong authoritarian state, sometimes even Stalin nostalgia, numerous people harboured seemingly self-contradictory attitudes towards Khrushchev and his leadership. On the one hand, they expressed a sense of absolute loyalty towards the Soviet army and the CPSU, supporting Khrushchev's repressive measures in Eastern Europe and calling for the Soviet state to use force to re-establish order at home and abroad. On the other hand, they also criticised the Kremlin's policies of 'liberalisation' suggesting that the regime's legitimacy should be grounded in economic paternalism. Citizens who expressed this vision of conservative patriotism were the most numerous amongst the participants in organised gatherings whose comments were recorded, and KGB reports suggest that many residents of Ukraine articulated similar opinions outside the strictly formal context of the meetings, often in very emotional terms.

War veterans in particular recalled the Soviet sacrifices in Eastern Europe, and claimed that the USSR must strengthen stability in the socialist camp to protect the fruits of victory of the Great Patriotic War. In the Crimea, local residents gathered together to listen to Soviet radio and discuss the incoming news. Many of them recalled their participation in the battle for Budapest: since 'Soviet soldiers' 'spilt blood' for Hungary, they were quoted as saying, the country must remain within the socialist camp.[54] At times, war veterans adopted a very aggressive tone. As a 'surgeon' and 'participant of the Great Patriotic War', a doctor of orthopaedics from Kyiv could not but express her outrage at reading the news from Budapest and Poznan in Soviet newspapers: nevertheless, she was confident that the 'deplorable degenerates' ('*zhalki vyrodki*') and 'pitiful animals' ('*zhalugidni tvaryny*') who opposed Soviet-style regimes in Eastern Europe would not 'turn back the wheel of history'.[55] Official reports that explicitly mentioned the veterans presented them as a group which unanimously supported Moscow's repressive policies in Hungary. This may suggest that foreign affairs provided one forum where the veterans, otherwise divided along generational lines and facing various degrees of discrimination and

---

[54] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 102-105.
[55] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 9-20.

outright repression in the USSR,[56] began to speak in one voice. Recently united in the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, they echoed the authorities' attempts to use former Red Army soldiers for cold war propaganda when they commented on the unfolding crises.[57] At the same time, even though they did not yet articulate demands for privileges as clearly as they would after avenues for formal organisation were closed again in the 1970s,[58] they used public meetings about Poland and Hungary to assert that they were a distinguished group in Soviet society. This was in line with broader attempts to strengthen veterans' collective identity and social standing in the USSR through emphasising their importance for Soviet foreign policy. As Mark Edele argues, retired career officers began to use the official veterans' association, established with the aim of strengthening the USSR's position in the World Veterans Federation, for defending former soldiers' interests at home.[59]

Whilst war veterans recalled their own sacrifices, some other residents of the republic invoked the myth of the Great Patriotic War, too. Amir Weiner shows that memories of war served as both a unifying Soviet experience and a means of articulating particularistic identities in post-war Ukraine.[60] At the height of the Polish and Hungarian crises, many participants in the public meetings highlighted that the Soviet defeat of Nazi Germany obliged East Europeans to remain loyal to the USSR. Not only did they implicitly recognise the special position of war veterans in Soviet society, but they also identified themselves with a glorious and powerful USSR. For example, speaking in the name of his collective, a primary party organisation secretary from Kyiv, citing *Pravda*, argued that the USSR would have to 'help' Poland. 'We do not believe that the Polish *trudiashchi*' share the anti-Soviet attitudes of the Polish press, he claimed: 'the Polish *robitnyk* and villager remembers that it was the Soviet army who liberated his country from German fascism'.[61] Through invoking memories of the war whilst commenting on the Hungarian crisis, these residents of Ukraine often adopted a very personal rhetoric. During an agitation meeting at her collective farm, a woman from the Drohobych

---

[56] M. Edele, *Soviet Veterans of the Second World War: A Popular Movement in an Authoritarian Society, 1941-1991* (Oxford, 2008), 148.
[57] Edele, *Soviet Veterans*, 162
[58] Edele, *Soviet Veterans*, 181.
[59] Edele, *Soviet Veterans*, 164.
[60] A. Weiner, *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton, 2001), 61, 71, 385.
[61] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 9-20.

oblast made an emotional speech about her 'friends and relatives' who had died during the Great Patriotic War. She was appalled that 'fascist bandits' had become active again in Hungary and Egypt and demanded that they be punished in the name of the 'entire Soviet *narod*'.[62] With the USSR 'as a whole realigned on the basis of wartime experience',[63] and despite the fact that veterans had not yet emerged as a 'generation' as they would in the 1970s,[64] many inhabitants of the republic made an explicit effort to underline their pride in the Soviet victory and to associate themselves with war veterans.

It appears that many citizens made references to the Polish and Hungarian crises to prove that they were loyal to the Soviet state and, more importantly perhaps, to claim a special 'privileged' status in Soviet society. Participants in the 'informational gatherings' suggested that they had contributed towards building 'socialism' and did not want to see Soviet 'achievements' in Eastern Europe undermined. In early November, the local authorities used the same gatherings both to celebrate the 39th anniversary of the October Revolution and to discuss the Polish and Hungarian crises; this juxtaposition helped to bring out the contrast between the reliable 'socialists' in the USSR and the unstable foreigners in Eastern Europe. A.I. Kyrychenko from the CPU Central Committee appeared candid when he stated that the authorities registered fewer undesirable incidents, even small ones, during the anniversary celebrations in 1956 than they had in previous years.[65] This is not to suggest that the holiday took on a greater significance for the republic's residents during such a tumultuous period, but rather that the citizens who were invited to take part in the celebrations were now more carefully selected.[66] This made the commemorative-informational gatherings into an exclusive experience, which permitted participants to distinguish themselves from other, less reliable citizens. Party activists in the western oblasts were particularly keen to express their pride in Soviet 'socialist achievements'. They stressed that they had personally contributed towards establishing the Soviet system in the newly incorporated regions after 1944, only to see the Poles and Hungarians reverse the very policies that they had promoted in Ukraine. A west-Ukraine born pensioner and former deputy of the

---

[62] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.62, ll. 81-87.
[63] Weiner, *Making Sense*, 84.
[64] Edele, *Soviet Veterans*, 17.
[65] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24. s.4265, ark. 156-165.
[66] Fursenko, *Prezidium*, Volume Two: Document 84.0.1, 478.

Ukrainian Supreme Council was clearly disturbed by Warsaw's new agricultural policy when he described his recent trip to Poland to a group of the local *trudiashchi*. He proudly underlined that west Ukrainian leaders had managed to deal with slackers and 'bandits' who attacked collective farms, and he was convinced that Ukraine's farmers, having seen the benefits of collectivisation, would never choose to move back to private agriculture. With this superior experience, Soviet people should travel to Poland more often to guide their Polish brothers along the road to socialism. While the Polish leaders failed to punish the harmful 'elements' who hoped to take Poland off the socialist path, the Polish industrial workers and poor farmer 'welcome us, the Soviet people, very warmly', he claimed.[67]

Thus, conservative patriotism fused the rhetoric of 'imperial' pride with a sense of elitism. The paternalistic claims of conservative patriotism posed a major challenge to the Soviet state. Raising concerns about the spread of 'hostile' attitudes in Ukraine, the dramatic and bloody events in Hungary, coupled with the confusion and incompetence of local officials, offered a stimulus and a fresh opportunity for some Soviet citizens to criticize the Kremlin's reforms and to advance a more positive image of Stalin. Stalin nostalgia seems particularly characteristic of those individuals who enjoyed a privileged status in Soviet society, such as the technical intelligentsia or university lecturers, and were keen to strengthen Soviet stability. In referring to their yearning for Stalin's iron fist, they portrayed themselves as responsible Soviet citizens concerned about the failure of Khrushchev's leadership to outline a clear Soviet point of view about the foreign crises. In Uzhgorod, for example, a university lecturer claimed that the Hungarian events occurred because of Khrushchev's excessive critique of the cult of personality. At the same time, he charged that Soviet newspapers provided very little information from Hungary, thus encouraging the growth of all sorts of incredible rumours and creating the impression that the Soviet authorities did not care about their *narod*.[68] Similarly, many residents of Kyiv used public gatherings to complain that Stalin's name was only ever invoked

---

[67] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 87-98.
[68] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.Similarly, in Yalta, an agitator failed to react to provocative statements voiced during a political discussion club meeting, where the former head of a local *artel'* claimed that Moscow's careless criticism of the cult of personality led directly to the Hungarian crisis. See TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 102-105.

in a negative context, even though he had had many 'positive sides'.[69]

Stalin nostalgia was common amongst army officers, too.[70] The KGB informed the CPU Central Committee that officers complained about shortages in the military budget, as well as Khrushchev's lack of 'alertness' (*bditel'nost'*), though the reports were not always clear about the circumstances in which they voiced such opinions. On 3 November, a party member and lieutenant from the Kyiv aviation school stated that the Hungarian crisis 'would never have happened under Stalin', whose authority was strong enough to hold Eastern Europe together; 'our talk of peace' has now led to the 'weakening of alertness', he lamented. Soviet leaders spent copious amounts of money on receiving foreign delegations, which gave them a false sense of security; this money should be spent on defence instead, the lieutenant stated, suggesting thereby that he did not trust diplomats to resolve international conflicts.[71] His opinions were echoed by an engineer and army captain who dramatically claimed that twelve years of Soviet domination in Hungary had 'gone to waste' in the space of twenty-four hours. 'Our leaders have had it coming', he asserted, because they enjoyed foreign trips and luxurious receptions, instead of strengthening foreign intelligence and looking after domestic affairs. There has been 'too much talk about the personality cult', as a result of which 'we' have become 'too democratic' and lost any semblance of discipline.[72] Some of those who had seen service in Hungary were particularly alarmed about Khrushchev's 'liberal' foreign policy and his reconciliation with Tito. Two officers who visited officials at the Khmel'nyts'kyi obkom on 16 November claimed that Yugoslavia actively supported the Hungarian rebels, which outraged Soviet army personnel. Local party apparatchiks tried to calm the officers down, explaining that the USSR should strive to maintain good relations with Tito's Yugoslavia. As they put it in their report for

---

[69] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 28-30. A local engineer from Kyiv pointed out that Soviet leaders had recently enjoyed 'parties and banquets', instead of working hard to resolve the problems which arose in Eastern Europe. Had Batia been alive, he said referring to Stalin, things would never have gone as far as they had. See TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 236-245.

[70] It should be noted that the officers seemed to differ from younger soldiers in their assessment of the Hungarian crisis. Individual soldiers expressed doubts about the USSR's repressive policies in Eastern Europe. See: TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 51-58.

[71] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 124-131.

[72] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 124-131.

A.I. Kyrychenko in Kyiv, however, the officers' 'facial expression' showed that they did not agree with them.[73]

To the extent that conservative patriotism was underpinned by fears of instability, it filtered through to other social groups in Ukraine. As a report from L'viv put it, workers, bureaucrats, and members of the intelligentsia emphasised that Soviet domination in Eastern Europe served the interests of 'progressive humanity', but first of all the '*trudiashchiesia* of our country'.[74] Public debates about Eastern Europe encouraged many inhabitants of Ukraine to demonstrate their loyalty towards a hierarchical and imperial Soviet society, because this allowed them to assert that the Soviet authorities should represent their interests as 'Soviet workers'. In particular, numerous citizens sought more information. For instance, a non-party worker from Kyiv bemoaned the fact that the Soviet press provided very little information about the East European crises, all the while trying to identify a clear Soviet narrative about the disturbances in Hungary. Condemning the rebels across the border, he argued that the 'capitalist' and 'fascist' unrest in Eastern Europe were directed against the USSR. Likewise, a metal worker demanded to know more about comrade Rokossowski's dismissal from the Polish Politburo and the developments in Hungary, while also stating that the 'American imperialist plot' was doomed to failure.[75]

Some workers and non-party members appeared to believe that the Hungarian crisis posed a military threat to the USSR. Fear of change and instability took on a special significance in western Ukraine, where the escalating violence in neighbouring Hungary brought to life the spectre of war. Having studied the mood amongst inhabitants of the L'viv oblast during agitation meetings, the obkom concluded that citizens were afraid that a war might break out soon.[76] During public meetings in the oblast centre, local citizens recalled Soviet sacrifices in the Great Patriotic War and declared their readiness to work hard for the 'Fatherland' to preserve peace in the world.[77] Further south, in the Khmel'nyts'kyi oblast, obkom leaders admitted that the quality of 'mass political work' was 'poor'. A party official

---

[73] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 267-268.
[74] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 79-86.
[75] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 9-20.
[76] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 23-27.
[77] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, 99-112.

witnessed panic amongst women collective farmers in the region, who misinterpreted radio broadcasts about the bombing of the Suez canal and thought that western powers had attacked the 'Soviet canal'. The apparatchik talked to them about the Suez crisis, and they laughed at their mistake, but he nonetheless reprimanded them, pointing out that there was in fact nothing to laugh about.[78] The authorities took popular fear of war very seriously, seeing it as a potentially destabilising influence in western Ukraine.

Ironically, perhaps, Soviet military intervention in Hungary was widely supported in the region, as it made a full-fledged war seem less likely. During an informational meeting at the L'vivsil'mash plant, workers explicitly condemned the 'reactionary forces' that sought to undermine the socialist system in Hungary and supported the Soviet army's struggle against counterrevolution. At the same time, they also suggested that the Soviet army should have intervened in Hungary earlier, which would have helped to prevent such large scale violence.[79] Thus, fear of war reinforced a sense of Soviet patriotism amongst many locals, strengthening support for Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, but it also inspired criticism of Moscow's foreign policy. Many residents of western Ukraine who attended explanatory meetings about the Hungarian crisis sounded accusatory as they repeatedly asked why the USSR had not intervened in Hungarian affairs earlier.[80] Some inhabitants of the L'viv oblast were more explicit in their criticism during agitation meetings, stating openly that the Hungarian uprising was 'our fault', because the USSR had not been alert when the 'fascists' in Budapest prepared their revolt. At the fittings factory, workers argued that 'we' should not take the army out of Hungary until order is completely restored across the border.[81]

As rumours spread and doubts about the Soviet future multiplied, west Ukrainian responses to the Polish and Hungarian crises were varied and contradictory. Inhabitants of the region took a strong interest in foreign affairs precisely because they unfolded just across the border. This encouraged people both to debate East European affairs outside the official context of agitation meetings and to express doubts about the strength of the Soviet army. 'Unhealthy rumours' appeared in the

---

[78] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s. 4265, ark. 151-154.
[79] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 28-31.
[80] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.406, ark. 83-85.
[81] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 79-86.

town of Khmel'nyts'kyi, one official noted, as some locals claimed that the town hospital was full of the wounded from Hungary, 'which was not in fact true'.[82] When a non-party Ukrainian laboratory worker from L'viv told her colleagues that she and her husband condemned Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Hungary, she was opposed by another employee who argued that events in the Soviet satellite states concerned them directly due to their geographical proximity; the 'American imperialist border' could move right down to our doorstep, she argued. Nevertheless, other employees, including a non-party Russian woman, supported the controversial opinion, and the laboratory worker boldly resisted her colleague's criticism by accusing her of simply being afraid to voice her true beliefs.[83] Thus, a sense of instability encouraged residents of western Ukraine to argue about the current crises and criticise Soviet policies in Eastern Europe.

Conservative patriotism was highly paradoxical. In calling for greater top-down control in the USSR and the Soviet empire as a whole, its adherents emerged as active citizens who criticised their leaders in Moscow. Even though the conservative vision of Soviet society put a strong emphasis on hierarchy and thereby appealed to members of the Soviet elite, such as war veterans, party activists, and army officers, it was also embraced by other residents of Ukraine. Conservative patriotism was based on the state's power to assure peace and stability at a time when many citizens feared the outbreak of war. As such, it turned Soviet citizens into claimants who demanded that the state provide safety and assure a decent standard of living in return for their political acquiescence.

III.   Economic shortages

Food and fuel shortages created problems for Soviet authorities in Ukraine during late 1956 and early 1957, raising doubts about the USSR's ability to deal with the escalating crisis. Industrial workers and collective farmers took advantage of explanatory meetings devoted to the Polish and Hungarian crises to complain about the quality of life in the socialist camp and in Soviet Ukraine itself. In demanding that local officials pay more attention to their material needs, they described

---

[82] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s. 4265, ark. 151-154.
[83] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 79-86.

themselves as reliable Soviet citizens who deserved to live better than the unreliable foreigners in the people's democracies. However, unlike in the early 1980s, when the rise and fall of the Solidarity movement in Poland sparked off wider debates about the position of workers in Soviet-style regimes,[84] the Party effectively stifled complaints about the economy by improving the supply of certain products during the height of the Polish and Hungarian crises in 1956. Only in isolated cases did economic complaints escalate into acts of what the party apparatchiks referred to as 'hooliganism'; similarly only scattered individuals in western Ukraine discussed the advantages of capitalism over socialism when describing the East European revolts. Meanwhile, more inhabitants of Ukraine seemed to be satisfied with the modest degree of economic stability that the Soviet authorities assured.

After the news of unrest in Poland and Hungary reached Ukraine, some citizens began to panic. They started to take money out of their savings accounts and buy basic necessities in preparation for the seemingly impending war: curiously, these normally included 'soap, salt, and matches'.[85] Panic buying was particularly prevalent in the western oblasts. The L'viv obkom was concerned that it was impossible to buy sugar and flour in some parts of the oblast.[86] They registered 'unhealthy opinions' in shops and in other public places. For instance, an obkom employee saw a man who approached people queuing outside a shop and told them that stocking-up would help nobody when they drop an atomic bomb on L'viv.[87] At the height of the East European crises, the key task that Party officials identified was to prevent panic by improving supplies of the products which citizens bought in mass quantities. As early as 3 November, the first secretary of the Volhynia obkom wrote that the Party was taking measures to supply and deliver such items 'on time'.[88] Some party officials found this to be a difficult task: on 19 November 1956, a secretary of the Bila Tserkva gorkom still registered significant problems in his area of jurisdiction.[89] Nevertheless, the authorities in Ukraine felt confident that they brought supply and demand under control by the second week of November. Most reports echoed that from Sumy, which claimed that the obkom had reacted to panic

---

[84] See Chapter 5.
[85] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 90-93; TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 120-123, 151-154.
[86] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 23-27.
[87] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.402, ark. 194-198.
[88] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 120-123.
[89] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 31-32.

buying promptly and efficiently: trading organisations made sure that the products in question were restocked, and the party *aktiv* conducted agitation work amongst the *trudiashchi* to encourage them to denounce collectively any signs of panic-mongering.[90]

While Soviet citizens did buy up basic food and fuel products, CPSU officials were equally concerned about the way in which they described economic problems and shortages. Unlike the more politicised calls for dissolving collective farms or introducing workers' councils which I discuss below, the majority of economic complaints should not be viewed as appeals to change the Soviet system. Rather, they represented attempts by ordinary citizens to exact benefits from the state as part of the Soviet 'social contract', bringing to mind those individuals whom Christine Varga-Harris describes in her study of housing petitions during the Thaw: citizens were now much more assertive in demanding that Soviet officials help them with their 'individualistic aims', often claiming 'a right to decent housing simply by reason of having been born "Soviet"'.[91] In late 1956, many inhabitants of Ukraine articulated economic complaints as Soviet citizens who deserved to live better than, or at least as well as, the 'foreigners' in Eastern Europe.[92] It was not uncommon to hear complaints to the effect that the USSR helped the satellite states while Soviet citizens themselves lived in poverty.[93] Ignoring his colleagues' protests, a party member born in the eastern oblasts who worked as head of department at a L'viv factory, complained that the USSR should send fewer products abroad and improve material conditions for its own people instead.[94] Another citizen suggested that the Hungarians would perhaps cease to strike if the USSR stopped sending products across the border.[95] In contrasting the USSR to other countries in the Soviet camp,

---

[90] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 90-93. In L'viv, the apparatchiks reported that after the Soviet armies marched into Budapest and a new Hungarian government was formed, demand for basic products subsided and reached 'almost normal' levels. A similar report arrived from the Khmel'nyts'kyi obkom. DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.402, ark. 194-198; TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 151-154.

[91] Varga-Harris, 'Forging Citizenship on the Home Front: Reviving the Socialist Contract and Constructing Soviet Identity during the Thaw' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 111, 104.

[92] For example, during a special meeting for party activists on 19 November 1956, some participants asked a senior lecturer to compare the standard of living in Czechoslovakia and the USSR, and even dared to enquire when the economic situation of the *trudiashchiesia* 'of our country would be raised to the standard of the leading capitalist states'. See DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.406, ark. 83-85.

[93] These complaints were considerably more widespread during the early 1980s. See Chapter 5.

[94] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 87-98.

[95] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 23-27.

these individuals invoked a Soviet identity to press for the satisfaction of their material demands.

Despite the fact that the Central Committee Presidium mentioned 'excesses of bureaucratism' in their official letters during this period, Soviet officials placed much emphasis on increasing conformity and top-down control amongst industrial workers and collective farmers. Already before the Hungarian uprising, central authorities had grown suspicious of the kind of criticism that Vladimir Dudintsev had levelled against managers in his controversial novel *Not By Bread Alone*, which 'pitted upright champions of social benefit against corrupt self-seeking bureaucrats'; after late November, the press abandoned the initial 'qualified praise' of the novel in favour of 'reserved censure' and even 'outright rejection'.[96] In line with this, obkom officials linked problems of party discipline to economic performance. Time and time again, they suggested that shortages encouraged citizens to deviate from the official Soviet interpretation of East European events. Conversely, loyalty to the USSR and its institutions was manifested through hard work and the fulfilment of production norms. S.V. Chervonenko from the CPU Central Committee measured the level of Sovietness and party-mindedness by the weight of meat produced in different regions of Ukraine for the Hungarian market.[97] When obkom officials tried to prove that the population displayed 'correct attitudes' in the aftermath of the crises, they often emphasised that they fulfilled their production targets. In the Khmel'nyts'kyi oblast, the obkom thus 'mobilised all means' to complete the autumnal agricultural works.[98]

Even though, as Donald Filtzer points out, Moscow failed to reform the system of work relations to raise labour efficiency in the post-Stalinist period,[99] it appears that Party officials were successful in maintaining the outward manifestations of labour discipline and productivity in the aftermath of the Polish and Hungarian unrest. During public gatherings called to discuss foreign affairs, most of the workers

---

[96] D. Kozlov, 'Naming the Social Evil: The Readers of *Novyi mir* and Vladimir Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*, 1956-59 and beyond' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 83, 87.
[97] Workers of the Ukrainian SSR rallied behind the communist party and the Soviet government, he emphasised in a report from 20 November 1956, and worked double shifts to help stabilise the situation across the border. The collective of the Darnytsia meat factory in Kyiv produced particularly impressive amounts of processed meat for the Hungarian market. RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.62, ll. 81-87.
[98] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 151-154.
[99] D. Filtzer, 'From Mobilised to Free Labour: De-Stalinisation and the Changing Legal Status of Workers' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 157.

and collective farmers whose comments were recorded talked about Soviet economic progress and made official pledges to over-fulfil their production targets. This is not to suggest that they actually worked efficiently, but rather that, despite the many economic grievances voiced in late 1956, most of them did not publicly question the nature of the Soviet economic system or their role in it. This was particularly significant in western Ukraine, where the authorities remained concerned about the 'wrecking' activity of Gulag returnees. In the Nemyrivs'kyi region of the L'viv oblast, the KGB would make a special effort to protect 'communal property', and collective farmers would finish all agricultural works by 7 November.[100] They were confident that most collective farmers would work as long as they were protected against the minority of 'wreckers'. Indeed, collective farmers and workers (*robitnyki*) in the west expressed support for the Soviet system. In L'viv, they publicly supported the resolution passed by 'workers' in Moscow and Leningrad, who agreed to work an extra two hours on top of their working day to help the Egyptian *narod*.[101] Meanwhile, during a 'solemn gathering' devoted to the 39th anniversary of the October revolution in the Krakovets' region, a local woman promised to 'extract 2100 litres of milk from each cow in 1957' in response to the imperialist aggression in Egypt and Hungary. She called for all collective farmers to follow her example.[102]

Only at times did economic complaints escalate into what the Soviet authorities labelled 'acts of hooliganism'. It is difficult to determine what the term signified: Vladimir Kozlov shows that '[i]n the criminal and half-criminal milieu, it was common to hear the promise to construct a "second Hungary" or a "second Budapest" as well as other widely spread anti-Soviet clichés',[103] and the KGB registered some very violent rhetoric in the aftermath of the crises. In late November or early December, a local resident of Bila Tserkva boasted that he, too, would have 'killed at least a few communists' had he been in Hungary during the uprising, because 'they bring hunger to the people'.[104] In a similar vein, in the village of Boiarka in the Kyiv oblast, the villagers threatened to do 'what the Hungarians did'

---

[100] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.418, ark. 62-63.
[101] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.418, ark. 58-59.
[102] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.406, ark. 86-95.
[103] V.A. Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the post-Stalin Years* (London, 2002), 155.
[104] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 28-30.

unless supplies of fuel improved.[105] However, while ascribing 'disruptive behaviour' to the influence of the Polish, Hungarian, and Egyptian crises, many official reports cited examples of 'hooliganism' which bore no explicit relation to the foreign developments; rather, they indicated that the local party authorities were very alert to any signs of disturbance during such an unstable period. In Sumy oblast, an obkom secretary pointed towards the need to increase party discipline and alertness – some disruptive 'elements' hoped to use the current 'economic' and 'cultural' problems to harm 'leading workers' and 'collective farms'. For instance, a former brigade leader by the name of Utkin, who worked at a collective farm in Kriasne in the Krasnopil' region, alienated the local officials at the end of October. The head of his collective farm promised to provide a lorry to transport two army recruits to the train station; for 'technical reasons', as Naumenko claimed, the car was not delivered on time. Consequently, led by Utkin, a 150-strong crowd, who came to see the soldiers off, marched down to the kolkhoz leader's house, where they insulted him, calling him a 'blood-sucker' and threatening to beat him up. The report underlined that the primary party organisation resolved the situation on its own: they excluded the brigade leader from the party for his 'anti-Soviet action'.[106]

The unrest in Poland and Hungary resulted in panic buying, inspiring some people to criticise the Soviet regime's economic performance in the name of a Soviet community. Party leaders in the regions and at the very top were painfully aware that their citizens' acquiescence rested on their ability to assure a modest degree of economic stability in the republic. Through improving supplies and conducting mass agitation work, they controlled consumer demand and made sure that the great majority of citizens voiced loyalty to the Soviet system. Even though economic complaints did at times sound very dramatic or threatening from the authorities' point of view, they did not often lead to questioning the role of workers and collective farmers in the USSR, or to articulating grievances in political terms.

---

[105] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 21-22.
[106] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 90-93.

IV.   Reformist Patriotism

 Frustration with the Soviet state did find more politicised forms of expression in Ukraine during late 1956. Small numbers of people, including students and members of the creative intelligentsia, voiced support for Gomulka's policies and hoped that they would be emulated in the USSR itself. More broadly, these proponents of reformist patriotism wanted to limit the power of the state and encourage citizens to comment on Moscow's domestic and foreign policy, rather than offering their political passivity in return for economic concessions and strong top-down Party control. However, in comparison to 1968, reformist patriotism occurred along a relatively wide spectrum.[107] It ranged from mild reformist comments that the state was prepared to tolerate, through more challenging calls for better access to information (which formed the backbone of future reformist dissent) to very radical complaints verging on demands for systemic change.

 Like conservative patriotism, some strands of reformist patriotism were bolstered by paternalistic sentiments and a sense of 'imperial' responsibility for the future of Eastern Europe. However, its proponents linked the need to combat anti-Soviet moods abroad to speeding up the pace of 'democratisation'. This was especially evident in the western oblasts, where a small number of workers (*robitnyki*) blamed the foreign crises on the fact that mistakes of the Stalinist era were being removed too slowly, which allowed 'hostile forces' to turn people against Soviet-style regimes.[108] They thus grounded calls for further 'liberalisation' by highlighting the role of the USSR as the centre of the socialist bloc.

 This had important implications for Soviet domestic politics. In particular, debates surrounding Ukrainian cultural autonomy provided an arena where some members of the creative intelligentsia justified their reformist agenda by the need to strengthen Soviet power in both Eastern Europe and Soviet Ukraine. They complained about the suppression of Ukrainian culture in the USSR when they discussed the situation in Hungary, describing encounters with their Hungarian colleagues who failed to understand why there were so few Ukrainian language

---

[107] See Chapter 3.
[108] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.406, ark. 78-82.

schools in the republic.[109] Inadequate provision of schooling in Ukrainian discredited the Soviet nationalities policy in the eyes of the Hungarian comrades, they suggested, which was a particularly pressing issue at a time when the USSR should guide Hungary away from 'counterrevolution'.

These demands were voiced openly and, arguably, found some resonance amongst Party leaders in the republic. The recently Ukrainianised local cadres in the western oblasts recognised that Ukrainian ethnic identities could be mobilised to strengthen pro-Soviet loyalties in the region. They had 'a personal stake in fighting nationalists', as well as enforcing the policy of 'ethnonational homogenisation of the borderlands'.[110] In order to demonstrate that local society was unified during such an unstable time, for example, regional party leaders organised a special meeting in the Zankovets'ka theatre. Not only did that gathering celebrate the 39th anniversary of the October revolution, but it also commemorated the 700th anniversary of the founding of L'viv. Furthermore, veterans of the 'revolutionary struggle' from west Ukraine spoke during the meeting.[111] These forms of commemoration pointed towards a distinctly Ukrainian contribution to 'building socialism'. The authorities in Kyiv also made nods in the direction of a Ukrainian nation, and proved responsive to demands voiced by members of the creative intelligentsia in the aftermath of the Hungarian crisis. On 12 November, A.I. Kyrychenko suggested that the authorities should strengthen the 'propaganda of friendship' between the Russian and Ukrainian *narody*, thereby propagating the idea of a distinct Ukrainian people. Regional administration should work in the language of the local majority.[112] The state would balance between the Russian and Ukrainian population of the republic, recognising their rights as separate entities: they would open Russian and Ukrainian schools 'according to demand'.[113] Thus, some party activists echoed demands of the creative intelligentsia, articulating a vision of reformist patriotism that put a strong emphasis on increasing Ukrainian cultural autonomy. They portrayed this as a means of

---

[109] The same document also stated that the Russian population of Ukraine, especially soldiers in small towns, complained about the lack of Russian-language education for their children. TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 156-165.

[110] Weiner, 'Empires', 342, 372.

[111] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 87-98.

[112] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 156-165. Interestingly, the draft of Kyrychenko's document was more radical here, stating that the local administration should operate in 'Ukrainian, especially in the western oblasts'. See TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 145-154.

[113] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 156-165.

neutralising the threat of Ukrainian nationalism. Crucially, however, they also invested 'Ukrainianness' with positive overtones by suggesting that it would help to strengthen Soviet influences in Eastern Europe.

Reformist patriotism posed a considerably more serious challenge to the CPSU when its proponents tackled issues surrounding access to information. Demands for more openness in the mass media and during 'informational gatherings' echoed some conservative concerns about inconsistencies in the official coverage of Eastern Europe, but they were underpinned by an anti-paternalist belief that a large number of people should engage in debates about the future of the socialist camp and the USSR itself. Throughout 1956, Soviet citizens revealed a 'keen awareness' of the extent to which they were denied access to information: during the crises in Poland and Hungary, workers, avid for news, 'clamoured to know why the radio and press were so sluggish in reporting fresh details' about East European crises.[114] Participants in 'informational gatherings' devoted to the events likewise demanded 'more detailed information' in the Soviet press and enquired why the USSR blocked western short-wave radio broadcasts.[115] University students were the most articulate advocates of *glasnost'*. Local apparatchiks, who conducted a gathering at Kyiv State University, infuriated their superiors at the CPU Central Committee for having failed to give a 'decisive reproach' to a student's 'provocative question'. He had apparently demanded to know why the Soviet state and the press had not considered it necessary to inform the population about Khrushchev's talks with Gomulka, which (supposedly) took place 'in the spirit of friendliness and party openness'. He had also attacked *Pravda*'s special correspondent who had written about 'anti-Soviet statements in the Polish press' and condemned them in the name of the Soviet *narod*. The student pointed out that the *narod* in question could not possibly condemn any articles published in Poland, because it was not familiar with them.[116] The CPU Central Committee claimed that the official who conducted the meeting should have replied that Soviet journalists had a duty to speak in the name of the *narod*; in an act of circular reasoning, they claimed that the correspondent could not be accused of giving an 'incorrect' assessment of the popular mood, because he clearly 'lives

---

[114] Hooper, 'What Can and Cannot', 316-317.
[115] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.79, ll. 11-15; DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.443, ark. 23-27; TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.
[116] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.712, ark. 9-20.

amongst the *narod*' and expresses its views 'correctly'.[117] The incident represented wider concerns about the limits of openness and information control. Taking advantage of the local officials' confusion and incompetence, the student had used the public meeting at his university to criticise central newspapers in the name of a 'Soviet people'. He portrayed himself as a loyal citizen who had the right to obtain information from the Soviet media, but also posited himself in opposition to the official media and party apparatchiks who conducted the meeting.

Indeed, reformist demands for *glasnost'* encouraged numerous students to bypass official channels, thus inspiring open criticism of Soviet policy and laying the grounds for future dissent. Disillusioned with the domestic mass media and public agitation meetings, they turned towards foreign broadcasters to obtain news about Eastern Europe. As a L'viv gorkom official put it, students failed to understand the East European developments 'correctly', because they did not read Soviet newspapers and relied instead on western radio stations.[118] He thus implied that students repeated the views that they had heard, portraying the reformist communist leaders in Warsaw and Budapest in a favourable light. Likewise, students in Kyiv used foreign radio stations to inform debates at home. They 'resorted to' listening to western radio stations, as the officials would have it, which inspired them to analyse Gomulka's reforms in more detail than the local apparatchiks desired. For example, a fourth-year history student from the Kyiv state university openly admitted that he listened to the BBC, claiming that this was now officially allowed: apparently, the Soviet minister of culture had recently signed a special agreement to that effect during his visit to the United Kingdom. A local agitator conducting a students' meeting at the university asked him what he heard on the foreign radio; in response, the student reported that Khrushchev had called Gomulka a 'traitor' and refused to shake his hand during his impromptu visit to Warsaw. He also asked whether the BBC could be considered to convey 'fifty percent of the truth'.[119] It is notable that the student quoted western radio broadcasts during an official meeting – he implied thereby that listening to the BBC was not a subversive act, perhaps because he hoped that the foreign news could enliven debate at home at a time when Soviet sources of information proved inadequate to the task. Fashioning himself as an active citizen, he

---

[117] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.
[118] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 99-112.
[119] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark.37-39.

effectively sought to extend public debate through reporting what he had heard on foreign radio stations, thereby compensating for the poor performance of Soviet journalists and agitators. Ironically, therefore, the student tried to claim that listening to foreign radio stations and spreading information about Eastern Europe obtained in this way was as an act of patriotism.

In fact, the same logic can be applied to the more radical and isolated young people who used illegal means to raise public awareness about Gomulka's policies and to advance the cause of reform in the USSR. In Kyiv, for example, a small group held meetings to discuss Gomulka's speech, which they planned to translate and distribute in the USSR. In the Soviet Union, they claimed, socialist theory had been turned into a set of 'unquestionable laws', and it was necessary to follow the example of Poland in building socialism and democracy from afresh.[120] In this way, they sought to redefine what it meant to be Soviet, encouraging citizens to participate in debates about reform and seeking unofficial sources of information to learn about Eastern Europe. Ultimately, however, they still wanted to improve the functioning of Soviet media and other Soviet institutions.

As critical observers of the unfolding events, a small number of advocates of reformist patriotism did express very controversial views. Most prominently, they protested against Soviet interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary.[121] Admittedly, criticism of Soviet policy in the socialist camp was often confined to private conversations, but, with its implications of treason, it was inherently political and was treated as a criminal act. A student from Kharkiv and a teacher from the Donets'k oblast were both tried in court for condemning the invasion.[122] At the same time, dissatisfaction with Moscow's policy in Hungary found more politicised forms of expression during the autumn of 1956. In Odesa, the KGB discovered 'counter-revolutionary' leaflets which called for the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Hungary.[123] More prominently, protests broke out at higher educational institutions in the USSR both before and after 4 November. Special anti-riot troops disbanded protests in Yaroslavl' and other cities, as students 'organised rallies and carried

---

[120] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[121] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 87-98.
[122] O. Bazhan, 'Zovnishn'o-politychni aktsii SRSR u 50-80-ti rr. ta ix vplyv na rozvytok opozytsiinoho rukhu v Ukraini', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000), 52.
[123] Bazhan, 'Zovnishn'o-politychni aktsii', 54.

banners demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary'.[124] This is not to suggest that citizens who expressed alarm at the invasion of Hungary spoke out against the Soviet system or agreed with the accusations of disloyalty levelled against them; rather, many portrayed the invasion as a violation of 'Soviet values', which suggests that they invoked their Soviet identity to condemn the state's foreign policy. During explanatory gatherings, individual members of the public asked why the Soviet state led its army into Hungary despite promoting the principle of non-interference during the Suez crisis.[125] Similarly, at the end of November, the chief constructor of the Kyiv Krasnyi Ekskavator plant received an anonymous letter which complained about his statements on the radio and during a public meeting devoted to international events. The letter despaired that the agitator used the Suez Crisis to distract the 'Soviet people' from what they should really concern themselves with: the Hungarian fight for freedom from 'Soviet oppression'.[126] Even whilst attacking the USSR's repressive foreign policy, the author wrote on behalf of the Soviet community. In this sense, some of the most controversial views about foreign affairs can still be seen as an expression of Soviet patriotism. At the same time, by expressing such opinions in anonymous letters and illegal forums, their proponents did conceptualise 'reformism' as an act of dissent.

Finally, in the confused atmosphere of 1956, a few scattered individuals advanced very radical ideas for economic reform. They tread the boundary between reformist patriotism and anti-Soviet views, essentially calling for systemic change, but also claiming that they wanted to protect Soviet and 'socialist' interests. Some citizens grounded their grievances in Marxist-Leninist ideology. One extreme example of social disobedience rooted in the economic situation was an illegal workers' organisation formed in Donets'k; according to the historian Anatolyi Rusnachenko, its leader was partly inspired by the example of the Poznan riots, which he saw as an attempt to defend workers' rights in Soviet-style regimes.[127] Calls for purifying the revolutionary cause and defending the proletariat were also apparent in the 1300 leaflets that the KGB found across the L'viv oblast between 8

---

[124] M. Kramer, 'Soviet Policy during the Polish and Hungarian Crises of 1956: Reassessments and New Findings', *Journal of Contemporary History* 33:2 (1998), 196.

[125] RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.79, ll. 65-67.

[126] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4302, ark. 155-156.

[127] A. Rusnachenko, 'Sprotyv robitnytstva ta robitnychi protesty v Ukraini (kin. 50kh- poch. 80kh rr)', *Rozbudova derzhavy* 4 (1996), 55.

and 19 February 1957. Signed in the name of the Popular Trade Union of Russian Solidarists (*Narodno-Trudovoi Soiuz Rossiiskikh Solidaristov*), the brochures described the Polish and Hungarian events and maintained that revolution was possible under the communist totalitarian regime – they called for workers' councils to rule factories.[128] More often, however, economically driven reformist patriotism took the form of ad hoc comments made during private conversations and focused on the issue of collective farming, which, as some citizens claimed, weakened the Soviet Union. A local farmer from the L'viv oblast stated that collective farms in the USSR should be dissolved like they had been in Poland.[129] Likewise, an oblast inspector from Zhytomir 'tried to prove the impracticability of the collective farm system in the USSR'.[130] Perplexed by Gomulka's drastic departures from the Soviet model, and emboldened perhaps by Moscow's acceptance of the Polish reforms, these individuals implied that radical economic restructuring was compatible with preserving a Soviet socialist system and would even help to restore ideological purity. Nonetheless, they were probably aware that the authorities would deem their views 'hostile', either because they attacked Soviet institutions or because they accused the Soviet leaders of failing to live up to the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Most advocates of reformist patriotism did not portray themselves as subversive when they criticised Soviet authorities in late 1956, but rather staked a claim to participate in debates about the future of their state. In fact, this was partly in line with Khrushchev's new policies, because, as Amir Weiner shows, 'the increased role for public organisations and popular participation [was] institutionalised through mass mobilisation campaigns and organisations'.[131] This gave rise to a range of reformist ideas which gradually morphed into 'legitimate' Soviet patriotism, patriotic dissent, and anti-Soviet opinions. Even though they represented very different attitudes towards the economy, foreign policy, the national question, and freedom of expression, reformist and conservative patriotism overlapped on the need to strengthen the Soviet state; conversely, and somewhat ironically, despite their contradictory opinions about the need to involve society at large in public debates, proponents of both varieties of Soviet patriotism actively criticised Khrushchev's

---

[128] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4537, ark. 52.
[129] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.402, ark. 194-198.
[130] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 86-89.
[131] Weiner, 'Robust Revolution', 224.

leadership. In fact, officials seemed less concerned about the rise of reformist patriotism than they were about economic shortages and conservative patriotism, which they believed to pose a more serious challenge to their authority. This is not to suggest that they welcomed calls for further 'democratisation', just that they were more preoccupied with other threats during this eventful period.

V. <u>Ethnic minorities</u>

A potentially more serious challenge to Soviet stability came from representatives of minorities in Ukraine as well as ethnic Ukrainians in the western oblasts.[132] The authorities in Kyiv believed that 'hostile opinions' were most widespread amongst Soviet Poles, Hungarians, and Jews, all of whom (with the partial exception of the Jews) concentrated heavily in the west.[133] Their reports highlighted the statements and responses of these groups, reflecting perhaps the officials' own prejudice and giving more 'coherence' to these groups than they actually possessed. However, they also spotlighted specific areas of grievance, showing how individuals used the unfolding events in Eastern Europe to articulate demands in the name of their national communities. Some Jews made unfavourable comparisons between Poland and the Soviet Union to talk about the problem of anti-Semitism in the USSR. Expressing separatist views, many Poles and Hungarians refused to participate in the life of their local Soviet communities, hoping thereby to obtain a greater degree of cultural and political autonomy.

After the anti-Semitic campaigns of late Stalinism, Soviet Jews enjoyed a somewhat more relaxed atmosphere under Khrushchev. A few books in Yiddish were published in the late 1950s, though not by contemporary authors; the yeshiva in Moscow's Great Synagogue was established, but it had few students, none of whom became rabbis; and in August 1961 the Yiddish periodical *Sovietish heimland* (*Soviet Homeland*) was started, though it was largely a tool of Kremlin propaganda.[134] Despite such achievements, the dramatic events in Eastern Europe brought out the problem of anti-Semitism in Ukraine. Many party officials highlighted the opinions

---

[132] See section six of this chapter for a discussion of ethnic Ukrainians.
[133] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[134] E.R. Drachman, *Challenging the Kremlin: The Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990* (New York, 1991), 30.

of Jewish citizens in their reports on public mood, and in doing so they almost exclusively wrote about 'misconceived' or 'hostile' views, thereby implying that Jews did not fit in well with the bulk of the Soviet community. In part, this was because the Polish and Hungarian events coincided with the Suez crisis, which inspired the rise of new forms of anti-Jewish rhetoric in the Soviet Union. The state of Israel was demonised in official propaganda, as the USSR chose to support Arab nationalism to weaken British and American positions in the Middle East.[135] Thus, reports about Jewish reactions may have reflected the officials' own anti-Semitic prejudice. However, it does also appear that the dramatic events in Egypt and Eastern Europe increased Soviet Jews' sense of distinctiveness. Indeed, this was fuelled by the fact that Jews continued to encounter 'official' prejudice as well as to experience tensions on a day-to-day level, especially since certain party circles in Ukraine, Boris Lewytzkyj notes, encouraged anti-Semitism to 'regain influence among the Ukrainian population'.[136] A number of Soviet citizens employed a shockingly anti-Semitic discourse after the official renunciation of the Doctors' Plot in 1953, claiming that the Jews 'will get away scot-free like during the war',[137] and anti-Semitic attitudes persisted in the years to come. During the height of the East European crisis, therefore, some Jewish residents of Ukraine, especially those who had friends or relatives in Poland, made explicit comments about the development of Jewish culture and the problem of anti-Semitism in the socialist camp. Whether this contributed towards the authorities' decision to allow former Polish citizens of Jewish origin to leave the USSR in 1957 is not clear, but approximately 300,000 Jews did emigrate at this time, most of whom used Poland as a transit point on the way to Israel or the West.[138]

It is difficult to assess the extent to which anti-Semitic attitudes manifested themselves during this tumultuous period, but there is some patchy evidence to suggest that the foreign crises provoked outbursts of xenophobia in Ukraine. Officials in Mykolaiv discovered eight handwritten 'anti-Semitic' leaflets, posted around Lenin Street in the regional centre of Bol'shaia Bradievka on 6 November, which called for the 'working *narod*' to 'beat up the Jews' to avenge the war in

---

[135] Z. Gitelman, *Bespokoinyi vek: Evrei Rossii i Sovetskogo Soiuza s 1881 g. do nashikh dnei* (Moscow, 2008), 232-233.
[136] B. Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine, 1953-1980* (Edmonton, 1984), 70.
[137] Weiner, *Making Sense*, 296.
[138] Gitelman, *Bespokoinyi*, 234.

Egypt.[139] Moreover, the Hungarian events invigorated anti-Semitic stereotypes amongst the Hungarian minority in Zakarpattia.[140] The dramatic turn of events on the international arena in late 1956 made many Jews in Soviet Ukraine particularly sensitive to manifestations of anti-Semitism at home. In Odesa, a party member of Jewish origin complained that Soviet authorities persecuted the Jews in the aftermath of the Suez crisis, recalling the Doctor's Plot in this context.[141] The pervading sense of instability in the socialist camp likewise encouraged the spread of rumours about the rise of anti-Jewish violence. A Jewish engineer from Kyiv and party member talked about pogroms in Eastern Europe, alleging (mistakenly) that the 'Hungarian fascists' had killed up to ten thousand Jews during the recent uprising.[142]

In private conversations, individual Jewish citizens tried to defend Israel and 'the Jews' from both the accusations voiced against them in official Soviet rhetoric, as well as anti-Semitic outbursts which they personally encountered. Interestingly, they often expressed support for the Hungarian uprising in this context. For example, a 59 year old Jewish man from Kyiv, who 'received Zionist literature from the Israeli embassy', stated that while the Soviet army shot at a peaceful population in Hungary, the Israelis defended their own lives from a fascist dictator in the war against Egypt.[143] Some citizens used illegal forums to draw links between Soviet repressive policies in Eastern Europe and discrimination at home. In February 1957, residents of a building in central Odesa discovered 18 anti-Soviet leaflets, which, apart from expressing support for the Hungarian revolutionaries and calling for improved living conditions at home, also protested against 'national' and 'racial' oppression in the USSR. Hand-written on pages torn out of exercise books,[144] the pamphlets probably used these terms to refer to anti-Semitism. Some Soviet citizens of Jewish origin cited the unfolding developments to argue that they should be allowed to emigrate from the USSR. An office worker employed in the barber shop at Khreshchatyk 4 (in the very centre of Kyiv) denounced a Jewish hairdresser who had recently spent a holiday in Warsaw. Upon returning, he claimed, the hairdresser stated that he felt like a foreigner in Kyiv and declared his intention to move to

---

[139] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4302, ark. 126.
[140] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[141] DAOO, f.P11, op.15, s.446, ark. 114-117.
[142] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 236-245.
[143] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 236-245.
[144] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4537, ark. 48-49.

Poland. According to the report, the hairdresser had emphasised how the Jews in Warsaw had their own newspapers and a theatre, enjoying complete freedom from the anti-Semitism that plagued the USSR. The hairdresser's frustration with the USSR may also have stemmed from the economic situation. During his stay in Poland he had apparently telephoned his sister in Tel-Aviv, who had told him about the high quality of life in Israel, and encouraged him to move to Poland so that he would then be free to emigrate again. He further complained that the Soviet authorities stifled all forms of private initiative through imposing a heavy tax burden on hard-working individuals, while living standards in Poland rose because the Polish leaders encouraged private enterprise. 'The hell with socialism', he was reported to have exclaimed: the Soviet workers 'vegetate' and suffer pointlessly in the name of 'some sort of future communism'.[145] Of course, both Shelest, who compiled the official report about the incident, and the man who denounced him may have distorted the hairdresser's opinions. Nevertheless, not only does the report demonstrate that his colleagues treated the hairdresser as an outsider because of his background, but it also suggests that anti-Semitic prejudice encouraged him to underline his alienation from the Soviet community by invoking his Jewish roots.

Official reports further suggested that isolationist attitudes flourished amongst other ethnic minorities in Ukraine, especially Poles and Hungarians. Even though most Poles had been exiled from the newly annexed regions of western Ukraine in the 1940s, some 9000 Soviet citizens of Polish ethnicity still lived in the city of L'viv in 1956.[146] There was also a Polish community further east, especially around Zhytomir, because the regions which had been part of the USSR prior to 1939 were not affected by the Polish-Ukrainian programme of population exchange in the 1940s.[147] The top brass was so concerned about the Poles in western Ukraine that when a member of the CPSU Central Committee visited L'viv to monitor the behaviour of 'unstable elements', his report concentrated almost exclusively on the Polish minority. In the town of L'viv alone, he wrote, there were 8,877 Poles who stayed in the region after the war. They did not socialise with other inhabitants of the

---

[145] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 236-245.
[146] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.402, ark. 220-222.
[147] T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven, 2003), 188.

oblast and, as the report put it, formed a 'closed' community.[148] It was their separation from the rest of Soviet society and their ethnic identity as such that made the Poles suspicious in the eyes of the authorities. Despite remaining largely silent on the topic of the Polish and Hungarian events, members of ethnic minorities thus attracted official attention and criticism. F. Koval' from the L'viv obkom complained that many Polish and Magyar lecturers who worked at the city's universities took no part in their local community's social life, remaining 'passive' after hearing the news from Poland, Hungary, and Egypt. For example, the Polish deputy head of the agricultural institute kept his opinions to himself, and when a secretary of his primary party cell asked him what he thought about recent developments, his only response was, 'We will see what happens'.[149] This makes it difficult to establish how outspoken and 'rebellious' the Soviet Poles really were, or to assess the extent to which they harboured isolationist ideas; rather, official reports suggest that party apparatchiks treated them as aliens within the Soviet community and expected them to dispel accusations of disloyalty by explicitly denouncing East European distortions from the Soviet model.

It appears that many ethnic Poles in Ukraine added fuel to the flame, distancing themselves from the rest of the population and associating themselves with their compatriots across the border. For one, they were particularly eager to listen to the radio from their 'external homeland'.[150] They also talked about developments in Eastern Europe with other Soviet citizens of Polish nationality. For example, a 21 year old Polish student of the forestry institute in L'viv discussed the news from Hungary with a Catholic priest, quoting Warsaw radio when he stated that the Soviet policies of 'peacemaking' had led to bloodshed in Hungary.[151] Many party officials believed that members of ethnic minorities developed particularly 'hostile' opinions about the events in Eastern Europe, interpreting them as a manifestation of a Polish 'national' opposition to Soviet rule. A 'small number' of Polish residents of L'viv, as the report would have it, expressed their joy at the recent developments in Poland and Hungary, using this opportunity to attack the Soviet system itself. A Polish employee of the machine building factory boasted that Soviet flags had been

---

[148] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.402, ark. 220-222.
[149] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 99-112.
[150] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[151] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 79-86.

destroyed in Krakow, a sure sign that Poland would soon turn into a new Yugoslavia. Similarly, a Polish music teacher supported the Poles' opposition to Russian interference in their domestic affairs. In Poland and Hungary the youth were 'decisive', she despaired, and 'here, that is in Ukraine, they do as they are told'.[152]

In Zakarpattia, where it was clearer that the local Hungarians were causing trouble, the local apparatchiks also displayed a degree of ethnic prejudice. There were nearly 50,000 Hungarians in the region,[153] and officials realised that the proximity of the border made them very exposed to non-Soviet sources of information about the crisis. Party apparatchiks and the KGB were consequently very sensitive to any sign suggesting that xenophobic attitudes were on the rise amongst the Hungarians in Zakarpattia, and they did indeed register a few unsettling incidents. Some Soviet Hungarians, former Gulag prisoners in particular, spread illegal pamphlets, voiced 'hostile opinions' about the Soviet intervention in Budapest, and intimidated other Soviet citizens. A Hungarian driver from Mukachevo told some non-Hungarians that a time would come when they would 'crawl at his feet'.[154] According to official reports, Hungarian nationalism was closely associated with anti-Semitic prejudice. On 28 October, an unidentified culprit distributed 152 'anti-Soviet leaflets' in the Russian and Hungarian languages in the town of Berehove; similar pamphlets, bulk-produced with the help of rubber stamps, appeared in Uzhgorod two days later. They praised the 'Hungarian revolution', while attacking the Jews and communists. Party leaders believed that local Hungarians opposed 'communism' from explicitly nationalist positions, to the extent that they expressed their support for the idea of an ethno-national government and despised what they saw as a Jewish-dominated communist leadership.[155]

Furthermore, it appears that other Soviet citizens shared the officials' fears of the national minorities, and they debated how the authorities in Ukraine dealt with the problem. To the extent that the Poles featured prominently in nationalists' view as

[152] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[153] Weiner, 'Empires', 353.
[154] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[155] A Hungarian woman employed at the Uzhgorod passport office had a peculiar interpretation of the dramatic developments across the border, stating that 'the Hungarians' took down the old Jewish prime minister and chose 'a Magyar' in his stead. TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.

Ukrainian enemies,[156] the question of their national rights was bound to inspire heated debates amongst the locals in western Ukraine. Rumours to the effect that L'viv would soon be given over to the Polish People's Republic did not help to bridge the gap between the local Poles and Ukrainians.[157] Likewise, inhabitants of Zakarpattia were deeply disturbed by local Hungarians' anti-Soviet outbursts, and they enquired why the Hungarians were not expelled to Hungary like the Poles had been from other parts of western Ukraine.[158]

More broadly, the East European crises also inspired many locals to discuss the importance of 'national' politics in the socialist camp. Many residents of the western oblasts who expressed support for the Polish reforms explained Gomulka's rise to power as an expression of the Polish 'national' spirit. In L'viv, for example, a senior teacher emphasised that the recent events across the border were natural and entirely predictable, because the Poles had 'always been distinguished by a strong drive for autonomy and independence', and had grown accustomed to a 'different way of life' during the 'thirty years of independence' [sic], when even the *rabochie* were better off than now.[159] Similarly, some people commented on the unrest to suggest that Eastern Europeans would go their own 'national' way, though the political valuation of this varied. A woman who travelled from L'viv to Zhytomir (whom the officials described as a *grazhdanka*, a term imbued with negative connotations) talked about the alleged mass exodus of the Soviet Poles to Poland, where 'the people's democratic system' and collective farms were dissolved.[160] She suggested that Warsaw had got out from under Soviet control, and pursued policies in the name of the Polish nation. Logically enough, other commentators expected the USSR would now crack down on 'national' dissent in Eastern Europe. The chief accountant of the oblast branch of the Gosbank in Zhytomir publicly claimed that Poland would be incorporated in the USSR.[161]

Thus, tensions between different ethnic groups in Ukraine brought the rhetoric of 'nationality' to the fore, especially in the western borderlands. On one level, whilst

---

[156] Weiner, *Making Sense*, 251. See also chapters 4 and 5, which consider Ukrainian-Polish relations in more depth.
[157] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 79-86.
[158] DALO, f.P3, op.5, s.406, ark. 83-85.
[159] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[160] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 86-89.
[161] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4377, ark. 86-89.

official reports probably did describe real incidents, they also reflected the bureaucrats' own fears of ethnic conflict. Reports often underlined that the individuals who expressed 'problematic' opinions were Jews, Poles, or Hungarians, but they did not always show how their ethnicity shaped their attitudes. This may suggest that Soviet officials believed ethnic minorities to be inherently unstable, which encouraged them to blame the existence of unorthodox views on ethnic diversity in the western borderlands; in this way, party apparatchiks implicitly defined Sovietness in ethnically exclusive terms. On another level, the Polish and Hungarian events inspired members of national minorities to mobilise their ethnic identities in opposition to the idea of Sovietness: some criticised Soviet foreign policy in private conversations with their compatriots, and others, former Gulag prisoners in particular, went so far as to articulate xenophobic opinions and to threaten Soviet citizens with physical violence. Finally, both these tendencies encouraged some other Soviet citizens to imbue ethnic identities with political significance, defining minorities as 'non-Soviet' outsiders.

VI. <u>Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalism'</u>

Debates about the role of national identities in Eastern Europe took on a special significance amongst Gulag returnees in western Ukraine. By 10 October 1956, the Ukrainian Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) registered over 45,000 'former nationalists and affiliates who [had] returned to the western provinces'.[162] Former members of Ukrainian nationalist organisations that had waged a civil war against Soviet power in the region a mere few years earlier, and supporters of the illegal Uniate church that the authorities had outlawed in 1945, often accused Soviet authorities of trying to Russify western Ukraine.[163] This fuelled officials' fears that they would adopt 'hostile' attitudes during the height of the East European crises. Indeed, their complaints did become especially pronounced in the aftermath of the Hungarian revolt.[164] At the same time, Amir Weiner shows that the Hungarian rebels

---

[162] Weiner, 'Empires', 337-338.
[163] See B. Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)* (Toronto, 1996), 107-127; V. Markus, 'Religion and Nationality: the Uniates of Ukraine' in Bohdan R. Bociurkiw and John W. Strong (eds.), *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (London, 1975), 106-109.
[164] Weiner, 'Empires', 360.

and the home-grown 'bourgeois nationalists' alike found little following amongst the wider population of western Ukraine, with many inhabitants afraid that 'nationalism' might lead to the rise of violence.[165]

The Polish and Hungarian events made party leaders particularly sensitive to manifestations of nationalism. Top CPU officials looked at western Ukraine with an especially strong degree of suspicion. They identified anti-Soviet and 'demagogic' statements amongst Gulag returnees, former members of nationalist organisations and 'bandits' (a term which was often used as shorthand for the UPA). They also wrote about members of the illegal churches, such as Uniates and Jehovah's Witnesses, many of whom were concentrated in the borderlands.[166] When discussing reactions to the unrest in Eastern Europe, therefore, Party bureaucrats focused on monitoring those groups which they had already considered unreliable. In that sense, official reports did not construct new enemies, but rather pointed to the urgent need to resolve an old problem. Making Party leaders even more determined to combat 'bourgeois nationalism' in Ukraine, therefore, the crisis in the outer empire fuelled tensions in the CPSU. In December 1956 Moscow accused all party organisations (right down to the level of primary party cells) of failing to take adequate measures against 'bourgeois nationalists'.[167] Still, from the perspective of the CPSU leadership, the fault lines dividing Soviet citizens from anti-Soviet nationalists remained unchanged.

Indeed, it seems that the Hungarian and Polish unrest had little discernible influence over the claims and reach of Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalism'. While embedded in reports about the popular reactions to the events in Eastern Europe, 'nationalist' outbursts bore little explicit relation to Poland and Hungary. For instance, in the Drohobych oblast, a local man (previously convicted for stealing) rode his bicycle through town in the evening of 1 November, shouting out anti-Soviet slogans: he called for the 'Ukrainians' to 'grab their weapons' and fight for 'independent Ukraine'. He was subsequently arrested and charged with a criminal offence.[168] Similarly, another report about popular reactions to the crises in Eastern Europe referred to a former political prisoner from western Ukraine who broke into

---

[165] Weiner, 'Empires', 344.
[166] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 156-165.
[167] Weiner, 'Empires', 362-363.
[168] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4302, ark. 125.

the house of a local party member, waving an axe and shouting that all communists should be killed.[169] The foreign crises should not be seen as an inspiration for the rise of Ukrainian nationalist ideas in the first place, because expressions of nationalism were still largely confined to the 'usual suspects'. This partly reflected the officials' predisposition to monitor the views of Gulag returnees more than other citizens, but probably also indicated both their 'extremism' and alienation from the rest of Ukrainian society.

Because events in Eastern Europe were seen to destabilise the Soviet Empire and thus strengthen the Ukrainian cause, 'bourgeois nationalists' were perhaps more willing to speak out. The Hungarian developments provided a 'spark' which transformed the 'dormant resentments' of the Gulag returnees into action at a time when, as Weiner puts it, 'the Twentieth Party Congress and the ensuing discussions inside and outside the party cells opened the wounds of the occupation and sovietisation policies in the western frontier'.[170] Reports about 'nationalist' leanings were not exclusively confined to the western oblasts. Petro Shelest informed the CPU Central Committee about a Kyivan who predicted that the 'Ukrainian *narod*' would follow the Hungarian example and put an end to the Soviet regime.[171] However, it was in the borderlands that most 'aggressive anti-Russian statements' were recorded.[172] Some locals talked about an independent Ukraine. In Volhynia, a woman from the village of Boholiuby in the Luts'k region, who had recently returned from imprisonment, discussed the Hungarian developments with a group of collective farmers. She predicted that the Ukrainians would follow the Hungarian example 'in the near future' and establish their own 'Ukrainian leadership'. In the same vein, a Gulag returnee hoped that a war would break out soon.[173]

It is difficult to determine how much support or sympathy residents of western Ukraine harboured for the active anti-Soviet 'nationalists'. According to Weiner, 'by and large, Gulag returnees encountered an unwelcoming society that saw them as potential trouble-makers and often blocked their reintegration into the social and

---

[169] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.
[170] Weiner, 'Empires', 351.
[171] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 236-245.
[172] A Zakarpattian miner claimed that a world war was about to begin, which would give 'us' a chance to chase the Russians out of Zakarpattia. The report did not actually specify the man's ethnicity, and he could well have been Hungarian. RGANI, f.5, op.31, d.62, ll. 92-95.
[173] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 223-226.

economic fabric'.[174] It would be very interesting (and all but impossible) to find out who denounced the 'nationalists', in particular whether many denunciations came from the migrants from Eastern Ukraine and other parts of the USSR, who were often met with a hostile reception in the western oblasts and found Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalism' threatening. It is likewise possible that personal animosities and other factors inspired Soviet citizens to denounce each other, and the reports should never be taken at face value. Equally, the denouncers may have represented the stable Soviet 'majority', who acted to prevent the crisis from escalating any further.

For the Soviet Union as a whole, Miriam Dobson demonstrates that many citizens were deeply distrustful of Gulag returnees, 'and derided the regime's claims that society itself was sufficiently robust to withstand this return of the banished other'.[175] Arguably, even though western Ukraine provided a more welcoming ground for the returnees, the same processes were evident in the region. Local residents expressed their fear of the Gulag returnees and of 'nationalists' in general. An inhabitant of L'viv who had migrated from the eastern oblasts, a former KGB officer, complained that the Soviet state failed to stop the rise of fascism in Hungary, and pointed out that 'dangerous individuals', such as former OUN members and smugglers who traded openly at L'viv markets, could easily destabilise the situation in the oblast itself. He suggested that only 'honest workers' should be allowed to live in the city.[176] Similarly, a lecturer from the Uzhgorod University argued that just as the Budapest revolt was supported by reactionary classes in Hungary, some residents of Zakarpattia could also provoke unrest at home. His statement reflected a tense situation in the oblast – he pointed out that there was 'a reason why the Uzhgorod furniture factory is dubbed the 'bourgeois' factory', employing as it did people who had enjoyed privileged status under Hungarian rule.[177] These individuals represented the Soviet 'elites', and as such they were almost certain to condemn the 'nationalists'. However, as the KGB reported, even the 'nationalists' themselves believed that they had little real influence in western Ukraine. A Volhynian-born member of the Komsomol, who had served in the Soviet army since 1953, told a

---

[174] Weiner, 'Robust Revolution', 225.

[175] M. Dobson, '"Show the Bandit-Enemies No Mercy!": Amnesty, Criminality and Public Response in 1953' in Jones, *Dilemmas*, 37.

[176] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 87-98.

[177] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 73-77.

Ukrainian student that everyone in his region wanted an 'independent Ukraine'. However, since nobody was willing to 'lead the *narod*' (so that everyone could 'write to the government' and say that Ukraine was leaving the USSR), calls for independence amounted to nothing more than isolated opinions.[178]

This suggests a need to modify Weiner's statement – it is difficult to determine how 'welcome' the Gulag returnees and 'Ukrainian nationalists' were in western Ukraine. Both the 'elites' and 'Ukrainian nationalists' believed that the indigenous population harboured some sympathy for 'the nationalists'. However, it is clear that they found little public support or actual following in the region. The Ukrainian authorities became increasingly strict about keeping Gulag returnees out of western Ukraine, and events in Eastern Europe added extra urgency to the issue. On 9 November 1956, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic issued a decree 'prohibiting former leaders and active members in the Ukrainian nationalist underground, who were tried and completed serving their sentences, to return to the western regions of Soviet Ukraine'.[179]

VII. <u>Conclusion</u>

Top party officials in Kyiv and Moscow were determined to contain formal and informal discussion. As the crises in Poland and Hungary escalated, they concluded, in reference to overly inquisitive citizens, that the events proved that the CPSU needed to intensify 'ideological struggle' at a time of international detente.[180] At the same time, the authorities were confident that they would manage to restore order and control public debate. While '"party-mindedness" [...] remained the fulcrum of party policy throughout the period',[181] most participants in the explanatory gatherings voiced support for CPSU policies in Eastern Europe and condemned the foreign 'rebels' in Hungary in the name of a distinct Soviet community.

Reformist patriotism was crushed under the weight of conservative patriotism in public forums. On an emotional level, many Soviet citizens did not like to witness

---

[178] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 124-131.
[179] Weiner, 'Empires', 361-362.
[180] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 208-212.
[181] Jones, 'Dilemmas', 13.

the 'foreigners' in Hungary and Poland challenge the authority of the Soviet state. Demanding that stability be assured at home, they hoped that the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe would grow in strength. Indeed, some were explicitly nostalgic about the Stalinist period.

Even as Polish and Hungarian events provoked a predominantly conservative reaction, they also encouraged citizens to criticise the authorities, fostering the rise of a more 'active' society in Soviet Ukraine. In response to the confusion and incompetence amongst low-level officials who organised explanatory meetings about Poland and Hungary, citizens openly attacked Khrushchev and his leadership. By articulating both conservative and reformist patriotism, they attempted to hold the leaders in Moscow accountable to themselves. Some reform-minded members of the public criticised the shortage of information about Poland and Hungary to portray themselves as loyal citizens who had the right both to obtain reliable news from the Soviet media and to participate in debates surrounding changes in the socialist camp. They used the explanatory gatherings about Eastern Europe to promote discussion. Equally importantly, however, through outwardly rejecting unorthodox opinions and underlining their Soviet and 'communist' credentials, exponents of conservative patriotism pursued their own agenda of reform. They demanded that senior officials and journalists provide Soviet audiences with more detailed and reliable news about Eastern Europe in order to avoid the spread of malicious rumours. Ironically, while engaging in political debate during agitation meetings, they called on the authorities to halt 'democratic' reforms at home. In this sense, the outbreak of violence in Hungary and Gomulka's reforms in Poland compelled citizens to discuss different ways in which the USSR and other Soviet-style regimes could develop. Meanwhile, confusion and incompetence of low-level officials created contexts where such discussions took place.

Soviet patriotism was grounded in a sense of belonging – citizens staked a claim to participate in discussions about the future of the USSR, which were underpinned by various concepts of Sovietness. Whilst conservative patriotism envisaged a strongly hierarchical Soviet community in which the 'elite' would ensure peace and stability for the 'masses', reformist patriotism embodied anti-paternalist attitudes and a belief that a large number of citizens should be able to access information and debate policy. These views were underpinned by differing visions of the USSR's

role as the centre of the socialist bloc: most citizens agreed that Moscow should preserve its influences in Eastern Europe, but whereas advocates of conservative patriotism expected unquestioning loyalty from the satellites and supported military measures in Hungary, reformist patriotism generally held that the USSR could best boost its international standing by becoming the leader of 'democratisation'. Still, in commenting on the Polish and Hungarian events, most implied that it was their duty as citizens to support the USSR's foreign policy.

Soviet patriotism also had a much darker side as it implicitly excluded significant parts of Ukraine's population from the Soviet community. As the very existence of numerous reports about conversations between friends and colleagues suggests, many 'loyal' citizens denounced their acquaintances to the authorities; they also condemned 'hostile' attitudes of the Jews, Poles, Hungarians and Ukrainian 'nationalists' during party meetings and agitation gatherings. They thus constructed certain groups as inherently unreliable and 'non-Soviet'. Gulag returnees, former OUN members, and ethnic minorities were always suspect – in that sense, party leaders defined 'hostile' individuals with reference to who they were rather than what they did.

Social, educational and generational divisions were important factors shaping Soviet citizens' attitudes towards Poland and Hungary and, by extension, towards Khrushchev and his 'liberalisation'. University students were the most vocal advocates of reformist patriotism during 1956: many voiced sympathy for Gomulka and criticised the invasion of Hungary. In contrast, the Soviet middle class, including war veterans, the technical intelligentsia, and army officers, proved the staunchest supporters of conservative patriotism. Conservative patriotism also held an appeal for low-level party officials who mobilised it to strengthen their position vis-à-vis their superiors in Kyiv and Moscow. While the central authorities accused their subordinates of failing to control popular opinion in the USSR, low-level bureaucrats, the technical intelligentsia, and regular workers blamed Khrushchev for letting the situation get out of hand. The position of blue-collar workers and collective farmers was more ambiguous, especially in the western oblasts, but it would seem that they tended towards conservative positions, too. If nothing else, they outwardly rallied behind the state when they commented on the unfolding developments during explanatory meetings. Because the fault lines in Soviet society

overlapped, citizens maintained complex and contradictory attitudes towards the foreign crises. After all, one and the same individual could be a claimant asking for more material benefits in response to the leaders' emphasis on improving living conditions during late 1956, a student criticising the Soviet censorship, and a resident of the western oblasts who attacked Khrushchev's 'lax' foreign policy vis-à-vis the rebellious Eastern Europe. This is why popular responses to the Polish and Hungarian events cannot be categorised along a simple axis of support and opposition to Khrushchev's reforms.

Moreover, Ukrainian reactions to the Polish and Hungarian crises of 1956 do not easily fit into the traditional East-West divide, which portrays western Ukraine as more anti-Soviet than other parts of the republic. It is true that most party reports about 'problematic' opinions came from the western oblasts and that the region was more exposed to news from Eastern Europe than other parts of Ukraine. Many locals expressed support for Gomulka's policies and members of ethnic minorities in the region, particularly Poles and Hungarians, began to voice 'isolationist' views. At the same time, however, anxieties about a possible war also fuelled conservative patriotism in western Ukraine. Most inhabitants of the western oblasts who spoke during public meetings welcomed the military invasion of Hungary, at least to the extent that they hoped it would bring about peace and stability. However, they also criticised Khrushchev's supposedly lax foreign policy. While Soviet patriotism ran strong in the west, the borderlands witnessed the most heated debates about the USSR's role as the centre of the socialist camp.

Repercussions of the 1956 crises in western Ukraine would be felt for a long time to come. At times, memories of the Hungarian events had very unexpected consequences in the region, and they reflected citizens' complex attitudes towards the Party leadership. The case of 'Tykhyi omut' was very radical and untypical. Nevertheless, it showed that, at least in west Ukraine, fear of war inspired both a longing for 'strong rule' and a critical approach towards the Party leadership. In December 1967, party authorities in L'viv informed their superiors in Kyiv about the discovery of an illegal youth group on their territory. An 18-year-old Ukrainian student by the name of Eresko, born and bred in the Ukrainian-speaking west, gathered seven young people and set out to form a paramilitary organisation. The group rather mysteriously called themselves 'Tykhyi omut' and printed leaflets

calling for the USSR to send tanks against China in order to prevent the repeat of a surprise attack from abroad as in 1941. They also wanted to rob shops to obtain money to buy weapons, but they were detained by the KGB before they managed to put their plans into action. Talking to KGB officers, Eresko explained that his older brother, who had served in the Soviet army in Hungary in 1956, had told him horrifying stories about the revolt in Budapest. He feared that 'nationalist elements' in L'viv could follow the Hungarian example and rise up against the authorities during the fiftieth anniversary of establishing Soviet power in Ukraine. Believing that the leaders in Kyiv and Moscow did not realise the scale of the threat, he had resolved to form an organisation that could defend the regime in battle. In other words, he formed an illegal group to support the Soviet system in L'viv, partly influenced by his perceptions of the 1956 Hungarian crisis. Unlike his co-defendants, Eresko refused to recognise the error of his ways, and was excluded from the Komsomol.[182]

---

[182] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.6313, ark. 36.

Chapter Two

National Supremacy: Soviet Travels in Eastern Europe

From the mid-1950s, travel became increasingly important in shaping Soviet perceptions of Eastern Europe. As international trips within the socialist camp became a possibility and an issue, top CPSU apparatchiks sought to give ideological meaning to face-to-face encounters between Soviet citizens and inhabitants of the people's democracies.[1] Just as Soviet officials had long stressed 'the productive value of touring and travel for intellectual and physical self-improvement',[2] they now likewise insisted that travel in Eastern Europe should be educational and instructive. Numerous state and Party institutions consequently promoted three main types of international travel.[3] Firstly, they coordinated the so-called 'borderland exchanges' (*prigranichnye obmeny*) between towns and regions on either side of the Soviet frontier, which normally included local professionals, amateur artists, and party activists. Secondly, small delegations of CPSU officials and various cultural, scientific, industrial, and agricultural specialists from across Ukraine met their colleagues from the satellite states. Thirdly, Soviet foreign tourism resumed in the mid-1950s, becoming better organised and more widespread, both geographically and numerically, from the early 1960s onwards.[4] Apart from relaxing and sunbathing at 'international camps of rest' (*mezhdunarodnye lageria otdykha*), most tourists who travelled to Eastern Europe formed part of organised groups which often visited

---

[1] According to Soviet estimates, by the late Brezhnev period, about 60 per cent of foreign tourists visiting the USSR came from socialist countries, while 55 per cent of Soviet tourists going abroad took trips to socialist states. Most of them travelled as part of organised groups. V.V. Dvornichenko, *Turizm v SSSR i deiatel'nost' sovetskikh profsoiuzov po ego razvitiiu (1917-1984 gg.)* (Moscow, 1985), 129-130. Many Ukrainian and Polish cities were twinned during the late 1950s and the 1960s, including Kharkiv and Poznan, Donets'k and Katowice, Cherkasy and Bydgoszcz, Szczecin and Odesa, and Kyiv and Krakow.

[2] D. Koenker, 'Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure', *Slavic Review* 62:4 (Winter 2003), 659.

[3] The institutions involved in organising travel included the central, republican, and local branches of the Society for Cultural Relations with the Abroad and its successor, the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies (the SSOD), its constituent organisations such as the Soviet-Czechoslovak, Soviet-Hungarian and Soviet-Polish Friendship Societies, as well as trade unions, gorkoms, obkoms, and the central committees in Moscow and Kyiv, individual factories and universities, not to mention state and party organisations in the people's democracies.

[4] Dvornichenko, *Turizm*, 132-133. In 1963 alone, more than 60,000 Soviet tourists travelled to Eastern Europe via Inturist, trade union organisations, or the Komsomol. A.E. Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers: Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe' in A.E. Gorsuch and D. Koenker (eds.), *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca, 2006), 206.

factories, farms, and cultural and educational institutions abroad.[5] The politics, ideology, and practices of travel evolved through the 1960s and took a more or less set form by the 1970s, moulding official narratives about Sovietness and the socialist camp.

Travel was a privilege awarded to those who excelled, yet also conformed. In this way, it served as both a marker and creator of social privilege and differentation in the USSR. Travel had formed an important part of the 'Big Deal' between Stalin's regime and an emerging middle class: not only was it a perk bestowed upon party activists and professionals, but, as Anne Gorsuch shows, it also set the most 'reliable' citizens apart from the rest of Soviet society and provided a context in which people showed that they thought and behaved in the 'appropriate' manner.[6] After the mid-1950s, the expansion of travel helped to extend the 'Big Deal' to a larger segment of the population. Nevertheless, although trips to Eastern Europe were considerably less elitist than travel to the capitalist West,[7] they still served as a means of social distinction, with official narratives of travel highlighting the special contribution that Soviet professionals, party activists, artists and 'leading workers' made to strengthening the USSR's ties with its satellites.

Because travel acquired an international dimension, official concepts of status became closely intertwined with Soviet and Ukrainian identities. The act of crossing the border, both mentally and physically, encouraged Soviet citizens to reflect upon their role in the international arena, while strict vetting procedures before departure served to determine the personal and social characteristics needed for an individual to represent the USSR abroad.[8] Travel was consequently a crucible in which ideas about Sovietness as an 'imperial' identity were forged, compelling citizens to describe the satellite states as junior partners in the process of international cooperation and to demonstrate their own contribution to strengthening Soviet influences in Eastern Europe. On one level, foreign trips thereby acquired a

---

[5] Dvornichenko, *Turizm*, 133 and 139.

[6] A.E. Gorsuch, '"There's No Place Like Home": Soviet Tourism in Late Stalinism', *Slavic Review* 62:4 (2003), 769, 781-782. K. Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Bloomington, 2000), 195-199.

[7] In 1961, only 40 per cent of tourists travelling to the people's democracies via Inturist were party members, with almost 17 per cent representing blue-collar workers; more *rabochie* visited Eastern Europe on the cheaper non-hard-currency exchanges organised by the Trade Union Excursion Bureau. Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers', 211.

[8] Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers', 206, 212.

particular importance for Ukraine, and especially its western oblasts. Pushed sometimes to showcase both Soviet and Ukrainian cultural achievements during their trips abroad, inhabitants of Ukraine and the western borderlands came into contact with residents of the people's democracies more often than most other Soviet citizens. This granted Ukraine and the borderlands a prominent role in official narratives of Sovietness.

Moreover, the 'imperial' dimension of travel had important implications for the evolution of the concept of middle class. Official accounts suggested that 'reliable' Soviet travellers should demonstrate their professional prowess, as well as accentuating 'conservative' beliefs by condemning foreign deviations from the Soviet model of socialism. Fractures emerging during travel further acted to reinforce this ideological frame of Sovietness, encouraging journalists and tour group leaders to juxtapose the 'serious' and 'responsible' Soviet people to 'frivolous' East Europeans. At the same time, at least during the 1960s, official portrayals of travel implied that citizens aspiring to the status of middle class had to demonstrate an active interest in their western neighbours, thus manifesting that they still cared about the 'common' future of the socialist camp.[9] The model middle class citizen thus emerged as both a Soviet patriot and a conscious internationalist.

The sources, ranging from the mid-1950s to the early 1980s, reveal normative narratives of travel, which probably did not correspond to people's 'real' interests and concerns. This chapter focuses on the period before the end of the Czechoslovak crisis in 1969, when official emphasis on travel as a means of strengthening Soviet influences in the socialist camp reached its apogee. Correspondence between top CPSU apparatchiks and representatives of the Soviet mass media, as well as reports about the collaboration between Soviet and East European journalists, demonstrate how these groups infused the concept of international travel with various ideological undertones. Official narratives were also shaped by travel itself. I thus examine plans for borderland exchanges, official delegations, and mass tourism, all of which were compiled by state and Party officials in Moscow, Kyiv and the provinces. While not unveiling popular responses to the official narratives, these sources expose fractions and contradictions within them. Reports from foreign trips further suggest that the

---

[9] This raised a different image of Eastern Europe than the historical portrayals that evolved under Brezhnev, which portrayed the satellite states as inherently 'non-Soviet'. See Chapter 4.

evolution of travel, and the meanings given to it, also occurred through the experiences of Soviet travellers. Compiled as they were by prominent activists and tour group leaders, the reports offer a skewed picture of Soviet travellers' experiences: after all, as Gorsuch points out, 'all trip leaders must have known that any possibilities for future trips, as well perhaps as possibilities for advancement at home, depended on their own behaviour and that of their charges while abroad'.[10] Nevertheless, they do reveal that travellers witnessed many 'deviations' from the Soviet model when they visited Eastern Europe, often encountering a cold or even hostile reception abroad. This compelled them to comment on 'non-Soviet' or even 'anti-Soviet' attitudes and behaviours in public, thus redefining official ideas about the 'socialist camp' and international cooperation.

Although travel as such often had other purposes, a rising number of Soviet citizens participated in the reproduction of the formulaic portrayals of a Soviet-led socialist camp to 'stage consent' for the CPSU and the Soviet state, improving thereby their own social standing. Some citizens even seemed to be genuinely upset when frictions and conflicts that surfaced during travel undermined these ritualised narratives, manifesting perhaps an emotional attachment to the idea of Soviet superiority in Eastern Europe.

I. <u>Teachers of socialism</u>

The Soviet mass media created the ideological frame of international travel, providing an important resource to citizens who sought to excel at and reap the perks of conformity. During the late 1950s and the 1960s, top CPSU apparatchiks increased their pressure on press, radio, and television to produce material about the socialist camp. Responding to signals from the CPSU, editors and journalists suggested that Soviet citizens should celebrate international cooperation in the socialist bloc, all the while maintaining a sense of pride or even superiority vis-a-vis the satellite states. Such portrayals then put pressure on various Soviet professionals, artists, and party activists both to educate themselves about their neighbours and to speak in public about their contribution to strengthening the unity of the Soviet-led

---

[10] Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers', 208.

socialist camp. Reproducing ritualised images of the USSR's leading role in the region in official reports and newspaper articles about their encounters with foreign citizens, members of these groups claimed a special status in Soviet society.

During the late 1950s, top Party officials made a concerted effort to encourage journalists and editors to write more about the people's democracies. In a special resolution from 6 June 1958, the CPSU Central Committee instructed the Soviet press organs to 'systematically describe' events and developments in Eastern Europe, focusing on the cooperation between communist and workers' parties, ideological questions, the policy of peace, and economic development.[11] The apparatchiks also wanted TASS to refrain from publishing lengthy lists of participants of foreign delegations which visited the USSR, and promote more 'analytical' materials instead.[12] The number of articles about the European satellite states did indeed increase in the following few years, official reports claimed, with *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* publishing 1500 items about Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania in 1961 alone. They included pieces by top party leaders from Eastern Europe, diaries of Soviet journalists, accounts by tourists who travelled around the region, as well as special reports devoted to important anniversaries in the people's democracies.[13]

Senior apparatchiks were not initially satisfied with the quality of journalism about Eastern Europe, reprimanding Soviet editors and journalists for failing to educate the public. Throughout the 1960s, top CPSU officials continued to complain that the majority of press articles about Eastern Europe were short informational notes, which did not explore the 'development of the economic base' or cultural and intellectual processes taking place in the region; journalists often focused on foreigners' reactions to 'Soviet achievements', but failed to analyse and learn from domestic experiences of the satellite countries.[14] Similarly, cooperation between Soviet and East European television and radio stations was erratic,[15] with a preponderance of formulaic broadcasts which reflected foreigners' 'admiration' for the USSR and pride in their own 'socialist' achievements. Foreign leaders and

---

[11] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.202, ll. 150-155.
[12] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.66, ll. 60-63.
[13] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.202, ll. 150-155.
[14] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.202, ll. 150-155; and RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 189-195.
[15] GARF, f.6903, op.2. d.564, ll. 34-38.

ambassadors regularly recorded special congratulatory messages for 1 May and 7 November, as well as speeches devoted to their own national holidays.[16] Furthermore, many portrayals of Eastern Europe did not explicitly concern social, economic or political questions, with Soviet television showing, for example, East German and Czechoslovak children's cartoons.[17]

However, under pressure from the Central Committee, journalists and editors did gradually create more 'analytical' materials about the Soviet bloc and international cooperation. In 1960, television showcased a fascinating range of programmes such as *The all-state conference of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*, *Golden Prague*, and *Czech National Drama*, along with special reports such as *Stalinovaros*, describing the life of Hungarian metallurgists.[18] Meanwhile, throughout the 1960s and the 1970s, East European radio and television stations exchanged news reports and other programmes about 'the building of socialism', culture, sports, and 'international cooperation' in the camp.[19] Not only did editors from the satellite countries send programmes to be broadcast on the all-union Soviet radio and television, but they also cooperated with the republican media in Kyiv.[20] Judging by the sheer quantity of articles written by East European leaders, contemporary and classical East European literature, publications concerning the social, economic, and technical progress in the Soviet bloc, and items about the ideological unity of the socialist camp, it is safe to conclude that Soviet readers could easily access information about Eastern Europe by the early 1970s. The Goskomizdat, the Academy of Sciences, and the Central Committee's Academy of Social Sciences prepared lists of items to be published in book form once every six months; in 1972, they printed 500 different titles about the socialist camp in 17 million copies.[21]

Political leaders perceived media portrayals of Eastern Europe as a means to improve diplomatic relations between the USSR and its satellites, and they condemned mistakes or omissions in the Soviet press as potentially offensive. In

---

[16] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll. 1-26; GARF, Moscow, f.6903, op.2, d.500, l. 184.

[17] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll. 18-22.

[18] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll.14-17, 18-22.

[19] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.500, l. 184; GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll. 1-26; RGANI, f.5, op.66, d.163, ll. 54-62; SWPW, t. 41/191 (Informacja o pobycie 120-osobowej delegacji TPRP w Polsce, 1973).

[20] SWPW, t.41/176 (Notatka ze wspolnego spotkania Kierownictwa Konsulatu w Kijowie z przedstawicielami TPRP, odbytego w dniu 23 maja br); GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.500, ll. 129-142.

[21] RGANI, f.5, op.66, d.163, ll. 45-51.

February 1958, for example, the Soviet Ministry of Culture bemoaned the fact that *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, while writing extensively about international sports, contained very little information about foreign artists visiting the USSR or Soviet artists performing abroad. This surprised 'our friends' in socialist countries, they argued, especially because their newspapers reported on such events on a regular basis.[22] Likewise, four years later, CPSU officials were alarmed that a piece about the Hungarian party plenum was published four days after it had taken place; they were afraid of offending the comrades in Budapest, because newspapers normally reported such crucial events on the next day.[23] Indeed, foreign leaders often 'delicately hinted' at the scarcity of information about their cultural achievements or political reforms, which made Soviet state and party apparatchiks keen to sponsor media materials about their neighbours. In 1966, for instance, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs categorically instructed journalists to publish more articles about the Hungarian reforms, lest Budapest interpret Soviet silence as a sign of disapproval, as well as to take action in response to Hungarian complaints that the Soviet press had published few reviews of Hungarian ballet performances in the USSR.[24] Even though journalists and editors frustrated their efforts from time to time, party officials continued to mandate that the media must show the USSR's commitment to 'international friendship' in Eastern Europe. This was particularly clear in the aftermath of the Prague Spring, when the CPSU instructed the press, radio, and television to discuss the 1970 Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship Treaty in much detail, thus rebuking 'hostile propaganda' about the USSR's alleged exploitation of its satellites.[25] *Pravda* would highlight the 'objective need' for the mutually beneficial 'proletarian internationalism' and 'brotherly friendship'; *Izvestiia* would focus on Soviet-Czechoslovak struggle for peace in Europe; *Sovetskaia Rossiia* would use 'concrete examples' to show how Prague and Moscow solved technical and scientific problems together; and *Krasnaia zvezda*, targeting the Soviet military,

---

[22] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.66, ll. 31-34.

[23] Meanwhile, foreign Party leaders complained about the editorial boards of *Sovetskaia kul'tura*, *Literaturnaia gazeta* and *Za rubezhom*, which refused to exchange news and articles with their colleagues abroad. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.202, ll. 150-155.

[24] This was an especially delicate issue, because the Soviet press had recently devoted considerably more attention to Romanian ballet. Moreover, good quality articles about Soviet-Hungarian relations would provide Hungarian communists with facts and figures needed to condemn western 'imperialist propaganda', which had recently intensified its activity in Hungary and was only likely to grow more hostile in the run-up to the tenth anniversary of the Soviet invasion. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 189-195.

[25] RGANI, f.5, op.62, d.41, ll. 134-135, 139-141.

would expose 'imperialist plots' seeking to break up the 'unity of the socialist camp'.[26]

While the push to have numerous reports on Eastern Europe was primarily intended to strengthen Soviet influence abroad, and even to send more or less covert signals to foreign leaders, the strong presence of this theme in Soviet publications carried an important message to readers: Soviet citizens were expected to cultivate a level of erudition about their western neighbours. Officials in Moscow went so far as to specify that *Novoe vremia* should present a 'more or less free view' of Soviet society, and not the 'official position' on international affairs,[27] thus underlining the need for 'ordinary citizens' to develop articulate views about the Soviet bloc. The CPSU Central Committee used the media to motivate readers to develop their own roles in establishing 'fraternal relations' with the people's democracies. In particular, they encouraged industrial and agricultural specialists to learn from the experiences of East Europeans. In April 1966, top Party leaders resolved to facilitate direct contacts between newspapers targeting similar audiences in the USSR and Hungary, claiming that this would help to educate engineers in both countries about the close links between their factories. Because Hungary had recently 'gained interesting experiences in the field of building socialism', Soviet journalists were instructed to analyse these developments in an 'accessible and interesting way', focusing on the 'national particularities' (*natsional'nye osobennosti*) of Hungarian development and common Soviet-Hungarian industrial projects.[28] Motivated by the need to shape popular opinion in Eastern Europe and counteract accusations of Soviet economic exploitation, senior apparatchiks even instructed newspapers to discuss the performance of particular factories which advanced the process of economic cooperation. Foreign journalists would visit Soviet enterprises which exported their products to Poland and Czechoslovakia, while Soviet journalists would write about Czechoslovak and Polish factories whose production was geared towards the USSR.[29] In this way, managers and engineers were to study the process of international cooperation and especially to learn about their colleagues and factories

---

[26] RGANI, f.5, op.62, d.41, ll. 136-138.
[27] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.66, ll. 60-63.
[28] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 189-195.
[29] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 203-204.

across the border; some even needed to prove that they actively participated in common projects with their 'socialist brothers' by speaking to foreign journalists.

Moreover, top apparatchiks used the mass media to promote closer collaboration between Soviet and East European artists, but only to the extent that they believed it would help to further the image of Soviet superiority in the region. They thus called for the press to discuss contemporary Hungarian culture, familiarising Soviet readers with the 'young generation', rather than just the same old painters and writers.[30] They also encouraged the radio to exchange musical programmes with the people's democracies.[31] For their part, East European bureaucrats were even more forthright in promoting artistic cooperation. In 1966, Czechoslovak radio officials insisted that Moscow and Prague transmit each other's concerts live, as well as encourage direct cooperation between Soviet and Czechoslovak composers who could then develop 'socialist dance', instead of simply following Western trends. This was essential for making common Soviet-Czechoslovak radio programmes more interesting and less pompous.[32] Interestingly, however, Soviet officials were sometimes apprehensive about East European initiatives in the field of cultural cooperation. While they were happy to send the composer Arkadii Ostrovskii to the fourth international song festival in the Polish seaside resort of Sopot in 1963, safe in the knowledge that he would be praised and pampered by the organisers and the mass media having won the first prize for his song *Pust' vsegda budet solntse* the year before,[33] they were more divided over the Polish idea to prepare a pan-East European concert of pop music under the banner of '*Estrada Druzhby*' (the Stage of Friendship). Afraid that the event would not give them a chance to show off 'the multinational' Soviet pop scene, and pointing out that East Europeans placed too much emphasis on such 'Western' genres of entertainment as cabaret songs, the CPSU Central Committee advised the Goskoncert not to get involved in the project.[34] Soviet officials used the mass media to show off East European artistic endeavours when they thought it would present the USSR as the most advanced state whose culture inspired other

---

[30] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 189-195.
[31] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll. 2-5.
[32] This was especially important in Czechoslovakia itself; as the officials from Prague put it, Soviet programmes broadcast in Czechoslovakia were 'successful', but 'nobody listened to them'. GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.500, ll. 129-142.
[33] The title means 'Let There Always Be Sun'. RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.107, l. 89.
[34] RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.107, l. 7.

nations in the bloc: the festival of Soviet songs held every year in the Polish town of Zielona Góra was perfect for this purpose.[35]

As top officials shaped media portrayals to suggest that citizens had a duty to strengthen the USSR's links with the people's democracies, people who aspired to the status of middle class further contributed to the spread of these narratives, stressing the need for both cooperation and Soviet leadership in Eastern Europe. Reproducing formulaic portrayals of the people's democracies in various public contexts and in official reports, they sometimes evaluated foreign practices and innovations on the constative level. In December 1967, for example, regional television in Krakow hosted the director of the Kyiv television studio to share experiences and exchange ideas. Reporting to the obkom, the latter described the Poles' short, dynamic news reports in very positive terms, and suggested that Ukrainian journalists could copy the Polish 'polemical' programmes where two speakers represented different views on a given topic and answered questions sent in by the viewers.[36]

At the same time, the aspirational middle class sought to present themselves as important social leaders. For one, journalists and editors claimed that they 'helped' their colleagues in Eastern Europe, which allowed them to demand the right to travel and improve their working conditions. Editors emphasised that foreign media activists should learn from the Soviet experience and thus lobbied the Central Committee to increase the number of journalists' delegations travelling between the USSR and Eastern Europe.[37] Through invoking the idea of 'Soviet guidance' and 'socialist cooperation' in official correspondence with senior Party officials, as well as in the work that they published, they presented themselves as a key link between Soviet and East European popular opinion. As early as 1956, the chief editor of the satirical journal *Krokodil* boasted that his publication was popular throughout Eastern Europe, helping thereby to deepen international cooperation and to spread Soviet practices across the region: *Krokodil* and humourous periodicals from the socialist countries, such as the Polish *Szpilki* and the Hungarian *Ludas matyi*, reprinted each other's cartoons, and, he stressed, foreign editors carefully listened to

---

[35] L.V. Loiko, *Ispytanie na prochnost'. Obshchestvo pol'sko-sovetskoi druzhby: Stanovlenie, razvitie* (Minsk, 1989), 134.
[36] DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.561, ark. 73-78.
[37] GARF, f.6903, op.2, d.218b, ll. 1-26; RGANI, f.5, op.73, d.274, ll. 57-59.

'our assessment' and advice. At the same time, even though personal contacts with foreign journalists would allow *Krokodil*'s artists to find out more about 'life abroad' and prepare appropriate materials, the chief editor complained that his employees could hardly afford to visit East European countries and were even deprived of the opportunity to order international telephone calls. This undermined their position as the 'senior' partners in the process of international cooperation: while their colleagues abroad telephoned them on a regular basis, they joked about Soviet 'formality' when Moscow contacted them by post.[38] Naturally, the chief editor sought to present the situation in such a way as to obtain more funding for his journal. Although his plight met with a rather cold reaction at the propaganda and agitation department of the CPSU Central Committee,[39] other editors did have more success in lobbying Party apparatchiks to increase the number of foreign correspondents in Eastern Europe.[40] Their justification reveals how they envisaged the role of the Soviet press. Invoking the rhetoric of 'Sovietness' to further their professional interests and presenting themselves as leading 'Soviet' people, editors and journalists depicted their work as an example of internationalist cooperation within the socialist camp, claiming both to familiarise readers at home with the 'life' of the people's democracies and to teach 'foreigners' about Marxist-Leninist principles and the building of socialism.[41]

Other citizens also participated in reproducing ritualised images of Eastern Europe as propagated by the mass media, claiming that they guided Soviet popular opinion. Top apparatchiks instructed the Soviet press to depict party activists, state officials, and prominent members of various social organisations (such as

---

[38] To make matters worse, foreign journals had the financial means to publish annual collections of their most popular cartoons on very good quality paper; Soviet satirists had no such compilations at all. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.17, ll. 36-44.

[39] The officials admitted that his comments were 'worthy of attention', but also stated that the question of international exchanges between journalists would be considered on a case-by-case basis. They flatly refused to sponsor any annual cartoon albums. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.17, l. 45.

[40] In November 1956, for example, the chief editor of *Komsomol'skaia pravda* admitted that the paper published very few materials about the life and problems of young people in socialist countries. He pointed out that journalists were largely ignorant of these issues because *Komsomol'skaia pravda* had not had its own correspondents in foreign socialist countries since early 1955 (with the exception of China). He sought the support of the CPSU Central Committee to reinstate reporters in Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Sofia, Budapest, and Bucharest. The party authorities proved more responsive this time, informing Goriunov that the propaganda department agreed to send more correspondents to Eastern Europe for *Komsomol'skaia pravda* along with a few other newspapers. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.7, ll. 176, 177.

[41] Nevertheless, funding problems continued to plague the Soviet media, making cooperation with foreign journalists difficult. RGANI, f.5, op.62, d.41, ll. 241-252.

international friendship societies) as 'authoritative observers' (*avtoritetnye obozrevateli*) who had a responsibility to inform the rest of the Soviet population about the people's democracies.[42] As the editors of *Politicheskoe samoobrazovaniie* put it after their visit to Hungary in 1973, Soviet 'party activists' had to study how their foreign comrades conducted political work and to write about the USSR's collaboration with its western neighbours in order to satisfy the thirst for knowledge of 'rank-and-file party members' and 'ordinary workers'.[43] Indeed, activists of friendship societies and obkom apparatchiks seemed to respond to these pressures, drawing on mass media portrayals of the 'outer empire' to parade their knowledge about the socialist camp and thereby to distinguish themselves from the 'masses'. They organised 'collective viewings' of television programmes such as those about Brezhnev's visit to Czechoslovakia in 1978. Even though these public meetings were tailored towards the 'mass' of workers, the duty to 'comment' rested on local party officials, war veterans, and 'leading workers' who spoke in the name of their 'workers' collectives', employing tired stock phrases or simply repeating what they had themselves gathered from the official news reports.[44] They thus reaffirmed their special status in the local communities.

Moreover, party activists, prominent members of friendship societies and various professionals advanced formulaic portrayals of Soviet superiority in Eastern Europe when they compiled official reports and produced media accounts of their meetings with foreign citizens. Those who described their journeys on 'friendship trains' presented them as a nobilitating experience, emphasising that, as Soviet people, they met with a fitting reception abroad: one report celebrated the fact that 3000 people turned out to greet one group at the Krakow train station despite adverse weather conditions, and the tourists met 'important people' and stayed in 'the nicest hotels' in Warsaw.[45] Reports also brought out the expertise of Soviet citizens who met foreigners in Soviet Ukraine. In 1959, for example, agricultural specialists from L'viv claimed to have 'taught' Polish farmers how to grow corn, while engineers from the local bus factory stressed that they had impressed the Poles with their new

---

[42] RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.235, ll. 189-195.
[43] RGANI, f.5, op.66, d.163, ll. 40-41.
[44] TsDAHO, f.1, op.32, s.1336, ark. 21-23, 24-26.
[45] DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.1003, ark. 12-23.

LAZ-695 model and instructed them on how to modernise production technologies.[46] Similarly, Soviet academics, CPSU activists, and museum directors received Polish delegations in western Ukraine, showing the Poles how to conduct agitation work and design exhibitions; the L'viv obkom underlined that foreign guests took 'detailed notes' about the way in which their Soviet comrades used old and 'new' *narodnye* traditions in order to strengthen socialism in the region (no matter how much of an oxymoron 'new traditions' may seem to be).[47] By participating in these international exchanges and, more importantly, producing reports that highlighted their senior status in the process of international cooperation, these individuals wrote themselves into the ritualised narratives of Sovietness, thus articulating their own prestigious social position. Indeed, Soviet travellers also printed many newspaper articles, appeared on the local radio, and published books in which they highlighted their contribution to establishing friendly relations with twinned towns and regions across the border.[48] They thereby asserted their special status in Soviet society, claiming such perks as access to information and the right to travel. In return, they had to act in an exemplary 'Soviet' manner by reproducing formulaic portrayals of the socialist bloc and thus 'teaching' other citizens at home about Soviet guidance and socialist cooperation in Eastern Europe.

Under pressure from top CPSU officials, the Soviet mass media produced numerous images of the satellite states. Through highlighting the need to establish strong links between the USSR and the people's democracies in the economic and cultural spheres, and to fortify Soviet authority in Eastern Europe, newspapers, radio, and television placed implicit demands on their audiences. They suggested that party activists, educated professionals, and artists should speak about their own contribution to international cooperation, emphasising that they could enjoy a special status in Soviet society. This encouraged numerous members of these groups to affirm their middle class status, distinguishing themselves from the 'masses' and claiming privileges such as travel, by reproducing formulaic accounts of their

---

[46] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 267-280.

[47] For instance, on 7 June 1964, Polish visitors participated in the Hammer and Sickle Holiday and a wedding ceremony in Drohobych. Meanwhile, Soviet activists visited Poland, where they devoted each day to 'a different category of youth', meeting with activists and learning about the life, work, and leisure of young people across the border. TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.5987, ark. 7-14.

[48] TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.1458, ark. 43-44; TsDAHO, f.1, op.32, s.46, ark. 15-22; DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.1835, ark. 21-24; GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 89-92.

encounters with foreign citizens. This further contributed to the spread of ritualised portrayals of Soviet supremacy in the socialist camp.

II.   <u>Travel as ritual</u>

As foreign trips featured so prominently in official portrayals of Eastern Europe, narratives of Sovietness were further shaped by the actual practice of travel. Personal and national antagonisms which surfaced during face-to-face encounters with foreigners, practical difficulties inherent in organising international travel, and conflicts between the idea of travel as leisure and travel as ideological act suggested new visions of what constituted Soviet identity abroad. Apart from permitting local officials in the west to bring out the special role of the borderlands in strengthening the USSR's links with the outer empire, the practice of travel encouraged party activists and professionals to compile reports where they defined 'seriousness' and modesty as crucial characteristics that distinguished Soviet travellers from citizens of the satellite states, which further permitted them to differentiate themselves as an elite middle class which embodied such attributes. Travel also encouraged these groups to speak about Soviet and Ukrainian culture during encounters with foreigners, as well as increasing the magnitude of various ritualised celebrations of the Great Patriotic War. This reduced the importance of the concept of international socialist cooperation in official depictions of the Soviet bloc, turning public attention towards themes that set the USSR apart from the rest of Eastern Europe.

Top state and party officials sought to shape international travel so as to conform to the official narratives as outlined in Soviet mass media. They wanted foreign trips to emphasise the key role that educated specialists and activists played in 'guiding' their East European colleagues. When travel between the western USSR and eastern Poland grew in the mid-1950s, senior CPSU and SSOD apparatchiks demanded that borderland exchanges become increasingly 'concrete and specialised', compelling Soviet 'experts' to impress foreigners with the achievements of the USSR.[49] Indeed, although borderland exchanges did include a small number of blue-collar workers and groups of Pioneers,[50] most citizens who participated in the programme during

---

[49] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 267-280.
[50] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 3-4.

the late 1950s and the 1960s were professionals (agricultural specialists, engineers, teachers, librarians, doctors, lawyers), Party and Komsomol activists, and groups of sportsmen and members of amateur dance ensembles.[51] When the authorities expanded travel to other parts of Ukraine in the early 1960s, they likewise attempted to highlight the importance of professional expertise as a crucial part of Soviet identities abroad. They took advantage of various new forms of travel, including 'friendship trains', to send Soviet specialists across the border.[52] While official reports underlined the wide-ranging social composition of the 'friendship trains', they also implied that citizens who enjoyed a high status in the USSR had an important role to play in these larger-scale exchanges, thus reaffirming their middle class credentials. Every train contained approximately 330 tourists, including blue-collar workers and collective farmers, but also scientific, artistic, and cultural activists, state and party officials, journalists and amateur artists.[53] To be sure, many 'workers' who visited the people's democracies as part of the trains were actually prominent members of their local societies who could therefore 'swap experiences' with their comrades abroad: in October 1968, passengers of a train from Kyiv to Krakow contained 'modernisers of production' (*novatory vyrobnytstva*), 'leading workers of communist labour' (*udarnyky komunistychnoi pratsi*), and 'Heroes of the Soviet Union and Socialist Labour'.[54] Professional encounters during which the

---

[51] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 3-4, 5-12, 89-92, 267-280; Even after the expansion of the exchange programme during the early 1960s, when the newly created 'buses of friendship' allowed more local inhabitants to visit Poland, the SSOD stressed that they must involve agitators and lecturers who would deliver inspirational speeches across the border. Still, the authorities permitted family members who lived on two sides of the frontier to meet and organised 'friendship gatherings' and concerts in towns on either side of the border. These normally included 38,000 locals and 2000 foreign guests. SWPW, t.41/181 (Informacja Prezydium ZW TPPR o przebiegu wymiany przygranicznej pomiedzy woj. rzeszowskim a obwodem lwowskim USRR, no date, but probably 1971).

[52] Other new genres of travel included 'buses of friendship', 'specialised tourist groups', as well as exchanges of 'veterans of communist and workers' parties', 'antifascists', friendship society activists, and inhabitants of twinned cities. GARF, f. 9612, op.3, d. 873, ll. 85-94. The idea to exchange friendship trains (*poezda druzhby*) between the USSR and Poland originated in 1959; from 1964 to 1969, 18 trains and over 60 buses of friendship travelled between the two countries. SWPW, t.41/219 (Informacja o ruchu turystycznym TPPR i jego wykorzystaniu w działalności propagandowej Towarzystwa. Dane na koniec grudnia 1966); DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.1003, ark. 12-23; GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.350a, l. 3.

[53] SWPW, t.41/219 (Informacja o ruchu turystycznym TPPR i jego wykorzystaniu w działalności propagandowej Towarzystwa. Dane na koniec grudnia 1966); DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.1003, ark. 12-23.

[54] DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.1003, ark. 12-23.

Soviet partners were supposed to manifest their superior knowledge and expertise consequently became part of the routine of travel.[55]

However, the authorities encountered numerous difficulties in organising international travel, which had important implications for internal Soviet dynamics of regional identities during the late 1950s and the early 1960s. In December 1959, the CPSU Central Committee passed a special resolution concerning the need to improve connections between Soviet republics, towns, and oblasts on the one hand, and towns and regions in the satellite states, on the other. The decree criticised members of Soviet delegations for failing to propagate Soviet achievements during their trips abroad, and sought to facilitate cooperation in the sphere of industry, agriculture, science, and culture.[56] Party activists and professionals from the western borderlands were probably not the main target of this criticism, having already proven their commitment to strengthening international cooperation. The late 1950s witnessed the rise of borderland exchanges in western regions of the USSR, which senior state and Party apparatchiks evaluated in very positive terms. At a February 1959 meeting in Warsaw, officials of the Ukrainian Society for Cultural Relations with the Abroad underlined that contacts between neighbouring regions on either side of the Soviet border had intensified in the previous years, supposedly enlivening the 'cultural life' in the L'viv, Drohobych, and Volhynia oblasts, as well as the Rzeszów and Lublin voyvodships, allowing their inhabitants to 'swap experiences' and to make 'practical use of them'.[57] Meanwhile, however, many Ukrainian oblasts were much more reluctant to establish face-to-face contacts with the people's democracies. Even after Moscow instructed local authorities throughout the USSR to strengthen connections with the satellites, major shortcomings persisted in the organisation of international travel. For instance, although the Kyiv obkom had made very ambitious plans to exchange numerous delegations with Krakow after the two cities were twinned in 1958,[58] the Agricultural Institute in Bila Tserkva did not take

---

[55] On average, the Soviet side organised 30 'specialist meetings' per each 'friendship train' from Poland, and significantly more for trains from the mining region of Katowice which visited the Donets'k oblast. Likewise, Warsaw made arrangements for Soviet tourists to meet Poles according to their 'professional profile' when they travelled around the country. SWPW, t.41/219 (Informacja o ruchu turystycznym TPPR i jego wykorzystaniu w działalności propagandowej Towarzystwa. Dane na koniec grudnia 1966).

[56] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.5174, ark. 353-355.

[57] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 89-92.

[58] DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.1060, ark, 1-6.

advantage of the opportunity to establish permanent contacts with Krakow's universities, while some raikom officials and managers who had officially agreed to cooperate with regions and enterprises in the Krakow voyvodship limited themselves to sending them congratulatory letters for important anniversaries.[59] Problems with Kyiv's performance in the sphere of international cooperation faded in comparison to other regions of the republic. In July 1960, officials of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society in Bydgoszcz stated that plans for mutual cooperation with the Cherkasy oblast were not being fulfilled at all: even though a few trips to Ukraine had been planned, none of them had taken place.[60] Around the same time, Society officials in Szczecin asked the Polish consul in Kyiv to intervene on their behalf, informing her that the Soviet officials in Odesa completely ignored their requests to establish friendly relations.[61] Soviet apparatchiks in the regions were slow to promote face-to-face contacts between residents of Ukraine and their 'socialist brothers' across the border. This raised the relative importance of western Ukraine in the process of international cooperation during the Khrushchev period, helping to counteract the impression that the region was somehow less 'Soviet' than other parts of the USSR

The gradual expansion of travel during the 1960s increased pressure on individuals who aspired to the status of middle class to show that they retained their Soviet characteristics even when displaced from the 'safe' context of their everyday lives in the USSR. In order to portray themselves as more sophisticated travellers than the 'mass' of Soviet citizens who came into contact with foreigners, they sometimes condemned the 'uncultured' behaviour of 'ordinary' tourists. Soon after international tourism resumed under Khrushchev, tour group leaders criticised tourists for behaving in an 'uncultured' manner. One report claimed that members of a Soviet group travelling around Czechoslovakia created a very bad impression on the local waiters after they showed no table manners, with one writer discrediting himself as a reliable 'exchange partner' by getting obscenely drunk and insolently trying to seduce a Slovak woman.[62] Similarly, the leader of a group that visited

---

[59] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.5174, ark. 353-355.
[60] SWPW, t. 41/180 (Sekretarz ZW TPPR, Krako, O dzialalnosci bydgoskiego oddzialu ZG TPPR, 23.7.60).
[61] SWPW, t.41/180 (Towarzyszka N Michalewska, Konsul PRL w Kijowie, 8.7.60, Sekretarz ZW TPPR Szczecin H. Niewiadomski, Przewodniczacy ZW TPPR Leon Szechter).
[62] RGANI, f.5, op.28, d. 400, l. 54.

Poland at the height of the 1956 crisis bemoaned the fact that many 'ordinary' travellers had failed to obey his advice, all the while underlining that he had protected them from the aggressive propaganda of Polish reactionaries.[63] Both report writers condemned what they depicted as 'undignified' and politically immature behaviour of other travellers, thus proving their own patriotic credentials and suggesting that reliable Soviet citizens were polite, sober and politically alert.

Furthermore, especially during the Brezhnev era, some social activists produced reports in which they complained that many travellers were lazy or even dishonest. In 1969, for example, the deputy head of the Soviet-Hungarian friendship society's youth commission reported on a trip to the third Soviet-Hungarian 'international friendship camp'. The Ukrainian branch of the society sent eight young people to Hungary, each of whom had been required to attend various lectures in Kyiv prior to departure: they learnt about Lenin's centenary and youth organisations of the socialist countries, and participated in discussions concerning different ideological questions and the 'moral stance of a Soviet young person'. Despite such careful preparations, the participants failed to represent their country appropriately during their stay in Hungary. Having visited the sights of Budapest and laid flowers on the Soviet soldiers' monument, some of them 'treated the trip as a holiday'.[64] In denouncing the participants' behaviour, the group leader emphasised her own commitment to improving international cooperation, and praised SSOD activists in Kyiv for their efforts to strengthen Soviet links with Hungary. The distinction between the reliable middle class travellers and the masses became even more pronounced during the 1970s, when smuggling became very prevalent.[65] Consequently, although an increasing number of citizens participated in international travel, report writers employed ritualistic images of Sovietness that stressed the importance of sophistication, honesty and commitment to deepening international cooperation, as well as suggesting that these Soviet characteristics remained

---

[63] RGANI, f.5, op.28, d.397, ll. 420-423.

[64] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d. 338a, ll. 43-46.

[65] Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers', 217, 222-224; DALO, f.P3, op.44, s. 85, ark. 7-8; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s. 2608, ark. 18-22; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2769, ark. 40-42; SWPW, t. 41/225 (Sprawozdanie z przebiegu wycieczki nr 7-2247 Warszawa-Moskwa-Kijow-Warszawa organizowanej w dniach 24-31 marca 1977, Opiekun społeczny grupy Jerzy Piechowicz, 4.4.77). Sowinski claims that smuggling was a common practice even on the friendship trains, facilitated by the propagandistic nature of such tourist exchanges – customs officials were reluctant to search trains decorated with red flags and the hammer and sickle emblems. P. Sowinski, *Wakacje w Polsce Ludowej. Polityka wladz i ruch turystyczny (1945-1989)* (Warsaw, 2005), 166.

confined to the privileged few. From the point of view of state and Party officials who organised and coordinated international travel, it was only the tried and tested activists, group leaders, and professionals who could assure that travel would help to spread Soviet influences in Eastern Europe, and it was the lack of their direct engagement which was to blame for the rising problems: Party leaders complained that activists did not give tourist groups 'well defined goals' to achieve during their trips abroad.[66]

Apart from the 'unworthy' behaviour of Soviet tourists, personal conflicts between Soviet citizens and inhabitants of the people's democracies moulded ideas about what formed Soviet identity, further helping to ground in official narratives the image of professionals and activists as a middle class that embodied crucial Soviet characteristics. Top CPSU apparatchiks expected residents of Ukraine to behave in a more 'cultured' way than citizens of the people's democracies, which raised the importance of modesty and 'seriousness' in official depictions of Sovietness. This trend had already become evident by the mid-1950s. Patryk Babiracki shows that Party bureaucrats often perceived East European students, who had come to study in the USSR from the 1940s, as a threat not only to the ideological, but also the 'moral' integrity of the Soviet population.[67] They consequently expected Soviet citizens to distance themselves from the foreigners, praising Soviet students not only for rebuking the foreigners' provocative political statements, but also for keeping their rooms more tidy.[68] The authorities were happy to report that most Soviet students maintained a distance from the Poles and Hungarians who drank heavily, started fights with 'our' students, and insisted on organising dancing evenings which carried on until the unholy hour of one in the morning every Saturday and Sunday.[69] As Soviet citizens came into contact with foreign students, Party officials expected them to condemn the foreigners' trivial pursuits and behave in such a way that would highlight their own sombreness.

---

[66] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2132, ark. 58-60.
[67] P. Babiracki, 'Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-57', *Ab Imperio: Studies of New Imperial History and Nationalism in the Post-Soviet Space* 4 (2007), 203.
[68] Top CPU apparatchiks closely associated the concept of *kul'turnost'* with the 'correct' opinions about the unfolding crises in Eastern Europe in 1956; the Hungarians' untidiness was 'demonstrative' of their general anti-Soviet stance. TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 272-273.
[69] TsDAHO, f.1, op.24, s.4265, ark. 30-31.

Similarly, when travel created new opportunities for Soviet citizens to meet other foreigners, conflicts between the idea of travel as leisure and travel as ideological act increased official pressure on citizens to publicly denounce the 'frivolity' of East Europeans, thus further helping to define simplicity and seriousness as positive Soviet characteristics. As Anne Gorsuch points out, party and state bureaucrats who organised international travel expected the 'cultured' individual who visited the people's democracies to avoid both 'the "Soviet" dress of the obviously working class and the vulgarity of the aspiring elite' in order not to bring embarrassment to his or her country.[70] She thus suggests that the authorities compelled citizens to portray themselves as modest and refined at the same time. Indeed, as late as 1979, when the CPSU Central Committee agreed upon the instructions which they should issue to Soviet tourists visiting socialist countries, they still reminded them to 'live modestly', but also to show pride in Soviet achievements and peaceful foreign policy.[71] The authorities praised members of official delegations for behaving 'simply and proudly', like Soviet people should,[72] and activists of the SSOD reprimanded their Polish colleagues for trying to place too much emphasis on 'merry light entertainment' rather than 'ideological tasks'.[73] While ritualised demonstrations of modesty and solemnity characterised all forms of travel, they were most evident during the borderland exchanges in the late 1950s and the early 1960s. During this period, numerous official reports emphasised that the Polish hosts 'placed too much emphasis' on the tourist programme rather than ideological work, and embarrassed the Soviet guests from western Ukraine by offering them expensive gifts: even though there was no reason to feel indebted to the Poles, top SSOD officials claimed, members of Soviet delegations felt guilty about only offering traditional souvenirs in return.[74] Consequently, as the apparatchiks in Moscow put it, many Soviet participants in borderland exchanges 'tactfully showed' the Poles how to work hard and avoid unnecessary pomp: they complained that their partners spent too much money on fancy dinners, expensive hotels, and personal gifts.[75] Despite few opportunities to meet 'ordinary' Polish citizens, residents of the western oblasts who crossed the western border also claimed that they did their best to address large

---

[70] Gorsuch, 'Time Travellers', 222-223.
[71] RGANI, f.89, op.31, d.7, ll. 2-9.
[72] RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.45, ll. 17-20.
[73] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d. 58, ll. 134-156.
[74] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 267-280.
[75] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 105-113.

audiences of Polish workers.[76] In order to prove their Soviet patriotism, they distanced themselves from the Polish hosts and acted as sophisticated 'Soviet experts'; at the same time, they demonstrated a commitment to egalitarianism to counteract any apparent impression of Soviet economic weakness.

The perceived need to contrast the USSR with the less reliable people's democracies also encouraged many travellers from Soviet Ukraine to highlight their ideological purity. Upon encountering foreigners, numerous members of official delegations manifested their Soviet middle class credentials by repeating conservative views on ideology, art, and literature. For example, a group of Kyiv party activists visiting Krakow in 1962 claimed to be astonished at Polish deviations from socialism. They asked their PUWP comrades why Polish agriculture had not been collectivised, and voiced their outrage at the ever-present 'Catholic propaganda' in Poland. They noticed small shrines decorated with fresh flowers all along the road from the Soviet border to Krakow, and were shocked to see two new churches being built en route to Lenin's former residence in Poronino: as responsible Soviet patriots, they alerted their superiors at the CPU Central Committee that the Catholic Church made extensive preparations to celebrate the millenium of Christianity in Poland.[77] Numerous academics, writers, and party apparatchiks explicitly condemned Polish 'cultural distortions', too. When a group of university lecturers from Kyiv visited Krakow in February 1960, they forced their reluctant Polish hosts to explain why 'abstractionism' had spread amongst students at the Academy of Fine Arts. They were not satisfied with the dean's explanation: he claimed that the students' interest in modern art stemmed from the Western style of teaching, where the role of university professors was limited to assisting young people in their individual creative explorations. The Kyiv academics argued that abstractionism was promoted by the lecturers themselves and charged that primary party organisations exerted a weak influence over Polish universities.[78] In fact, Kyiv obkom officials staying in Krakow seven years later pointed to the same issues,

[76] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 267-280.
[77] Many Soviet tourists were likely to travel along the same route. DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.2576, ark. 12-16. Six years later, party activists travelling to Krakow still criticised private farming in Poland. DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s. 786, ark. 35-48.
[78] Their negative impressions of Polish academia were strengthened by the cool reception which they received from the dean of the Jagiellonian University, Professor Jakubowski, and by the Poles' unwillingness to organise a mass meeting with students for the delegation. DAKO, f.P5, op.6, s.1835, ark. 9-18.

claiming that 'abstractionism' and 'modernism' were widely propagated in Poland, with hotels even buying such suspect works to decorate guest rooms.[79] By citing their experiences of travel within Eastern Europe, and speaking to the Polish hosts during the actual trips, many members of official delegations suggested that conservative beliefs were a defining characteristic of reliable Soviet citizens. This permitted party activists and educated professionals to reaffirm their special status by presenting themselves as articulate defenders of Soviet ideology abroad.

Because they encouraged travellers to contrast the USSR with the satellite states, conflicts and tensions that emerged during face-to-face encounters with foreigners also infused the concept of Sovietness with national undertones. Whilst some travellers commented on the 'warm welcome' which they received abroad,[80] many others depicted themselves (in public and in official reports) as defending the 'Soviet people' from what they perceived as xenophobia. This was already evident in May 1956, when a group of Soviet journalists visited Czechoslovakia. The group leader was struck by the level of hostility which they encountered on the streets of Prague, and offended to see that the people of Czechoslovakia were 'proud and convinced of their superiority over other Slavic nations': he suggested that the USSR should make more effort to demonstrate the richness and splendour of 'Russian and Soviet' culture, appealing to the CPSU Central Committee to send the best Soviet symphonic orchestras and opera singers to tour Czechoslovakia, and to invite a few hundred members of the Czechoslovak intelligentsia to the USSR to show them 'our cultural and economic achievements'.[81] Similarly, a few years later, the writer I.L. Prut clearly stated that the USSR had 'few friends' amongst the Polish intelligentsia. Unlike the 'simple people', he claimed in his report for the CPSU Central Committee, Polish writers forced him to answer for all the evils of Tsarist Russia and the brutality of Khmel'nyts'kyi's uprising, and 'crossed all boundaries of elementary politeness' by blaming the USSR for Katyn and the scale of destruction during the Warsaw Uprising. Interestingly, this led Prut to the conclusion that more Soviet writers should visit Poland to propagate both 'socialist' values in the arts and

---

[79] On the other hand, they were very impressed with the Palace of Culture and Science in Warsaw. DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.561, ark. 63-71.

[80] RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.65, ll. 29-39.

[81] At the same time, he also argued that the Soviet press and radio should discuss the 'life and work' of the Czechoslovak *narod* at more length, demonstrating a comradely interest in the development of Czechoslovakia, while avoiding a didactic and patronising tone. RGANI, f.5, op.33, d.7, ll. 36-44.

friendship towards the USSR: he specified that they should spend less time advertising their own personal achievements, focusing more on exposing progressive Soviet literature in general.[82] He drew an explicit link between preserving conservative 'socialist' values in art and literature on the one hand, and defending Soviet honour in the socialist camp on the other.

The practice of travel helped the aspirational middle class to establish rituals that grounded in official rhetoric the image of East European satellite states as 'foreign'. From the early 1960s, the authorities used travel to encourage citizens to commemorate the rise of socialism in individual people's democracies under the USSR's guidance, and thus to express a sense of Soviet pride. Numerous inhabitants of Ukraine and citizens of the satellite states participated together in very formulaic anniversary celebrations of the Great Patriotic War and the subsequent Soviet 'liberation' and 'modernisation' of Eastern Europe. SSOD activists, gorkom officials, factory managers, and heads of collective farms organised 'evenings of friendship' with the people's democracies, where citizens marked their official anniversaries together with foreign visitors to Ukraine. In Kyiv, the locals often joined 'socialist' tourists on 22 July celebrating the Polish communist manifesto, while Czechoslovak veterans who had fought in the Crimea met in Yalta with representatives of the oblispolkom, gorispolkom, local branches of the friendship society and the writers' union, as well as correspondents of the local press and television.[83] In fact, it was common for tourists to participate in historical commemorations of the war. In 1964 alone, 7,041 foreigners who came to L'viv from socialist countries were treated to various lectures and discussions organised by regional bureaucrats. They touched on such joyful topics as 'the patriotic underground movement in L'viv', the 'bestiality of the fascist occupation', and 'the fascist massacre of thirty-six Polish academics'.[84] Meanwhile, local officials in the village of Sokolovo in the Kharkiv oblast (the site of a bloody battle where many Soviet and Czechoslovak soldiers had been killed in March 1943) had been hosting

---

[82] RGANI, f.5, op.55, d. 45, ll. 57-61.
[83] GARF, f.9612, op.3, d.10, ll. 101-116. Similarly, to mark the twentieth anniversary of Hungary's 'liberation', Crimean tourists who had visited the 'brotherly state' addressed audiences at collective farms and factories. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 5987, ark. 15-17.
[84] GARF, f. 9612, op.3, d. 10, ll. 54-63.

Czechoslovak veterans since the late 1950s,[85] and the Ukrainian Council of Ministers finally decided to erect a monument on the site in 1964.[86]

Soviet citizens, mostly party members and professionals, as well as some blue-collar workers and collective farmers, travelled to Eastern Europe to participate in victory anniversary celebrations, too. For instance, when passengers of the Soviet 'friendship train' to Czechoslovakia attended the 'liberation' anniversary celebrations in 1965, the group included 47 blue-collar workers (*rabochie*), 38 collective farmers (*kolkhozniki*), 93 engineers and technicians, 34 university lecturers, 23 teachers, 14 doctors and others. Out of 330 people, 253 were members of the CPSU and the Komsomol.[87] Similarly, during a ten-day trip to Poland in October 1973, a delegation of Soviet friendship society activists laid fifteen wreaths at Soviet and Polish 'sites of martyrology', as well as places associated with the life and work of Lenin.[88] Indeed, by the early 1970s, most organised tourist groups travelling around Eastern Europe followed a trail of 'historical-revolutionary monuments', 'Lenin places' (*leninskie mesta*), and sites of battles against 'Hitlerite occupiers'.[89] Through encouraging tourists to reminisce about the Great Patriotic War and the achievements of Soviet socialism, state and party officials established sites where many inhabitants of Ukraine could speak about the 'revolutionary unity' of the socialist camp, all the while underlining the idea that the 'foreigners' were indebted to the USSR for their 'socialist progress' and 'liberation from fascism'.[90]

---

[85] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 4575, ark. 109-111.

[86] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 2370, ark. 130.

[87] Before departure, SSOD officials equipped the tourists with Soviet souvenirs to give out as presents, as well as 'propaganda materials' relating to the USSR and the 'fraternal friendship' between the Soviet and Czechoslovak *narody*. Armed with special celebratory banners in Russian and Czech, the group travelled around Czechoslovakia for twelve days, taking part in over 150 discussions with the local *trudiashchiesia* (the report asserted that over 30,000 people attended the meetings). These gatherings were carefully orchestrated and specialised. For example, Soviet partisans met a group of Slovak veterans who had fought on Belarusian territory, while shoe factory workers from Leningrad visited a shoe factory in Gottwaldov. GARF, f. 9576, op.4, d. 212a, ll. 18-19.

[88] SWPW, t.41/191: 'Informacja o pobycie 120-osobowej delegacji TPRP w Polsce, 1973'.

[89] GARF, f. 9612, op.3, d. 873, ll. 85-94.

[90] In fact, it seems that the main purpose in involving foreigners in some historical commemorations was to imbue residents of Ukraine with a sense of Soviet pride. For instance, together with their colleagues from the Lublin voyvodship and the Brest oblast, obkom officials in Volhynia organised a special conference devoted to the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the USSR in 1973. It is perhaps surprising that the Poles participated in celebrating the holiday, considering that Poland never formed part of the USSR itself. Clearly, however, they played a vital part in popularising the anniversary in Soviet Ukraine through underlining their admiration for the Soviet Union: regional and republican newspapers, radio, and television in Ukraine emphasised that leading workers of Volhynia, local journalists, and academicians received a very warm welcome in Poland, laid flowers at the

Residents of the republic who met East Europeans in the 1950s and the 1960s could claim to represent both a Soviet and a Ukrainian community during such encounters. During the borderland exchanges, amateur artists performed a 'Soviet and Ukrainian' repertoire in Poland, and travellers delivered speeches in the Ukrainian language which, reportedly, 'created a good impression on the Poles'.[91] Furthermore, while commemorations of the war were a means of instilling a sense of Soviet pride among the population, Roman Serbyn suggests that interactions between the Kremlin, CPU leaders in Kyiv, oblast authorities and 'ordinary Ukrainians' led to the emergence of a distinct Ukrainian national rhetoric in commemorations of the Great Patriotic War.[92] For instance, in October 1968, officials at the Ukrainian branch of the SSOD reported that the 'workers' (*trudiashchiesia*) often travelled on 'trains of friendship' to Hungary. The Hungarians were keen to share their experiences of economic reform which they conducted with 'Soviet assistance', and it was the 'Hungarian and Soviet *trudiashchiesia*' who met to celebrate such socialist occasions as the fiftieth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. This implied that residents of Ukraine were expected to portray themselves as Soviet people in relation to the Hungarian foreigners. On the other hand, even when celebrating the 'achievements of the Soviet *narod*', the SSOD encouraged residents of the republic to focus on the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet Ukraine rather than the USSR as a whole, and Soviet guests helped their hosts popularise 'Ukrainian culture' in Hungary.[93] Moreover, the authorities approved when inhabitants of the republic expressed a distinctly Ukrainian identity when celebrating the socialist victory in 1945. The Ukrainian branch of the SSOD reported that the '*trudiashchi* of Ukraine' hosted foreign delegations and visited their western neighbours during the 1967 Soviet-Czechoslovak peace relay race. The event commemorated the twenty-second anniversary of the 'liberation' of Czechoslovakia. In Chernihiv and other oblasts, the

monument to the Red Army in Lublin, and attended a Polish production of Gorky's play *Mother*. Thus, obkom apparatchiks cooperated with local officials in Poland in order to show that the 'foreigners' in Poland respected the Soviet historical and cultural legacy. RGANI, f. 5, op.66, d. 106, ll. 14-20.

[91] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.58, ll. 3-4, 5-12, 89-92, 267-280; SWPW, Warsaw, t.41/181 (Informacja Prezydium ZW TPPR o przebiegu wymiany przygranicznej pomiedzy woj. rzeszowskim a obwodem lwowskim USRR, no date, but probably 1971).

[92] R. Serbyn, 'Managing Memory in Post-Soviet Ukraine: "Victory Day" or "Remembrance Day"' in S. Velychenko (ed.), *Ukraine, the EU and Russia: History, Culture and International Relations* (Basingstoke, 2007), 116-118.

[93] GARF, f. 9576, op.4, d. 308, ll. 48-52.

locals welcomed the athletes with bread and salt as 'the old Ukrainian custom' requires.[94]

The practice of international travel encouraged top CPSU apparatchiks, party activists in the regions, members of friendship societies, and educated specialists to respond to problems that arose during face-to-face contacts with foreigners. They wrote reports and spoke in public in ways that helped to define professional expertise, sophistication, modesty and a conservative mindset as crucial attributes of a Soviet citizen who travelled in the socialist camp and encountered 'unreliable' foreigners. These narratives suggested that specialists and activists were instrumental in strengthening the USSR's hold over the outer empire, allowing some citizens, particularly in the borderlands, to portray themselves as a Soviet middle class that embodied all the characteristics of an international Soviet traveller. Stories of travel also implied that this middle class helped to imbue correct attitudes among other citizens, defending them against the foreigners' 'xenophobia', inspiring a sense of Soviet pride, and eliminating 'undignified' behaviour among the mass of Soviet tourists. Indeed, in order to popularise formulaic depictions of Soviet superiority in Eastern Europe and to establish firmly in the public imagination the image of Soviet and Ukrainian people as a distinct group within the socialist camp, the authorities further shaped practices of travel, encouraging an increasing number of citizens to join residents of the satellite states in ritualistic commemorations of the Great Patriotic War.

III.   Tourism as Diplomacy: 1968

The ritualisation of travel was especially pronounced during the Prague Spring. Tourist exchanges between Soviet Ukraine and Czechoslovakia intensified in 1968: as Grey Hodnett and Peter Potichnyj claim, this allowed Ukrainian party authorities to gather intelligence about the unfolding situation, and – more broadly – formed part of the Ukrainian 'quasi-diplomacy'.[95] Because travel served as a means to secure Soviet influences in Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian authorities instituted strict vetting procedures to determine who came into face-to-face contact with

---

[94] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6377, ark. 50-56.
[95] G. Hodnett and P. Potichnyj, *The Ukraine and the Czechoslovak crisis* (Canberra, 1970), 119.

Czechoslovak citizens; they specified that members of amateur artistic groups, sportsmen, and war veterans should be encouraged to travel, while 'informal contacts' between friends and relatives should be limited.[96] Consequently, even more than the various forms of travel which developed during the 1960s, trips to 'rebellious' Czechoslovakia were clearly a perk awarded to 'trustworthy' citizens prepared to manifest in public their commitment to strengthening Soviet power in Eastern Europe. They allowed distinguished members of the republic's society to affirm their patriotic and middle class credentials.

Although a number of idealised accounts about face-to-face contacts celebrated how Ukraine's farmers welcomed Czechoslovak delegations 'with bread and salt' while the latter, 'moved to tears', laid flowers at monuments to Lenin,[97] this buoyant style clashed with the more factual tone of other reports. Questions of international cooperation became more complicated in 1968 and 1969. Journalists and newspaper editors experienced this especially strongly, which encouraged them to condemn the foreigners' 'incompetence' and 'ignorance' in official reports. When Kyiv television showed the opening ceremony of the Ukrainian Culture Days in Bratislava, editors found their colleagues in Czechoslovakia incompetent and uncooperative. As a result, they could only show the picture with no sound during the live transmission in May.[98] Similarly, the head of the Ukrainian radio and television committee complained that Czechoslovak journalists were unwilling to work with their Ukrainian colleagues. Soviet journalists were shocked that the Czechoslovak media failed to report on the Ukrainian Culture Days in Prague: it made their work difficult, because they hoped to travel around the city and produce reports in cooperation with them.[99]

Furthermore, Soviet officials complained about the rather chilly reception which Soviet citizens encountered in Czechoslovakia, drawing a link between their role as 'experts' and a sense of Soviet pride. While it is not possible to determine whether tourists and members of official delegations were indeed as 'appalled' at their cold treatment as the reports claimed, it seems unlikely that they failed to notice that

[96] O. Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi v Ukraini u khodi chekhoslovats'koi kryzy 1968 roku za donesenniamy radians'kykh spetssluzhb', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008), 40.

[97] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s. 255, ark. 41-44.

[98] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 161.

[99] The correspondents also claimed that they received no assistance in arranging their travel and accommodation in Czechoslovakia. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 119-133.

citizens of Czechoslovakia remained aloof or even suspicious of them. Leaders of tour groups complained about the rude attitude of waiters and tour guides, and emphasised that Soviet citizens were deprived of the usual opportunities to meet representatives of Czechoslovak youth, workers (*robitnyki*), villagers, prominent academics and 'cultural activists'.[100] As one report put it, Soviet travellers did not feel in 1968 the 'enthusiasm' and 'love' so characteristic of visits to Czechoslovakia in previous years.[101] Indeed, personal conflicts with foreigners acquired new political significance due to their 'anti-Soviet' or even xenophobic undertones. When a group of 61 Czechoslovak miners and engineers from Ostrava came to L'viv to visit the Soviet soldiers whom they had befriended back home during the autumn of 1968, the trip took a nasty turn. One guest from across the border came up to a Czech woman who was dancing with a Soviet soldier, slapped her in the face and called her a 'Russian swine'.[102] As the authorities encouraged their citizens to act as 'bearers of peace' when they met residents of Czechoslovakia, they also exposed them to attitudes and opinions that challenged the status of the USSR in Eastern Europe.

This problem was especially difficult because Czechoslovak citizens sometimes criticised Moscow's excessive interference in their domestic affairs. At the time of the military intervention, individual inhabitants and institutions in Ukraine received collective letters from Czechoslovakia, which defended Dubcek's reforms while also reaffirming Czechoslovak loyalty to the USSR. Even school children who corresponded with their pen-pals across the border read about the Czechoslovak fight for 'freedom' and 'democracy' and popular fears of a Soviet invasion.[103] Moreover, during their trips across the border, Soviet citizens often encountered opinions which questioned the USSR's leading position in the socialist camp. Many Czechoslovak citizens claimed that the USSR did not always provide a good example for other

---

[100] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.255, ark. 126-147; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 33-39; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 132-137.

[101] Apart from concerts organised by the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Society, Ukrainian artists in Czechoslovakia had to perform in poor conditions, mostly in the open air, and the Ministry of Culture in Prague failed to advertise their recitals. Reportedly, Soviet citizens were also appalled that the microphones were switched off during an official meeting with Ludvik Svoboda precisely at those moments of his speech when he talked about the sacrifices which the USSR made to liberate Czechoslovakia. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 33-39.

[102] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.255, ark. 2-5.

[103] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 15-19, 99-100; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 46-48, 61, 92-93, 132-137; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s. 33, ark. 6, 105-110; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.255. ark. 41-44, 126-147; O. Bazhan (ed.), '"Praz'ka Vesna" u dokumentakh Galuzevoho derzhavnoho arkivu Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008), 55, 74-75, 76; 78-79.

socialist states in Eastern Europe: for instance, a group of Czechoslovak workers laughed at the primitive advice they were given by two Soviet industrial specialists who lectured them on leather production, pointing out that Czechoslovakia was a highly developed industrial country which had adopted modern production technologies long before the USSR.[104] Characteristically, most reports filed around this time underlined that trips to and from Czechoslovakia were generally successful, barring a few unfortunate incidents.[105] Still, some Czechoslovak complaints leveled against the USSR were very radical: during their stay in Bratislava, a group of Soviet students were confronted by a local man who claimed that 'Soviet rule here was now over'.[106] Unsurprisingly, similar attacks became more frequent after the August 1968 invasion.[107]

During such a tumultous time, the authorities demanded increasingly conformist forms of behaviour in return for the right to travel. Furthermore, top Soviet officials sought to use tourism as a means of influencing the domestic situation in Czechoslovakia during 1968. The SSOD made a special effort to intensify cooperation with the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Society,[108] thus strengthening 'pro-Soviet' institutions in Prague. Citizens travelling to Czechoslovakia had a mission to fulfil: they needed to explain the Soviet point of view on current affairs and counteract the influence of the tendentious Czechoslovak media. They were also to popularise Soviet and Ukrainian culture: Kyiv fashion designers presented their

---

[104] While some 'socialist initiatives' were worthwhile, one Czechoslovak tourist in the USSR claimed, and people supported such projects as the building of nursery schools by volunteer brigades, the Czechoslovak *robitnyki* were 'outraged' that they were now forced to follow the Soviet practice and help farmers 'dig out potatoes' during harvest time. This created anti-Soviet feelings in Czechoslovakia, he concluded. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 139-148.

[105] When a group of twenty-two Czechoslovak *trudiashchiesia*, containing only one *rabochii* and no farmers. visited Uzhgorod and Kharkiv at the end of May 1968, they took part in the peace relay race celebrating the twenty-third anniversary of liberation, visited the museum of Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship in Sokolovo, and met the local *trudiashchiesia* at a tractor factory, a collective farm, a school and a university. At the same time, another member of the delegation Joanna Gotlibova, an editor of the journal published by the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Society, 'started up conversations with Soviet citizens', idealising Tomas Masaryk and justifying the current measures undertaken by the Prague leadership. As Petro Shelest put it in his report to the CPSU Central Committee, she sometimes voiced 'openly anti-Soviet views': she criticised the Soviet nationalities policy by stating that 'she could not see Ukraine, its language, culture and way of life' during her travels, and hoped that the Czechoslovak reforms would be replicated in the USSR itself. She also praised Solzhenitsyn and claimed to oppose Stalinist bureaucracy and not the Soviet Union as such. Shelest made sure to underline that Soviet citizens and other members of the Czechoslovak delegation (including the lone *rabochii*) opposed Gotlibova. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 15-19.

[106] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 132-137.

[107] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.255, ark. 41-44, 126-147.

[108] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.330a, ll. 1-23.

work in Prague and Karlovy Vary in April, and the SSOD assisted in preparing the Ukrainian Culture Days.[109] When the Ukrainian republican dance ensemble toured Czechoslovakia between 7 and 29 May 1968, the group leader emphasised that they had an impact on the local population: 40,000 spectators attended the performances, and claimed that the artists 'socialized with the population of the Czech and Slovak parts' of the country.[110] Their tour was organised in such a way as to reach wide audiences, putting pressure on the Soviet artists to exert a 'positive influence' over the foreigners on and off the stage. Indeed, as late as July 1969, party officials insisted that tourist exchanges should be promoted to speed up the process of recovery in Czechoslovakia. A secretary of the Chernihiv obkom claimed that the 'presence of our people' in Czechoslovakia would help to resolve the ever difficult situation there.[111]

In 1968, travel to Czechoslovakia functioned as a reward for loyalty and conformity, but it also conferred certain responsibilities on Soviet citizens who took part in ritualistic affirmations of Sovietness. In this way, it came to function as a perk and symbol of middle class identity. In order to manifest their patriotic credentials, during the trips and in official reports which they compiled upon return, citizens needed to distance themselves from 'foreign' criticisms leveled against their country, as well as highlighting their role as senior 'Soviet' experts who aided foreigners in Czechoslovakia. Various specialists, artists and party activists whom the top officials considered to be 'reliable' were in a privileged position to reaffirm their middle class status during the Prague Spring, encouraged as they were to travel across the border to help resolve the crisis.

IV.   Conclusion

After the mid-1950s, an increasing number of Soviet citizens spoke about travel as a means of strengthening the USSR's links with the people's democracies. By shaping mass media portrayals of the socialist bloc, top CPSU officials suggested that educated professionals, party activists, prominent members of friendship

---

[109] GARF, f.9576, op.4, d.330a, ll. 24-47.
[110] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 33-39.
[111] RGANI, f.5, op.61, d.3, ll. 101-119.

societies, and artists had a crucial role to play in advancing international cooperation through travel. Drawing on such concepts and taking advantage of the new opportunities to encounter foreign citizens, members of these groups produced their own accounts of travel in the mass media and official reports, as well as speaking in public during their trips abroad. They thereby portrayed themselves as a middle class that embodied important Soviet characteristics, guiding both the satellite states and the 'masses' at home on the path of progress. As such, not only did they claim a right to travel and enjoy elite status in the USSR, but they also participated in the reproduction of formulaic images of Soviet superiority in Eastern Europe.

Reflecting pressures from top CPSU officials, narratives of travel were underpinned by the idea that Soviet people formed a distinct group within a nationally diverse Eastern Europe that nonetheless also helped to unify the socialist camp. The practice of travel contributed towards establishing firmly the concept of Soviet national uniqueness in official representations of the socialist camp. Personal and ideological tensions, the clash between the idea of travel for fun and travel as duty, and perhaps even genuine shock at the attitudes and practices which travellers witnessed in the satellite states encouraged many citizens to condemn foreign deviations from the Soviet model, both when speaking to citizens of the people's democracies during official meetings and when describing their experiences of travel to Party officials and the wider public at home. Furthermore, practical difficulties inherent in organising international travel and the perceived need to distinguish the USSR from Eastern Europe encouraged the growth of various ritualised commemorations of the Great Patriotic War, as well as the celebration of Soviet and Ukrainian culture. As they became part of the routine of travel, these practices essentially compelled residents of Ukraine to portray themselves as superior 'Soviet people' and 'Ukrainians' who, though committed to preserving the unity of the Soviet bloc, were uninspired by foreign ideas and practices.

Because Sovietness and Ukrainianness were defined against other nations in the Soviet bloc, citizens increasingly articulated the idea of middle class in national rhetoric. It was the Soviet and Soviet Ukrainian people, and not their 'foreign' neighbours, who promoted the interests of their republic, country and the socialist bloc as a whole. This created a context in which some citizens sought to establish their status as a Soviet elite: with blue-collar workers or farmers still relatively few

amongst the 'cultured' tourists, they spoke and wrote about travel to suggest that education, artistic talent, or specialist knowledge were key attributes that allowed them to strengthen the USSR's hold over the 'outer empire'.

Furthermore, in speaking about socialist cooperation in Eastern Europe, Soviet citizens also articulated various local identities, claiming that their regions contributed to spreading Soviet influences abroad. In the late 1950s, borderland exchanges allowed state and party officials in the western oblasts, as well as other local specialists and artists, to present themselves as important Soviet citizens whose contribution was necessary to improve the USSR's relations with the satellite states. They proved their allegiance to Moscow by asserting that they taught their socialist brothers abroad how to work. As travel then spread during the 1960s, it became an important means for local party authorities throughout Ukraine to emphasise their role in international cooperation, especially because trips were often organised in the framework of twinned towns and regions.

Official narratives and increasingly ritualised practices of travel consequently helped to establish in public rhetoric a clear definition of what constituted a Soviet identity. Professional expertise, ideological conservatism, sophistication and modesty emerged as key features that Soviet patriots were expected to display, thus spreading the USSR's influences abroad. This reinforced 'imperial' attitudes towards Eastern Europe: Soviet travellers condemned in public foreign distortions from the Soviet model and stated their commitment to preserving the USSR's power in the region. Top CPSU apparatchiks, journalists, editors, and citizens aspiring to the status of middle class participated in and popularised various ritualised forms of depicting Soviet hegemony in the socialist bloc. These included writing official reports, publishing travel accounts in the mass media, and participating in various ritualised practices such as war commemorations during actual travel. Such rituals turned into crucial markers of Soviet identity. In sum, international travel became a forum for depicting conservative patriotism as the only legitimate attitude or frame of mind that citizens should adopt vis-a-vis Eastern Europe.

Indeed, as debates about the Prague Spring were to demonstrate, many residents of Ukraine reproduced fixed portrayals of Soviet domination in Eastern Europe, thus presenting themselves as an elite which fortified the USSR's hold over the region, as

well as grounding conservative patriotism among the Soviet 'masses'. At the same time, the foreigners' apparent indifference to Soviet citizens' proud heritage, which became particularly evident during the Prague Spring, made Soviet travellers question the extent to which their 'brothers' accepted the idea of a USSR-led socialist camp. When speaking to Soviet tourists, numerous Czechoslovak citizens raised a whole set of issues about national roads to socialism and the degree to which the USSR should interfere in the domestic affairs of its socialist neighbours. As the next chapter shows, this encouraged some Soviet citizens to reflect upon the role of the USSR in Eastern Europe, whilst convincing others to stage their patriotic commitment to the Soviet Union and its foreign policy all the more intensely.

Chapter Three

**A Matter of Soviet Pride: The Prague Spring and the Rupture of Soviet
Identities in Ukraine**

In October 1968, to mark the fiftieth anniversary of Czechoslovak independence, a Soviet citizen by the name of Nekrasov, a resident of the town of Putivl' in north-east Ukraine, posted a letter to his friend in Czechoslovakia. It never reached the addressee, Stanislav, whom he had met eight years earlier as they were both convalescing in a Kyiv hospital. Writing to *Literaturnaia gazeta* in early 1969, Nekrasov complained that the letter was stopped by Soviet censors and further described his shock at the fact that Stanislav's package with medicines unavailable in the USSR had recently been confiscated by the Soviet customs officials. This proved that the Soviet state was only concerned with its citizens' welfare on paper, Nekrasov exclaimed, underlining that he understood why the Czechs wanted more freedom from the economically backward Soviet Union. His anger apparent as he protested against Soviet portrayals of Jan Palach as a 'fanatic of the Maoist kind', he argued that Palach's self-immolation expressed the plight of the 'highly cultured Czechoslovak people'. Nekrasov was ashamed to be Russian.[1]

Although more openly critical of the Soviet authorities than the vast majority of residents of Ukraine who commented on the Prague Spring in 1968 and 1969, Nekrasov's letter illustrates wider tendencies in Soviet Ukrainian society. Unlike in 1956, when reformist and conservative patriotism represented more ambiguous opinions about Khrushchev's 'liberalisation', inhabitants of the republic defined their attitudes towards Moscow's domestic and foreign policy much more sharply in 1968. Admittedly, top CPSU leaders did maintain complex attitudes towards 'reform socialism', which often inspired both confusion among citizens who tried to define and align themselves with Moscow's stance and hopes among those who wanted to change the system. Nevertheless, because citizens did not see the Kremlin as the initiator of reform, but rather as an object of pressures from the outer empire, the Prague Spring posed a very direct challenge to Brezhnev and his vision of the Soviet future. Moreover, with the emergence of the Soviet dissident movement, boundaries

---

[1] RGANI, f.5, op.61, d.35, ll. 57-61.

between what was permitted and what was illegal were now less fluid than in 1956.[2] During the trial of Andrei Siniavskii and Iulii Daniel in 1966, readers of Soviet newspapers had already witnessed a clash between state and party bureaucrats and representatives of the creative intelligentsia. While top apparatchiks condemned the two writers for 'anti-Soviet propaganda', some intellectuals refuted the accusations of disloyalty levelled against Daniel and Siniavskii, defended the right to free speech, and began to publish in the *samizdat*.[3] However, it was only the Prague Spring which compelled a large number of Soviet citizens to adopt a clear stance on such issues as the USSR's hegemony in Eastern Europe, the rise of new media and access to information, and Soviet nationalities policy.

An important prelude to the crisis occurred in early 1968. In January, the Polish authorities had banned a Warsaw theatre production of Adam Mickiewicz's *Dziady*, due to concerns that the nineteenth-century play evoked excessive enthusiasm amongst the audiences, who applauded the anti-Tsarist and, arguably, anti-Russian dialogue. The ban led to student demonstrations in Warsaw and other Polish university towns in early March, which were followed by a large scale anti-Semitic campaign. In his infamous speech to the communist active in Warsaw, Wladyslaw Gomulka blamed the events on 'the Zionists' and 'fifth columnists'. Polish Jews were expelled from the party, fired from their jobs and effectively forced to emigrate.[4] In sum, the Polish crisis highlighted the problem of censorship, ethnonational identities, and popular protest in Soviet-style regimes. The Czechoslovak events extended debates about the meaning of national sovereignty and ethnic diversity, freedom of expression, as well as the possibilities of reforming the socialist camp. After Alexander Dubcek replaced Antonin Novotny as the first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in January, the new leaders in Prague announced their action programme in April 1968. Whilst they encouraged change within a socialist framework, they also outlined a more circumscribed place for the Communist Party in society, advocated 'freedom of speech', and expanded rights of personal choice in profession and 'lifestyle'. By mid-1968 the

---

[2] D. Spechler, *Permitted Dissent in the USSR:* Novyi Mir *and the Soviet Regime* (New York, 1982), 264.

[3] M. Hayward, 'Introduction' in Leopold Labedz and Max Hayward (eds.), *On Trial. The Case of Siniavskii-Tertz and Daniel-Arzhak* (London, 1967), 34-39.

[4] See W. Rozenbaum, 'The March Events: Targeting the Jews', *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry* 21 (2009); W. Roszkowski, *Najnowsza Historia Polski 1945-1980* (Warsaw, 2003), 531-547.

developments had gone further than the Kremlin was prepared to tolerate. Many Czechoslovak students and intellectuals began to challenge the 'leading role' of the Communist Party. Their views were embodied in Ludvik Vaculik's *Two Thousand Words*, published on 27 June 1968, in which he wrote about 'foreign domination' of Czechoslovakia, the rule of 'power-hungry individuals', and social inequality.[5] The Soviet leadership did not accept Dubcek's calls for patience, growing increasingly convinced that the Czechoslovak party had lost control of the situation. On the night of 20–21 August 1968, armies of the Warsaw Pact marched into Czechoslovakia 'to smother the Prague Spring with direct force and restore power to a reliable set of conservative leaders'.[6] Protests against the Soviet domination of Czechoslovakia continued until April 1969, when Dubcek was replaced by a more conservative and repressive leader, Gustav Husak.[7]

Residents of Ukraine commented on the unfolding developments very widely.[8] Conscious of Volodymyr Dmytruk's warning that internal party reports were extremely formulaic and unreflective of popular opinion,[9] I examine scores of official reports from the agitation meetings to analyse the ways in which Soviet citizens articulated support for Brezhnev's foreign policy, conveying different visions of what it meant to be a loyal party member, consumer of Soviet mass media, and obedient citizen. I also look at a few dozen KGB reports to gauge a range of less official reactions to the unfolding events.[10] The KGB produced especially numerous reports in the fortnight after the invasion, which they summarised on 26 August and then again on 12 September,[11] paying special attention to the western oblasts and

---

[5] J. Suri, 'The Promise and Failure of "Developed Socialism": The Soviet 'Thaw' and the Crucible of the Prague Spring, 1964–1972', *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006), 146-147.

[6] Suri, 'The Promise', 153.

[7] Suri, 'The Promise', 102.

[8] This was partly because the Prague Spring affected the situation of the Ukrainian minority in Czechoslovakia and cultural relations between the USSR and Czechoslovakia were the closest out of the entire socialist camp. G. Hodnett and P. Potichnyj, *The Ukraine and the Czechoslovak Crisis* (Canberra, 1970), 45; S. Yekelchyk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford, 2007), 169. Poland as a whole attracted less interest, largely due to the brief duration of the events there. M. Kramer, 'Spill Over from the Prague Spring – a KGB Report', *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 4 (1994), 67-68.

[9] V. Dmytruk, *Ukraina ne movchala: Reaktsiia ukrains'koho suspil'stva na podii 1968 roku v Chekhoslovachchyni* (Kyiv, 2004), 43, 225.

[10] Many of these reports were published by the archive of the Security Services of Ukraine. O. Bazhan (ed.), ''Praz'ka Vesna' u dokumentakh Galuzevoho derzhavnoho arkivu Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008).

[11] Bazhan, ''Praz'ka Vesna'', 111-116.

Odesa.[12] At the same time, political officers carefully monitored moods in the army,[13] conducting 'individual work' with soldiers who expressed 'apolitical views'.[14] These reports focus disproportionately on the attitudes which the authorities considered 'problematic' or even 'hostile', and they may very well construct certain social and ethnic groups as unreliable and anti-Soviet, reflecting in many respects the officials' own prejudices. Nevertheless, especially when combined with *samizdat* publications, they do offer interesting insights into the emergence of unofficial views about the Prague Spring during 1968 and 1969.

Even more prominently than in 1956, the great majority of citizens articulated a vision of conservative patriotism.[15] Because the regime offered 'commitment for material improvements in exchange for unchallenged political and ideological hegemony', and it seemed that the 'numbing Soviet order' was there to stay,[16] residents 'staged' their approval of Brezhnev's foreign and domestic policy by reproducing ritualised portrayals of Czechoslovakia and thus condemning Dubcek's ideological deviations, or by silently attending agitation gatherings as instructed by the authorities. Conservative patriotism was now less challenging to the CPSU leadership than twelve years earlier. In order to prove their patriotic credentials, citizens contrasted themselves with foreign and domestic 'enemies' rather than the supposedly inefficient apparatchiks in the Kremlin. Even though party activists were the bluntest advocates of conservative patriotism, they acted as members of collectives which defined their Sovietness in opposition to isolated and 'suspect' individuals, as well as foreigners who diverged from the Soviet model of socialism. They thus elevated the silent participants of public meetings to the status of reliable citizens, too. The formulaic meetings about Czechoslovakia and the ritual of naming and shaming 'enemies' thus emerged as a means to reconcile the elitist aspirations of party activists and professionals with the growing ambitions of the population at large, helping to suggest that they could all pursue their goals as Soviet citizens.

---

[12] O. Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi v Ukraini u khodi chekhoslovats'koi kryzy 1968 roku za donesenniamy radians'kykh spetssluzhb', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008), 39.

[13] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.32, ark. 141-145.

[14] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark.138-140.

[15] Partly because the military intervention was launched before events got out of control, and partly because the Gulag returnees were no longer as significant as in 1956, Ukrainian society remained remarkably stable during the height of the Czechoslovak crisis. A. Weiner, 'Robust Revolution to Retiring Revolution: The Life Cycle of the Soviet Revolution, 1945-1968', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008), 230.

[16] Weiner, 'Robust Revolution', 190.

Partly because exponents of conservative patriotism contrasted themselves with some socio-political and ethnic groups, East European events encouraged a small number of Ukraine's residents to express ideas of reformist patriotism. Its advocates believed that it was their patriotic duty to oppose a state which they saw as increasingly repressive. Some challenged the regime by expressing sympathy for Dubcek's reforms in illegal pamphlets and *samizdat* publications.[17] Others voiced their opinions in anonymous letters and wall graffiti and, perhaps in less obviously illegal ways, in private conversations. Because the KGB considered their views to be incriminating, and many exponents of reformist patriotism were tried for 'anti-Soviet agitation', they grew increasingly aware that they opposed Brezhnev's leadership when they called for an end to censorship, advocated deep economic and political reform inspired by Dubcek's policies in Czechoslovakia, and defended Ukrainian national autonomy in the USSR. Considering Moscow's strict attitude towards dissent, advocates of reformist patriotism formed a surprisingly vocal section of the Ukrainian society at the height of the Czechoslovak crisis. Alarmed though they were that the military intervention would spell the end of reform in the Soviet Union itself, they still appealed for change 'within the system'. The stilted form of agitation meetings and the KGB's failure to identify many individuals who expressed 'problematic' opinions make it difficult to determine who the reformist patriots were. It seems, however, that reformist patriotism united citizens from various social, geographical and ethnic backgrounds, who had different hopes and expectations of 'reform', but all faced the same obstacles vis-à-vis an increasingly oppressive state

Finally, a small number of anti-Soviet citizens hoped to pursue their interests by overthrowing existing institutions and the Soviet state. Anti-Soviet views attracted a narrow group of inhabitants, particularly in the western oblasts. They were most popular amongst the clergy and the faithful of the underground Uniate church and former members of Ukrainian nationalist movements. There was probably some overlap between reformist patriots, anti-Soviet citizens and advocates of conservative patriotism, to the extent that any one individual could attend agitation meetings and voice illegal views in other contexts. Still, the Prague Spring and, to a

---

[17] A. Weiner, 'Déjà Vu All Over Again: Prague Spring, Romanian Summer, and Soviet Autumn on Russia's Western Frontier', *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006), 173.

lesser extent, the Polish crisis evoked radically divergent reactions or attitudes in Soviet Ukraine.

The chapter begins by analysing the ways in which Soviet apparatchiks exploited the mass media to shape popular attitudes towards Poland and Czechoslovakia. It then proceeds to examine the claims of conservative patriotism, tracing how citizens commented on Soviet portrayals of Eastern Europe during agitation meetings between March 1968 and April 1969. This is closely followed by an analysis of reformist patriotism and ideas forwarded for improving Soviet society. The chapter concludes by assessing the significance of anti-Soviet views in Ukraine.

I.   A Matter of Soviet Pride

The Prague Spring was a mass media event in the USSR. Paradoxically, however, even though the authorities shifted political discussion away from informational gatherings, they were unsure whether the mass media provided an effective means to control popular opinion. Consequently, as the official rhetoric underwent a process of 'progressive normalisation',[18] public recitation of Soviet slogans about the Prague Spring and silent participation in the ritualised agitation meetings became important means of 'staging consent' and manifesting a sense of Soviet pride.

The growth of mass media and the attempts to embed it into the agitational functions of the 'propaganda state' raised the spectre of the national in the Soviet context. In 1968 and 1969, mass media portrayals of Czechoslovakia reinforced the idea that residents should refrain from commenting on foreign affairs, to the extent that they did not affect them as 'Soviet people'. This emphasis on 'passivity' can partly be attributed to the specific cultural practices associated with the new media: as Kristin Roth-Ey points out, because of its location in the home, television facilitated 'the transformation of an active Soviet person into a passive and childlike viewer'.[19] During the Czechoslovak crisis, silent acceptance of the media message acquired a special significance. Particularly in the first few months of 1968, the

---

[18] A. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006), 47.
[19] K.J. Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home for Television in the USSR, 1950-1970', *Slavic Review* 66:2 (2007), 296.

Soviet media was ambiguous about the permissible limits of national sovereignty which Czechoslovakia would be allowed to enjoy in the socialist camp.[20] Even as it became increasingly obvious that Dubcek was departing from the Soviet model, and both the central and republican press began to depict the reform communists as 'revisionists',[21] the Soviet media continued to present Czechoslovak officials as sovereign leaders and, as late as 18 July, renounced military invasion as a possible solution to the crisis.[22] Newspapers even offered a platform for Czechoslovak journalists, academics, and politicians to defend their right to pursue their own 'national' path of reform,[23] thus presenting the crisis as Prague's domestic problem. Despite the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia on 21 August, which the official TASS announcement justified by stating that 'further exacerbation of the situation in Czechoslovakia affects the vital interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries', emphasis on the importance of national sovereignty within the socialist bloc did not disappear from official Soviet rhetoric.[24] Between August 1968 and early 1969, newspapers repeatedly emphasised that 'most of the working people' of Czechoslovakia tried to 'normalise the situation in the country', though their efforts were frustrated by 'counterrevolutionary forces'.[25] The Soviet media

---

[20] In January, central newspapers applauded the election of Dubcek as first secretary, and at the end of March *Izvestiia* continued to emphasise that 'relations between our two countries are developing on a mutually advantageous basis'. CDSP 20:1, 24 January 1968: 'Plenary Session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee', *Pravda*, 6 January 1968, *Izvestiia*, 7 January 1968; CDSP 20:13, 24 January 1968: M. Volgin, 'The USSR and Czechoslovakia on an equal basis' by M. Volgin, *Izvestiia*, 29 March 1968.

[21] B. Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine, 1953-1980* (Edmonton, 1984), 119.

[22] The open letter of East European leaders to the Czechoslovak Party stated that '[t]he reactionaries' offensive, supported by imperialism' threatened not only the interests of socialism in Czechoslovakia, but also imperilled 'the entire socialist system'; at the same time, however, the letter assured that the Warsaw Pact states had 'no intention of interfering in your internal affairs''. CDSP 20:29, 7 August 1968: 'To the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 18 July 1968. Similarly, the otherwise alarmist 'statement of communist and workers' parties of socialist countries' published on 4 August emphasised that 'each fraternal party takes into account national characteristics and conditions'. CDSP 30:31, 21 August 1968: 'Statement of communist and workers' parties of socialist countries', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 4 August 1968.

[23] CDSP 20:26, 17 July 1968: Jan Prochazka, 'To Comrades', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 26 June 1968.

[24] In fact, the TASS communiqué itself underlined that 'party and state leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic' requested military 'assistance' to defeat 'forces hostile to socialism', and that the armies would be withdrawn as soon as possible. CDSP 20:34, 11 September 1968: 'TASS announcement', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 21 August 1968.

[25] The death of Jan Palach, for example, was described as 'political murder': newspapers claimed that 'hostile elements' had managed to fool Palach into thinking that the fuel he had used would only produce a 'cold flame' and that he would not die as a result. CDSP 20:35, 18 September 1968: 'Situation in Czechoslovakia', *Pravda*, 30 August 1968; V. Sevriuk, 'Rosy words and black deeds: what fate the Counter-revolutionaries were preparing for the Czechoslovak Working Intelligentsia', *Izvestiia*, 27 August 1968; CDSP 20:40, 23 October 1968: V. Beketov, 'In the countryside around

suggested that the Czechoslovak situation would be resolved on the home front, downplaying the importance of the Warsaw Pact invasion and further putting Soviet consumers of the media market in the position of passive observers.

Paradoxically, however, while silence emerged as a model Soviet reaction to the foreign upheavals, the media also suggested that citizens had a duty to actively defend 'Soviet values' against the outside threat. Official portrayals of Czechoslovakia brought to the fore the tension between national sovereignty and unity in the socialist camp. Even though the new media provided some room for the celebration of something resembling a Soviet 'couch potato',[26] in the tense atmosphere of 1968 top Soviet apparatchiks exerted more pressure on citizens to comment on the news which they obtained from the mass media and thus to become more critical and discerning audiences.[27] This was especially because the CPSU Central Committee was alarmed by some spectacular blunders in the mass media coverage of Eastern Europe. They complained that editors at Soviet central television took no account of the current international situation when planning their broadcasts: on the 20th of March, soon after the Polish students' strikes, they ill-advisedly showed *The Mendicant Student*, an operetta about the struggle of Polish students 'for their rights' in 1704. This led officials to conclude that Soviet television focused too much on light entertainment instead of producing 'educated' viewers.[28]

Despite all the talk of 'national sovereignty', the media increasingly suggested that the Prague Spring was in fact 'Soviet business', encouraging citizens to condemn Czechoslovak reforms as dangerous distortions from the Soviet model of socialism, and to underline that they got involved in resolving the crisis. By June 1968, newspapers wrote that Dubcek's reforms undermined economic progress in Eastern Europe as well as Czechoslovak respect for the USSR and its 'great

---

Bratislava', *Pravda*, 7 October 1968; CDSP 21:5, 19 February 1969: 'The Provocateurs and their victims', *Pravda*, 30 January 1969.
[26] Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home', 296.
[27] In fact, by the late 1960s, the press began to criticise the 'hypnotic effect' of television and the practice of watching indiscriminately. Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home', 298, 330.
[28] The country needed an institute to train professional TV journalists, producers and engineers, they claimed. RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.28, ll. 23-30.

achievements'. They also claimed that Prague weakened the unity of the socialist camp.[29]

A Soviet version of Slavophilism further acted to blur the boundary between national independence and East European unity. The media appealed to the audiences' Slavic loyalties to highlight that they needed to help to unite the Soviet bloc, as well as to fight dissenting views in the USSR itself. Describing the 'defence of socialism' as 'the highest international duty' on 22 August, for example, *Pravda* wrote about 'the centuries old traditions of Slavic community'.[30] This echoed some of the statements published in the USSR in the aftermath of the Polish crisis earlier in the year, when *Pravda* and *Radians'ka Ukraina* printed Gomulka's speech about Polish-Soviet friendship, and the threat of 'German imperialism', 'Zionism' and 'cosmopolitanism'. The speech suggested that parents of many students of 'Jewish extraction' who took part in the Polish unrest held 'more or less responsible and high posts' in Poland, and yet were not committed to its national interests. Poles were not anti-Semitic, *Literaturnaia gazeta* qualified in early April 1968, but Bonn and Tel Aviv launched an anti-Polish and antisocialist propaganda campaign to discredit Gomulka.[31] The implication was that ethnic Jews undermined the Polish position in the Warsaw Pact by allying their interests with Israel (and, bizarrely enough, West Germany), who in turn supported them and threatened Poland's security. By contrast, Polish 'non-Jewish' patriots strove towards a socialist future and eternal friendship with the USSR. Thus, 'socialist patriotism' was described in ethnically

---

[29] Soviet newspapers compared the Prague Spring to the 1956 crisis in Hungary, despaired that 'some Czechoslovak press organs ... have attempted to belittle the significance of the Soviet people's glorious exploit during the Second World War' and cast 'veiled aspersions' on Czechoslovakia's economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, as well as informing readers about the inherently suspicious inflow of West German tourists into Czechoslovakia. Whereas some articles mentioned the uncontrolled activity of 'rightist forces' which did not meet with a sufficient response on the part of the Czechoslovak Party or the mass media, others portrayed Czechoslovak Communist Party leaders themselves as hostile, with Iurii Zhukov arguing that '[t]he preachers of "democratic socialism" are calling upon the working people to abandon the class struggle'. CDSP 20:23, 26 June 1968: 'Plenary Session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee', *Pravda*, 8 June 1968; CDSP 20:26, 17 July 1968: A. Nedorov, 'Contrary to the facts', *Izvestiia*, 29 June 1968; CDSP 20:28, 31 July 1968: I. Aleksandrov, 'Attack on the socialist foundations of Czechoslovakia', *Pravda*, 11 July 1968; CDSP 20:30, 14 August 1968: V. Mikhailov, 'In the revanchists' sights', *Pravda*, 22 July 1968; B. Aleksandrovskii, 'Fruitful cooperation', *Pravda*, 29 July1968; CDSP 20:31, 21 August 1968: Iurii Zhukov, 'Concerning a false slogan', *Pravda*, 26 July 1968.

[30] CDSP 20:34, 11 September 1968: 'Defence of socialism is the highest internationalist duty', *Pravda*, 22 August 1968.

[31] CDSP 20:14, 24 April 1968: 'Speech by Comrade W. Gomulka at meeting with Warsaw Party aktiv', *Pravda*, 22 March 1968; Boleslaw Kowalski, 'On certain theses of Israeli and West German propaganda', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 3 April 1968; DSUP 12:5, May 1968: 'An address by Comrade W. Gomulka at the Meeting with the Party Active', *Radians'ka Ukraina*, 23 March 1968.

exclusive, Slavic terms. Not only did this suggest that the Slavs in Eastern Europe built socialism in alliance with the USSR within their respective homelands, but it also had wide-reaching implications for Soviet nationalities policy at home. It built into the anti-Semitic rhetoric of the Soviet media, which identified enemies of the USSR with Jews in the aftermath of the 1967 Arab-Israeli conflict.[32]

The media thus encouraged citizens to draw parallels between the situation in Czechoslovakia and the USSR, discerning between the 'positive' and 'harmful' forces in both countries. This was especially important in Ukraine, where Dubcek's reforms ultimately shaped high politics. With the rise of Ukrainian quasi-diplomacy in Czechoslovakia and the official rejection of Romanian territorial claims towards 'Ukrainian' lands,[33] Ukrainian national identity appeared to strengthen the Soviet state and its interests in Eastern Europe during the late 1960s. Shelest was very vocal in condemning developments in Czechoslovakia, thus seeking to demonstrate to Moscow that his limited endorsement of Ukrainian culture was different from Czechoslovak policies,[34] despite – or perhaps because of – his genuine fear of a potential spill-over of the Prague Spring into Ukraine.[35] Hence, even as members of the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia grew increasingly frustrated with cultural policy in Ukraine, citizens could still legitimately seek to defend Ukrainian national interests in the USSR.[36] Meanwhile, however, developments in Czechoslovakia helped to discredit Shelest's relatively liberal national policy. Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi had no scruples about subordinating the republic's interests to those of the Soviet state. As such, he was seen as more reliable by the Kremlin and his position in the CPU was strengthened during 1968.[37] Interestingly, his evaluation of political stability in Czechoslovakia was much less alarmist than that of Shelest, and

---

[32] Zvi Gitelman shows that the 'anti-Zionist' campaign employed stereotypical images of Jews, and it became virtually impossible to distinguish between 'Zionists' and Jews. Z. Gitelman, *Bespokoinyi vek: Evrei Rossii i Sovetskogo Soiuza s 1881 g. do nashikh dnei* (Moscow, 2008), 244.

[33] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 171.

[34] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 78; Yekelchyk, *Ukraine*, 161.

[35] Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society*, 119; M. Kramer, 'The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine' in Carol Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker (eds.), *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge, 1998), 144.

[36] Despite the Warsaw Pact crackdown on Dubcek's 'national road to socialism', Pastor shows that there was still a tacit recognition amongst East European leaders that 'socialist patriotism must be propped up by traditional patterns of nationalism'. P. Pastor, 'Official nationalism' in Gerasimos Augustinos (ed.), *The National Idea in Eastern Europe: The Politics of Ethnic and Civic Community* (Lexington, 1996), 91, 94.

[37] Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society*, 204.

he was less supportive of military intervention.[38] Grey Hodnett and Peter Potichnyj have partly attributed this apparent paradox to economic considerations,[39] but it is also conceivable that Shcherbyts'kyi was less threatened by the unfolding developments than his CPU rival. Because Dubcek's 'national road towards socialism' cast doubts on the extent to which ethno-national interests were compatible with existing Soviet-style regimes, the Czechoslovak crisis posed a potential challenge to Shelest's alliance with the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia. By contrast, like Brezhnev, who initially took a more tolerant position toward Alexander Dubcek's liberalisation than Shelest, Gomulka or Ulbricht,[40] Shcherbyts'kyi's political vision combined loyalty to Soviet institutions in return for political stability, social benefits, and economic growth.

In line with the ambiguous status of Ukrainian cultural autonomy, the Soviet media variously defined residents of the republic as Soviet and 'Ukrainian' people vis-à-vis the troublesome foreigners in Eastern Europe. For example, when *Literaturna Ukraina* printed an interview with the Czech scholar Vaclav Zidlicky on 19 April 1968, it wrote about both Ukrainian-Czechoslovak and Soviet-Czechoslovak international cooperation. Zidlicky discussed 'days of Ukrainian culture' and the broader question of relations between Ukraine and Czechoslovakia, but he also identified the differences of approach towards the study of Ukraine which arose between Czech and Slovak scholars on the one hand, and their Soviet colleagues on the other.[41] More prominently, however, portrayals of the Prague Spring acted as a warning against over-emphasising Ukrainian distinctiveness in the USSR. Indeed, the Soviet Ukrainian press drew explicit links between Czechoslovak and Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalism'. As late as 28 October 1969, *Radians'ka Ukraina* cited a Czechoslovak communist official who labeled the enemies of socialism in Czechoslovakia as 'our Mazepas' who unsuccessfully tried to 'undermine our friendship with the Soviet Union'.[42] Through comparing anti-Soviet nationalists to an early 18th century Cossack leader who opposed the Russian Tsar,

---

[38] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 123.

[39] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 85.

[40] I. Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), 350.

[41] DSUP 12:6, June 1968: Vaclav Zidlicky, 'Achievements of Ukrainian Studies in Czechoslovakia', *Literaturna Ukraina*, 19 April 1968.

[42] DSUP 13:12: 'Eternal Friendship! A meeting of Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship in the Illich Kolhosp on Vasylkiv Rayon, Kyiv Oblast', *Radians'ka Ukraina*, 28 October 1969.

the article invoked the idea of a Russian-dominated Slavic community, suggesting that Ukrainian residents' loyalty to the Soviet Union was tantamount to a close Ukrainian-Russian political union. In particular, federalism in Czechoslovakia was hardly discussed in the Soviet Ukrainian press in 1968 and 1969, and it did not figure at all in public anti-Czechoslovak polemics. While Hodnett and Potichnyj claim that there may simply not have been much public interest in the issue,[43] reports from agitation meetings show that residents of the republic asked about the relationship between Czechs and Slovaks over and over again.[44] It seems more likely that the subject was too sensitive to raise publicly.[45] With the Slovaks striving towards greater autonomy in Czechoslovakia, the authorities wanted to prevent inhabitants of Ukraine from questioning the position of their own republic in the USSR.

These tensions underpinned the growing concerns of the authorities in Moscow and Kyiv about the exposure of Ukraine's population to both the Western radio broadcasts and the Czechoslovak, Polish, Hungarian, and Romanian mass media. Even as far east as Sumy the obkom officials complained that the local population relied on 'foreign, hostile' broadcasts to find out about current affairs, adding that the local press, television and radio should report on recent events before the news reached people from abroad in a distorted form.[46] According to Soviet officials, the foreign media encouraged the rise of anti-Soviet opinions and Ukrainian national identities defined in non-Soviet terms. On numerous occasions, Petro Shelest complained to Brezhnev about the fact that inhabitants of the western oblasts received information directly from their neighbours across the border, and tuned in to both Czechoslovak and Western radio and television, including the Ukrainian-language broadcasts produced by the Ukrainian minority in Presov in eastern Slovakia.[47] Indeed, Czechoslovak radio (available throughout the republic) and television (whose broadcasts were easily picked up in the western oblasts) tried to convince their allies of the legitimacy of Dubcek's reforms before August 1968, adopting a more aggressive and openly confrontational discourse in the months to

---

[43] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 116-117.
[44] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 131-133;TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark. 6-7; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.39, ark. 10-14.
[45] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 116-117.
[46] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 26-30.
[47] Kramer, 'The Czechoslovak Crisis', 144.

follow.[48] Even though, the 'socialist' Czechoslovak media could not be labeled counter-revolutionary, particularly before the invasion, some of the ideas propagated therein would have been considered revisionist in the Soviet context.[49] By the end of July, for example, Ukrainian-language publications posted to the republic from Czechoslovakia included *Druzhno vpered* and *Duklia*, which had printed Vaculik's '2000 words' and commented extensively on the unfolding events.[50] Moreover, Czechoslovak media reported on the revival of the Greek Catholic Church in eastern Slovakia, 'a true red flag for the Soviets', and questioned the need for collective farming.[51] Throughout 1968, the Presov newspapers also contained more direct references to the situation in Soviet Ukraine, printing letters from Soviet citizens who protested against the suppression of Ukrainian culture in the USSR and the invasion of Czechoslovakia, publishing an interview with Ivan Dziuba, and giving voice to the views of a Kyivan Ukrainian who wrote about the deaths of Ukrainian writers in Soviet concentration camps and the loss of ten million lives in the famine of 1932-33.[52] Thus, the Czechoslovak media that was reaching Ukraine's residents raised the issue of Ukrainian national rights defined in opposition to the Soviet state.

Because residents of the western oblasts came into contact with these 'revisionist' views more often than other Soviet citizens, the authorities were particularly active in combating such influences, and inhabitants often had to go the extra length to prove their Soviet patriotic credentials. In the Chernivtsi oblast, for example, the authorities condemned the influence of the 'ideologically hostile' Romanian media, which sympathised with Dubcek and condemned Soviet policy in Czechoslovakia. According to obkom apparatchiks, this exacerbated national conflicts in the region and had a 'detrimental effect' on Soviet citizens of Romanian origin. Consequently, they conducted 'individual work' with local residents: in order to encourage them to publicly manifest their commitment to the Soviet media and its message, obkom leaders needed to undermine the isolating and private nature of watching television.[53] In the village of Gorbivs'k, for example, where there were seventy television sets, twenty five families had watched Romanian television in the

[48] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 96.
[49] Hodnett and Potichnyj, *The Ukraine*, 117.
[50] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 73.
[51] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 174.
[52] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 172-173.
[53] Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home', 296.

first half of August. However, after 'clarification work' was conducted by local communist officials, fifteen out of them turned their antennas onto Chernivtsi.[54] By choosing the Soviet media, the villagers displayed their loyalty to the Soviet state and its policy to the whole community. Still, tactics adopted by the obkom officials here could not assure that the public at large would follow the fifteen families in Gorbivs'k, reflecting the generally ambivalent and somewhat amateurish approach of the political elites towards television.[55]

Indeed, Party leaders found it difficult to make Soviet broadcasts appealing in western Ukraine, largely because the standard of Soviet programming did not compare well with the East European media. In February 1968, the propaganda and agitation department of the CPU Central Committee warned that the Uzhgorod television studio (the construction of which was already delayed by two years) produced a few trial broadcasts of poor quality, and still failed to come up with regular transmissions. The programmes were 'long-winded and pompous', as a result of which inhabitants of the Zakarpattia lowlands tuned in to Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Romanian television.[56] The need to improve the quality of Soviet programmes in western Ukraine fuelled tensions between Petro Shelest in Kyiv, who was increasingly frustrated that foreign media affected 'moods' in the region, and state and party officials in Moscow, who did not seem to appreciate the need to popularise Soviet broadcasts instead. On 1 July, for example, the CPU first secretary alerted his superiors to the fact that broadcasting stations in Chernivtsi, Odesa and Zakarpattia oblasts did not assure good quality reception for Soviet programmes, which increased the popularity of foreign broadcasts.[57] However, just over a month later, the propaganda department of the CPSU Central Committee concluded that 'international agreements' did not allow for the building of more powerful television broadcasting stations in those regions.[58] Similarly, after party leaders in Kyiv asked the propaganda department in Moscow to decrease the amount of Czechoslovak publications in Ukraine in May, they were informed that the issue would be considered at a later date, after the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central

---

[54] TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3604, ark. 129-132.
[55] Roth-Ey, 'Finding a Home', 290.
[56] TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3607, ark. 1-9.
[57] RGANI, f.1, op.60, d.28, ll. 65-66.
[58] RGANI, f.1, op.60, d.28, l. 67.

Committee plenum.[59] Their request fell on deaf ears, or in any case it was never fully satisfied. Over two months after the CPU compiled their report, on 30 July 1968, the Czechoslovak press was still easily accessible in Ukraine by subscription and in *Soiuzpechat'* outlets.[60]

Because the authorities were concerned that the influence of the Soviet mass media was limited, particularly in the western oblasts, they put pressure on citizens to actively manifest their 'Soviet pride'. As a result, despite losing their previous functions, the ritualised agitation gatherings provided an important setting for 'staging consent'. Mass agitation meetings occurred in several waves over 1968. The first took place at collective farms, factories and other institutions between 22 March and 27 March, where participants expressed support for Gomulka's 'decisive actions' in the aftermath of the student strikes in Poland.[61] Agitation work was particularly intensive in the L'viv oblast, where one hundred lecturers addressed party members and non-party members alike, paying special attention to the creative intelligentsia, university students, as well as reserve army officers, educating the last in particular about the 'patriotic education of youth' with the aid of the political department of the Prikarpattia military district.[62] Another wave of mass agitation meetings about Czechoslovakia, geared towards party members and non-members alike, took place between June and August 1968.[63] Most of them were organised in the first few days after the Warsaw Pact intervention, and reports concerning workers' reactions to the TASS announcement about the invasion started to flood into Kyiv on 21 and 22 August.[64] In the mining town of Chervonohrad alone, the L'viv obkom organised over 3000 discussions and 'political information meetings' in the aftermath of the invasion on 21 August, where participants were expected to 'express support' for Soviet foreign policy.[65] During this period, party officials were keen to underline that the meetings attracted non-party members. For example, a

---

[59] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 98.

[60] Censors only intervened on a case by case basis. RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.20, ll. 58-75.

[61] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.27, ark. 47-49.

[62] DALO, f.P3, op.10, s.248, ark. 1-2.

[63] For example, once a week, 25,355 political workers gave short lectures to workers at local factories in the Donets'k oblast. They normally spoke between two shifts to assure maximum attendance, describing the 'current situation' and discussing the results of the meeting of world communist parties in Budapest. See TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3604, ark. 180-186.

[64] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37. ark. 93; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s. 37, ark. 94-96; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 102-104.

[65] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 36-39.

raikom apparatchik from the Odesa oblast wrote that out of the 500 people who spoke during public meetings about the invasion, 70% did not belong to the Party.[66]

The meetings were very formulaic,[67] and, in a stark contrast to 1956, numerous reports claimed that the local authorities registered 'no undesirable opinions' during their conduct,[68] though they did offer an opportunity for workers to ask questions.[69] In practice lecturers were unlikely to provide participants with any more information than they could gather from the Soviet media, for the agitators' role was often limited to reading the TASS announcement and other press materials concerning the Czechoslovak situation.[70] Nevertheless, through the very act of organising large agitation meetings, the authorities showed that they expected all residents of Ukraine to prove their loyalty to the Soviet state and their support for Moscow's foreign policy. The press publicised examples of the good behaviour of citizens who attended mass meetings devoted to the crisis, claiming that workers' gatherings have been 'unanimously approving and warmly supporting the actions of the Soviet government and governments of other socialist countries in providing emergency aid to the workers of the CSSR'.[71] Between 21 and 31 August, *Vilna Ukraina* printed 24 articles about the support of workers' collectives and individual readers for the 'aid' given to Czechoslovakia.[72] The meetings were ritualistic, with attendance itself constituting a public manifestation of the 'correct' Soviet stance, and active involvement distinguishing the most reliable citizens from the mass of participants. In late June, when the Party organised 'meetings of solidarity' with the Czechoslovak people in response to the pro-Soviet letter of the Czechoslovak Militia, 791,747 workers (*trudiashchiesia*) participated, but only 9,415 actually spoke.[73] Moreover, party apparatchiks now gave the workers an opportunity to 'display initiative' in proving their loyalty to the Soviet state: after meetings at factories, a report from Dnipropetrovs'k claimed, many workers suggested

---

[66] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s.724, ark. 96-98.

[67] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 43, 225.

[68] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 9-12; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 17-18; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark. 101-104; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 114.

[69] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 36-39.

[70] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 14-16.

[71] DSUP 12:10: H. Nikol'nikov, 'The Struggle of VI Lenin and the CPSU for Consolidating the Principles of Proletarian Internationalism', *Radians'ka Ukraina*, 3 September 1968.

[72] V. Dmytruk, '"Praz'ka vesna" i Ukraina', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008), 9.

[73] They underlined their 'friendship and respect for the Czechoslovak *narod*' and reminisced about heroic feats of the Great Patriotic War. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.30, ark. 190-193.

organising 'demonstrations of support' for the Soviet defence of Czechoslovakia's socialist achievements.[74] Hence, during the summer of 1968, and particularly in the last ten days of August, residents of Ukraine had a forum where they could speak about their pride in Soviet achievements in Eastern Europe.

Party activists and the Soviet middle class, including members and candidate members of raikoms, gorkoms, the obkoms, the CPU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee, as well as revision commissions, had more opportunities to voice publicly their 'correct' views about Czechoslovakia than other members of society, thus proving their patriotic credentials and claiming a special elite status for themselves. Indeed, even at the ostensibly open gatherings during the summer, it was they who predominated. The order in which participants spoke at the meetings was likewise telling: during a gathering of an Odesa weavers' collective on 21 August, two senior managers spoke first, only then followed by two women from the shop floor.[75] Similarly, a report from L'viv specified that a head of a collective farm made a moving speech during a 'workers' meeting'.[76] Some reports explicitly ascribed the workers' 'correct' opinions to the efficient work of the local apparatchiks, mentioning specific collective farms and enterprises, as well as the heads of primary party organisations who conducted effective agitation work.[77] In effect, they invoked the managerial middle class composed of the most important and reliable citizens. Furthermore, between March and June 1968, and then again between September 1968 and April 1969, non-party members and rank-and-file communists were largely excluded from public discussion about Eastern Europe, and closed party meetings continued to be organised throughout the summer.[78] During the whole of May 1968, closed party meetings were conducted in all 2,297 primary party organisations of Ukraine, and they were attended by 59,814 communists, out of whom 5,849 made a public contribution.[79] From September 1968 to April 1969, the news from Czechoslovakia was again discussed during closed party meeting, with 'party activists' expressing outrage at Dubcek's indecisiveness, the continuing anti-Soviet and 'anti-socialist' attacks in the Czechoslovak media, and finally expressing relief

---

[74] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 5-7.
[75] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s.724, ark. 106-107.
[76] DALO, f.P3, op.10. s.248, ark. 49-50.
[77] DAKO, f.5., op.7, s.822, ark. 42-43.
[78] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 37-38;TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 53-55; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 99-10; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 26-30.
[79] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 114-117.

at the election of Husak as the new first secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.[80] Through participating and speaking at closed party meetings, a very narrow group of party activists portrayed themselves as the most reliable 'patriots', or active citizens who defended the USSR in the face of the escalating crisis in Czechoslovakia.

The authorities in Kyiv hoped that the Soviet press, radio, and television would encourage residents of the republic to distance themselves from the unreliable 'foreigners' in Czechoslovakia and silently support Soviet policy in the region. At the same time, they struggled to define a clear Soviet point of view about the Prague Spring, failed to restrict access to foreign sources of information, and remained unsure about the effectiveness of the mass media in shaping popular opinion. Consequently, silent participation in the formulaic agitation meetings emerged as a crucial context where citizens distanced themselves from the 'foreign' unrest and identified with a Russian-led Slavic and Soviet community. Moreover, for most of the period between March 1968 and April 1969, the opportunity to speak in public was confined to party activists and the Soviet middle class, with non-party members encouraged to prove their commitment to Soviet goals and values during the meetings only for a short period during the summer. This increased the 'performative' dimension of the gatherings: active participation was a marker of status, leading to a sharper articulation of social differences than at the height of the Polish and Hungarian events in 1956. At the same time, outside the narrow context of agitation meetings, debates about the Prague Spring did retain a strong 'constative', as opposed to 'performative', dimension: this is to say that language was used to refer to the world and to state facts about it, as people still voiced different opinions about Dubcek's reforms and their potential application in the USSR, with popular reactions polarised along the axis of conservative and reformist patriotism.[81]

---

[80] DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.1001, ark. 4-6; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.40, ark. 58-59; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.40, ark. 89-92; DALO, f.3, op.10, s.248, ark. 102-104; TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3817, ark.1-3; TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3817, ark.31-32; TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3817, ark. 39-40.

[81] Yurchak, *Everything*, 17-18, 23-28.

II.   Conservative Patriotism

Conservative patriotism was even more widespread in 1968 than it had been twelve years earlier. It provided a format for expressing support for the principles which governed Moscow's policy in Eastern Europe and allowed residents to 'stage consent' during the agitation meetings. Just as in 1956, it was a double-edged sword, as citizens who manifested their support for repressive policies in Czechoslovakia also felt emboldened to criticise the Soviet mass media and Brezhnev's performance in foreign affairs. However, conservative patriotism was now less challenging to the state, with fear of war and Stalin nostalgia considerably weaker than during the Hungarian crisis. Proponents of conservative patriotism increasingly focused on identifying 'enemies' amongst non-party members rather than criticising party apparatchiks. Meanwhile, conservative patriotism also acquired strongly paternalistic undertones, because it allowed party activists and other members of the middle class to act as steadfast patriots who protected the silent 'masses' from foreign and domestic reactionary forces.

In articulating ideas of conservative patriotism in 1968, citizens condemned Czechoslovak reforms and called for the preservation of Soviet-style socialism in Eastern Europe. Their statements were underpinned by the assumption that all leaders in the socialist camp should maintain a common outlook on reform. Invoking 'Marxist-Leninist principles', some citizens spoke of the need to maintain the 'unity' of the socialist camp and to combat 'anti-communist' ideologies,[82] and others enquired why the Czechoslovak leadership remained 'divided'.[83] In line with this, many participants in public gatherings explicitly condemned Czechoslovak departures from the Soviet model. They often spoke about the dangers of Prague's new media policy, arguing that 'hostile' elements were allowed to publicise their ideas in the mass media.[84] They also voiced outrage at the fact that some members of the Czechoslovak intellgentsia 'alienated themselves' from the working class.[85] Most prominently, participants in public gatherings expressed suspicion about the idea of 'national independence' from the USSR, ascribing it to bourgeois influences and

---

[82] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 4-6.
[83] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.27, ark. 47-49.
[84] DAOO, f.11, op.19, s.702, ark. 4-11; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.27, ark.47-49; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark.131-133;
[85] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 7-10; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark.131-133; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark.18-19.

Western imperialism. 'Independence from what and from whom?' – exclaimed a participant of a public meeting in Donets'k – perhaps the Romanian media which claimed to defend Czechoslovak sovereignty referred to independence from 'scientific communism and Marxism-Leninism', he charged.[86] Well into 1969, when the CPC leadership in Prague was brought under control, active participants in public meetings continued to talk about 'imperialist' attempts to sow distrust between Prague and Moscow. In the Donets'k oblast, even as a miner brigade leader rejoiced that 'imperialist attempts to tear Czechoslovakia out of the socialist community had now completely failed', he talked about the continuing threat of 'rightist' and 'imperialist' forces.[87]

Conservative patriotism further held that reform resulted in economic difficulties. Numerous citizens enquired about short supplies in Poland and Czechoslovakia,[88] in the apparent belief that the crises were caused by the failure of Warsaw and Prague to assure a decent standard of living for their citizens. They also suggested that Dubcek's policies only aggravated the situation further. In May 1968, an engineer from Mukachevo stated that his father had died in Czechoslovakia fighting for 'a life without the rich' for the Czechoslovak people. Now his achievements were being undermined, he despaired, because the Czechoslovak Party was in no hurry to build socialism, and some of its members were even 'anti-communist'.[89] Two months later, a pensioner from the Sumy oblast claimed that Dubcek's democracy would mirror Masaryk's and Benes's 'bourgeois republic', with the 'working class' condemned to 'hunger, unemployment, executions, and imprisonment'. It was necessary to increase 'revolutionary alertness' (*pylnist'*), he concluded.[90] In this way, with the elite dominating public discussions about Czechoslovakia, the link between conservative patriotism and economic populism, so evident in 1956, was now broken. From the new conservative perspective, economic complaints resulted from ideological dissent and as such they were inherently 'non-Soviet'. Members of the middle class suggested that the Soviet Union was superior to Eastern European satellites because it had successfully eliminated 'capitalist' and 'bourgeois' influences.

---

[86] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 154-155.
[87] TsDAHO, f.1, op.31, s.3817, ark. 8-10.
[88] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.27, ark. 47-49; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 131-133.
[89] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 102-112.
[90] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark. 6-7.

Public criticism of Czechoslovak policy had important implications for the making of social identities in Soviet Ukraine. Because the agitation gatherings were geared towards reliable citizens, most participants who actually spoke focused their energies on correcting the 'mistaken' and 'hostile' opinions in their immediate surroundings, particularly outside the privileged circle of party activists. They denounced those individuals who spoke favourably about Dubcek's reforms, and thus failed to subscribe to Soviet 'socialist' ideology. In late August, for example, taxi drivers from Luhans'k held a special meeting to discuss a colleague who had spoken to his passengers about the high standard of living abroad and the 'occupation' of Czechoslovakia. They very aggressively branded him ungrateful and ignorant, said that they could not 'bear even to look at him', but finally allowed him to remain a member of the collective after his wordy apology.[91] Similarly, 'war veterans, veterans of labour, and leading workers' condemned a non-party miner born in Czechoslovakia: in sympathising with the Prague Spring, they claimed, he betrayed 'workers' honour'. KGB officials believed that his case had attracted much attention in Luhans'k, with many local citizens claiming that it would act as a warning for other 'demagogues'.[92] In order to claim the status of 'conservative patriots' for themselves, citizens also named and shamed those residents of Ukraine who questioned the legitimacy of the Soviet economic system. For example, the obkom authorities in Poltava illustrated the success of their agitation work by citing the example of a non-party collective farmer who had complained that all of Eastern Europe 'feeds off us', but then 'understood his mistake' after the deputy head of a local soviet visited the kolkhoz to explain the intricacies of 'internationalist help'.[93] Instances like this allowed party apparatchiks to demonstrate that they were instrumental in maintaining the 'correct' ideological stance amongst the population of Ukraine.

The making of internal enemies was a crucial part of the social hierarchies which emerged via ritualised politics and which helped to reconcile the elitist claims of party activists and professionals with the rising ambitions of 'ordinary' Soviet citizens. This was possible because party activists invoked the rhetoric of East Slavic unity during agitation gatherings, thus implicitly extending the definition of

---

[91] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s. 32, ark. 199-202.
[92] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 109.
[93] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.39, ark. 142-144.

conservative patriotism to most people in the audience. Blaming national conflicts between Czechs and Slovaks for the escalation of the crisis across the border,[94] they suggested that national diversity was a destabilising influence in socialist regimes. In line with this, they contrasted reliable citizens with 'bourgeois nationalists' at home.[95] In fact, Soviet dissidents who advocated Ukrainian national rights felt alienated from the majority of Ukraine's population. They were outraged that students and teachers at Kyiv State University laughed at the ironic remarks made (in Ukrainian) by the deputy head of the Ukrainian KGB in March 1969 as he talked about attempts to defend Ukrainian culture against Russification.[96] Members of the audience did not have to speak to show that they belonged to the East Slavic community conjured up by the party apparatchiks, but merely laughed at the right moments.

More frequently, participation in the meetings was a way for citizens to claim membership in the 'non-Jewish' Soviet community. Admittedly, top apparatchiks condemned some openly anti-Semitic statements. When an unnamed individual from Minsk wrote a letter to *Pravda*, claiming that 'political diversion conducted by people of Jewish origin' threatened the national (*natsional'nye*) interests of our country and the building of communism, the chief editor branded him an anti-Semite.[97] The official censure of anti-Semitism may partly be explained by Brezhnev's growing suspicion of Russian nationalism and the 'Russian party' which had previously challenged his authority in the Politburo, and still preserved influence in journals such as *Molodaia gvardiia* and *Ogonek*.[98] During the second half of the 1960s, party apparatchiks became suspicious of what Nikolai Mitrokhin calls the 'red patriots' who articulated a sense of Stalin nostalgia and began to join forces with young 'anti-communist' Russian nationalists, adopting some of their anti-Semitic views.[99] However, it appears that residents of Ukraine who attended meetings about the East European crises did listen to many speeches which singled out the Jews as a potentially unstable group in East European societies, especially in the aftermath of the Polish events. As Amir Weiner points out, 'Jews seemed to antagonise the party

[94] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 12-13.
[95] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.40, ark. 97-99; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 124-125.
[96] KhTS, 30 June 1969.
[97] RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.26, ll. 68-70.
[98] N. Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia: Dvizhenie russkikh natsionalistov v SSSR 1953-1985* (Moscow, 2003), 255-256.
[99] Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia*, 340-341.

and the KGB, especially in western Ukraine': the 'visible role of several Jewish figures in the Prague Spring', demands for restoring relations with Israel, and the Polish anti-Semitic events 'fuelled the anti-Jewish campaign already under way inside the Soviet Union'.[100] In fact, it appears that some residents responded to such portrayals, asking many questions concerning the role of Jews in the Polish disturbances during agitation gatherings.[101] The meaning and implications of Gomulka's speech were unclear, but the Soviet press coverage of the Polish crisis allowed party activists who addressed audiences in Ukraine to legitimately single out 'Zionists' (or simply Jews) as a special and potentially disruptive group.

Some members of ethnic minorities made an explicit effort to defend themselves against popular suspicions of disloyalty. In early April, a sewing factory worker by the name of Zaltsman tried to distance himself from 'Zionism', as he stated that Gomulka sounded so convinced about the Zionist plot that 'it must be true', and concluded that 'the Jews must decide whose side they are on'. For his part, a local rabbi went so far as to deny that the problem of anti-Semitism existed at all, claiming that Gomulka's speech was not anti-Semitic, because it emphasised that most Jews were loyal to the Polish state. Consequently, he claimed, the speech cannot inspire anti-Semitic feeling here in the USSR, and 'we, the Jews', have nothing to fear.[102] Similarly, some Soviet citizens of Polish and Czech origin highlighted their alienation from their rebellious external homelands, seeking thereby to downplay the importance of ethnicity in the Polish and Czechoslovak crises.[103] Nonetheless, debates surrounding the events in Eastern Europe affected the discourse of ethno-cultural identities in the republic. They strengthened proponents of the thesis that Soviet state and party institutions should represent a unified ethno-cultural community. As Geoffrey Hosking argues, both the Hungarian revolt of 1956 and the Czechoslovak events twelve years later discredited the idea of world socialism, encouraging Moscow leaders to turn towards Great Russian patriotism to legitimise their power.[104] Consequently, most inhabitants of Ukraine could claim to be reliable Soviet citizens by simply participating in the agitation meetings, because conservative patriotism was defined in sweeping national terms and party activists

---

[100] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 180.
[101] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.14, ark. 131-133.
[102] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 93.
[103] DAOO, f.P11, op.20. s.88, ark. 15-26; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.37, ark. 93.
[104] G. Hosking, *Rulers and Victims: The Russians in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), 362.

suggested that 'undesirable' reactions to the Prague Spring were an anomaly confined to social outcasts. At the same time, conservative patriotism was elitist and exclusivist, articulated as it was by members of the middle class who barred ethnic minorities from the East Slavic, Soviet community.

The peculiar combination of its elitist claims with the nationalising, nearly all-embracing appeal turned conservative patriotism into a powerful commentary on the Soviet media and the empire. Through underlining their loyalty to the Soviet media and its message, the outspoken and self-styled members of the middle class demanded more information from official Soviet channels and implicitly criticised policy by explicitly denouncing Czechoslovak radio and television. In early May, obkom secretaries in Donets'k and L'viv underlined that party members were outraged that Czechoslovak journalists expressed 'anti-Soviet views'.[105] Attacks on the Czechoslovak media intensified during July and August, and even though non-party citizens participated in public meetings at this time, it was mostly party apparatchiks who commented on the foreign broadcasts. For instance, in July 1968, party members in the Ivano-Frankivs'k oblast condemned the 'liberal attitude' of the Czechoslovak leadership.[106] It was only in the immediate aftermath of the Warsaw Pact invasion that non-party members expressed their outrage at the 'reactionary' mass media in Czechoslovakia.[107] Whilst the CPU leaders in Kyiv deemed the mass media an inadequate means of controlling popular opinion in the republic, concerned as they were by the influence of foreign broadcasts, it was through explicit condemnation of the 'unorthodox' or 'counterrevolutionary' East European media that citizens proved their loyalty to the Soviet state. At the same time, inhabitants who sought to underline their indignation at the foreign broadcasts talked about the Soviet media as a more ideologically sound institution. Referring to the *Pravda* article which stated that *Mlada Fronta Dnes* published anti-communist and anti-Soviet materials, a shoe factory worker and member of the Ivano-Frankivs'k gorkom called on Prague to fight against the 'hostile elements' in Czechoslovakia. He claimed to speak in the name of 'the thousands of workers' of the west Ukrainian

[105] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 37-38; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 93-96.
[106] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark.18-19.
[107] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.39, ark. 10-14; DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.822, ark.42-43.

region.[108] The CPU Central Committee underlined that communists in other parts of the republic echoed *Pravda*'s condemnation of *Mlada Fronta Dnes*, too.[109]

As loyal consumers of the Soviet information market, citizens refused to be taken for fools. In contrasting Soviet media to foreign broadcasts, many residents of Ukraine emphasised that they had the right to obtain reliable news through their own 'national' channels. In late April, a *Pravda* reader from L'viv stated that the 'Soviet *narod*' were not idiots and they understood that their authorities did not trust them with all the available information, even though people could obtain it from foreign radio stations anyway. His comments were echoed by a man from Kyiv, who stated that 'regular communists' were concerned by the course of events, and enquired whether *Pravda* editors considered their readers unworthy of 'the truth'.[110] These letters were not anonymous, and many of their authors considered themselves to be loyal citizens and Party members, who had the right to understand how Soviet people and communists should relate to the foreign crises. As avid readers of Soviet newspapers, many inhabitants of Ukraine likewise picked up on inconsistencies and shortages of information. Obkom reports sent to Kyiv at the end of August revealed that residents wanted the local party members to expand on the information which had already been made available. For example, when debating the news of invasion, residents of the Ivano-Frankivs'k oblast wanted obkom lecturers to name the leaders in Prague who asked for military assistance.[111] Thus, some citizens focused their criticism of the Soviet media on the need to establish a clearer narrative about the events in Eastern Europe, thus both affirming and reinforcing their status as the Soviet middle class: they emphasised the 'national' dimension of conservative patriotism by speaking in the name of the Soviet people, all the while invoking a paternalist rhetoric by claiming that Soviet officials had a duty to guide popular opinion. Ever since the publication of Gomulka's speech, which clearly blamed the 'Zionists' for student unrest in Poland, some citizens demanded that a similarly clear

---

[108] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.35, ark. 18-19.
[109] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 2-6. At around the same time, a local primary party cell secretary from Kyiv bemoaned the 'restoration of capitalism' in Czechoslovakia during a gorkom meeting. He stated that 'Ukrainian communists' were concerned that bourgeois, 'hostile elements' (including party members) found an arena to voice their 'reactionary attacks' on socialism in the Czechoslovak press, radio and television. See DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s. 780, ark. 21-25.
[110] RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.26, ll. 43-49, 64-65.
[111] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 21-24.

statement should be produced with regards to Czechoslovakia.[112] They claimed that incomplete information about the situation in Czechoslovakia was conducive to the appearance of numerous rumours.[113]

Furthermore, conservative patriotism was underpinned by imperial sentiments, which inspired many citizens to express support for the military intervention in Czechoslovakia, but also fuelled some criticism of Brezhnev's foreign policy. Throughout 1968 and 1969, many inhabitants of Ukraine underlined that the USSR would not allow its satellites to depart from the Soviet model. Citizens highlighted their status as 'conservative patriots' by showing that they were not afraid to fight against the creeping 'counterrevolution' in the satellite states. In early May, the L'viv obkom reported that most residents of the oblast 'understood the need for military mobilisation'.[114] Similarly, immediately after 21 August, participants of public meetings in the Crimea stated that they were 'ready to take part in the defence of Czechoslovakia'.[115] The military intervention awoke a form of Soviet national fervour in Ukraine, with many expressing passionate support for the army. In Chernivtsi alone, 100,000 people, more than half the local population, attended cinema screenings of the film *Counterrevolution shall not pass* (*Kontrrevoliutsiia ne proidet*) and other documentaries devoted to Czechoslovakia. According to official reports, they often applauded the heroic acts of the Soviet army and reacted very vocally to images of 'counterrevolutionary sabotage' aimed at 'our soldiers'.[116] When they talked about the 'eternal bond' between the USSR and its satellites, some citizens actually defined Sovietness in a national framework, especially when they recalled the 'liberation' of Eastern Europe during the Great Patriotic War. For instance, after the student unrest in Poland, a *Pravda* reader from Dnipropetrovs'k wrote to the editors, describing his outrage at the abuse of 'the great Polish patriot, Mickiewicz'. As 'a Soviet person', he was shocked that the poet's work was misinterpreted to inspire 'anti-Soviet feelings' in Poland and sow hatred between our *narody*, who had fought arm in arm during the Great Patriotic War. Similarly, a letter sent from Kharkiv asserted that Poland must stay within the Soviet camp, recalling the brotherhood of Soviet and Polish communists in the face of a common Nazi

---

[112] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s. 702, ark. 4-11.
[113] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 86.
[114] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 93-96.
[115] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 28-32.
[116] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.33, ark. 111-115.

enemy.[117] Both men aligned themselves with the generation of veterans and thus identified with a Soviet *narod*, more advanced along the path towards communism and distinguished in the struggle against the Nazis, but also open to attacks from socially backward foreigners whom they were trying to help. Through contrasting the Soviet *narod* with a separate Polish nation, with its own peculiar form of patriotism and anti-Soviet national prejudice, they equated the Soviet *narod* with another national community. In that sense, they construed it as a 'nation' in its own right.

These claims about Soviet superiority in the socialist bloc further reinforced the selective nature of conservative patriotism. To prove their commitment to the defence of Soviet 'national' interests in Eastern Europe, some citizens explicitly renounced defeatist attitudes. Most prominently, soldiers condemned their colleagues who spoke out against the invasion. On 28 August, the political department of the Kyiv military district wrote about a group of officers who listened to a Soviet radio programme about the brotherly help shown to Czechoslovakia in 1945. One of them commented that, unlike the Great Patriotic War, nobody asked the USSR for assistance now and yet 'we' still marched in. His comment provoked lively protests among other officers present in the room, and he was later required to report to the commander of his unit. He explained that the comment was an ignorant joke.[118] Not only did the man seek to reinstate his 'conservative patriotic' credentials by repudiating his earlier statements, but his case also offered an opportunity for other officers to prove that they remained committed to the Soviet cause. Furthermore, citizens demonstrated 'courage' in the face of the impending war, denouncing panic and fear as 'non-Soviet' reactions. Like in 1956, most citizens who were afraid that the events would escalate into a full-blown military conflict came from the western oblasts. Some residents of Zakarpattia bought up great quantities of 'soap, salt, and matches', whilst others prepared to leave the region and escape further east.[119] However, even though numerous citizens feared the outbreak of a third world war, reports suggesting that the population resorted to panic buying were now

---

[117] RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.26, ll. 51-54.

[118] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.32, ark. 141-145.

[119] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 70-71, 73, 105. Reportedly, after 21 August, two students from Uzhgorod wrote to their parents in L'viv and Kam"ianets'-Podil's'kyi, exaggerating the scale of mobilisation, describing 'panic' in the oblast and relaying rumours to the effect that 'the Czechs wanted Zakarpattia back'. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 102-112.

considerably fewer.[120] Shelest claimed that most inhabitants of the republic were confident that 'our government' would not allow the situation to escalate into a full-blown military conflict.[121] Thus, through remaining calm, many residents distanced themselves from the allegedly unstable individuals who spread panic in the USSR.

As proponents of conservative patriotism identified with a strong and influential Soviet Union, they judged Brezhnev by the effectiveness of his policies in Eastern Europe. Before the invasion, a non-party worker from Uzhgorod compared the Czechoslovak events to Hungary in 1956 and called for an end to 'chaos',[122] and, according to KGB reports, many soldiers claimed that it was necessary to take the armies into Czechoslovakia.[123] When expressing support for the idea of intervention, some proponents of conservative patriotism displayed a very deep, perhaps even cynical understanding of the mechanics of Soviet 'imperial' policies in the region: as early as May, a 48-year old teacher from Zakarpattia argued that it was now necessary to install a new leadership in Prague, which could then request Soviet military assistance.[124] Even after 21 August a small number of individuals believed that the USSR should adopt a still stricter policy in Eastern Europe, asking why the army did not invade Romania, too.[125] Party officials who organised agitation meetings in the immediate aftermath of the invasion were growing increasingly frustrated that security services failed to deal with the 'counterrevolution' in Czechoslovakia, and complained that their indoctrination work was constantly compromised by the Romanian media.[126] They may well have been concerned that foreign broadcasts would encourage citizens to condemn the Warsaw Pact invasion, but it also seems that they perceived the continuation of anti-Soviet programming as a factor which discredited the Soviet state as a powerful player in East European affairs in the eyes of its own citizens. For instance, collective farmers in Zakarpattia displayed 'great interest' in the recent developments in Czechoslovakia, asking how it was possible that the press, radio and television were still controlled by

---

[120] See Appendix A.
[121] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 191-194.
[122] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 102-112.
[123] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 141-143; DAOO, f.P11, op.20, s.88, ark. 15-26.
[124] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 12-13.
[125] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.39, ark. 10-14. The KGB classified similar opinions as 'criticisms'. See Appendix A.
[126] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.27, ark. 47-49.

counterrevolutionaries.[127] Likewise, during agitation meetings in Zaporizhzhia, members of the audience asked about the USSR's failure to locate and destroy the underground radio stations in Czechoslovakia with all the advanced technology at its disposal.[128] Just as the foreign broadcasts grew increasingly radical and explicitly anti-Soviet, citizens measured the success of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe by Moscow's ability to curb the rebellious 'socialist' mass media. Unlike in 1956, however, when residents explicitly blamed Khrushchev's Secret Speech for the outbreak of violence in Hungary, they now refrained from direct attacks on Brezhnev's leadership, often dressing up their comments as questions about the reasons why the Soviet leaders pursued a certain policy. The non-party engineer from Mykolaiv who ascribed the Prague Spring to Moscow's excessive critique of Stalin's cult of personality would have fitted in to the wider group of 'conservative patriots' in 1956,[129] but he was now no more than an interesting oddity.

Conservative patriotism was a common response to the Polish and Czechoslovak crises in Ukraine between early 1968 and 1969. Because party activists had the most opportunities to prove their 'correct' stance vis-à-vis the unfolding developments, they were the most well-established 'conservative patriots'. At the same time, somewhat paradoxically, the elites who defined the ideas of conservative patriotism during public discussions extended the concept to the bulk of Ukraine's inhabitants by framing it in very broad terms. They contrasted the stable majority who attended agitation meetings with members of ethnic minorities and Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalists'. Therefore, conservative patriotism emerged as a means of social stratification in Ukraine, allowing party activists and other members of the middle class to present themselves as a paternalistic national elite. With the established reputation of 'reliable Soviet people', perhaps even a Soviet nation, they posed some challenges to Brezhnev's leadership. They criticised the effectiveness of Moscow's foreign policy and demanded that the Soviet media provide a better access to information. However, in contrast to 1956, adherents of conservative patriotism voiced few economic complaints and focused not on criticising the Party and the state, but rather unmasking the unreliable individuals, particularly Jews and non-party members, against whom they could establish their own patriotic credentials. In

---

[127] DAKO, f.P5, op.7, s.822, ark. 42-43.
[128] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.39, ark. 10-14.
[129] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 178-179.

this sense, through differentiating between different groups of citizens, organising closed agitation meetings about the threat of capitalism and imperialism, and invoking the rhetoric of East Slavic unity, CPSU leaders redirected the critical power of conservative patriotism away from themselves.

III.   Reformist patriotism

Freedom, equality, democracy – this is how a prisoner from the Donets'k oblast described the Prague Spring in a poem he wrote during 1968. The Czechs 'voted for democrats', he suggested, even though they were materially better off than Soviet citizens. His appeal to the 'peoples of Russia' illustrates another trend in Soviet reactions to the Czechoslovak events when a small but very vocal group of Soviet citizens began to criticise the Soviet state for its betrayal of 'socialist ideals'.[130] Referring to the plural 'peoples' of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe when they demanded a more tolerant nationalities policy in the USSR, they criticised the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia and called for 'openness' and a 'spiritual renewal' of Soviet society. This was a generation that built on the ideas of the reformist patriots who had supported Gomulka's policies in 1956, and, starting in the mid-1960s, began to insist that many features of Stalinism in the USSR had not been eliminated, urging 'popular vigilance and protest' should the authorities fail to make a fundamental break with the past.[131] Now, with Moscow's crackdown on Dubcek's 'reform socialism' and the increasing determination to root out dissent at home,[132] their ideas were decidedly pushed outside the boundaries of acceptable Soviet discourse. Whilst seeking to reform and improve the Soviet system, the reformist patriots of 1968 mostly expressed their ideas in private conversations and underground publications, risking prison sentences for 'anti-Soviet agitation', as well as exclusion from the Party, creative unions, universities, or jobs.[133] They were

---

[130] Народы России/ Скорее проснитесь/ Быстрей оглянитесь/ Вас гнут в три дуги/ Свободу и равенство здесь не найти/ Смотрите на Запад/ Там двинулись чехи./ И сделали это/ Не ради потехи/ Жизнь ведь там лучше/ Большая зарплата,/ Но голосуют/ За демократов. (Peoples of Russia/Awaken quickly/Come to your senses/They have subordinated you/You will not find freedom and equality here/Look to the West/The Czechs have risen there/And it is not for fun/That they have done that/Life is better there after all/The salaries are high/Yet still they vote/For democrats). Quote after Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi', 45.
[131] Spechler, *Permitted Dissent*, 242.
[132] H. Kasianov, *Nezhodni: ukrains'ka intelihentsiia v rusi oporu 1960x-80x rokiv* (Kyiv, 1995), 64.
[133] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 227-228.

aware that the authorities condemned their views and, despite divergent interests and concerns, they often emphasised the need to protect freedom of speech from an increasingly repressive state: in that sense, in contrast to 1956, they formed a relatively coherent group of 'reformist patriots'.

Mark Kramer argues that members of the creative intelligentsia and university students were especially prone to voice support for Czechoslovak reforms and to call for the implementation of similar policies in the USSR. If KGB reports are to be trusted, he writes, the majority of university students in cities such as Odesa sympathised with Dubcek's ideas.[134] Volodymyr Dmytruk further points out that some workers and soldiers voiced support for the Prague Spring.[135] Nevertheless, the extent to which the ideas of 'reform socialism' permeated the Ukrainian society was very limited. If we understand reformist patriotism as a critical and reformist frame of mind adopted by citizens who expressed their faith in Soviet and 'socialist' values, it was weak even amongst university students. Even the authorities were convinced that students' complaints against the invasion of Czechoslovakia were more an expression of youth rebellion that did not automatically translate into a principled effort to change Soviet foreign policy or to copy Czechoslovak reforms in the USSR itself. Some KGB reports claimed that students found the very word 'opposition' appealing,[136] which suggested that their controversial views about the Prague Spring did not have a strong ideological or principled basis. At least in the authorities' view, young people were not particularly predisposed to support Dubcek's 'liberal' ideas. Iurii Andropov's report about Soviet university students, transmitted after the invasion of Czechoslovakia but completed sometime before then, thus highlighted youth's alienation from official ideology and their receptivity to Western culture, but also pointed towards the 'resentment that most students felt toward the Soviet Union's "fraternal" allies'.[137] This may go some way towards explaining why the Party adopted a conciliatory attitude towards young people in the aftermath of the crisis, seeing potential to reintegrate even the more rebellious individuals into the Soviet mould. As Amir Weiner points out, after a major purge of the Komsomol, the organisation was given a bigger role to play at educational

---

[134] Kramer, 'Spill over from the Prague Spring', 67-68.
[135] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 225-227.
[136] Suri, 'The Promise', 154-155.
[137] Kramer, 'Spill-over from the Prague Spring', 67.

institutions, where it encouraged officials to follow the example of one rector from L'viv who engaged students in discussions on any topic, including Ukrainian nationalism.[138] In sum, students' reformist patriotism seemed to be ill-defined and, as such, it was partly neutralised by including some of their concerns into formal debates organised by the Komsomol.[139] Thus, Party and Komsomol apparatchiks weakened reformist patriotism as an ideology aimed at reforming the Soviet system. Although they may have spoken out of frustration with the Soviet state and its officials, even a spirit of rebellion, many citizens who outwardly sympathised with the Prague Spring did not articulate any reformist ideas, and the Soviet officials did not treat them as ideological adversaries.

What distinguishes many proponents of reformist patriotism from these rebellious individuals is that they did articulate several clear ideas about the need to reform the Soviet system in the name of 'socialist' values, in the process developing a group consciousness based on the awareness that their activities were illegal. Firstly, they suggested that the official Soviet media did not provide reliable information about the Prague Spring and more generally. Through publishing statements by Soviet intellectuals and translations of Czechoslovak documents, Soviet *samizdat* shed its predominantly literary character and turned into an illegal source of news about the unfolding events at home and abroad during 1968.[140] A year later, in an attempt to evaluate the Czechoslovak events, many *samizdat* materials continued to emphasise that 'freedom of expression' was the only guarantee of democracy and economic progress in the Soviet bloc.[141] Secondly, underground publications attacked the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia as an expression of 'imperialism'.[142] Whereas a month before the invasion 'a group of honest communists' was still convinced that the USSR would not risk discrediting

---

[138] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 185.

[139] Meanwhile, Party officials in charge of cultural affairs pressured members of the creative intelligentsia to publicly deny that they sympathised with the Prague Spring. In order to counteract the impression that the 'Ukrainian Writers' Union turn[ed] into a discussion club about Czechoslovakia', *Literaturna Ukraina* published a collective letter condemning Dubcek's reform movement; among other signatories was the writer Oles' Honchar, who had previously been accused of sympathising with the Prague Spring and had generally developed a reputation for 'oppositional' views. Dmytruk, '"Praz'ka vesna" i Ukraina', 22-23.

[140] KhTS, 31 December 1968.

[141] KhTS, 30 June 1969.

[142] KhTS, 31 October 1969; KhTS, 31 August 1970. The most famous example of protest against the Soviet crackdown in Czechoslovakia was the demonstration of a few brave individuals on the Red Square on 25 August. KhTS, 30 August 1968.

itself 'by invading a brotherly country',[143] numerous *samizdat* publications at the end of August talked about the violation of 'Czechoslovak sovereignty', underlining that 'Soviet people' did not want to be seen as 'occupants' in the eyes of the outside world.[144] Thirdly, as the anti-imperialist rhetoric of *samizdat* was underpinned by a sense of Soviet pride, many underground publications appealed to 'Soviet people' to oppose Brezhnev's repressive actions both at home and abroad. Like Valentin Komarov's open letter about the occupation of Czechoslovakia from September 1968, they warned 'all citizens' that silence had already once allowed for the rise of Stalinism. Not only writers and artists, Komarov specified, but also students, workers, and collective farmers should now get involved in the peaceful campaign to defend the Soviet constitution, civil rights, and freedom of speech and assembly.[145] Thus, reformist patriots emphasised that Soviet citizens had a social and political responsibility to criticise the CPSU and to demand that Moscow shape both foreign and domestic policy on the basis of Soviet law. Finally, in the years to come, *samizdat* continued to refer to the Prague Spring in an attempt to specify the 'true' values embedded in the Soviet legal system. As self-proclaimed 'communists',[146] many *samizdat* authors underlined their commitment to Dubcek's 'reform socialism'. They reprinted the Czechoslovak Communist Party reform programme from 5 April 1968, which specified that the law should clearly outline the functions of all state and party organisations, whilst guaranteeing 'real freedom' of speech, gathering, and organisation.[147] Likewise, they published translations of Czech translations of Leszek Kolakowski's theses about 'what socialism was not', criticising Soviet-style regimes for imposing their will on the people instead of consulting citizens about the policies they introduced.[148] In other words, through commenting on the Prague Spring, reformist patriots suggested that Soviet citizens should be active in condemning Moscow's repressive policies at home and abroad in

---

[143] SDS, AS108: P. Grigorenko, A. Kosterin, V. Pavlinchuk, S. Pisarev, I. Iakhimovich, 'Otkrytoe pis'mo "Kommunistam Chekhoslovakii, ko vsemu chekhoslovatskomu narodu', 28 July 1968.

[144] KhTS, 30 August 1968; SDS, AS69: Valentin Komarov, 'Otkrytoe pis'mo v sviazi s okkupatsiei Chekhoslovakii', 30 September 1969. A year later, an anonymous 'group of Soviet citizens' who wrote an open letter to commemorate the invasion argued that they wanted to see the USSR 'free', but they were convinced that no nation (*narod*) could achieve 'happiness' while suppressing other nations. KhTS, 31 August 1969.

[145] SDS, AS69: Valentin Komarov, 'Otkrytoe pis'mo v sviazi s okkupatsiei Chekhoslovakii'.

[146] KhTS, 28 February 1970.

[147] KhTS, 30 April 1970.

[148] KhTS , 31 October 1969.

order to regenerate Soviet society through creating more representative institutions and increasing freedom of expression.

Most of the underground publications that outlined these ideas originated outside Ukraine.[149] While it is very difficult to trace how *samizdat* affected popular opinion, Party and KGB reports suggested that some individuals in the republic shared the beliefs of reformist patriots in other parts of the USSR. For example, a fourth year student from L'viv state university despaired that students in western Ukraine were less active than in Moscow, as she added that 'something had to happen' here, too.[150] Through sending anonymous letters and spreading illegal pamphlets, dozens of inhabitants of the republic demonstrated an 'active stance' in the aftermath of the invasion. By 12 September, the KGB in Ukraine had registered twenty-three cases of citizens spreading anti-Soviet pamphlets about the invasion of Czechoslovakia, as well as ten examples of graffiti criticising Soviet foreign policy.[151] 'Dear comrade, if you are a patriot of your country, make and distribute a few copies of this leaflet' – read the back of one anti-invasion pamphlet found in Odesa in late August.[152] Whether its authors read the all-Soviet 'reformist patriotic' *samizdat* is not known, but they represented the same commitment to 'active citizenship'. The pamphlets and graffiti were mostly handwritten and amateurish, like the huge Russian-language slogans 'hands off Czechoslovakia' drawn with charcoal on the kolkhoz market in Novovolyns'k. Still, despite consistent efforts, the KGB did not often manage to identify their authors.[153]

Most reformist patriots in Ukraine criticised the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In the first two and a half weeks after the invasion, the KGB had registered 303 statements critical of the military intervention, as well as 209 cases where citizens

---

[149] This may partly be explained by the fact that, as Kenneth Farmer shows, Ukrainian *samvydav* operated under more severe restraints than *samizdat* in Russia. K. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the post-Stalin Era: Myth, Symbols, and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (The Hague, 1980), 212.

[150] DALO, f. P3, op.10, s. 248, ark. 1-2.

[151] See Appendix A.

[152] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 103-104.

[153] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 105; Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi', 45; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 61-63; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.64, ark. 178-179. When they did manage to identify the perpetrators, the authorities were prepared to distribute very harsh sentences. For example, they sentenced an inhabitant of Cherkasy to five years in hard labour colonies for putting up posters calling for people to protest against the occupation of Czechoslovakia. See O. Bazhan, 'Zovnishn'o-politychni aktsii SRSR u 50-80-ti rr. ta ix vplyv na rozvytok opozytsiinoho rukhu v Ukraini', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000).

referred to the events as an 'occupation'.[154] In attacking the military measures, some citizens claimed that Moscow violated 'Soviet values', which they defined in several different ways. Many of them were rather vague when they articulated their support for 'reform socialism', claiming that the USSR did not represent 'the type of socialism for which I stood'.[155] The Soviet Union should learn how to build 'socialism' from the Czechs – read the four leaflets discovered in Chernihiv on 24 August – as the struggle in Czechoslovakia was not a fight between communism and capitalism, but rather a battle between new and old ideas within socialism.[156]

At the same time, some other inhabitants of Ukraine were a little more specific about the reasons why they condemned the Soviet suppression of Dubcek's reforms. For one, a large proportion of reformist patriots believed that the military intervention would weaken communist parties around the world and blur the division between socialist countries and the capitalist West. Their opinions were illegal not necessarily because they publicised them in underground publications, but rather because the KGB considered such views to be incriminating when expressed at all, suggesting perhaps that some of them were not aware that their opinions were deemed 'harmful'. Official reports quoted dozens of individuals who despaired that the intervention would weaken the communist movement in the whole world.[157] At the same time, it appears that some citizens consciously opposed the official media line, all the while invoking ideals propagated in the official rhetoric and complaining about the violation of the principle of non-interference. They suggested that the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia weakened the USSR's reputation as the leader of world socialism. They claimed that Soviet foreign policy would alienate the working class in capitalist countries, weaken liberation movements in the Third World, and encourage the socialist countries of Eastern Europe to leave 'us'.[158] In a similar vein, independently of each other, a Jewish doctor from Luhans'k and a student actor from Kyiv despaired that Soviet policies were now no different from US actions in Vietnam.[159]

---

[154] See Appendix A.
[155] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 105.
[156] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 141-143.
[157] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 84, 94-96.
[158] See Appendix A.
[159] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 88, 94.

Furthermore, many reformist patriots referred to the Prague Spring to argue that Soviet-style systems had to become more representative and fair. Not only did Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia undermine socialism around the world, they suggested, but it also weakened 'socialist' institutions at home and led to the militarisation of Soviet society. For instance, local authorities in Chernivtsi found many leaflets spread at the university campus, as well as some stairwells around town, which claimed that the Komsomol had turned from a youth organisation into an instrument of state control, whose role was now limited to dressing children in uniform and teaching them military discipline.[160] The state's insensitivity to the citizens' needs aggravated the population's living standards, some reformist patriots suggested: 'we have built socialism ... and yet living becomes more and more difficult', despaired an inhabitant of Odesa oblast. A few citizens came up with suggestions about how to make the Soviet system more 'democratic' and equal. In Odesa, for example, a lecturer of political economics applauded the Czechs and Slovaks for trying to create a multi-party system and free trade unions.[161] At times, complaints against the lack of political representation in the USSR took on the form of very concrete attacks against the local bureaucracy and even top CPSU apparatchiks. In Uzhgorod, the authorities wrote about a lawyer of Jewish background who claimed that party members, inspired by the example of Czechoslovakia, would dismiss local factory managers.[162] The tone of complaints against corrupt officials was especially sharp after 21 August. As the anonymous residents of Zhdanov in the Donets'k oblast put it in a letter sent to a Moscow newspaper, the 'Soviet *narod*' condemned the 'bandit' invasion of Czechoslovakia. The letter ended with a series of griping slogans: 'long live freedom of speech and press', 'down with red fascism', 'down with Brezhnev, long live Kosygin'.[163] Some residents went so far as to call for the state to dissolve collective farms and 'to give land to peasants', thus altering the relationship between ordinary farmers and representatives of the state. While the authorities characterised similar opinions as anti-Soviet, their proponents tried to claim that they would help to restore 'Leninist principles' in the USSR: for instance, a pharmacy accountant from Zakarpattia stated

---

[160] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25. s.64, ark. 56-58.
[161] DAOO, f.P11, op.20, s. 88, ark. 15-26.
[162] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 102-112.
[163] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 93.

that the USSR would soon follow Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, because things should not 'stay the way Stalin made them'.[164]

Soviet citizens who called for a more representative system in the USSR linked the problem to their ability to access information. Disbelief in the official coverage of Czechoslovakia was widespread,[165] which sometimes encouraged reformist patriots to advocate reforming the entire media system. For example, leaflets distributed around several stairwells in Chernivtsi accused the Soviet media of 'lying' about Czechoslovakia and concluded that 'the cancellation of censorship was the most important precondition for democratising the political system of our country'.[166] Occasionally, displays of distrust in the official media took on a very public form: a resident of a village in the Odesa oblast demonstratively put a radio in his window, and played the Voice of America on full volume for all his neighbours to hear.[167] While this was probably an expression of frustration with the authorities, it differed from other instances of what the officials called 'hooliganism'. The man's actions seemed more considered and meaningful than some drunken 'anti-Soviet' outbursts cited in KGB reports, suggesting perhaps that he considered Western radio broadcasts to be worthy of public attention, or at least that he perceived access to information as a controversial issue which soured relations between the state and citizens. Similarly, on 22 August, a student from Uzhgorod who condemned the Warsaw Pact invasion decided to express his views by sending a letter to Prague radio. At the very height of the crisis, he manifested his faith in the Czechoslovak media as a reliable channel through which he could voice his concerns, implying that the Soviet media did not represent his interests. The authorities believed that this was a very incriminating act: on 23 March 1969, the court in Uzhgorod sentenced the 24 year old to three years in a hard labour colony.[168] While many Soviet citizens were eager to access Czechoslovak mass media,[169] and they complained about the quality of the Soviet press, radio, and television, it was only in isolated cases that this led

---

[164] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 102-112.
[165] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 105.
[166] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.64, ark. 56-58.
[167] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s.724, ark. 96-98.
[168] V. Dmytruk, 'Nelehal'na informatsiina merezha v Chekhoslovachchyni ta ii vplyv na formuvannia opozytsiinykh nastroiv v Ukraini (kinets 60x – pochatok 70-x rr.)', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000), 71.
[169] Three years later, *samizdat* authors recalled that it was difficult to buy Czechoslovak newspapers in the USSR, even though they continued to be distributed through official channels before 21 August 1968. KhTS, 5 March 1971.

them to engage in illegal activities and to demand that the entire Soviet system should be made more transparent.   It is not surprising, considering the harsh punishments which the state was ready to dispense in return.

The Prague Spring also encouraged reformist patriots to discuss the national question. On the most basic level, some individuals distributed copies of the Ukrainian language journals from Czechoslovakia, which discussed national issues. In May, for example, the Ivano-Frankivs'k obkom discovered that an inhabitant of Kolomyia received seventy-two copies of *Nove zhyttia* by post.[170] Even though he distributed a magazine which could not yet be labelled anti-Soviet, he aroused suspicion of the local authorities. This is probably because they associated the journal with the *samvydav* rhetoric of many Ukrainian dissidents. As Dina Zisserman-Brodsky demonstrates, throughout the latter half of the 1960s, 'ethnic minority *samizdat* championed "genuine socialism" and "the restoration of Lenin's norms"' as a guarantee of greater national autonomy for republics in the USSR.[171] In line with this, during the Prague Spring and in its aftermath, some authors who published in the *samizdat* sought to defend 'Ukrainian rights', but also underlined their commitment to the Soviet Union and its official ideology. They thus articulated a Ukrainian version of 'reformist Soviet patriotism'. For example, an anonymous member of the Ukrainian writers' union addressed a letter to Oles' Honchar and secretaries of the union.[172] The letter complained that, despite the fact that Soviet publications were available in Czechoslovakia, it was virtually impossible to buy Ukrainian literature across the border; equally, Soviet citizens found it difficult to obtain literature published by Ukrainians living in the satellite states. The author suggested that the Soviet authorities were prejudiced against Ukrainian culture, creating 'artificial bureaucratic barriers' which halted its development.[173] Even though he was critical of Soviet nationalities policy, he still appealed to an official Soviet institution, the writers' union, to rectify the problem. This was representative of wider tendencies in the Ukrainian *samvydav*. Before Shcherbyts'kyi's crackdown on dissent in the republic in 1972, dissidents often linked the question of national

---

[170] TsDAHO, Kyiv, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 169-170.
[171] D. Zisserman-Brodsky, *Constructing Ethnopolitics in the Soviet Union: Samizdat, Deprivation, and the Rise of Ethnic Nationalism* (New York, 2003), 197.
[172] It later circulated in the *samvydav*.
[173] SDS, AS970, Chlen spilki pysmennykiv Ukrainy, 'Lyst do Olesia Honchara i sekretariv SPU pro kul'turni vidnosyny mizh Ukrainoiu i ChRSR', 1968.

rights to the Prague Spring: they acted as 'Ukrainians' who defended their national culture, and 'Soviet citizens' who criticised the repressive policy of their state. Many members of the 'national and democratic movement', as *Khronika tekushchikh sobytii* described them, were officially tried for speaking out against the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia and publishing illegal materials about it.[174] It seems likely, although it is difficult to prove, that the Czechoslovak events affected some of their tactics, too. For instance, in the aftermath of Ukrainian student demonstrations which followed the death of Jan Palach in January 1969,[175] a 45 year old teacher from Berdians'k and a father of three, who had been a prisoner of the Stalinist Gulag, put out banners protesting Russification in Ukraine and tried to set himself alight in front of Kyiv State University.[176] Reformist patriots portrayed the invasion of Czechoslovakia as proof of re-Stalinisation in the USSR, but they still believed that a more representative, 'democratic', and transparent Soviet system would permit for the free development of Ukrainian culture. Nonetheless, they were getting increasingly desperate in the face of Moscow's repressive policies.

The KGB's failures to identify the authors of illegal publications and anonymous letters, as well as their generic descriptions of the individuals who voiced 'hostile views', make it difficult to determine who the reformist patriots were. According to the KGB statistics, most citizens who expressed 'critical' views at the height of the Czechoslovak crisis were white collar workers, followed by blue collar workers, collective farmers, and students. More strikingly, the great majority of KGB reports concerned non-party members.[177] Both before and after 21 August, reports suggested that anti-war sentiments spread amongst soldiers stationed in Ukraine, as a few privates and officers were reported to have claimed that the USSR should not interfere in Czechoslovak 'domestic affairs'.[178] Soon after the invasion, the army command in Kyiv wrote about an officer who admitted to listening to foreign radio stations, and told his colleagues that four army generals and two members of the Moscow Central Committee condemned Soviet policies in Czechoslovakia.[179] It is conceivable that soldiers were more predisposed to criticise the invasion, as they

---

[174] KhTS, 15 October 1972.
[175] Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi', 48.
[176] He was arrested before he managed to do so. KhTS, 30 June 1969.
[177] See Appendix A.
[178] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 138-140.
[179] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.32, ark. 15-20.

were most directly affected by it, afraid perhaps of war and confrontation. In letters to their relatives back in Ukraine, soldiers often described their isolation and difficult living conditions. One soldier went so far as to write of 'putting a bullet through his head',[180] and another wrote to his fiancée stating that there was a 99% chance he would not come back alive.[181] Moreover, according to the CPU Central Committee, the army was exposed to 'hostile' opinions. Soviet soldiers stationed in Czechoslovakia were reportedly shocked by the anti-Soviet propaganda in the country and the 'bourgeois lifestyle' of the Czechoslovak youth.[182] In their letters home, soldiers often included 'nationalist' and anti-Soviet pamphlets spread in Czechoslovakia – in late October, the KGB registered between ten and fifteen such instances every day.[183] However, it is difficult to determine whether this reflected any allegiance to the cause of reformist patriotism in the army, or merely showed that soldiers took an interest in the Prague Spring. This is especially true because the seemingly disproportionate number of reports concerning the military may simply reflect special concern about moods in the army around this time.

Moreover, numerous reports specified the ethnic background of the individuals who expressed illegal views, especially when they were Jewish, even though the opinions in question did not often concern ethnic or religious issues.[184] Rather than anything else, this shows that KGB officers and party apparatchiks implied that there was a link between Jewishness and 'anti-Soviet views', reflecting perhaps their own anti-Semitic prejudice. It is conceivable, of course, that residents of Jewish origin were more outspoken reformist patriots than other Soviet citizens. Allegedly, some of them linked the Czechoslovak crisis to Soviet relations with Israel, a particularly thorny issue in the aftermath of the Six Days War,[185] as well as commenting on the publication of Gomulka's speech in the Soviet press. During the late 1960s more citizens of Jewish origin became vociferous in demanding a right to emigrate to Israel.[186] Whereas in the 1950s Jewish protest was still quite limited, by the 1960s the CPU Central Committee propaganda and agitation department compiled reports

---

[180] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.33, ark. 131-135.
[181] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 129-132.
[182] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 125-127.
[183] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 129-132.
[184] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 88, 94-95, 96, 105.
[185] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 181.
[186] E.R. Drachman, *Challenging the Kremlin: The Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990* (New York, 1991), 32; Gitelman, *Bespokoinyi*, 247.

about problems caused not only by 'separate individuals', but 'a certain part of the Jewish population of the republic'.[187] Therefore, it is not surprising that some residents of Jewish origin praised Warsaw's decision to allow the Jews to emigrate, claiming that the 'swine' in the Soviet leadership would never agree to that.[188] However, it is striking that most Jewish residents were outraged by the rise of anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe and wanted the authorities to reinstate a more tolerant nationalities policy in Soviet-style regimes. For instance, on 1 April 1968, the chief of the KGB in Odesa claimed that the majority of the local population had welcomed Gomulka's speech. Writing to the obkom, he contrasted this 'majority' with isolated individuals who voiced 'negative and hostile' views after the speech was published. Most of the 'problematic' individuals, the report underlined, were Jews who were outraged that the Soviet press published a blatantly anti-Semitic speech.[189] A few months later, in a one-to-one conversation with an undercover KGB agent, a 68-year old party member compared the 'fascist-leaning' Polish and Soviet leadership to Tsar Nicholas who used the Jews as a scapegoat for the failure of his policies.[190] These individuals underlined their Jewish identity, but also acted as Soviet citizens who criticised the performance of 'their' mass media and the failure of Soviet leaders to depart from pre-revolutionary anti-Semitism. As the media increasingly identified Sovietness in ethnically exclusive, non-Jewish terms from 1967 onwards, citizens of Jewish origin who commented on Soviet policies and demanded that the state should represent their rights turned almost by default into reformist patriots. At the very least, they were perceived as unreliable by the KGB and party officials in Soviet Ukraine.

In sum, it is very difficult to define the roots of support for reformist patriotism, which may well have spread amongst various social groups in Soviet Ukraine. Whilst reform-minded patriots in 1956 had various attitudes towards the state, ranging from explicit support for Khrushchev's new course to protest and dissent, reformist patriots in 1968 harboured unambiguously negative feelings towards Brezhnev's leadership, especially after the military intervention in August. Disappointed as they were with the Soviet state's apparent reluctance to reform, they

[187] O. Bazhan, 'Represyvni zakhody radians'koi vlady shchodo hromadian evreis'koi natsional'nosti v URSR (1960ti-1980ti rr.)', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2004), 113.
[188] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s.702, ark. 4-11.
[189] DAOO, f.P11, op.19, s.702, ark. 4-11.
[190] DAOO, f.P11, op.20, s.88, ark. 48-51.

did not hope to pursue the interests of any particular social group, but rather focused on the need to force the leaders to become more responsive to reformist demands in the first place. Consequently, in contrast to the citizens who had openly spoken during public meetings in 1956 in the name of their student collectives, writers' unions, or workers' brigades, reformist patriots were now operating clandestinely and in the name of the 'Soviet people', often identifying themselves by such pseudonyms as 'voice of the *narod*' or 'revolutionary worker'.[191]

Whereas Amir Weiner identifies certain groups which were more prone to express support for Dubcek's reforms than others, including residents of the western oblasts, the Jewish minority, and university students,[192] it seems that reformist patriotism as such was not defined by any geographical, ethnic, or social criteria. The extent to which university students sympathised with Dubcek's policies was limited, and while citizens of Jewish origin may have been more willing to criticise Soviet-style regimes during 1968 than other residents of Ukraine, the official reports probably overemphasised the link between illegal views and Jewishness. In fact, reformist patriots represented a whole spectrum of interests, defending Ukrainian national rights, condemning anti-Semitism, calling for the 'liberalisation' of the Soviet media, and invoking socialist ideas to criticise Soviet repression at home and 'imperialist' foreign policy. Faced with an increasingly 'militarised' and 'imperial' state, they claimed that the only way to reform the Soviet system was to introduce freedom of speech and more representative political institutions. Thus, reformist patriots from various social and national backgrounds shared common goals and values, to the extent that they faced the same obstacles when they called for reforming the Soviet system. Soviet reformist patriotism of 1968 was more openly challenging to the state than the reformist patriotism of 1956: neither representatives of the state nor the proponents of reformist patriotism had many doubts that they were now in opposition to the CPSU leadership.

---

[191] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.31, ark. 141-143.
[192] Weiner, 'Déjà Vu', 174-175, 183.

IV.   The other side of illegal: Prague Spring and anti-Soviet views

Some forms of illegal protest were more radically anti-Soviet and as such they do not fit the category of reformist patriotism. They did not represent more than a small minority of all the illegal statements which the authorities identified in underground publications or private conversations, but they do show that some citizens did not believe that change could be achieved within the Soviet system. The most prominent amongst anti-Soviet citizens were Ukrainian nationalists who embraced the cause of independence and concentrated mostly, although not exclusively, in western Ukraine. However, the term 'nationalist' does not accurately reflect the range of anti-Soviet opinions in the republic. Whilst commenting on the Prague Spring, inhabitants of Ukraine employed a nationalist rhetoric to call for a radical restructuring of the economic system, to appeal for religious toleration, or simply to express anger and frustration with the Soviet bureaucracy.

Anti-Soviet opinions represented an explicit renunciation of the Soviet system and its institutions. Consequently, not all cases where citizens attacked the Soviet state and its institutions should be classified as anti-Soviet. On 23 August, for example, the KGB wrote that an unemployed 45 year-old dental hygienist, 'previously sentenced for mild hooliganism', began to shout out slogans 'against the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia' after he was stopped by the militia for 'disrupting social order'.[193] Similarly, another report informed Party leaders about a worker from Melitopol' who, upon being arrested for 'hooliganism' in the city park one August evening, turned towards a group of youth standing nearby and encouraged them to 'sort [the militia officers] out Czechoslovak style'.[194] Both documents suggested that the men's drunken outbursts were spontaneous, although it is difficult to determine whether the officials were accurate and sincere in ascribing them to the 'hooligans'' momentary frustration with militia officers. It is, however, conceivable that the scope of media coverage surrounding the Prague Spring and the Warsaw Pact invasion turned Czechoslovakia into a symbol of 'anti-establishment' attitudes, meaning that positive references to Dubcek's reforms did not necessarily

---

[193] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 89.
[194] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 96.

reflect support for altering the system, but rather anger with state officials.[195] This influenced the rhetoric of some citizens who threatened to kill communists 'if the situation in the country becomes more complicated'.[196]

In other more radical cases, it seems likely that acts of 'hooliganism' reflected a broader dissatisfaction with the Soviet order. Between 1967 and 1969, the KGB informed Shelest about eighty-eight incidents where citizens damaged state insignia, portraits of CPSU officials, and political posters, thus apparently expressing their 'oppositional' stance.[197] Although not necessarily inspired by the Prague Spring in the first instance, these anti-Soviet citizens were certainly fuelled on by developments in Czechoslovakia. When a twenty-three year-old non-party man from Uzhgorod was found producing daggers at his work station in the immediate aftermath of the Warsaw Pact invasion, he explained that he was planning to use them to stab communists 'like they did in Czechoslovakia'.[198] His behaviour may well have represented a frustration with the economic situation in Soviet Ukraine, but it is also conceivable that he saw the Prague Spring as the beginning of an anti-Soviet war. Some citizens did make plans to resist the Soviet army. For instance, on 25 September, the Kirovohrad KGB intercepted a letter to the Czechoslovak embassy in Moscow, which contained advice on how to fight against the Soviet army in Czechoslovakia. They managed to identify the author who soon faced trial: he turned out to be a Russian non-party lecturer from the local pedagogical institute.[199] Unfortunately, it is not clear what his motives were or how he justified his actions, but his letter could not be more anti-Soviet – it basically amounted to treason.

Official reports about 'anti-state' outbursts did not concentrate in regions which the authorities normally associated with 'nationalism'. They mostly came from Sumy, Cherkasy, Chernivtsi, Donets'k, Luhans'k, Dnipropetrovs'k, and Volhynia.[200]

---

[195] On the other hand, the extent to which such outbursts could become politicised is uncertain. For the 1950s, Vladimir Kozlov shows that a blatant political mistake or an obvious abuse of power could pull the 'typical urban bystander' into mass urban riots and encourage them to 'support hooligans against the police'. See V.A. Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the post-Stalin Years* (London, 2002), 161.
[196] See Appendix A.
[197] Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi', 43.
[198] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 97.
[199] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.64, ark. 133-138; TsDAHO, Kyiv, f.1, op.25, s.64, ark. 71-72.
[200] Bazhan, 'Suspil'ni nastroi', 43.

Nonetheless, the KGB often equated anti-Soviet views with nationalist influences, even when the opinions they cited did not explicitly concern 'national' questions. For instance, they wrote about a 'nationalist' from Zaporizhzhia who was reported to have said that he hoped to see the day when 'they will shoot communists down like dogs'.[201] Similarly, on 27 August, the L'viv obkom secretary claimed that 'nationalist' and anti-Soviet elements intensified their hostile activities in the oblast after the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia.[202] No doubt, the link between 'anti-Sovietness' and nationalism was largely constructed by the reports themselves, reflecting the officials' distrust of Ukrainian nationalism. At the same time, it seems that many anti-Soviet citizens employed a national rhetoric to show that they opposed the Party and state. For one, CPSU officials often branded their political adversaries in Ukraine as 'bourgeois nationalists' and accused them of having cooperated with the Nazi occupiers during the Great Patriotic War.[203] Thus, they inadvertently turned fascist and nationalist symbols into signs of opposition to the Soviet regime. For example, standing by a monument to the Soviet army in L'viv, a local engineer claimed that 'Ukrainians' should follow the Czech example and overthrow 'communist oppression'. He added that Soviet soldiers were 'bandits', while 'real heroes' were buried in the woods.[204] In order to manifest his support for what he saw to be an anti-Soviet movement, the man rejected official portrayals of the Great Patriotic War as represented by the monument and recalled the 'nationalist' heroes of the anti-Soviet underground. Likewise, on 9 May, 'a fascist symbol' was drawn on the building occupied by a village council in the L'viv oblast.[205] It is difficult to determine whether the person or persons had drawn a swastika or perhaps the Ukrainian *tryzub*, which the Soviet authorities also considered 'fascist', but they certainly used an officially condemned symbol to manifest their alienation from the Soviet system.

At the height of the Prague Spring, the national solution was the most immediately obvious alternative to Soviet socialism for those who rejected existing state structures (as opposed to seeking reform within them). For instance, the KGB quoted a Gulag returnee from Stryi who claimed that the only way to solve the

---

[201] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 95.
[202] DALO, f.P3, op.10, s.248, ark. 87-89.
[203] A. Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation* (New Haven, 2002), 143.
[204] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 90.
[205] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.29, ark. 97.

Czechoslovak problem was to grant 'freedom and independence' to all *narody* in Eastern Europe, including Ukraine.[206] Whereas he implied that it was the Soviet authorities who would ultimately grant national independence to Ukraine, other 'nationalist' residents employed a more provocative and violent language, particularly before the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia. In a few towns and villages in western Ukraine, some locals promised to 'hang the Muscovites' soon and claimed that it was now time 'to stock up on rusks and join a different army'.[207] Meanwhile, in the Sambir region of the L'viv oblast, the KGB discovered that 'nationalists' had gone so far as to build a bunker in the woods in preparation for the seemingly impending civil war.[208] Even after the swift invasion, when opposition to Moscow's policy must have appeared more hopeless than before, the authorities suggested that some Ukrainian soldiers were reluctant to fight the 'Russian' war, and a resident of L'viv spread rumours to the effect that some Ukrainian conscripts were replaced with professional soldiers after they sang 'nationalist songs'.[209] With the Prague Spring escalating out of control, some residents of Ukraine hoped that the 'Ukrainians' would now have to confront their 'Russian occupants'. A 'famous Ukrainian nationalist' and Gulag returnee from L'viv predicted that the socialist camp was about to implode, arguing that East European countries would either pursue the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak path of reform or they would wage war against each other. The former solution, he stated, was undesirable from the Ukrainian national point of view, because it would weaken national antagonisms in the region and undermine support for the nationalist cause.[210]

Inhabitants of Ukraine who voiced 'nationalist' and anti-Russian opinions often linked them to economic complaints. Immediately after the invasion, an employee of a furniture factory in Chernivtsi stated that the 'Moskali' prevented the people of Czechoslovakia from 'living well',[211] and a local resident claimed that the Ukrainians would be richer had it not been for fifty years of 'Muscovite oppression'.[212] Cloaked in nationalist rhetoric, some material demands represented personal interest and ambition. For instance, a metal worker from L'viv boasted that

---

[206] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 90.
[207] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 71-72.
[208] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 99-100.
[209] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 90.
[210] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 97.
[211] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.38, ark. 141-143.
[212] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 90.

he had identified a house belonging to a Russian man in order to occupy it during the coming war. However, the fact that he had already been under KGB observation before this incident may suggest that his 'nationalism' was not merely an attempt to take advantage of the unstable situation in 1968, but rather more deep-rooted.[213] As such, it may conceivably have underpinned his perceptions of the 'Russian economic exploitation' of Ukraine which he then used to justify his plans for dividing the spoils. While the desire for personal enrichment may have existed within various 'nationalist' opinions, these citizens who voiced them should not be seen as any less anti-Soviet. Like a resident of Drohobych, who, upon refusing to pay his Komsomol fees 'for the Moskali', argued that Ukraine should follow the Polish and Czechoslovak example, they rejected Soviet and 'Russian' institutions which they believed not to represent their material interests.[214] In some cases, 'nationalism' was very explicitly associated with pro-capitalist views. A woman employed at the bread factory in Uzhgorod stated that 'the Russians take everything away'. At the suggestion that it was still better to live under the Russians than the Germans, she retorted that the Germans would 'give people their land'.[215] Likewise, a non-party manager at a sausage factory in Zakarpattia hoped that the region would now be returned to Czechoslovakia and private property would be reinstated: 'I will be a large entrepreneur and I will show everyone what I am capable of'.[216]

Anti-Soviet Ukrainian nationalism was also closely associated with support for the Greek Catholic church which the authorities had de-legalised in the 1940s. Dmytruk shows that the legalisation of the church in Czechoslovakia during 1968 emboldened the faithful in Ukraine to call for similar measures at home.[217] They found the Czechoslovak example both inspiring and instructive. On hearing the TASS announcement about the military intervention in August, one cleric criticised the clandestine Ukrainian Greek Catholics for focusing too much on the elderly, pointing out that Uniates in Czechoslovakia were in a much stronger position for having attracted young people to church.[218] At the same time, Uniate supporters had clear nationalist leanings and, according to official reports, they did not harbour

[213] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 71-72.
[214] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 99-100.
[215] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 97-98.
[216] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 12-13.
[217] Dmytruk, *Ukraina*, 228.
[218] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.33, ark. 82-87.

many illusions that they would be able to profess their faith in the Soviet state. The head of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR reported that priests and the faithful listened to the Vatican radio broadcasts, which encouraged them to support the cause of Ukrainian independence. Furthermore, the suppression of religious belief fuelled anti-Soviet and 'nationalist' attitudes amongst the Greek Catholic sympathisers, because they associated religious intolerance with foreign occupation and, at times, the supposed Jewish domination of Ukraine. A cleric from L'viv thus encouraged the faithful to listen to the Pope, rather that the 'old Yid- the Patriarch of Moscow'.[219] The resentment felt against 'Russian' atheism was not only characteristic of the underground Greek Catholic church, but spread to other religious citizens in the republic, as the following incident illustrates. In May 1968, a non-party worker from Zakarpattia complained that the USSR did not allow clergymen to ring church bells on the pretext that they made too much noise, all the while allowing military planes to disrupt local residents' peace. This was part of the reason why 'they hate Russians everywhere', he suggested, adding that Soviet power in Czechoslovakia would be taken down with American aid.[220]

Not all appeals for religious tolerance took on a Ukrainian nationalist form, of course. Some anti-Soviet residents who focused their energies on attacking the state's religious policy were more broadly 'anti-communist' and they did not refer to the ethnic question. In late August, for example, the KGB wrote about an Orthodox priest from Kyiv who hoped that citizens in Ukraine would 'oppose communist power, too'.[221] Likewise, an inhabitant of Volhynia, 'previously sentenced for anti-Soviet activity', claimed that 'the communists are prepared to shoot just to stay in power', for which 'God would punish them'.[222] The atheist state alienated those citizens who continued to possess religious feelings, including the handful of individuals who, during the mass mobilisation preceding the invasion of Czechoslovakia, refused to serve in the Soviet army on religious grounds.[223] However, though religion was a source of opposition to the Soviet state, most official reports identified 'Ukrainian nationalism' as the major foundation for the rise of anti-Soviet feelings in the republic.

---

[219] RGANI, f.5, op.60, d.24, ll. 151-156.
[220] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.28, ark. 12-13.
[221] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 97-98.
[222] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 71.
[223] Bazhan, '"Praz'ka Vesna"', 71-72.

Whereas reformist patriots invoked 'Soviet values' and called for democratising the USSR, anti-Soviet citizens had much more concrete hopes and expectations. In questioning the legitimacy of Soviet rule in Ukraine, they anticipated a war against the CPSU officials and the 'Russians'. Some individuals were even preparing to fight, hoping to achieve Ukrainian independence. Most 'anti-Soviet citizens' were Ukrainian nationalists who hoped to obtain economic independence for their republic, take their vengeance on the detested 'foreigners' whom they blamed for all the evils that befell the country, and rehabilitate religious belief and the Greek Catholic church in particular. They never appealed to large audiences in the republic.

V.   Conclusion

Because developments in Czechoslovakia discredited Brezhnev's 'developed socialism' as a reformist movement and challenged Moscow's leadership in Eastern Europe, the authorities expected inhabitants of Ukraine to condemn Dubcek's policies. They urged residents to condemn unreliable 'foreigners' in the socialist camp and to reject foreign radio and television portrayals of the dramatic events, suggesting that people needed to 'stage consent' during highly ritualised agitation meetings or face accusations of disloyalty.

Agitation meetings devoted to the Prague Spring served two main functions. On the one hand, they acquired a new performative role which conjured up the image of a Soviet middle class whilst also elevating the silent 'masses' to the status of reliable patriots. On the other hand, the gatherings retained an important constative dimension: in repeating formulaic slogans about the USSR's guiding role in the socialist camp, citizens did not only stage consent without reflecting upon the meaning of what they said, as Yurchak suggests, but also distanced themselves from 'non-Soviet' narratives about socialism as propagated by dissidents and, more importantly, the Czechoslovak media.[224] While it is very difficult to assess the extent to which Soviet citizens believed in the simplistic slogans concerning Czechoslovakia which resounded during agitation meetings, it seems that they did identify competing opinions about the way in which Soviet-style regimes should

---

[224] Yurchak, *Everything*, 286.

develop, especially because they engaged in ritualised acts of naming domestic and foreign 'heretics' who advanced conflicting interpretations of socialism and Sovietness. In the highly politicised atmosphere of 1968, residents who spoke in public had to distinguish between 'correct' and 'incorrect' views about Czechoslovakia, displaying thereby a degree of political erudition, which may partly explain why only a small number of citizens who attended the agitation meetings actually expressed their opinions.

Debates about Czechoslovakia ruptured Soviet patriotism in Ukraine, as citizens rallied behind explicitly contradictory opinions about Moscow's policies at home and in Eastern Europe. Inhabitants reflected upon three main aspects of Sovietness: attitudes to foreign policy, the role of national identities under socialism, and the relationship between citizens and Soviet mass media.

Unlike in 1956, when reformist patriotism was still underpinned by a sense of 'imperial' responsibility for the 'democratisation' of the Soviet bloc, reformist patriots now perceived Prague and not Moscow as the driving force behind 'liberalisation'. They therefore condemned the military crackdown as an expression of backward imperialism. Similarly, most citizens who articulated anti-Soviet views shared these anti-war sentiments,[225] although, in condemning 'Russian imperialism', a very small number of radicals in the west went so far as to support the idea of war against the Russian occupation of Ukraine. In contrast, in order to distance themselves from the 'heretics' and to prove their loyalty to the Soviet state, advocates of conservative patriotism showed support for Moscow's foreign policy. Conservative patriotism was thus grounded in 'imperial' sentiments, as participants in agitation meetings condemned Dubcek's departure from the Soviet model and suggested that the USSR was the leading 'nation' of the socialist camp.

Likewise, discussions surrounding the national question retained a strong constative dimension. Because the Soviet press suggested that ethnic diversity fueled conflict in the socialist camp, both party activists and non-party members articulated conservative patriotism by describing or silently listening to speeches which defined

---

[225] Interestingly, during the 1970s, some anti-Soviet dissidents, including Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, condemned Dubcek's reforms and approved of the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, seeing it as a sign of conflict within socialism which weakened the USSR and its allies. SDS, AS 2181, G. Poliakov, 'K probleme Vostok-Zapad – kommentarii k publikatsiiam zhurnala Kontinent', no place and no date, but no earlier than January 1975.

the Soviet 'nation' in ethnically exclusive, non-Jewish terms. Consequently, some Jewish citizens, motivated by the example of Poland, were now more vocal in appealing for the right to emigrate, but many others defended themselves against accusations of 'disloyalty', often turning into reformist patriots who complained about the rise of anti-Semitism in the USSR. They did not reject the 'legitimate' idea of a 'Soviet people', perhaps even a 'nation', but they did discard the notion that Sovietness was grounded in an East Slavic ethnic consciousness.

Moreover, the East European crises had a particularly ambiguous influence on debates concerning the role of 'Ukrainianness' in the USSR. Some reform-minded members of the creative intelligentsia who published in *samizdat* and spread illegal leaflets appealed to Soviet officials to reinstate a more 'Leninist' nationalities policy, thus bringing the problem of ethno-cultural rights to the fore but also largely confining it to the illegal sphere. Meanwhile, a small number of citizens who sympathised with the illegal Greek Catholic church, as well as former members of nationalist movements in the western oblasts, went even further, frustrated as they were with state policies of 'Russification'. They saw independence as the only way to defend Ukrainian 'national' rights. Partly in response to these criticisms of Soviet policy, and in line with the more general condemnation of 'national deviations' from the Soviet model, articulators of conservative patriotism downplayed the importance of 'Ukrainian' identities and explicitly identified themselves with a Russian-led, East Slavic community.

Debates about access to news and information were likewise complex, combining constative arguments with implicit claims grounded in the practices of 'staging consent'. Reformist patriots questioned the very mechanisms which governed the Soviet information sphere, calling for an end to censorship. Meanwhile, since Soviet officials condemned Western radio programmes, as well as Czechoslovak, Romanian, and Polish broadcasts, citizens who attended agitation meetings outwardly distanced themselves from the 'non-Soviet' sources of information and illegal publications, proving their commitment to conservative patriotism by acting as loyal consumers of Soviet media. Through thus establishing their patriotic credentials, however, they also implicitly criticised the official media, suggesting that they deserved to obtain more reliable and consistent information. There was a strong paternalistic undercurrent to these complaints, as active

participants in agitation meetings suggested that inconsistent and incomplete information fuelled 'undesirable' attitudes amongst other, less reliable citizens.

More broadly, by articulating different political views, citizens performed various social identities. Participation in agitation meetings and the ability to speak in public acted as means of social distinction, separating professionals and party activists from the merely reliable 'masses' on the one hand, and dissident voices on the other. Meanwhile, many reformist patriots complained that the USSR was politically and socially unrepresentative. Not only did they admire Dubcek's 'democratisation' across the border, but they were also aware that they broke the law by siding with the Czechoslovak reformers and, as such, risked prison sentences and social ostracism. Their illegal actions thus acquired a performative role, turning them into social outcasts. This was especially because Soviet apparatchiks and the press constructed certain groups, including former 'bourgeois nationalists' and the 'Jews', as inherently unstable, encouraging some of their members to prove that they were after all reliable citizens, whilst pushing others towards reformist patriotism and anti-Soviet views.

A very striking aspect of conservative patriotism was that it relied on silence. Residents of Ukraine demonstrated their loyalty to the Soviet state by attending agitation meetings during the summer of 1968 where, for the most part, they did not actually speak. Conservative patriotism allowed the majority of Ukraine's residents to claim the status of reliable citizens because it was defined against various 'enemies'. At the same time, however, most citizens who staged their consent for conservative patriotism differed from the elite participants who spoke during public meetings, remaining politically and socially impotent. Unlike individual party apparatchiks, who emphasised that they were instrumental for maintaining peace and stability in the republic, their patriotism was largely defined in an impersonal and negative way – workers' collectives distanced themselves from unreliable individuals. This may partly explain why economic complaints, so prominent in 1956 and the early 1980s, were all but absent in 1968. The elite comprised of active participants in agitation meetings defined economic grievances as inherently 'non-Soviet'.

Social and class identities thus emerged as another potential source of identity formation for Soviet citizens. Conversely, variously defined national identities could be used to quench social conflict in the republic, transforming some aspects of reformist patriotism and anti-Soviet attitudes into an instrument of social control. This became apparent during the early 1980s, when residents of Ukraine commented on the rise and fall of the Solidarity trade union in Poland. With citizens increasingly frustrated with economic shortages, reformist patriotism and, to a lesser extent, anti-Soviet attitudes crumbled. The great bulk of Soviet citizens articulated a vision of conservative patriotism, defining Poland as a 'national enemy' of the USSR and Ukraine. At the same time, they also variously aligned themselves with the 'Soviet elite' or the 'masses'.

Chapter Four

Soviet Patriots and the Cossacks: Poland as a 'National Enemy' in Soviet Ukraine

School pupils in the Brezhnev-era USSR spent many a history class learning about Russian and Ukrainian conflicts with their neighbours in Eastern Europe. Having studied ancient and medieval history in years five and six, they moved on to explore how the 'peoples (*narody*) of our country' defeated both 'foreign enemies' and 'class oppressors' to guide the rest of the world on the 'path towards communism'. They thus studied the past of Eastern Europe in a national framework, reading about Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians as the driving force behind 'socialist progress'. The 'tall, strong, and beautiful' Eastern Slavs had inhabited the lands of the USSR since times immemorial, facing the destruction of the Galician-Volhynian kingdom by the Poles and Hungarians, defeating the Polish occupiers in Moscow, and fighting for the reunification of Ukraine with Russia during the seventeenth-century Cossack uprisings. The year seven history textbook sought to help school children develop a notion of Soviet patriotism: with pupils attending separate classes on the history of their republics, the introduction reminded them that their 'national' past was 'part of the wider history of our multinational homeland – the Soviet Union'.[1]

The history of Eastern Europe, and particularly Poland, was a controversial topic in post-war Soviet Ukraine. School education, public anniversary commemorations, and the mass media ensured that the history of Ukrainian-Polish relations entered the public imagination. Historians, local apparatchiks, and top Party officials sponsored portrayals of a common 'socialist' past of the Soviet camp,[2] but they also tried to differentiate between Soviet citizens, 'Ukrainians', and residents of the western borderlands on the one hand, and their 'feudal', 'pan', and 'Piłsudskiite' Polish 'oppressors' on the other. Although some Polish and Ukrainian émigrés and many dissidents in the Soviet bloc tried to reach beyond a narrow national understanding

---

[1] M.V. Nechkina, S. Leibengrub, *Istoriia SSSR: Uchebnik dlia 7-go klassa* (Moscow, 1982), 5-7, 24, 62, 80, 83, 128, 141-143, 146, 173, 207-208.

[2] F. Feher, 'Eastern Europe's long revolution against Yalta', *East European Politics and Societies* 2:1 (1988), 28-29.

of history,[3] national conflicts were by far the most dominant theme in official Soviet narratives about Eastern Europe. Historians also emphasised the superior role of Russia, Ukraine, and the USSR in spreading socialism across the entire region.

My sources range widely to include officially propagated narratives, as well as responses to them on the part of the creative intelligentsia, teachers, lecturers, and party activists. Press articles, school textbooks, and survey histories of Ukraine expose the changing portrayals of Soviet, Russian and Ukrainian historical relations with Poland. On a deeper level, official correspondence between senior academicians from the Ukrainian and all-Soviet Academy of Sciences and senior Party apparatchiks, as well as reports about international scholarly cooperation in the socialist camp, illuminate different ideas about writing history that moulded official accounts. Moreover, a bottom-up perspective is provided by reports about the work of school history teachers, museum directors, and university lecturers, which demonstrate how they contributed to the growth of historical memory about Eastern Europe, transforming or even distorting plots as mandated from 'the top'.

Soviet historical depictions of Poland were relatively diverse during the late 1950s and the early 1960s, but scholars gradually developed a fixed canon of 'important' historical events. Under pressure from top CPSU officials, historians juxtaposed the oppressive Poles to Soviet and East Slavic 'masses', thereby portraying history in a strictly national framework. Paradoxically, as images of East European past were becoming ritualised by the 1970s, they also exposed different categories within the Soviet community. Because unified nations and strong political leaders emerged as the main protagonists in East European history, CPU bureaucrats in Kyiv sponsored representations of Ukraine and Ukrainians as important historical actors alongside 'Soviet' and 'Russian' people. Despite the rising levels of Russification under Brezhnev, they thus promoted a distinct Soviet Ukrainian identity.[4] However, what Roman Szporluk calls 'the nationalisation of

---

[3] J. Kupczak, 'Pojednanie polsko-ukrainskie na tle politycznej wizji Jerzego Giedroycia' in T. Zaretskaia (ed.), *Rola* Kultury *paryskiej w ksztaltowaniu ukrainsko-polskiego zrozumienia wzajemnego* (Kyiv, 2002), 27.

[4] Boris Lewytzkyj claims that Russification made it difficult for historians to propagate Ukrainian history after the early 1970s. Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi insisted that even those parts of a people's history that have nothing to do with nationalism should not be glorified, implying that Petro Shelest had violated this principle by eulogising the democratic Cossack state. B. Lewytzkyj, *Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine, 1953-1980* (Edmonton, 1984), 150.

communism', or the adoption of 'some of the principles of nationalism' in communist regimes,[5] was a process of constant negotiation. Party officials, scholars, and writers voiced differing views about how to portray Ukrainian history. Most prominently, they advocated differing historical descriptions of the borderlands. Afraid that memories of the region's 'non-Russian' past would fuel 'undesirable' opinions, senior Party officials were very reluctant to grant 'indigenous' residents any historical agency. Nonetheless, invoking the story of Ukrainian resistance to Polonisation, obkom bureaucrats gradually wrote the western oblasts into the history of Ukraine and the Soviet Union as a whole.

Apart from the national and regional tensions, studying historical memory in the USSR also reveals social frictions in Soviet Ukrainian society. While party apparatchiks under Brezhnev established very strict control over academicians in the republic, some intellectuals, and especially writers, continued to promote 'unorthodox' visions of the past, which were underpinned by a sense of professional pride and a striving for more creative autonomy. Moreover, Soviet politics of memory exposed and created a more subtle, but potentially explosive division. Historians never resolved the tension between the importance of the 'simple people' and 'workers' in driving 'historical progress', and the stress which they put on the role of strong 'national' leaders. Top apparatchiks who shaped images of the past emphasised the positive function of both the 'masses' and 'elites', thus inadvertently outlining different ways in which residents of Ukraine could identify themselves.

I.   <u>East European Brothers or Socialist Foreigners?</u>

Soviet history of Eastern Europe was in flux during the late 1950s and the 1960s. Some academicians wrote about East European cooperation in the field of culture, thus articulating an 'international' vision of historical development in which the East European 'masses' had fought together against their class oppressors under the leadership of the progressive intelligentsia. These narratives functioned side by side with more confrontational ones of Ukrainian and Russian conflicts with Poland, in which national identities played a more important role than class loyalties. This latter

---

[5] R. Szporluk, *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (New York, 1998), 5, 234.

vision of the past became increasingly widespread during the 1960s, as two processes encouraged commemoration in a national framework. Firstly, as the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Council of Ministers grew increasingly determined to contain professional debates amongst historians,[6] and conservative establishment figures such as S.P. Trapeznikov and E.M. Zhukov set great store by official anniversaries and the publication of collective works,[7] scholars could no longer introduce new themes and topics.[8] The Party was now firmly in charge of commemorating the past, especially after a major crackdown on dissent in the early 1970s,[9] which helped to fix in official rhetoric the idea of the USSR, Ukraine and Russia as both liberators of other East European 'nations' and victims of Polish nationalism. Secondly, local dynamic often pushed in the same direction as the central one. A rising number of citizens with a professional interest in history, including school teachers, university lecturers, and Party agitators, participated in public debates about Eastern Europe. In order to manifest their 'correct' views, they stayed clear of controversial topics and propagated a simple and internally consistent official vision of the past, highlighting the importance of national conflict between East Slavs and their western neighbours.

While the general intellectual climate for historians remained oppressive under Khrushchev, as the purging of the editorial board of *Voprosy istorii* in 1957 demonstrated,[10] the Thaw witnessed the rise of a prominent group of historians who resisted excessive Party interference in the Academy of Sciences, and complained about censorship, restrictions on access to archives, and isolation from international scholarship.[11] Soviet historians hardly abandoned all the canons outlined in the Stalinist *History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) – Short Course*,[12] but Khrushchev's Secret Speech did attack the text, which was replaced in 1959 by a

---

[6] G.D. Komkov, B.V. Levshin, L.K. Semenov, *Akademiia Nauk SSSR: Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk, tom vtoroi, 1917-1976* (Moscow, 1977), 279; G.D. Alekseeva, *Istoricheskaia nauka v Rossii. Ideologiia. Politika (60-80-e gody XX veka)* (Moscow, 2003), 15-19, 59-60; R.D. Markwick, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia: The Politics of Revisionist Historiography, 1956-1974* (New York, 2001), 68.

[7] A.L. Litvin, *Writing History in Twentieth-Century Russia: A View from Within* (New York, 2001), 23.

[8] Alekseeva, *Istoricheskaia nauka*, 23.

[9] K. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the post-Stalin Era: Myth, Symbols, and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (The Hague, 1980), 121, 210, 213.

[10] Litvin, *Writing History*, 22.

[11] Alekseeva, *Istoricheskaia nauka*, 50-51; Litvin, *Writing History*, 25; Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 69, 71.

[12] Alekseeva, *Istoricheskaia nauka*, 40-41.

considerably less dogmatic and crude book, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*.[13] These factors encouraged some scholars to promote new ways of representing the past, which they used both to reaffirm the importance of autonomous scholarship in explaining historical progress and to drive attention away from strong national leaders as the main protagonists in history. It was in this spirit that they began to highlight the role of 'masses as the creators of history', departing from the view that there was inevitability in the '"lawfulness" of the historical process'.[14] The 'international' history of Eastern Europe, which celebrated class solidarity across national and ethnic divides, helped to promote such a 'de-Stalinised' vision. On one level, by writing about the complex social and national interactions in Ukraine, scholars tried to prove that they needed to investigate the details and intricacies of the region's complicated history, rather than simply to reproduce simplistic dogmas. Moreover, some historians sought to underline the importance of an autonomous intelligentsia in history: by writing about the 'masses' in Ukraine, they identified the 'common people' with 'historical progress' but also portrayed the intelligentsia as leaders of a common Ukrainian-Polish 'revolutionary struggle' against both 'class oppression' and 'foreign rule'.[15]

Cultural landmarks played a crucial part in this 'international' history of Eastern Europe. As the first secretary of the Ukrainian communist party during the 1940s, Khrushchev himself insisted that the statue to the poet Adam Mickiewicz, unlike other Polish monuments, should not be removed from the streets of L'viv, stating that he was 'a writer popular among the Ukrainian people and loved by them'.[16] In line with Khrushchev's appraisal of Mickiewicz, some Soviet scholars in Ukraine in the 1950s pointed to the importance of writers in leading the 'masses' against their exploiters. In June 1959, for example, the Presidium of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences resolved to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Polish 'revolutionary poet', Juliusz Slowacki, who had been born in the town of Kremenets' in modern-

---

[13] Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 45.

[14] Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 68.

[15] Soviet scholars wrote about various conflicts between Polish landlords and Ukrainian peasants, all the while emphasising that the Poles had their own 'socialist' forces which not only fought against the rule of the 'pans', but also helped to ease ethno-national conflicts in Ukraine. For example, they argued that the 'Polish masses' supported the Cossacks during the seventeenth century, partly because Khmel'nyts'kyi's uprising helped to alleviate Polish peasants' suffering at the hands of their landlords. J. Basarab, *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton, 1982), 179-180, 182.

[16] S. Yekelchyk, *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto, 2004), 123-124.

day Ukraine. They turned to the CPU Central Committee for permission to convene a special conference devoted to Slowacki, as well as organise exhibitions and name the public library in Kremenets' after the poet. The academics presented Slowacki as an important social leader, claiming that his poetry 'described the Ukrainian *narod* and its struggle for independence'.[17] It seems that the celebration of great, 'progressive' writers was often a means of commemorating Eastern Europe's 'international' history. In 1967, literary scholars employed at the Ministry of Culture library in Kyiv commemorated another nineteenth century writer, Aleksander Fredro, praising him for 'ridiculing the *szlachta*' and advancing the revolutionary cause in Ukraine.[18] Not only did members of the Soviet Ukrainian 'intelligentsia' thereby suggest that history and literature played a crucial part in 'socialist progress', but they also presented themselves as active promoters of the Ukrainian 'national' cause and successors to a shared East European revolutionary legacy.

Polish diplomatic pressures helped further to ground the importance of 'international' history of Eastern Europe in Ukraine during the Brezhnev period. Polish scholars, as well as the consuls in Kyiv, attached particular importance to the commemoration of prominent cultural figures from Poland and Ukraine. For instance, during an official visit to Ukraine in 1968, Polish 'Ukrainianologists' emphasised that they studied Taras Shevchenko's creative and personal relations with Poles,[19] thus encouraging their Soviet colleagues to examine international links between 'progressive' Polish and Soviet intellectuals, too. Indeed, this was a recurring theme in international scholarly cooperation in the Soviet bloc: as late as the 1980s, the Polish mass media and diplomats commented extensively on Ukrainian celebrations devoted to Frederic Chopin and the writer Jaroslaw Iwaszkiewicz.[20] The Poles often encouraged Soviet scholars and Party officials to celebrate East European 'cultural' anniversaries, as well as co-producing films, including one about the Ukrainian-Polish communist activist, Wanda Wasilewska.[21]

At the same time, however, historians and party apparatchiks in Ukraine also promoted a much bloodier version of history, in which national differences

---

[17] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31. s.1212, ark. 7-10.

[18] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s.6373, ark. 10-11.

[19] DSUP 12:1, 1 January 1968: 'Interview: Ukrainian Studies in Poland', *Literaturna Ukraina*, 12 December 1967.

[20] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.32, s. 2146, ark. 13-14.

[21] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.32, s. 2231, ark. 29.

overshadowed international cooperation between Polish, Ukrainian and Soviet 'progressive forces'. These narratives differed from 'international' history, because they suggested that progress had occurred in a national framework. In particular, by the mid-1950s, public representations of the Cossack uprising against Poland in 1648 and the 1654 Pereiaslav Council provided a crucial means of outlining the connection between the imagined nation and socialist progress. Whereas early Soviet historiography presented the hetmans as class oppressors, by the late 1930s Soviet scholars began to depict Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi as a positive hero who had furthered both the social and the national liberation of the Ukrainian people.[22] In 1954, the CPSU Central Committee issued the 'Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunification of Ukraine with Russia (1654-1954)', which helped to ground this interpretation in public rhetoric for many years. The document instructed academics, school teachers and other groups to stress the Ukrainians' 'progressive role in history' through their struggle for 'social and national' liberation from Poland. The official historical consensus was based on the assumption that the primary aim of the 1648-54 revolt was Ukrainians' 'reunification' with the Russian people, which removed the threats of Polonisation and annexation by Turkey.[23] In line with this, Soviet historians wrote extensively about the Cossack uprisings against Poland, and began to ostracise those colleagues who failed to pay enough attention to national conflicts in Ukraine. While O.K. Kasymenko's *History of the Ukrainian People*, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1960, evoked positive comments amongst the republic's historians, some reviewers suggested that he should have examined the national conflict of the Cossack period at more length, underlining that the 'struggle of the Ukrainian *narod* against Polish pans' began immediately after the 'Polish aggression on Ukrainian lands' in the sixteenth century.[24]

Images of the Cossacks, and Ukrainian-Polish national conflict more generally, came to dominate historical commemorations in Ukraine. This process was slow and gradual, only really becoming evident during the early 1960s, largely because the authorities had paid less attention to spreading knowledge of East European history

---

[22] S. Plokhy, *Ukraine and Russia: Representations of the Past* (Toronto, 2008), 109.
[23] Basarab, *Pereiaslav*, 180; L. Tillett, *The Great Friendship: Soviet Historians on the Non-Russian Nationalities* (Durham, 1969), 420-421.
[24] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 5201, ark. 146-150.

before then. Historians who advanced a 'de-Stalinised' vision of the past in the late 1950s concentrated at the Academy of Sciences and, forming the professional elite, mostly lived in Moscow, Leningrad, and Kyiv.[25] Unsurprisingly, perhaps, provincial historians were slower to pick up on the theme of the Ukrainian-Polish past. When a Russian academic from the Academy of Sciences in Moscow visited L'viv in early 1956, she was shocked to discover that the study and popularisation of Ukrainian-Polish history in the region was largely neglected. The local landscape was still scattered with such Polish-sounding place names as Rzęsa, seemingly browsed over when the local authorities transformed Gródek Jagielloński into Horodok.[26] By no means should this suggest that local bureaucrats and historians cultivated the memory of a multi-cultural past in L'viv; rather, it seems that they were generally passive and inefficient when it came to popularising historical knowledge.[27] In early 1957, the obkom authorities in L'viv reported that many monuments in the oblast were in a state of disarray: in the regional centre of Briukhovychi, for example, the monument commemorating NKVD officers killed by Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalists' stood in the middle of a Polish military cemetery from 1920, with a figure of the Virgin Mary to the side and the Polish eagle right in front.[28] Local historians had not even put up a notice by the ruins of Prince Danylo's castle in L'viv to explain that it had served to defend the western borderlands of *Rus'* against foreign invaders, leading tourists to pass by the site on their way to the 'Polish' *Vysokyi Zamok* (*Wysoki Zamek*).[29]

It was only at the beginning of the 1960s that the CPU Central Committee and its Institute of Party History made a more concerted effort to encourage residents to commemorate the history of Eastern Europe, compelling more teachers, scholars and

---

[25] Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 64.

[26] DALO, f. P3, op.5, s. 406, ark. 98-103.

[27] Admittedly, some university lecturers, museum employees, and school teachers highlighted any signs of popular interest in the East European past to demonstrate that they helped to ground a 'socialist consciousness' in the USSR and Eastern Europe as a whole. For example, employees at the L'viv National Museum boasted that their exhibition had attracted 63,000 *trudiashchi* in 1955 alone; in 1934, by contrast, the old Polish administration had only drawn 8,500 visitors, which included US press correspondents, a Dutch baroness, and Mussolini's personal secretary, and thus by no means represented the 'simple people'. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 335, ark. 73-97.

[28] DALO, f. P3, op.6, s. 97, ark. 39-45.

[29] DALO, f. P3, op.5, s. 406, ark. 98-103. The failure of local Party officials and historians in L'viv to cultivate the memory of Ukrainian-Polish relations in the region may partly be attributed to economic difficulties and the unwillingness of state institutions to cooperate in preserving historical monuments. For instance, the Carmelitan and Dominican churches were falling into a state of total disrepair, because the Bil'shovik and Kirov factories which occupied their premises had refused to spend any money on refurbishment. DALO, f. P3, op.5, s. 444, ark. 49-53.

local party activists to speak and write about it. They resolved to improve the *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (*Ukrainian Historical Journal*), which printed articles about such topics as 'Soviet patriotism and internationalism', the development of Russo-Ukrainian friendship, and Ukrainian relations with the people's democracies.[30] Senior party officials planned to make the journal more accessible to a wider audience of agitators and university lecturers, rather than just senior academics at research institutions who had been reading the journal up until then.[31] Partly because of these top-down pressures from academics in Moscow and Kyiv, various individuals with a professional interest in history, as well as local state and party apparatchiks, tried to show that they included large audiences in anniversary celebrations. Particularly in the second half of the 1960s, teachers organised special after-school history clubs and school museums, in which, among other issues, they discussed questions associated with the appearance of the 'socialist camp'. In Chernihiv, for example, a teacher from school number 18 gained the recognition of local party apparatchiks after he encouraged a group of Pioneers to collect testimonies from Ulianovsk and Leningrad, as well as Prague and Warsaw, after which they published a special pamphlet entitled 'I have never seen Lenin, but I have not lived a single day without him'.[32]

Paradoxically, while an increasing number of residents of Ukraine discussed the past, they contributed towards the establishment of a fixed canon of East European history, in which culture played a less important role than socio-political and ethnic conflicts. In order to spread historical knowledge, they participated in the creation of school textbooks which helped to identify a set of 'important' historical events. Despite the 1958 education reform, school textbooks continued to establish the 'politically, and therefore professionally acceptable paradigm'.[33] Roger Markwick suggests that teachers and lecturers relied on textbooks partly because they lacked adequate professional qualifications.[34] As a matter of fact, however, they were not passive recipients of historical dogmas defined in Kyiv and Moscow, but had some leeway to shape official narratives. This was evident during the early 1960s, when

---

[30] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 34.
[31] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 35-38.
[32] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 3222, ark. 26-32, 5-9, 22-25, 117-123.
[33] S. Matthews, *Education in the Soviet Union: Policies and Institutions Since Stalin* (London, 1982), 29; Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 46.
[34] Markwick, *Rewriting History*, 66-67.

the Ministry of Education in Kyiv commissioned the first Soviet school textbook specifically for teaching Ukrainian history.[35] School teachers, university lecturers, and party activists throughout Ukraine commented on two drafts of the manual during special meetings organised by local CPSU officials in March 1960 and July 1961. They demonstrated their resolve to convey historical knowledge in a manner understandable for as many people as possible. For instance, teachers from Dnipropetrovs'k claimed that the authors did not use enough illustrative examples. This did not allow school children to imagine how the Ukrainian population lived under the Habsburgs, or to understand why they rebelled against foreign rule. The textbook only contained a very general statement that the life of the Ukrainian *narod* had become even harder at the end of the eighteenth century, as it was now oppressed not only by Polish and Ukrainian feudal lords, but also the Austrian ruling classes.[36] At the same time, many residents of Ukraine who participated in public discussions about the new textbook did not want to compromise on accuracy. In Mykolaiv, they charged that the textbook was imprecise as far as the history of southern Ukraine was concerned.[37] Similar views were echoed in Zakarpattia, where the locals complained about distortions of regional history, and appealed to the authors to talk about 'tens of thousands' rather than 'hundreds of thousands' when discussing the workers who strove for reunification with the USSR during the 1940s.[38]

Nonetheless, teachers and lecturers typically did promote a simplistic vision of 'national' history. While they pushed the authors of the textbook to focus less on high politics and 'princes', and more on the 'mass of workers',[39] they also suggested that the 'masses' should be portrayed as unified national communities. In line with this, they examined the textbook's portrayals of the Cossacks in much detail, with historians in Volhynia pointing out that the textbook should describe how the Poles

---

[35] Children aged fourteen and fifteen would first study the 'Soviet' past, which basically amounted to Russian history, and then focus on how the same social and political developments occurred on the territory of their own republic. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 3-6.

[36] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 30-32. Similarly, teachers in Kamianets'-Podil's'kyi complained that the manual was incomprehensible because it was overloaded with facts and figures, whilst some chapters were written in an extremely dry manner. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 3-6.

[37] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 3-7.

[38] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 40-43.

[39] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 3-6; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 30-32; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 90-94; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 46-48; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 3-7.

built the Kodak fortress on the Dnipro river to stop peasants from joining the Free Cossacks during the seventeenth century, which would help to ground students' 'love and respect for the *narodni masy*' and 'hatred for their exploiters'.[40] Moreover, 'common people' were not just 'workers' but also 'Eastern Slavs'; some teachers praised the textbook draft for demonstrating how this ethnic group achieved a high level of socio-economic, political, and cultural development, and played 'an important role in Europe from ancient times'.[41] This amounted to a crude distinction between the 'good' Ukrainians and Russians, and the 'evil' Poles who exploited East Slavic lands.[42] Indeed, some teachers were worried that students would be left confused by any 'complicated' analysis of the seventeenth century. For example, they pointed out that the authors discussed the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising from the point of view of successes and failures, which made it difficult for students to understand the true 'meaning of the national liberation struggle'.[43] Historians in the regions of Ukraine consequently suggested that the textbook should emphasise the close relationship between Ukraine and Russia, whilst distancing both from the 'Western Slav' Poland and other East European countries. Lecturers from the Chernihiv pedagogical institute complained that the first draft failed to explain how the position of Ukrainians improved from Polish to Russian rule,[44] and their colleagues from the Uzhgorod university argued that the textbook should talk more about the influence of the Russian 1905 revolution in Habsburg-ruled Ukraine.[45] The need to maintain a close relationship with Russia would also be made clear by reminding students that the Austrians occupied Northern Bukovyna as soon as the Russian army withdrew in the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish wars.[46] In trying to create a more approachable history textbook, therefore, inhabitants of Ukraine with a professional interest in history sought to differentiate Ukraine from Poland and to bring out the historical role of the western borderlands, as well as putting an emphasis on the role of the 'masses' in historical progress. They thus drew on well-established historiographical traditions, trying to 'strike a balance between the grand

---

[40] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 8-12.
[41] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 36-45.
[42] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 3-6; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 30-32; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 90-94; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 46-48.
[43] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 27-35.
[44] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 73-78.
[45] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1463, ark. 90-94.
[46] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1665, ark. 8-12.

narrative of the nation and class analysis', in which negative depictions of the Polish 'pans' helped to bring out the progressive role of Ukrainian national leaders.[47]

It is very difficult to establish the extent to which the reported opinions reflected broader attitudes of Ukraine's teachers and university lecturers. They took active part in shaping the textbook's contents, openly criticising the authors and suggesting very specific improvements and additions, but it also seems that they consciously operated within the limits of what they considered to be permissible. This was partly because they knew that prominent historians and Party apparatchiks expected them to discuss the role of the 'masses' in 'socialist progress' and to focus on the Cossack period and the 'reunification' of Ukraine with Russia. After all, they were commenting on a complete draft of the textbook which outlined a teleological vision of history during public meetings organised by local apparatchiks. However, it is striking that school teachers and university lecturers in the early 1960s actually tried to establish a coherent and 'correct' vision of the past for students at schools. Even though they suggested that teaching should be accurate and inclusive of the historically non-Russian parts of Ukraine, they also argued that the past should be portrayed in a simple manner in order to ensure that as many residents of Ukraine as possible maintained a consistent vision of historical developments. It was partly because of this that they turned towards the simplistic 'national' paradigm. Even though Soviet historians still had some room to produce more nuanced representations of Khmel'nyts'kyi during this period,[48] the great bulk of citizens who participated in the popularisation of historical knowledge stayed clear of controversial topics, employing instead formulaic portrayals of national conflicts between the Ukrainian 'masses' and their Polish 'oppressors'.

In other words, the majority of citizens who actively contributed to commemorative activities increasingly reproduced fixed accounts of national

---

[47] For example, immediately after the war, Soviet authorities encouraged the official cult of Ivan Franko in Western Ukraine in order to displace the 'nationalist tradition of revering Mazepa, Hrushevs'kyi, and the Ukrainian Galician Army'. Franko was presented as both a proto-socialist and 'the father of the nation'. For a while, the 'Ukrainians' were even described as 'great', a label normally reserved for the Russians. When the Institute of Ukrainian History finally published in 1940 a collectively written *History of Ukraine: A Short Course*, socialist deeds were described in an unmistakably national rhetoric. The apogee of Ukrainian history came in 1939 with the Soviet annexation of Eastern Poland and 'the great Ukrainian people's reunification within a single Ukrainian socialist state'. Yekelchyk, *Stalin's Empire*, 24, 52.

[48] F. Sysyn, 'The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising', *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas* 46:4 (1998), 543-544.

conflicts in order to avoid the ambiguity associated with introducing new tropes into official rhetoric.[49] Indeed, by the late 1970s, depictions of Ukrainian resistance to Polonisation became a crucial part of Soviet history, almost an unquestionable dogma. With Naukova Dumka finally publishing *Istoriia Ukrains'koi RSR: Korotkyi narys* (*History of the Ukrainian SSR: A Short Course*) in 1981, the idea that Ukrainians defended the common interests of Eastern Slavs and Soviet people against the Poles became firmly entrenched in public rhetoric. Aimed at a 'wide circle of readers', as Iu.Iu. Kondufor and other editors stated, it described the 'long history of the Ukrainian *narod*, and its struggle for social and national liberation'. Opening by emphasising the common basis from which the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian *narody* sprang up, it outlined their 'struggle against feudal and capitalist oppression'. The introduction set out a clear teleological structure of history: it was asserted that, through working together against class enemies and foreign tormentors, the 'brotherly *narody*' developed a new Soviet way of life, shaping a new community – the Soviet *narod*. The editors underlined that internationalism did not preclude, but actually encouraged, the love for one's nation (*natsiia*) and country.[50] This authoritative statement summed up the theses outlined in the eight volume history of the Ukrainian SSR. The Ukrainian national movement for 'reunification' with Russia thus emerged as a major progressive force.

Volodymyr Shcherbtyts'kyi and other Brezhnev-era leaders sought to spread this message very widely, with commemoration of the Cossacks turning into an institutionalised ritual during the 1970s. This was particularly evident in 1979, when the authorities organised the 325th anniversary of the 'reunification' of Ukraine and Russia. While the celebrations were mostly concentrated in Ukraine itself, Shcherbyts'kyi was adamant that the anniversary should be an all-Soviet holiday, equating Ukrainian resistance against social and national exploitation by Poles to other founding events in Soviet history, including the October Revolution. In a report for the CPSU Central Committee, he insisted that the seventeenth century 'reunification' was not only one of 'the greatest acts in the history of Russian and Ukrainian nations', but also 'all nations of our country'.[51] By commemorating the

---

[49] A. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006), 284.

[50] Iu. Iu. Kondufor (et al), *Istoriia Ukrains'koi RSR: Korotkyi narys* (Kyiv, 1981), 2-6.

[51] TsDAHO, f. 1, op. 25, s. 1679, ark. 9-10.

anniversary, the CPU Central Committee compelled numerous Soviet scholars and state and Party institutions to reproduce the formulaic portrayals of Ukrainian-Polish national conflicts in order to prove their commitment to spreading 'Soviet patriotism'. Just as the celebrations took on an all-union character in 1954, Shcherbyts'kyi hoped that the 325th anniversary would be used to commemorate the 'deep historical roots of unity' between all *narody* of 'our multi-national homeland', strengthening Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism in the face of 'bourgeois, bourgeois-nationalist, Maoist, Zionist and other' distortions of history.[52] Accordingly, the CPU Central Committee departments of propaganda and agitation, obkoms, gorkoms, raikoms and primary party organisations, the ministries of education and culture, the writers' union, amateur book clubs and many other bodies prepared for the celebrations. The unions of artists, architects, journalists, as well as the Gosteleradio were given the task of coming up with proposals for a monument to mark the reunification.[53] To celebrate the occasion, state and party organisations also held special meetings with Ukrainian and Russian artists, as well as convening seminars for workers at factories; in Kyiv alone, half a million people attended 180 special concerts.[54] Shcherbyts'kyi thus involved multiple individuals and organisations in commemorating East European history in a national framework. As they all underlined Ukraine's alienation from Poland and Kyiv's special relationship with Moscow, Shcherbyts'kyi could legitimately and publicly describe Ukrainians as a separate and distinguished nation in the USSR.

The authorities further advanced the image of East European satellite states as 'foreign' by including numerous inhabitants of Ukraine in very ritualised anniversary celebrations of the Great Patriotic War and the subsequent Soviet 'liberation' and 'modernisation' of Eastern Europe.[55] During the late Brezhnev era, anniversaries of the 'liberation' of the individual satellite states were used to remind the Ukrainian (and broader Soviet) public about the glorious Soviet victory in Eastern Europe.[56] As

---

[52] TsDAHO, f. 1, op. 25, s. 1679, ark. 9-10.

[53] TsDAHO, Kyiv, f. 1, op. 25, s. 1679, ark. 15-24.

[54] TsDAHO, Kyiv, f. 1, op. 25, s. 1880, ark. 9-12.

[55] From the early 1960s, the authorities used travel to promote this vision of history. See Chapter 2.

[56] While commemorations of the war were a means to instil a sense of Soviet pride among the population, Roman Serbyn suggests that interactions between the Kremlin, CPU leaders in Kyiv, oblast authorities and 'ordinary Ukrainians' led to the emergence of a distinct Ukrainian national rhetoric in commemorations of the Great Patriotic War. Serbyn, R. Serbyn, 'Managing Memory in Post-Soviet Ukraine: "Victory Day" or "Remembrance Day"' in S. Velychenko (ed.), *Ukraine, the EU and Russia: History, Culture and International Relations* (Basingstoke, 2007), 116-118.

these forms of commemoration were part of the routine, day-to-day work of the state and party bureaucracy, variations from the established script were hard to come by. In March 1979, for example, the Kyiv gorkom, the Ukrsovprof, and the Ukrainian branch of the Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Society organised meetings to celebrate the 34th anniversary of the Soviet liberation of Hungary. They held a very bombastic gathering in the building of the Kyiv conservatoire, but also invited representatives of the Hungarian embassy in Moscow and the consulate in Kyiv to participate in 'evenings of friendship' in some oblast centres and at factories ('collective members' of the friendship society). The Ukrainian Gosteleradio was responsible for preparing special announcements for the media, and the radio and television were put on high alert in case the Hungarian consul decided to address inhabitants of Ukraine.[57] Once again, party officials in Kyiv planned very similar measures for the 35th anniversary of the Polish communist manifesto in July (they even used the same format for the report), although on this occasion they would also hold sport competitions, amateur artistic performances, festivals of Polish cinema in Kyiv, Kharkiv, L'viv, Zaporizhzhia, Vinnytsia, Luts'k, Poltava, Zhytomir, Khmel'nyts'kyi, and Cherkasy, as well as 'mass meetings of friendship' in the borderland regions.[58] Thus, under Brezhnev, the Great Patriotic War and the establishment of the socialist camp emerged as the most progressive events in East European history, and the officials bombarded citizens with formulaic accounts of 'liberation'. Scholars, state officials, and party apparatchiks invoked the myth of the war in order to underline the unity of the Soviet bloc, but also to emphasise the superior status of the USSR in it.[59]

---

[57] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1963, ark. 9-11; Similar examples abound. For instance, the CPU Central Committee issued virtually identical instructions in January, when they marked the 60th anniversary of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1963, ark. 5-7.

[58] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1963, ark. 25-28.

[59] With this aim, top state and party officials retained very strict control over all forms of war commemoration in Eastern Europe. In both 1963 and 1983, when the Polish authorities decided to award medals to Soviet citizens who had fought in the Polish army in September 1939 or been members of partisan units on Polish territory, the all-Soviet and Ukrainian Ministries of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence in Moscow, the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, the Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism, as well as the Institutes of Party History in Kyiv and Minsk carefully chose the list of veterans who would receive the medals, giving priority to those who had already been conferred Soviet state awards. They also discouraged the Poles from granting the Warsaw Uprising Cross to Soviet citizens, 'considering the true goals of the leaders and instigators of this uprising'. Soviet officials were determined to have the final say in shaping historical commemorations, systematically eliminating any portrayals which undermined the position of 'Soviet heroes' as the main protagonists in the war. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 5744, ark. 76-77; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 2600, ark. 98.

Some Khrushchev-era historians wrote about the history of Eastern Europe to tell a story about 'the masses' and 'common people'. They were particularly keen to explore Ukrainian-Polish relations, which offered an opportunity to talk about the 'socialist' history of Eastern Europe and the special role of the intelligentsia in driving 'socialist progress'. However, most Soviet citizens who participated in spreading historical knowledge diverged from this 'international' vision of history as propagated by senior scholars from the Academy of Sciences. From the early 1960s, instead of writing about a common East European past, they made an explicit effort to differentiate Russian and Ukrainian history from Poland and Eastern Europe. While historians identified 'common people' as the main driving force behind 'progress', they also deprived them of any autonomy by glorifying the idea of national unity. Strong national political leaders, such as Khmel'nyts'kyi, emerged as the positive heroes of Soviet and Ukrainian history. Public debate about the East European past grew increasingly constrained under Brezhnev, as top state and Party officials established tight control over anniversary commemorations. They encouraged residents of Ukraine to celebrate the Soviet 'liberation' of Eastern Europe, thus promoting a sense of Soviet pride in the republic. They likewise made historical commemorations of the Cossack uprisings against Poland highly formulaic and repetitive, seeking to encourage citizens to discuss history in a national framework.

II.   The second Soviet republic[60]

Because commemorations of the Ukrainian-Polish conflict played a prominent part in distinguishing the Soviet community from Eastern Europe, they provided a forum where senior CPU bureaucrats portrayed their republic as the bulwark of Sovietness. Not only was Ukraine different from Poland, they suggested, but it also played a distinctive role in the wider East Slavic and Soviet community. Party officials in Kyiv sponsored various historical images to show that Ukraine had remained exemplary in its loyalty to Russia, but also that Ukrainians had developed a rich culture and played a prominent part in combatting the Polish threat. The

---

[60] I borrow this term from Yaroslav Bilinsky, *The Second Soviet Republic: the Ukraine after World War II* (New Brunswick, 1964).

authorities became increasingly keen to outline such a major historical part for Ukraine between the late 1960s and the early 1980s. As CPSU bureaucrats and some historians sought to criticise the views of Polish scholars who questioned the superior status of the USSR in the region, they grew more determined to speak and write about Ukrainian glory and bravery. In doing so, however, Party leaders invited criticism from some members of the creative intelligentsia who, whilst rarely undermining the grand narratives of Ukrainian-Russian 'reunification', believed that citizens should be encouraged to learn more about 'Ukrainian' history as distinct from other nations in Eastern Europe.

Tensions and conflicts in East European academia encouraged Soviet scholars to underline that Ukraine had always remained loyal to the Eastern Slavic community. This was closely intertwined with the professional interests of Soviet academicians, as they feared that research opportunities for Soviet scholars were undermined by the Poles. After the CPSU Central Committee instructed archivists and Slavicists from the Soviet Academy of Sciences to choose which books to transfer from the old Polish Ossolineum library in L'viv to Poland in 1967, the scholars stressed that approximately 60,000 volumes should be left in Ukraine: the books left in L'viv 'exclusively' concerned 'the history, culture, and economics of the western oblasts of Ukraine' and 'historical connections between the Ukrainian, Russian, and Belarusian people', and as such they were of most interest to 'Soviet historians'. Meanwhile, the CPU Central Committee lobbied for Polish libraries to donate materials about the 'history of the Russian and Ukrainian *narody*' to Soviet institutions.[61] They advocated the idea that the history of Ukrainians, Russians, and Eastern Slavs could be neatly separated from Poland, differentiating Soviet scholars who studied 'their' past from Polish historians who focused on their own heritage.[62]

---

[61] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6377, ark. 108-110.

[62] There were examples, of course, when difficulties were successfully overcome. In 1961, a senior researcher from the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences' Institute of History commented on a new Polish book about L'viv in the 1930s, which, as he suggested, should be translated and published in the USSR. The author described the 'struggle of Polish and Ukrainian workers' and, as its former member, devoted much attention to the Stalinist repression of the Communist Party of Poland and the Communist Party of West Ukraine (KPZU); at the same time, however, he retained an ambiguous attitude towards Bukharin, Zinoviev and Tukhachevskii, and failed to give a positive enough assessment to the KPZU. The Ukrainian historian was keen to ask the Polish author to revise his work for its Soviet publication. Indeed, the author did make corrections and brought out the role of the Ukrainian communists in L'viv, thus contributing towards building a vision of a common East European past. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 25-26; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 27-28.

More importantly, pressures from the outer empire pushed CPU apparatchiks and Soviet historians to write about Ukraine's special contribution to the Soviet community, highlighting that it had resisted Polonisation and thus protected Eastern Slavdom as a whole. This tendency was especially pronounced because, from the early 1960s, Polish historians implicitly questioned the exclusivity of East Slavic history and the supposed unity of Ukrainians and Russians by studying the national movement in Tsarist as well as Habsburg Ukraine, as part of the broader European phenomenon of nationalism.[63] Soviet state officials informed Warsaw about their anger at such 'shortcomings', and CPU leaders instructed Ukrainian scholars to criticise their Polish colleagues who brought out the 'non-Soviet' character of Ukraine in their work. Accordingly, in February 1974, Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi complained about two collections of Ukrainian poetry published in Poland two years earlier. They both represented the 'anti-scientific ideology of one current', which underplayed ideological conflicts in Ukrainian literature, grouping 'Ukrainian classics' and 'Soviet writers' with 'nationalist' authors from the interwar period and even explicitly 'anti-Soviet' poets. Shcherbyts'kyi instructed *Voprosy literatury* (*Issues of Literature*) or *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* (*Soviet Literary Studies*) to publish critical reviews of the Polish publications.[64] Because the Poles diverged from official Soviet scholarship, top Party apparatchiks in Kyiv urged Soviet scholars to deny any suggestion that the history of Ukraine could be considered outside the context of a wider Russian and Soviet past, but also to discuss Ukrainian defiance in the face of the Polish threat.

The official emphasis on Ukrainian-Polish conflict and the Soviet 'liberation' of Eastern Europe further allowed some historians to promote historical accounts that distinguished Ukraine from Russia. Party apparatchiks encouraged Soviet scholars to cooperate with their colleagues from around the socialist camp, promoting the cult of the Soviet liberation of Eastern Europe,[65] but also compelling academicians to write

---

[63] S. Velychenko, *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914-1991* (New York, 1993), 203.

[64] The report concerned *Z poezji ukrainskiej*, published by Czytelnik in 1972 in Tadeusz Hollender's translation, and Kazimierz Jaworski's book, *Przeklady poezji ukrainskiej, bialoruskiej i ludow kaukaskich*, published by Wydawnictwo Lublin in 1972. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1036, ark. 40-42.

[65] In 1963, for example, top apparatchiks in Moscow put pressure on historians to cooperate with their colleagues from around Eastern Europe to come up with a coherent definition of 'resistance', thus encouraging them to write about the Great Patriotic War in an authoritative way. RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.3, ll.51-53. Soviet scholars also worked with the Polish Academy of Sciences to write about the Soviet liberation of Poland, discuss the 'just' resolution to the question of the Soviet-Polish border,

about Russia, Ukraine, and Poland as distinct historical actors.[66] In order to counteract Western 'bourgeois' propaganda, the CPSU Politburo instructed Soviet historians to work with the Poles on very delicate issues that highlighted national differences between Russians, Ukrainians and Poles. Among other issues, they were to deny claims that the NKVD stood behind the Katyn massacre, and to denounce publications about the 'Soviet occupation' of western Ukraine in 1939.[67]

As historians discussed national questions when they cooperated with their East European colleagues, they paid particular attention to cultural diversity in the region, portraying Ukrainian culture as a constituent part of a wider East European heritage. Indeed, they defined the very idea of Eastern Europe in a national framework, participating in projects about a 'transnational' history of Slavs.[68] By the early 1970s, the celebration of 'Slavdom' acquired institutionalised forms. International Congresses of Slavic Studies were held in one of the Slavic countries every five years.[69] As scholars from across Eastern Europe worked together to show that the Soviet-led socialist camp was firmly united by its predominantly Slavic roots, they also suggested that Ukrainian culture prospered under Soviet socialism. During the 1970s, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences participated in a Polish-led and UNESCO-funded project which aimed to 'acquaint the world's public opinion with the contribution that all Slavic peoples [had] made to global culture'. Not only were they to ensure that Ukrainian materials be included in any collective publications, but they would also counteract Austrian attempts to popularise the historical paradigm of 'East-Central Europe', discredit Ukrainian émigré publications, and

and highlight the significance of Soviet aid for safeguarding Poland's western frontiers. RGANI, f.5, op.55, d.3, ll. 295, 301.

[66] As early as the mid-1950s, Soviet and Polish historians set up a special international committee to study how East European countries 'converged into one socialist community'. The Soviet-Czechoslovak, Soviet-Hungarian, and Soviet-Romanian committees were respectively set up in 1966, 1969, and 1973. E.A. Dudzinskaia, *Mezhdunarodnye nauchnye sviazi sovetskikh istorikov* (Moscow, 1978), 96, 101, 110, 114. Far from representing a professional initiative of historians, international scholarly collaboration formed part of Soviet state diplomacy, especially during the Brezhnev period. The CPSU Central Committee secretariat instructed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to inform ambassadors of the socialist countries about various measures undertaken throughout the USSR to celebrate their national holidays. Research meetings devoted to a common East European past were even a means of re-establishing contacts between Soviet and Czechoslovak scholars after the Prague Spring. RGANI, f. 89, 31, d. 20, ll. 1-7; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 575, ark. 102-107.

[67] RGANI, f. 89, 14, d. 11, ll. 1-6; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1880, ark. 32-34.

[68] Soviet scholars and their colleagues in Poland and Czechoslovakia thus strove to expose the common 'ethnogenesis of Slavs', and Slavicists from the Ukrainian and Soviet Academy of Sciences participated in celebrations devoted to 'socialist friendship' in Eastern Europe in the late 1950s. Dudzinskaia, *Mezhdunarodnye nauchnye sviazi*, 107-108; RGANI, f. 5, op.33, d. 66, l. 1.

[69] Kyiv hosted over 2000 delegates in 1983. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 2052, ark. 21-23.

resist UNESCO attempts to focus the project on 'ancient times' as opposed to more contemporary developments. If publishing an album about old Ukrainian architecture, for example, scholars in Kyiv would insist on describing how the contemporary socialist state preserved heritage sites.[70] As East European academicians invoked the rhetoric of Slavic unity, therefore, they highlighted the importance of Soviet socialism for the development of Ukraine, thereby linking Soviet unity to the flourishing of Ukraine's unique national culture.

Inescapably, perhaps, because the history of Ukraine was discussed very widely and frequently, some portrayals diverged from the grand narrative of 'reunification'. For one, blunders and inconsistencies occurred. From 1978, for example, *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* devoted a special section to the 325th anniversary of the Pereiaslav agreement, but 'serious doubts' were voiced after a publication by M.F. Kotliar. Party apparatchiks alleged that his article effectively publicised the views of 'hostile' authors who denied that 1654 amounted to a 'reunification' of Ukraine and Russia. In arguing against them, it quoted at length the 'falsified' views of such 'bourgeois historians' as Hrushevs'kyi, Kostomarov, Antonych, and Doroshenko. Meanwhile, Kotliar failed to refer to Lenin or Brezhnev in his analysis.[71] More importantly, fictional literature continued to produce ambiguous depictions of Khmel'nyts'kyi's role in Ukrainian history. Catherine Wanner shows that, due to the blatant manipulation of historical accounts in Ukraine, artistic renditions of historical events, which could more easily slip by the censors than purely scholarly texts, 'were often seen as more truthful' than academic studies.[72] It is difficult to assess how literature shaped popular attitudes towards history, but it did evoke some heated debates. This was evident after Pavlo Zahrebelnyi published in 1983 his novel *Ia, Bohdan* (*I, Bohdan*), which presented a more complex psychological portrait of the hetman than inhabitants of Ukraine were accustomed to. It called into question Khmel'nyts'kyi's motivations in staging the uprising against Polish rule and signing the Pereiaslav agreement. Public reactions to the novel were symptomatic of the status quo in Soviet Ukraine's politics of memory during the early 1980s. As many reviewers criticised the book for undermining the idea of

---

[70] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 575, ark. 102-107.
[71] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1880, ark. 16-17.
[72] C. Wanner, *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in post-Soviet Ukraine* (University Park, 1998), 205.

Russian-Ukrainian unity, even the dissident historian Volodymyr Serhiichuk spoke of the work's potentially negative influence on Ukrainian youth. This 'Ukrainian patriot', as Frank Sysyn describes him, believed that national myths should not be challenged, especially 'under foreign occupation': however distorted his image, Khmel'nyts'kyi constituted one of the few official symbols helping to foster a separate Ukrainian identity in the USSR.[73]

Some scholars, writers, and state and party bureaucrats disputed how the history of Ukrainian conflicts with Poland should be presented in the official rhetoric under Brezhnev, which further introduced ambiguity into official representations of the Russo-Ukrainian friendship. It was precisely because apparatchiks and members of the creative intelligentsia could refer to a codified set of historical narratives about the role of class and nation in history that they began to argue about the desirable limits of 'orthodoxy' in history. Some scholars and party leaders underlined that residents of the republic were well enough educated to give the 'correct' interpretation to stories of the Cossacks which undermined the glorious rhetoric of 'reunification'. They thus suggested that some controversy could enter the public realm, as residents would continue to define the Ukrainian national idea in terms of East Slavic unity and social struggle. Meanwhile, others stressed the need for the Party and senior academicians to guide the formation of collective memory much more tightly.

These conflicts became apparent in 1984, after the Goskomizdat in Moscow decided to publish the first Soviet edition of Henryk Sienkiewicz's *Ognem i mechom* (*With Fire and Sword*).[74] The nineteenth-century epic forms part of a popular trilogy, telling the story of a Polish nobleman who seeks to rescue his beloved from Cossack captivity. Written from a very Polonocentric point of view, the novel portrays Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossacks as barbaric bandits who weaken the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. While Sienkiewicz's other works (including two segments of the trilogy set against the background of the commonwealth's wars against Sweden and the Ottoman Empire) had been published in the Soviet Union, *Ognem i mechom* did not come out until 1983. The print run was large: 200,000 copies. In May 1984, a group of four Ukrainian historians and one literary scholar

---

[73] Sysyn, 'The Changing Image', 543-544.
[74] *Ogniem i mieczem* in the Polish original.

from L'viv complained about the publication. Arguing that the book would undermine the population's 'class understanding' of the past, they pointed out that as early as 1884 the Polish writer Bolesław Prus attacked Sienkiewicz for idealising the elites and ignoring the cause of the 'oppressed *narod*' which suffered most during the wars. The scholars alleged that the Ukrainian masses were represented as 'hordes of dogs', while Sienkiewicz mistook social struggle for national conflict. The novel described the Ukrainian war of liberation, the academics continued, from the point of view of the Catholic magnates, who sought to enslave the Ukrainians and break their ties with the brotherly Russian *narod*. Even though the report admitted that the introduction to the Soviet edition contextualised *Ognem i mechom*, it also questioned how much influence this would have on the readers and lobbied for the large-scale publication of Marxist academic studies of the novel. The authors added that while the work had been published in Poland regularly since 1955, the Soviet publication would weaken its critiques there.[75]

Ironically, perhaps, the scholars talked of Ukrainian 'national' liberation and reunification with Russia as they attacked the novel for emphasising the national rather than the class question. It may well be that they thus sought to advance their professional interests. They portrayed themselves as defenders of both the 'masses' and the Ukrainian *narod*, suggesting that the Ukrainian intelligentsia had a crucial role to fulfil in Soviet society. They believed that a wide audience should read their analysis of Sienkiewicz's work. However, other bureaucrats and scholars in both Russia and Ukraine opposed their views. For instance, the chief editor in charge of fictional literature at the Goskomizdat defended the publication. He pointed out that it received the approval of the Central Committee, the Institutes of World Literature and Slavic and Balkan Studies at the USSR Academy of Sciences, as well as the chief editor of the Soviet Ukrainian Encyclopaedia, the writer Mykola Bazhan. The Goskomizdat editor also emphasised that the exclusion of *Ognem i mechom* from the collected works of Sienkiewicz would evoke an 'unpredictable reaction' in brotherly Poland.[76] Similarly, the head of the Goskomizdat's section for literatures of the socialist countries argued that the first full publication of Sienkiewicz's prose in the USSR could not exclude his 'most significant' work. He claimed that the novel was

---

[75] RGANI, f. 5, op.90, d. 139, ll. 10-15.
[76] RGANI, f. 5, op.90, d. 139, ll. 25-29.

a good read, allowing Soviet audiences to 'feel the poetry of the Ukrainian landscape'. While the book was set in Ukraine, it was written 'from within Polish history', and as such it should be read as an expression of progressive nineteenth-century ideas. Even though Sienkiewicz resorted to hyperbole and idealised the Poles who had fought against the Cossacks, he did this to create strong characters and contrast them with his imperfect contemporaries, praising the ideals of soldiers' camaraderie, friendship, as well as loyalty and stability in love. To support his views, the author of the report cited the 'Lenin prize laureate', Mykola Bazhan, who voiced his views about Sienkiewicz in December 1979: the history of Polish-Ukrainian relations was complex and bloody, but while Soviet people could understand the class background of the mutual conflicts, they should not expect the same of Sienkiewicz. The Goskomizdat official was confident that, with the right introduction, Soviet readers would understand *Ognem i mechom* correctly. He also stressed that Sienkiewicz was a very popular writer in people's Poland, and the publication of his novels would help strengthen Polish-Soviet friendship.[77]

The exchange of ideas about *Ognem i mechom* was an expression of conflicts between intellectuals and cultural bureaucrats, both on the all-Soviet and Ukrainian-republican stage. Undoubtedly, their opinions were conditioned by the institutions which they represented and the need to defend the decisions which they had taken earlier. The scholars from L'viv were most adamant that academics should guide the formation of both national and class approaches towards the novel in the republic. By contrast, Goskomizdat officials, members of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, and some representatives of the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia saw less cause for alarm and top-down instruction in the aftermath of the publication. This is not to suggest that they did not concern themselves with Sienkiewicz's influence on popular understandings of class and nation in Ukraine's history, but they had very different ideas about the extent to which inhabitants of the republic could be trusted to develop 'Soviet' attitudes towards the book on their own. As such, all sides involved in the debate surrounding the publication of *Ognem i mechom* wanted the Central Committee to recognise their right to influence the politics of identity formation in Ukraine, and they all agreed that history should be understood in a 'national' framework.

---

[77] RGANI, f. 5, op.90, d. 139, ll. 16-24.

Therefore, while top state and Party officials under Brezhnev established very tight control over public portrayals of East European history, they suggested that Ukraine played a special part in defending the common Russo-Ukrainian community against Polish 'pans', as well as implying that Ukrainians and Ukrainian culture would flourish in the USSR. As both 'Sovietness' and 'Ukrainianness' were defined against Poland and other countries of the socialist bloc, the national paradigm overshadowed the narrative of a common East European 'revolutionary' past. Rather than arguing about the grand themes and messages which history should promote, state and Party apparatchiks, as well as historians and other scholars who toed the official line, began to dispute an entirely different set of issues. They disagreed about the extent to which they should guide inhabitants of the republic in reaching the 'correct' conclusions from the study of history, and were suspicious of any 'unorthodox' ideas which entered public rhetoric. This had a special significance for the history of western Ukraine. Although obkom apparatchiks and some historians tried to talk about the history of the western borderlands to underline their belonging to the wider Ukrainian and Soviet community, they met with the opposition of other apparatchiks who feared that memories of a 'non-Russian' Ukraine would fuel 'incorrect' attitudes amongst residents of the republic.

III.   The Borderlands

While the great majority of Soviet historians turned towards narrow topics of regional or local history to keep out of trouble,[78] the study of the western borderlands did not offer such an escape from controversial issues. As Roman Solchanyk argues, party leaders were concerned that memories of exclusion from Russian rule could encourage residents of the western oblasts to articulate their national identities in non-Soviet terms.[79] Although top apparatchiks in Moscow and Kyiv instructed historians to condemn foreign claims to the western borderlands, and to emphasise their belonging to the wider Ukrainian and Soviet community, they were more suspicious of the obkom bureaucrats who strove to popularise the knowledge of regional history. They were afraid that local residents would refer to the 'west

---

[78] Litvin, *Writing History*, 22.
[79] R. Solchanyk, 'Polska a sowiecki zachod', *Suchasnist: Zeszyt w jezyku polskim* 1-2 (1985), 82, 86.

Ukrainian' past to underline the unique status of the western oblasts. Only with increasing state control over the intelligentsia did the local bureaucrats begin to promote a cult of specifically local historical events and heroes on a mass scale, thus claiming for their region an equal status in the USSR.

The history of the western oblasts was a prominent theme in public discussions of the Ukrainian-Polish past throughout the post-war period. The CPU Central Committee inspired historians to write about the history of 'foreign occupation' in western Ukraine.[80] Senior state and party apparatchiks shaped representations of the borderlands in such a way as to depict many residents of the region, particularly the faithful of the illegal Greek Catholic church, as 'collaborators'. Already during the 1940s, immediately after the incorporation of the western oblasts into Soviet Ukraine, the church union of Brest was depicted as a Polish and subsequently Austrian-German tool designed 'to break up the unity and friendship of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples'.[81] Aggressive attacks on the Uniates in western Ukraine continued after 1956,[82] especially because the authorities were determined to deny claims made in Ukrainian émigré publications. Concerned that the 'Catholics' who published in the Western press distorted the history of the region, the CPU Central Committee instructed *Pravoslavnyi visnyk* to write that 'Ukrainian people', oppressed by the Greek Catholic clergy, always strove to return to the faith of their ancestors.[83] Campaigns to discredit Greek Catholicism had an especially wide reach in the western oblasts. In order to combat 'Uniate propaganda', under pressure from Kyiv, the L'viv obkom opened a museum of the history of religion and atheism. According to official statistics, it attracted 30,000 visitors between its opening in April and December 1970. Housed in the former Dominican monastery in L'viv, the exhibition was designed to educate 'workers' about the socio-political context in which 'foreign occupiers' created the Uniate church, thus 'spiritually enslaving the working masses of Ukraine and Belarus'. The obkom claimed that the museum portrayed the Greek Catholic church as subordinated to the Polish 'pans'. In designing the exhibition, historians made a special effort to bring out the alleged

---

[80] For instance, they instructed the obkom authorities in Uzhgorod to search the local archives for documents about the activity of 'American imperialists' in Zakarpattia during the interwar period. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 5111, ark. 4, 9-10.

[81] B. Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)* (Toronto, 1996), 108.

[82] DSUP 6:7, July 1961: F. Burlachenko, 'Vatican Forgers', *Voiovnychyi ateist*, 6 June 1962.

[83] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 20.

links between the Uniates, Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, and German fascists, both before and after the imposition of Soviet power in the region.[84]

In the context of discussing 'foreign occupation' in western Ukraine, top Party apparatchiks also encouraged historians to present the 'indigenous' inhabitants as passive victims, thus implying that other regions of the USSR had played a more 'progressive' historical role. Just as portrayals of the past underlined the evils of 'foreign occupation' in the borderlands, the 'reunification' of the western oblasts with Soviet Ukraine in 1939 emerged as the most celebrated event in the region's history. On numerous occasions, party leaders and historians emphasised that foreign 'ruling classes oppressed the hungry and illiterate' west Ukrainians, who subsequently achieved great progress under Soviet tutelage.[85] As Kondufor's *Istoriia Ukrainy* put it, all *narody* of the USSR helped western Ukraine defeat illiteracy and economic backwardness in the aftermath of 1939.[86] By celebrating the events of 1939, Soviet officials highlighted the role of other parts of Ukraine in modernising the borderlands. Notably, it was the Kyiv obkom who organised many events devoted to the 20th anniversary of the 'reunification' in 1959,[87] suggesting that residents of the city contributed to the 'liberation' of their co-nationals further west. As late as 1979, when the CPU Central Committee carefully coordinated the 40th anniversary of 'reunification', they instructed party organisations and other institutions engaged in planning the celebrations to place emphasis on the socio-economic and cultural changes which revolutionised western Ukraine 'under the guidance of the communist party'. Party and state institutions were expected to take extra measures to improve the 'material and living conditions' of certain 'honourable' groups: 'active members of the revolutionary movement', individuals who helped establish Soviet power in west Ukraine, as well as those whose relatives were killed by 'bourgeois-nationalist bands' in the region.[88] Thus, Shcherbyts'kyi suggested that some individuals contributed to the development of western Ukraine more than others. While he remained vague about it, they probably included old

---

[84] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 369, ark. 14-23.
[85] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.32, s. 51, ark. 11-42; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 2370, ark. 18-20; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1880, ark. 21-22.
[86] Kondufor, *Istoriia*, 418-421.
[87] DAKO, f. P5, op.6, s. 1411, ark. 1-2.
[88] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1880, ark. 21-22.

communists, veterans, and KGB members (as well as their families), many of whom were not originally from west Ukraine.

While the CPU authorities in Kyiv sought to control historical commemorations in Soviet Ukraine, oblast party and state leaders showed some initiative in shaping historical images of Ukraine's relationship with Poland, too. They attempted to spread the knowledge of regional history to present the locals as reliable Soviet citizens who had achieved the liberation from 'foreign occupation' through their own efforts. In order to distance the local community from the Polish and Hungarian unrest, and to highlight the close links between the borderlands and Soviet Ukraine and the USSR as a whole,[89] the Ukrainianised local cadres in L'viv began to propagate the knowledge of regional history in the mid-1950s. The obkom secretary lobbied for the CPU Central Committee to award the Order of Lenin to the city of L'viv, claiming that it would act as evidence that the western oblasts had been and would always remain Ukrainian. In his appeal, he argued that the people of L'viv had always resisted Polish feudal oppression and the Austro-Hungarian occupation, fighting for 'national freedom' and the 'reunification of Ukraine with Russia'.[90] He thus portrayed residents of the west as part of both the all-Soviet and Ukrainian communities in order to claim a special status for the region over which he presided. However, although he explicitly presented Ukrainian nationalism in its anti-Soviet guise as alien to the local population, and despite the obkom's repeated appeals, his request was denied. The central authorities in Kyiv were reluctant to commemorate western Ukraine as a discrete, distinguished segment of the Soviet Ukrainian people at a time when Khrushchev's Secret Speech, Gulag returnees, and the events in Poland and Hungary were destabilising the region.[91] Officials at the propaganda and agitation section of the Kyiv Central Committee believed that other industrial centres in Ukraine, such as Kharkiv, Odesa, Stalino, or Dnipropetrovs'k, 'had a glorious history', revolutionary traditions, and had proven their commitment to the Ukrainian *narod*: L'viv did not stand out amongst other cities, and 'elevating it to a higher

---

[89] See chapter 1.

[90] Especially after the Great October Revolution, the report stated, L'viv was also a centre of revolutionary struggle against international imperialism, Polish capitalism, and Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 335, ark. 56-58.

[91] See A. Weiner, 'The Empires Pay a Visit: Gulag Returnees, East European Rebellions, and Soviet Frontier Politics', *The Journal of Modern History* 78:2 (2006).

level' would be unjustified.[92] They were afraid that representations of local history would fuel 'undesirable' attitudes in the region because, it was implied, the locals had not yet shown their commitment to the USSR.

In order to propagate knowledge of regional history, state and party officials in west Ukraine needed to prove that the local population, including the oblast bureaucrats themselves, would invoke historical myths with the 'correct' intentions in mind: to underline their belonging to a wider Ukrainian, Soviet, and internationalist whole. This was problematic during the 1950s and 1960s: although the authorities in L'viv were careful not to overemphasise their region's non-Russian and non-Soviet path of development, this was often undermined by lower level bureaucrats. Museum directors were a particularly uncooperative group, devoting little attention to the region's links with other parts of the USSR when they designed historical exhibitions. In 1967, the local authorities reprimanded museums for failing to propagate the ideas of the friendship of the peoples and proletarian internationalism. They displayed few materials relating to western Ukraine's development during the Soviet period and the spread of Leninist ideas in Polish-ruled western Ukraine before 1939. Moreover, while the open-air ethnographical museum in L'viv enjoyed the status of a republican institution, the architecture it displayed was predominantly representative of west Ukraine, with the left bank ignored almost entirely. Its employees paid little attention to contemporary housing and provided descriptions of the exhibits in the Ukrainian language only, even though over fifty per cent of tourists who visited the museum came from other parts of the republic.[93]

Furthermore, during the 1960s, literary narratives of the village contributed to undermining the image of western Ukraine as part of the Soviet whole. In his study of Russian village prose, Geoffrey Hosking demonstrates that many writers explored folk traditions, thus portraying the village 'in the grip of an alien bureaucracy and losing its values and culture in the face of the encroachments of urban and industrial civilisation'. This evoked contradictory responses amongst Soviet officials and literary critics, some of whom believed that the static village characters provided no model for Soviet people who lived in a fast changing world, with others retorting

---

[92] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 335, ark. 55.
[93] DALO, L'viv, f. P3, op.13, s. 142, ark. 11-15.

that men in the modern urban environment had the most need for 'moral guidance'.[94] While the village prose movement caused controversy because it fed into wider debates about de-Stalinisation and subjectivity in Soviet society,[95] many Ukrainian party officials gave a very negative assessment to literary descriptions of the countryside in the western borderlands, in particular asserting that they put into question the very status of the western regions as 'Soviet'. This explains why, when Roman Andryiashyk sent his novel *Zelenyi klyn* (*The Green Wedge*) to be published in the journal *Dnipro* in 1967, the editors refused to publish it, pointing out that the Hutsuls were not shown to have strong links with other 'Soviet' people.[96] Charging that the Hutsul fight against the colonial politics of Austria-Hungary, Germany, Tsarist Russia, and Romania was treated in an artificial manner, as if it bore no relation to the revolutionary uprisings in the east and west, they sent the manuscript back to the author for corrections. However, Andryiashyk's work was eventually published in *Dnipro* in 1969 under the title *Dodomu nema vorottia* (*There Is No Return Home*), furthering the impression that western Ukraine was 'different' from other parts of the USSR. Party leaders in Kyiv were outraged, because the author had made few changes to the original.[97]

Western obkom officials consequently sought to eliminate depictions of regional distinctiveness from public rhetoric, seeking to defend their regions against accusations of 'non-Sovietness'. For one, they defended themselves against criticisms voiced in Kyiv. When the November 1968 plenum of the CPU Central Committee blamed the local authorities in L'viv of lax control over live shows in the city, pointing out that the Zan'kovets'ka theatre production of *Sestry Richyns'ki* (*The Richyns'ki Sisters*) contained a Ukrainian nationalist anthem, the obkom secretary explained that the melody in question was not a nationalist hymn, but rather a folk song. Nevertheless, considering the 'specificity of ideological work in our oblast', as the obkom secretary put it, and taking into account the 'associations and

---

[94] Some went so far as to argue that village prose rediscovered 'universal human ideals'. G. Hosking, *Beyond Socialist Realism: Soviet fiction since Ivan Denisovich* (London, 1980), 81-82.

[95] Hosking, *Beyond*, 198.

[96] The novel is about the life of Hutsuls during the First World War.

[97] They also emphasised that editors of the journal should have known better: Andryiashyk had previously been convicted for 'hooliganism', and he was generally considered to be an unreliable individual. At the same time, the authorities continued to send mixed signals about how to represent Ukraine's past: a positive review of the story had been published. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 363, ark. 55-57.

unprecedented reaction' which the musical motif could evoke among older members of the audience, officials at the obkom's propaganda and agitation department instructed the artists to replace the song.[98] In order to prove their resolve to cultivate the 'correct' version of historical memory, local officials sometimes blamed their superiors in Moscow and Kyiv for exoticising the borderlands. In October 1960, for example, a secretary of the Zakarpattia obkom complained about a tourist guide to the region published in Moscow recently. *My idem po Karpatam* (*We Are Walking around the Carpathians*) was 'apolitical', he alleged, as it glorified old traditions. The author sought out 'sensational' evidence of the region's distinctiveness, which forced the obkom onto the defensive. Describing the town of Vynohradovo, he wrote about Hungarian language, 'typical Hungarian faces', and western architecture, encouraging the obkom to underline that there were only 2630 Hungarians out of the total 15,900 population. The Soviet authorities and workers built two factories, schools, nurseries, and libraries in the region after 1945, the obkom report emphasised, and there was nothing typically western about the local architecture.[99] Indeed, with time, Party officials became more efficient in eliminating historical depictions of west Ukraine's 'otherness'. On 11 March 1975, the head of the Glavlit's Ukrainian branch was happy to report that censors had strengthened their control over publishing in the republic over the course of the preceding two or three years. Under increased pressure from the CPU, editors approached their work more carefully and committed fewer mistakes than before. The editorial board of *Vitchyzna* had thus removed Hutsal's short story *Zustrich z Karpatamy* (*A Meeting with the Carpathians*) from the May issue of the journal, due to its focus on old architecture, customs and traditions.[100]

Nevertheless, republican and all-Soviet bureaucrats did promote the use of specifically local historical themes and heroes in the west when they believed that this would help to strengthen Soviet patriotism in the region. Still, it was only very gradually and cautiously that Party leaders in Kyiv allowed scholars and obkom

---

[98] Between 1923 and 1939, many people in western Ukraine, including nationalists, sang the lyrics of Mykola Voronyi's poem *Za Ukrainu* (*For Ukraine*, published by Radyanskyi Pysmennyk in 1959) to the popular tune. During the performances on the 19th and 20th of October, the melody (with different lyrics) was played for sixteen seconds each night. DALO, f. P3, op.10, s. 249, ark. 26-27.

[99] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1458, ark. 13.

[100] Even though the story was about contemporary Zakarpattia, its author was accused of paying little attention to socialist developments under Soviet rule or new 'socialist relations' between the region's people. TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 1036, ark. 5-13.

apparatchiks to portray residents of western Ukraine as historical agents who drove progress in the borderlands. Stories about 'socialist' struggle in the region emerged first. From the mid-1950s, historians and Party apparatchiks talked about the importance of rehabilitating the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (CPWU), which had been an autonomous unit in the Communist Party of Poland dissolved by Stalin in 1938.[101] The process was painfully slow, partly because it took until 1966 before the archivists at the USSR Council of Ministers found many materials relating to the CPWU (even then, they would only agree to give photocopies of the documents to the archives in Kyiv).[102] Meanwhile, however, Party officials in L'viv continued to argue that historians should explore the history of the CPWU in more depth. As late as 1962, a senior party activist, historian and former member of the CPWU still found it necessary to underline that the party should be rehabilitated. He appealed to the Institute of History at the CPU Central Committee to publish a collection of documents and a history of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine. His version of west Ukrainian history was much more favourable to indigenous inhabitants of the region than portrayals which emphasised the special role of other oblasts and republics in bringing 'socialism' to the borderlands: he suggested that veterans of the CPWU should be given state pensions.[103] Likewise, three years later, the L'viv obkom stressed that it was the workers of west Ukraine, led by the CPWU, who staged street demonstrations in 'bourgeois Poland', strove for reunification with the USSR, and fought against the fascists during the Great Patriotic War.[104] Indeed, the obkom gradually found some recognition for the 'brave struggle' of 'west Ukrainian workers' against national and social oppression. Kondufor's history of Ukraine conceded that the accusations leveled against the CPWU in the 1930s were fabricated by 'provocateurs'.[105] The positive role of local inhabitants during the Great Patriotic War was recognised, too. In 1965, the city of L'viv was awarded the Order of the Great Patriotic War for 'great courage and heroism shown in the face of the German-fascist occupiers',[106] and Petro Shelest highlighted that 100,000 residents of L'viv joined the Red Army in the first few days of the war.[107] Even so,

---

[101] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 4259, ark. 42.
[102] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6140, ark. 3-11.
[103] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 1949, ark. 101-105.
[104] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6060, ark. 46-48.
[105] Kondufor, *Istoriia*, 344.
[106] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6060, ark. 49.
[107] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 6060, ark. 46-48.

when the L'viv industrial obkom asked to mark the 20th anniversary of liberation from fascism alongside Kyiv, Odesa, and Sevastopol, the Central Committees in Moscow and Kyiv refused to organise state- or republican-wide celebrations in west Ukraine, arguing that the obkom should limit itself to smaller-scale measures, such as publishing articles in the local press or holding a special session of the city soviet.[108]

Furthermore, Soviet historians of the western oblasts grounded the legitimacy of their research by explicitly rebuking the claims of their 'socialist' colleagues from outside the Soviet border, whom they accused of trying to undermine the Ukrainian, East Slavic and Soviet character of the western borderlands. It was the 'historian's duty', claimed the Ukrainian press, to expose any such 'falsifications'.[109] From the mid-1960s, the Romanians were especially provocative, publishing books and atlases which claimed that Northern Bukovyna was an ethnically Romanian land.[110] Similarly, Polish historical representations of L'viv increased official pressure on Soviet scholars to integrate Galicia into the broader framework of Soviet and Ukrainian history. As early as 1956, party apparatchiks noted that the Polish press used the 700th anniversary of L'viv to portray it as a Polish town, underlining that it was important for the Soviet side to write about L'viv as 'a city of the friendship of the *narody*'.[111] The need to respond to foreign 'distortions' inspired Party apparatchiks to sponsor more historical images of the borderlands, which permitted Soviet historians to introduce west Ukrainians as positive historical protagonists. This was evident during the 1962 tercentennial of Stanislaviv – another oblast centre in the west. The CPU first secretary, Mykola Pidhornyi (Nikolai Podgornyi), emphasised that it was at the initiative of the local state officials and social organisations that the city was renamed Ivano-Frankivs'k. In a report to the Central Committee in Moscow, Pidhornyi justified the decision by referring to a distinctly regional history. The city was founded in the seventeenth century (on the site of ancient Ukrainian settlements, Pidhornyi underlined) by the Polish Count Potocki who named it after his son. The Potockis, the report continued, were associated with

---

[108] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 2370, ark. 11-12.
[109] DSUP 12:8, August 1968: 'Not one day...', *Pravda Ukrainy*, 25 June 1968; 'Soviet Bukovyna Celebrates', *Robitnycha hazeta*, 3 August 1968.
[110] DSUP 12:5, May 1968: A. Hlushovsk'kyi, I. Kompaniyets', 'Against Bourgeois Falsification of Bukovyna's History', *Komunist Ukrainy* 1, January 1968; TsDAHO, f. 1, op.32, s. 631, ark. 24.
[111] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 335, ark. 70-71.

the darkest period in the history of the Ukrainian *narod*, although Pidhornyi also stressed that the magnates oppressed both the Polish and Ukrainian *narody*. Workers of the Stanislaviv region took an active part in the struggle against foreign exploiters, fighting for social and national liberation, and the reunification with Soviet Ukraine: the Communist Party of Western Ukraine was founded here in 1919. In changing the name of their city and oblast, the 'workers of Prykarpattia' wanted to pay homage to the great writer, revolutionary, and democrat – Ivan Franko, who had lived amongst the region's 'brave and proud people' and 'fairy-tale landscapes'.[112] Citizens commemorated local opposition to foreign oppression to show that this led to the 'reunification' of Soviet Ukraine in 1939, which suggests that west Ukrainian history was used to reinforce a sense of Soviet patriotism in the borderlands.

Party officials and scholars were especially eager to condemn Polish histories of L'viv during the height of the Solidarity crisis in the early 1980s.[113] This allowed Soviet historians to lobby Party authorities to let them explore west Ukrainian history from the 'correct' positions. For instance, in March 1981, the director of the Social Sciences Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences warned the L'viv obkom about the negative influence of Polish history writing in the USSR and the shortcomings in the work of the local archives. The autumn 1980 issue of the Polish journal *Z pola walki…*, available to buy in western Ukraine, contained the entire 'Constitution of the Association of Mutual Credit and Brotherly help in L'viv, 1881' as part of its rubric devoted to the 100th anniversary of the 'workers' movement on Polish soil'. The document had been held at the central state archive in L'viv and, according to the report, its publication implied that L'viv was a Polish city at the end of the nineteenth century, which was an opinion 'mistaken from the scientific perspective', and 'unacceptable from the political point of view'. The academic charged the Soviet bureaucracy with incompetence, as he believed that similar documents should only be available for Soviet historians. The Soviet law did not permit individual researchers to make copies of entire documents, and if a copy was presented to Poland as part of an inter-state exchange, Soviet archivists should have made sure to publish and interpret the document in Soviet scholarly journals first.[114] Even though the CPU Central Committee did not entirely agree with the academic's

---

[112] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.24, s. 5501, ark. 22-23.
[113] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 2295, ark. 37-50.
[114] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 2287, ark. 67-69.

opinion, concluding that no rules were broken when the document was presented to the Polish People's Republic in 1978, they admitted that contemporary Polish historiography gave an 'anti-historical assessment to a number of Polish-Ukrainian questions'. This boosted the professional status of scholars at the Academy of Sciences: Party bureaucrats specified that the Social Sciences Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences should analyse how Polish academic periodicals presented Ukrainian (and especially west Ukrainian) history, and instructed the Institute of Social and Economic Problems of Foreign Countries to prepare a 'scholarly note about the current processes taking place in Poland'.[115]

This may go some way towards explaining why Kyiv agreed to honour the memory of Prince Danylo Halyts'kyi in the early 1980s, though they had rejected L'viv's appeal to commemorate his resistance to Polonisation in 1956.[116] In June 1981, the CPU Central Committee and Ukraine's Council of Ministers received a petition from L'viv. The obkom secretary, V. Dobrik, and the head of the oblast council of people's deputies, M. Kirei, asked for permission to erect a new monument honouring Prince Danylo as the founder of L'viv. They wrote that the project had received the Academy of Sciences' approval, and stressed that Danylo Halyts'kyi had led the popular struggle against Tatar-Mongol, Hungarian, Polish and German invasions. They thus suggested that residents of western Ukraine actively struggled for the reunification with their East Slavic brothers. After Danylo's death, when L'viv fell under Polish feudal rule in 1349, the Ukrainian *narod* in the region strove for social and national liberation for almost 600 years, which culminated in the glorious reunification of 1939. Dobrik and Kirei despaired that Polish historians deviated from this version of history, portraying L'viv as a Polish city with only coincidental links to Kyivan Rus; they argued that a monument to Prince Danylo would strengthen 'the patriotic education of the workers'.[117] The Ministry of Culture in Kyiv agreed to include the monument in the plan of new constructions for the period between 1981 and 1985.[118] Dobrik and Kirei staked a claim to represent inhabitants of western Ukraine whose distinct history acted as proof of their proletarian and Soviet credentials. In contrast to many portrayals originating in Kyiv,

---

[115] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.25, s. 2287, ark. 70.
[116] TsDAHO, f. 1, op.31, s. 335, ark. 56-58.
[117] DALO, f. P3, op.46, s. 99, ark. 22-23.
[118] DALO, f. P3, op.46, s. 99, ark. 15. However, the monument standing in L'viv today was not built until after 1991.

the way in which they employed historical images of Ukrainian-Polish relations suggested a very different interpretation of who the Ukrainian 'workers' were – by virtue of their prolonged struggle against Polish oppression, the indigenous population of west Ukraine (and their oblast leaders) could legitimately claim to belong to the progressive social forces of the Soviet Union.

Allusions to regional distinctiveness and Polish domination of west Ukraine could be made in public in order to emphasise the local population's belonging to a larger Soviet and internationalist community, but not their special status within it. In this sense, the context in which historical narratives were employed mattered more than their actual content. Top CPSU officials encouraged discussion of how the CPWU and 'brave Ukrainian workers' resisted Polish exploitation only to the extent that, in the their assessment, it would help strengthen the impression that western regions were part of Soviet Ukraine, and even promote the idea of friendship between the exploited 'masses' of Ukraine and Poland. By the late Brezhnev period, state and party bureaucrats in the regions invoked the history of west Ukrainians' opposition to Polish oppression to claim for their oblasts an equal status in the USSR. Inhabitants of western Ukraine could speak about their struggle for social and national liberation to defend themselves against accusations of being unreliable, second-class Soviet citizens. On the other hand, this meant that they could not legitimately employ regional history to claim a special status for the western oblasts, or to articulate specifically local identities. Public discussion of regional history aimed to reinforce both Ukrainian and all-Soviet identities in the western oblasts.

IV.   Conclusion

Inhabitants of Soviet Ukraine participated in a striking number of anniversary celebrations, special concerts, lectures, and parades devoted to East European history. Senior academics and school history teachers, writers, foreign diplomats and historians, as well as state and party bureaucrats in Moscow, Kyiv, and the provinces all contributed to the popularisation of a 'national' vision of East European history, in which the USSR emerged as the leading state in the socialist bloc. Especially in the late 1950s and the early 1960s, some historians made significant attempts to bring out the role of the East European intelligentsia in guiding workers along the

path towards communism. However, these images were then overshadowed by historical portrayals, ranging from the times of Kyivan Rus' to the Great Patriotic War. They suggested that 'Ukrainians', 'Russians', 'Eastern Slavs' and 'Soviet people' were the ones who had brought progress to Eastern Europe, resisting the 'national' and 'social oppression' of other ethnic groups.

From the early 1960s, under pressure from top CPSU apparatchiks, Soviet academicians, university lecturers, teachers, and CPSU activists who disseminated knowledge of East European history were increasingly keen to reproduce formulaic, ritualised stories about the Cossack uprisings against Poland, as well as Soviet 'liberation' of the people's democracies during the Great Patriotic War. Paradoxically, the establishment of a canon of important 'national' heroes and events which distinguished the USSR from other socialist states created new possibilities for imagining national consciousness in Soviet Ukraine. Underlining that the creation of the USSR resulted from centuries of national struggles and social progress, state and party officials in Kyiv and the oblasts, as well as members of the republic's intelligentsia, were safe from accusations of disloyalty and atomism. At the same time, they highlighted the role of particular regions, as well as Ukraine and Ukrainians, in events that were deemed important for 'Soviet' history.

Ukrainian academics and the Central Committee in Kyiv employed representations of Polish-Ukrainian historical relations to strengthen the position of their republic on the all-Soviet arena, and to legitimise their rule over a distinct Ukrainian community. Despite increased levels of Russification and a crackdown on 'nationalist' dissidents under Brezhnev and Shcherbyts'kyi, Ukraine's bureaucrats encouraged inhabitants of the republic to identify themselves as both Ukrainian and Soviet. Apparatchiks sought to highlight the development of class consciousness and Soviet unity, but also identified separate Russian and Ukrainian communities which drove historical progress. Especially by the 1970s, history was even used to suggest that Ukraine and Ukrainians were particularly distinguished members of the Soviet community. In order to reaffirm the unity of Eastern Slavs and the achievements of East European socialist cultures, as well as to criticise controversial views of foreign historians who questioned the unity of Russia and Ukraine, historians celebrated the growth of a distinct Ukrainian culture under Russian and Soviet auspices.

Meanwhile, state and party institutions in the oblasts challenged Kyiv's monopoly over the production of historical images. Once they were able to prove that regional history did not reinforce particularistic identities, officials in the western oblasts sought to demonstrate that 'workers' in their part of Ukraine played a progressive role in history. Resisting attempts to portray inhabitants of other oblasts or post-war arrivals to the region as somehow more reliable Soviet citizens, they spoke about resistance to Polish national and class oppression in the west to portray the locals as part of a wider Ukrainian, Soviet, and proletarian community. Ironically, perhaps, regional history was used to weaken separate regional identities and to show that the locals were worlds apart from their 'unstable' western neighbours who also happened to be their former oppressors.

The question of subjectivity underpinned discussions of the past in Ukraine. On one level, the omnipresence of the Cossacks in Soviet Ukrainian historical memory was partly counterproductive, leading some individuals to question the extent to which 1654 amounted to a 'reunification'. More importantly, state and party bureaucrats, writers, and academics disagreed about the extent to which they should guide the formation of popular opinion in the republic. Despite the ritualisation of public rhetoric, some room still existed to dispute portrayals of the Polish-Ukrainian past, and to advance conflicting views about the role which the state and the 'intelligentsia' should play in the formation of collective identities in Ukraine. The importance of the past in the Soviet public sphere led many party activists and members of the intelligentsia to perceive themselves as an elite responsible for the state of historical knowledge in the USSR. Indeed, although Soviet bureaucrats spoke of 'workers' or 'working masses' to describe the actors behind historical progress, they often implied that war veterans and old communists could claim to represent these communities and thus claim rewards from the Soviet state to the development of which they contributed. This suggests that the historical rhetoric of 'workers' clashed with the implicit idea that there was a Soviet elite which both drove historical progress in the past, and shaped historical imagination in the present. This made the idea of national unity all the more important in containing potential social conflict in the USSR.

Chapter Five

The Elites and the Workers: Polish Solidarity and the Unifying Force of Soviet Patriotism in Ukraine

'There was a Soviet man and a Pole', went a popular joke which circulated around the USSR at the height of the Solidarity crisis. 'Why do you have an eagle in your national emblem when surely you need a kangaroo? After all, you jump high, but with an empty pouch', the Soviet man would ask. 'Why then is there no cupid in the Soviet emblem?', the Pole would retort. 'He too is naked, carries weapons, and imposes his love on everyone'.[1] As this joke demonstrates, Soviet citizens often talked about social tensions and economic problems in Poland and the Soviet bloc as a whole as well as about the rising discord between Moscow and Warsaw. Popular perceptions of Solidarity fuelled a sense of Soviet pride in Ukraine, as many citizens explicitly rejected the Polish trajectory of reform. Criticising the appearance of 'anti-Soviet moods' in Poland, they articulated a range of national stereotypes about 'lazy Poles' who jeopardised the socialist camp. Although Soviet leaders found it increasingly difficult to deliver on their promises of economic prosperity, with the late Brezhnev period witnessing a modest increase in domestic labour unrest, many Soviet citizens condemned Solidarity's political activism, confining their own demands to 'bread and butter' issues.[2]

In August 1980, in the midst of an enormous wave of strikes, the Polish state recognised the 21 demands of the newly formed independent trade union, Solidarity. In contrast to earlier workers' protests, the demands of the union were distinctly political: freedom of association, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, social autonomy and self-government, and equality of rights and duties. As such, they reflected the alliance among workers, intellectuals, students, and the Catholic Church that had been developing since the mid-1970s; they combined a commitment to civic activism with the ideas of the democratic opposition and the moral views of the church. As Grzegorz Ekiert puts it, the rise of Solidarity 'indicated the collapse of a definite concept of social and political order' in Poland. With some ten million members, the movement 'presented a mighty political force that was able to threaten

---

[1] MS 33:82, 8 October 1982, Document AS4728: 'Informatsionnyi biulleten' SMOTa no.26', Moscow, December 1981-January 1982.

[2] L. Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract and Why It Failed: Welfare Policy and Workers' Politics from Brezhnev to Yeltsin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), 73.

not only the domestic order but the entire political stability of the region'.[3] As Solidarity continued to grow over the course of 1981, Soviet criticism of the independent trade unions became increasingly sharp, and Warsaw adopted a more confrontational attitude towards the 'opposition'. This culminated in the imposition of martial law on 13 December 1981, which demonstrated the regime's ability to survive a major challenge from below, but also Solidarity's 'self-limiting' demands and non-violent tactics. While the stalemate between the state and society was not broken, the regime weakened the 'opposition' and forced Solidarity underground.[4]

Party activists and some dissidents had already discussed the problem of workers' unrest in Poland in December 1970, following the bloody riots on the Baltic Sea coast, and in 1976, after the creation of the Workers' Defence Committee.[5] However, the events of 1980 and 1981 attracted more interest in Soviet Ukraine. The rise and fall of Solidarity pushed numerous inhabitants of the republic to blame economic shortages on 'foreigners' across the border. More importantly, citizens commented on the rising economic difficulties in Poland as proof that political activism could undermine the tenuous balance between a 'benevolent' regime and 'beneficiary' workers, as well as increase national tensions in Eastern Europe and create the risk of war.[6] Still, despite the scale of changes taking place just across the border, the rise and fall of Solidarity evoked considerably fewer comments in Soviet Ukraine than the dramatic events of 1956 or the Prague Spring of 1968, though this might partly be explained by the fact that the Soviet army did not intervene in Poland, as it had in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

With a partial exception of the western oblasts, and apart from the first few days after the introduction of the martial law in December 1981, primary party meetings and public agitation gatherings for industrial workers only touched on the Polish

[3] G. Ekiert, 'Rebellious Poles: Political Crises and Popular Protest Under State Socialism, 1945-89', *East European Politics and Societies* 11:2 (1997), 325-327; D. Mason, 'Solidarity as a New Social Movement', *Political Science Quarterly* 104:1 (1989), 41.

[4] Ekiert, 'Rebellious Poles', 331.

[5] For an account of the events see Ekiert, 'Rebellious Poles', 320-325. For a broader analysis of the Polish opposition see D. Ost, *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics: Opposition and Reform in Poland since 1968* (Philadelphia, 1990).

[6] Elizabeth Teague asserts that the attempts by 'Soviet authorities to discredit Poland's free trade union movement were successful in playing on Soviet citizens' inherent distrust of disorder, anarchy and chaos; on their deep, if latent, anti-Polish sentiments; and on their simple human envy of Poles who, even though materially better off than Soviet citizens, could still demand more'. E. Teague, *Solidarity and the Soviet Worker: The Impact of the Polish Events of 1980 on Soviet Internal Politics* (London, 1988), 152- 153.

problem 'in passing'. Agitators spoke about the unfolding developments as part of their regular talks about the 'international situation', and participants in public meetings asked questions about Solidarity. Top Party apparatchiks also organised additional meetings between industrial workers, trade union officials, and factory managers, giving residents an opportunity to raise any complaints that they had against the 'bureaucracy', but also allowing them to comment on the Polish situation. On an unofficial level, KGB reports document that such comments proliferated in the western oblasts. In conversations on public transport, at market places, and in queues outside shops, some residents drew a direct link between economic shortages at home and the Polish strikes. Unfortunately, records of official and unofficial comments are sparse, especially because numerous KGB and Party reports focus on the behaviour of Polish tourists in Ukraine rather than Soviet citizens themselves. Furthermore, they do not reflect the range of views about Solidarity, for some materials about the period are likely still classified. Nonetheless, the categories used in describing and asking questions about Solidarity, as well as the conflicts that emerged between residents of Ukraine and Polish tourists, reflect some popular attitudes towards 'opposition' and strikes in Soviet-style regimes, and views about the role of workers and responsibilities of the state.

The Solidarity period witnessed a major triumph of conservative patriotism in Ukraine. In contrast to 1968, when the various discourses of Soviet and Czechoslovak mass media, as well as illegal pamphlets and publications, fuelled popular awareness of conflicts over the meaning of Sovietness and socialism, the Polish crisis did not evoke constative discussions between proponents of reformist and conservative patriotism. Deemed to be inherently 'non-Soviet' and 'non-socialist', Solidarity could not provide an external commentary on socialist values in the same way that Gomulka's reforms of 1956 and the Prague Spring had. The ritual of naming and shaming domestic 'enemies' was now much less widespread and, with the exception of scattered dissidents, more isolated than in the late 1960s; reformist patriotism and anti-Soviet views did not manifest themselves in 1980 and 1981. Rather, afraid of political and economic instability, perhaps even a war, citizens whose comments were actually recorded sought to underline their loyalty to the Soviet community, which they presented as unified in the face of the Polish threat.

Although these ritualised affirmations of loyalty prevented the rise of political activism,[7] turning into a means of staging support for conservative patriotism, they also exposed social tensions in Ukraine. Members of the Soviet middle class were scared by the turn of events across the border and began to look at their own 'masses' with apprehension. Even as they sought to become more responsive to the material needs of blue-collar workers, party and Komsomol activists, trade union officials, factory managers and other members of the Soviet 'elite' were becoming ever more aware of forming a class apart in the USSR. They used the agitation meetings as well as travel and mass shock-work projects to articulate a form of 'elite' conservative patriotism: in commenting on Solidarity, they underlined their belonging to a unified Soviet community, all the while emphasising that they were more reliable than ordinary Soviet citizens. Most important to them were 'labour discipline' and 'unity', as well as Soviet 'aid' for Poland, up to and including a military intervention across the border.

Meanwhile, however, some of the silent supporters of conservative patriotism from 1968 gained a voice now, challenging these elite articulators of conservative patriotism. In particular, numerous residents of the western oblasts commented on the rise of Solidarity much more extensively than other Soviet citizens. Although scholars have suggested that the biggest potential for spreading 'ideas from Poland' existed in the Soviet west,[8] it actually seems that many inhabitants of the region spoke about their location in the borderlands to prove their allegiance to conservative patriotism. During public meetings, but also in unofficial conversations and upon meeting Polish citizens, they suggested that their historical struggle against Polish oppression, geographical proximity to the border, and exposure to the 'threat' of Polish tourism turned them into a bulwark of Sovietness. They invoked the ideal of unity that members of the middle class were so keen to promote in order to demand an improvement in their living standards, and to criticise Soviet economic subsidies for Poland. Despite dissident attempts to mobilise Soviet workers against the state, these patriots from the western borderlands apparently rejected the Polish trajectory

---

[7] Not only did members of the 'elite' deprive blue-collar workers of the opportunity to collectively defend their interests, as Donald Filtzer demonstrates, but numerous Soviet citizens were satisfied with the limited control which they did have over 'the individual labour process'. D. Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and de-Stalinisation: The Consolidation of the Modern System of Soviet Production Relations, 1953-1964* (Cambridge, 1992), 4-5, 232-236.

[8] R. Solchanyk, 'Polska a sowiecki zachod', *Suchasnist: Zeszyt w jezyku polskim* 1-2 (1985), 79.

of reform: believing that political activism could upset their material wellbeing, they limited their complaints to the economic sphere.

I. Elite concerns

The Polish crisis posed a challenge to the middle class in Ukraine, further reinforcing its sense of distinctiveness. As top CPSU officials instructed the mass media to present Solidarity as a 'nationalist' movement, but also to condemn Warsaw's neglect of the working class, they put pressure on party activists, trade union officials and factory managers in the USSR to highlight their own concern for the 'masses'. This allowed numerous members of these groups to portray themselves as a responsible Soviet 'elite', all the while exposing them to criticism, as public agitation gatherings shamed the Soviet bureaucrats who remained 'insensitive' to workers' needs.[9] Paradoxically, therefore, while emphasising the ideal of Soviet unity vis-à-vis the 'Polish threat', CPSU apparatchiks inspired residents of Ukraine to talk about the responsibilities of the Soviet 'elite' and the rights of the 'working class', thereby encouraging them to articulate different social identities.

Workers' protests in Poland had already inspired party activists in Ukraine to identify workers as a troublesome group and thereby to distinguish themselves from them. Obkom, gorkom, and raikom members and candidate members were very disturbed by the bloody events in Gdansk, Gdynia, and Szczecin in December 1970. During closed party meetings, they spoke about 'workers' as a potentially explosive force that must be controlled and managed. Activists also participated in special gatherings to discuss how Party officials in Soviet-style regimes could prevent the rise of discontent amongst the 'masses'.[10] Expressing concern that the 'Polish communists' had lost touch with the 'working class' in their country, they suggested that 'bureaucrats' in Soviet-style regimes should strive to satisfy the needs of the 'workers'.[11] For example, a party activist from Kyiv stated that the Polish authorities were wrong to raise food prices, thus provoking protests among the 'working class'; the events demonstrated that 'the Party' needed to 'consult the masses' and to

---

[9] Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract*, 77.

[10] DAKO, f.5, op.7, s.1396, ark. 176-177; DAKO, f.5, op.7, s.1396, ark. 179-180; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.355, ark. 47-50.

[11] DAKO, f.5, op.7, s.1396, ark. 176-177.

maintain 'close links with the working class' in order to solve difficult problems.[12] The Polish elite and workers should cooperate, he suggested, even though they had their own distinct interests and concerns. In his view, 'communist leaders' had to satisfy the needs of the 'masses' as well as pursuing other, less popular goals. As a history professor from Kyiv State University put it, Warsaw concentrated on building up heavy industry and producing for export, while failing to improve the living standards of the *trudiashchiesia* in a country so ravaged by the war.[13] Because they were worried that Soviet 'workers' could challenge their authority, too, the Polish crisis of December 1970 encouraged activists in Ukraine to explicitly discuss the relationship between 'the Party' and 'the masses'. Many CPSU members in the republic thus inquired whether prices would be raised in the USSR like they had been in Poland, concerned as they were about the potentially destabilising consequences of such a move.[14] Local leaders in L'viv were particularly apprehensive about the influence of the Polish events on students and workers (*rabochie*) who lived in halls of residence, intensifying 'ideological and educational work' amongst them.[15]

The overwhelming majority of reports concerning reactions to the Polish disturbances in 1970 only refer to discussions amongst the party active. This could suggest that there was relatively little public debate about the events among the broader population. Indeed, owing perhaps to the short duration of the crisis, it appears that even party activists did not publicly discuss the events after December 1970. By contrast, public debates about Solidarity extended from August 1980 and December 1981, slowly raising the spectre of workers' unrest as a threat to Soviet-style regimes. Because they feared that the news from Poland would highlight the conflict between Party leaders and workers, top CPSU officials first attempted to discredit Solidarity as small and insignificant. In line with this, the immediate reaction of the Soviet press, radio, and television to the August events in Poland was

---

[12] DAKO, f.5, op.7, s.1396, ark. 179-180.
[13] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.355, ark. 47-50.
[14] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.355, ark. 47-50.
[15] They took 'operative measures' to investigate popular reactions to the Polish crisis, sent propagandists and lecturers to certain borderland regions, and increased control over the telegraph, the telephone, and the Warsaw-Bucharest and Przemysl-L'viv trains. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.355, ark. 58-60.

silence and a careful evasion of the talk of strikes.[16] After newspapers began to write openly about 'Polish strikes' in the last days of August 1980,[17] abandoning the rhetoric of 'work stoppages... at certain enterprises along the Gdansk coast',[18] they still portrayed Solidarity as an unpopular movement. This tendency was particularly strong after Solidarity was crushed in December 1981, when numerous articles stated that 'most Polish citizens have welcomed the steps carried out by the army and the agencies of law and order'.[19] Even earlier, however, the press often asserted that the power of Solidarity was exaggerated by 'the bourgeois news media',[20] suggesting that the movement was doomed to failure: the Polish press was quoted to reaffirm that the Poles resisted 'Western manipulation' and remained loyal to 'the large family of peoples and countries of the socialist commonwealth'.[21] This was largely a response to concerns that western radio stations broadcasting to the USSR referred to the Polish events to question the leading role of the Party, propagating instead the idea of free trade unions, a strong church, and the relaxation of censorship.[22]

Meanwhile, portrayals of Poland were becoming increasingly alarmist. After August 1980, the CPSU leaders further sought to discredit Solidarity by highlighting the importance of Soviet unity in the face of the 'Polish threat' to peace and economic stability.[23] Whilst underlining Soviet citizens' right to live well, top Party

---

[16] A. Rachwald, 'Introduction' in Arthur R. Rachwald (ed.), *In Search of Poland: The Superpowers' Response to Solidarity, 1980-1989* (Stanford, 1990), 5.

[17] CDSP 32:33, 17 September 1980: 'Shameless Hypocrisy', *Pravda*, 31 August 1980.

[18] CDSP 32:33, 17 September 1980: 'Gierek's Speech', *Pravda*, 20 August 1980; *Izvestiia*, 21 August 1980.

[19] CDSP 33:50, 13 January 1982: 'Martial law introduced', *Pravda*, 14 December 1981, *Izvestiia*, 15 December 1981; 'Homeland was in mortal danger', *Pravda*, 16 December 1981; CDSP 33:51, 20 January 1982: 'On the situation in Poland', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 19 December 1981.

[20] CDSP 32:33, 17 September 1980: 'On events in Poland', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 28 August 1980; CDSP 32:35, 1 October 1980: 'West Pushes Liberalisation for Poland', *Pravda*, 3 September 1980; CDSP 32:49, 7 January 1981: 'The Situation in Poland', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 28 November 1980.

[21] CDSP 32:33, 17 September 1980: 'Article from *Trybuna ludu*', *Pravda*, 24 August 1980; CDSP 32:49, 7 January 1981: 'The Situation in Poland', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 28 November 1980.

[22] RGANI, f.89, 46, d.59, ll. 4-5.

[23] George Kolankiewicz goes so far as to argue that, partly under the influence of Poland, Iurii Andropov tried to increase societal discipline and promote the idea of 'law and order', hoping to use judicial means to increase labour efficiency and 'exact obligations from managers and managed alike'. Andropov appeared to believe that Poland was an extreme example of societal disobedience and the militarisation of its society was necessary to strengthen work discipline and bring back order. The USSR itself, while not nearly as unstable, needed 'militarisation at one remove' to combat absenteeism, high labour mobility, work indiscipline, as well as laxity in management and plan fulfilment. Thus, Andropov's reforms aimed to encourage Soviet citizens to work more efficiently through imposing a strict and well-defined system of rights and responsibilities. They were shaped to inspire blue-collar workers in the USSR to think of themselves as Soviet, in the sense that they were subject to a Soviet law, as distinct from Poland with its own legal and social system. Appreciative of the dangers of mutual over-identification which discredited the Soviet system at home and

leaders defined 'quality of life' in a national framework: they encouraged residents of Ukraine to comment on the unfolding events in the name of a 'Soviet people', distinct from Poland with its specific socio-political conditions, and materially better off than their Polish 'brothers'. As Gyorgy Peteri argues, East European portrayals of the West during the Brezhnev era depicted the 'socialist' lifestyle as superior not necessarily because it offered better access to consumer goods, but rather because it made fewer demands of employees in the workplace, fostered good inter-personal relations, and allowed ordinary citizens to achieve a rather vaguely defined self-fulfilment.[24] During the early 1980s, official Soviet images of the Polish crisis suggested that wellbeing was a specifically Soviet achievement, because it was the USSR that guaranteed peace and material stability in Eastern Europe. The media stressed that the Soviet Union sent economic help to Poland and guaranteed the inviolability of Poland's western border. [25] Consequently, through remaining loyal to the Soviet state and its institutions citizens could assure their own wellbeing and the safety of the socialist camp as a whole, especially because 'foreigners' threatened the integrity of the USSR itself. Shortly before the introduction of martial law, *Pravda* wrote that '[c]ertain provocateurs are questioning the existing Soviet-Polish border', which evoked 'legitimate indignation among Soviet people'.[26] Soviet newspapers increasingly alleged that the Poles were nationalist and anti-Soviet, hinting at the possibility of a Warsaw Pact intervention in Poland.[27] Although these images

encouraged anti-Soviet feelings in Poland, journalists began to emphasise that Warsaw, lagging behind on the road towards communism, should follow its own policies, albeit within the confines of 'a clearly defined set of legal and political norms'. G. Kolankiewicz, 'The Polish Question: Andropov's Answer?' in Leonard Schapiro and Joseph Godson (eds.), *The Soviet Worker: From Lenin to Andropov* (London, 1984), 259, 272-275, 277.

[24] G. Peteri, 'The Occident Within- or the Drive for Exceptionalism and Modernity', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9:4 (2008), 937, 934-935.

[25] CDSP 32:36, 8 October 1980 'Poland gets more Soviet financial aid', *Pravda*, 5 September 1980, *Izvestiia*, 6 September 1980; CDSP 32:38, 28 October 1980: A. Petrov, 'Interference in internal affairs is inadmissible', *Pravda*, 20 September 1980; 'Interference in the PPR's internal affairs continues', *Pravda*, 27 September 1980; Solchanyk, 'Polska', 89.

[26] CDSP 33:50, 13 January 1982: 'On the Situation in Poland', *Pravda*, 11 December 1981. The imposition of the martial law on 13 December 1981 put a rapid end to such alarming articles. CDSP 33:50, 13 January 1982: 'Soviet leaders pleased by Jaruzelski speech', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 15 December 1981; CDSP 35:4, 23 February 1982: 'Cooperation is developing', *Pravda*, 26 January 1982.

[27] CDSP 32:49, 7 January 1981: 'Czech newspaper warns of counter-revolution', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 30 November 1981; 'Warsaw Pact leaders meet in Moscow: Poles say Poland will remain socialist', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 6 December 1981; CDSP 33:17, 27 May 1981: Igor Sinitsin, 'The Great Strength of Unity', *Sovetskaia Rossiia*, 24 April 1981; CDSP 33:30, 26 August 1981: 'A Socialist Poland in possible only in Soviet alliance, Grishin says', *Pravda*, 18 July 1981; CDSP 33:36, 7 October 1981: 'Where is the Gdansk congress headed?', *Pravda*, 10 September 1981, *Izvestiia*, 11 September 1981; CDSP 33:37, 14 October 1981: Vladimir Bolshakov, 'Socialism is peace', *Pravda*,

clashed with portrayals of Solidarity as small and insignificant, they still presented the 'Polish disease' as inherently alien to the USSR itself.

Nevertheless, top leaders in Moscow also suggested that Warsaw must satisfy the 'working class' to maintain stability at home and in Eastern Europe as a whole, which had far-reaching implications for Soviet domestic policies. During the autumn of 1980, they instructed Soviet newspapers to inform the population about all measures undertaken by authorities in Poland that served to 'strengthen socialism', paying special attention to the 'working class' and its 'Marxist-Leninist party'.[28] Accordingly, Soviet mass media charged that Edward Gierek had failed to fulfill his obligations towards the Polish 'working class' and, in the immediate aftermath of the strikes in August 1980, they talked about the 'improper functioning of a number of structures, which in turn gave rise to dissatisfaction among the population in the economic and social fields'.[29] At the same time, official media portrayals of Poland left no doubt that the PUWP would restore peaceful relations with the 'masses', with censors stopping those issues of Polish periodical publications that criticised the achievements of Polish communists in the post-war period.[30] Thus, the mass media suggested that Polish society was divided into the 'elite' who had to provide, and the 'masses' that received benefits and remained loyal to Party 'leadership'.[31]

The Polish crisis therefore brought out tensions between the 'rulers' and the 'ruled' in a Soviet-style regime, and it consequently spurred top CPSU officials to pressurise industrial managers, trade union officials, and party activists in the regions of Ukraine to become more responsive to people's needs and opinions at home, too.

---

13 September 1981; CDSP 33:38, 28 October 1981: 'Polish leaders urged to curb anti-Sovietism', *Pravda*, 19 September 1981, *Izvestiia*, 20 September 1981.

[28] RGANI, f.89, 46, d.59, ll. 6-7.

[29] CDSP 32:35, 1 October 1980: 'Reason gained the upper hand', *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, 2 September 1980; CDSP 32:38, 28 October 1980: A. Petrov, 'Interference in internal affairs is inadmissible', *Pravda*, 20 September 1980.

[30] RGANI, f.89, 46, d.81, ll. 15-20.

[31] This is why, as problems persisted in Poland, the Soviet media talked about augmenting discipline amongst the Polish 'working class' to stifle the strikes which threatened the socialist system, all the while continuing to emphasise that the PUWP needed to grant concessions to the 'masses'. CDSP 32:49, 7 January 1981: 'Step-up in antisocialist activity seen', *Pravda*, 27 November 1980; CDSP 32:52, 28 January 1981: M. Baglai, 'No place for strikes under socialism', *Pravda*, 26 December 1980; CDSP 33:1, 4 February 1981: 'Provocational demands', *Pravda*, 2 January 1981; 'New Trade Unions as Political Opposition?', *Pravda*, 6 January 1981; CDSP 33:17, 27 May 1981: Vladimir Lomeiko, 'Evil Force', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 15 April 1981; CDSP 33:30, 26 August 1981: 'Kania reports on economic crisis, Solidarity, threat to socialism', *Pravda*, 15 July 1981; CDSP 33:40, 4 November 1981: 'On the situation in Poland', *Pravda*, 2 October 1981 and *Izvestiia*, 3 October 1981.

In September 1981, *Pravda* stated that the events in Poland demonstrated the necessity of utilising public opinion as a barometer to provide advance warning of 'contradictions and conflict situations in socialist society'.[32] Similarly, Konstantin Chernenko's article in *Voprosy istorii KPSS* (*Issues of the History of the CPSU*) from February 1982 emphasised that 'the Polish events showed the "vital significance" of heeding popular opinion'.[33] Top officials sought to make members of the Soviet middle class more attuned to the mood among the population, and especially among blue-collar workers, hoping that this would decrease the potential appeal of Solidarity. Particularly in late 1980, the CPU Central Committee considered this to be a pressing issue, as it strove to intensify the contacts between 'workers' and Soviet bureaucrats. Describing the influence of the Polish crisis in Ukraine, Party leaders identified numerous cases where officials at individual enterprises and building-sites proved unresponsive to the pressing demands of the republic's *trudiashchiesia*.[34] Similarly, when top apparatchiks in Moscow wrote about work conducted 'in connection' with informing the population about Solidarity, they charged that trade union officials were unfriendly and indifferent towards Soviet blue-collar workers, rarely visiting them at factories to better their working environment.[35] Consequently, top Party apparatchiks held meetings with the republic's trade union council to improve labour conditions and health services at large enterprises.[36] They asserted that local bureaucrats should make a special effort to improve the material well-being of the Soviet industrial workers, increasing the supply of consumer goods and selling them directly at big factories. In October 1980, they also resolved to strengthen control over the building of hospitals and schools, housing, restaurants and canteens, as well as cultural institutions.[37]

These pressures from Kyiv and Moscow persuaded obkom officials in Ukraine to improve the organisation of agitation meetings for rank-and-file party members and many non-party citizens. Regional apparatchiks organised regular meetings under the banner of *Den lektora*, where representatives of the Znanie society instructed lecturers and agitators to answer any queries about Solidarity from 'class positions',

---

[32] Teague, *Solidarity*, 74.
[33] Teague, *Solidarity*, 69.
[34] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 49-53.
[35] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7.
[36] Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract*, 65, 67, 79.
[37] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7.

using information from the Soviet mass media.[38] They were thus to reassure audience members that the communist parties in Eastern Europe, including the CPSU itself, represented the needs of the 'working class'. In the autumn of 1980, the Volhynia obkom went so far as to set up a special commission which regularly met with secretaries of primary party organisations from large factories, held seminars for agitators who addressed workers on the topic of 'combating bourgeois ideologies', and 'systematically analysed' the locals' questions about Solidarity.[39] As in 1968, when the ritual of naming and shaming 'enemies' had allowed party activists to portray numerous inhabitants of Ukraine as 'conservative patriots', public discussions about Solidarity helped to differentiate the stable majority from isolated, unreliable individuals. In L'viv, for example, the obkom first secretary distinguished between the information that lecturers provided for groups of students and workers during public gatherings, which allowed them to investigate popular opinion about international and domestic problems, and the 'individual work' that they conducted with former prisoners convicted for 'nationalist activity', citizens who kept in touch with relatives in the capitalist West, as well as those 'under the influence of Israeli Zionist propaganda'.[40] Likewise, while obkom officials in Volhynia were prepared to answer students' questions and concerns during special agitation meetings, considering the 'historical past' and geographical proximity to Poland, they also intensified 'individual preventative' work amongst former OUN members and their supporters, as well as 'religious sectarians' and Roman Catholics.[41] Thus, it was the demands of the Soviet 'collective' which party officials were keen to explore and respond to, all the while focusing on more repressive measures amongst the 'individuals' whom they considered less Soviet.

Consequently, party activists in the regions addressed the public about the 'unprecedented political events' in Poland, outlining the 'correct' Soviet point of view.[42] For instance, commenting on Brezhnev's meeting with Gierek during party-active meetings in late August 1980, they underlined that Warsaw must restore the

---

[38] DAKO, f.P5, op.86, s.243, ark. 106-107; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 15-18; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4.
[39] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 122-128.
[40] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100.
[41] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 122-128.
[42] Cook, *The Soviet Social Contract*, 77.

'mutual trust between the leadership and society'.[43] Local party activists were also keen to monitor popular attitudes towards the Polish crisis, which was particularly evident in the western borderlands.[44] In order to investigate the mood amongst the 'masses' there, lecturers and agitators 'answered workers' questions' during special meetings about Poland held in September and October 1980. The bulk of these gatherings took place in parts of western Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, and Latvia with significant Polish minorities.[45] Moreover, on 4 October 1980 and 25 March 1981, the authorities organised special 'political days' for residents of the republic where agitators devoted much attention to the Polish crisis,[46] and in June 1981 soldiers, party members, and non-party 'workers' throughout the country participated in gatherings about the Polish crisis, discussing the CPSU Central Committee's letter to the Polish leaders.[47]

More importantly, however, top apparatchiks' pressure to 'reestablish' close links with the working class pushed lecturers, factory managers, and trade union officials to organise public discussion in such a way as to downplay the importance of Solidarity and highlight instead the achievements of Soviet power. In contrast to 1956 and 1968, when the local authorities organised numerous gatherings specifically in order to discuss the Hungarian and Czechoslovak crises, most citizens talked about Solidarity during meetings which were explicitly called to debate other issues. Arguably, this was in line with the wider tendency of downplaying the importance of the independent trade unions in Poland. Rank-and-file party members discussed the unfolding crisis during electoral meetings in October 1980,[48] while other residents asked many questions about the situation in Poland at gatherings devoted to the Warsaw Pact meeting in December 1980,[49] and again during public debates about the 26th Congress of the CPSU Central Committee in April 1981.[50] The topic of Poland was also very prominent when residents debated *Der Spiegel*'s

---

[43] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 50-55.

[44] Kuzio and Wilson, *Ukraine*, 57. This may go some way towards explaining why plans to found a republican, Ukrainian public opinion testing centre were drawn up at the beginning of 1981, before other Soviet republics. Roman Solchanyk, 'Polska', 88-89.

[45] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7, 49-53; DAKO, Kyiv, f.P5, op.86, s.243, ark. 106-107.

[46] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 49-53; TsDAHO, Kyiv, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 5-8.

[47] RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 20-23, 30-33, 35-39.

[48] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100.

[49] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88.

[50] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 12-13.

interview with Brezhnev in November 1981.[51] Moreover, agitators and lecturers regularly addressed people at their factories and collective farms, touching on such general topics as 'international affairs', 'economic development', and 'Marxist-Leninist ideology',[52] which gave participants an opportunity to discuss the unfolding events in Poland. Quoting his own experience in July 1981, a political commentator of the 'Novosti' press agency noted that 'no matter what audience one addresses today with a lecture about international affairs, the first question from the floor will unavoidably concern Poland'.[53] CPSU officials thus channeled public discussion about Solidarity into the relatively safe context of agitation meetings about the great achievements of the CPSU, the victory of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the might of the Warsaw Pact, and the international stature of Brezhnev.

The main purpose of these gatherings was not to shape popular opinion about Poland, but rather to examine and respond to workers' complaints about socio-economic problems at home, thus helping to contain any potential unrest. While alarming reports about the need to improve workers' living conditions were especially frequent during the autumn of 1980, with leaders then turning towards 're-establishing' discipline among blue-collar workers,[54] party activists, trade union officials, and bureaucrats in charge of trade, among others, were again very concerned about improving the wellbeing of blue-collar workers and the vaguely defined 'masses' at the end of 1981, that is immediately after General Jaruzelski introduced martial law in Poland on 13 December. In Kyiv, the gorkom held a special meeting at three o'clock in the afternoon on the very same day, when the city's top officials instructed secretaries of the raikoms, heads of the city's social organisations, and officials of the gorispolkom to address state and party bureaucrats in different parts of the city later in the evening. For their part, primary party organisations were to conduct appropriate work immediately 'among the masses', focusing on the workers' collectives in particular. The gorkom also instructed the city's bureaucrats to 'increase political alertness' and act decisively against any 'negative phenomena'. No doubt, this implied that the authorities would closely monitor popular opinion to crack down on anyone who dared to criticise Jaruzelski's

[51] RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 61-64, 65-70.
[52] DAKO, f.P5, op.90, s.399, ark. 4-6.
[53] Solchanyk, 'Polska', 93.
[54] Teague, *Solidarity*, 322.

actions – the gorkom specified that the city's internal security organs should be closely involved in the preventative measures, and local officials visited Polish students in Kyiv's halls of residence to make sure that they expressed support for martial law. The local administration further introduced more positive measures to assure calm and stability. They made a special effort to monitor public transport and other services in the city, while seeking to guarantee reliable food and fuel supplies, as well as making sure that the central heating functioned properly. In its conclusion, the report emphasised that the local population understood the situation correctly, beginning as normal the working day on Monday, 14 December.[55] Similarly, in the Zhytomir oblast, a region with a sizable Polish minority, the obkom issued special orders to gorkom and raikom secretaries on 13 December, requesting detailed information about popular moods in the oblast, and instructing them to monitor local trade, transport and communal services. Officials in all the primary party committees, as well as managers at large industrial enterprises, were on a twenty-four hour call to help control the state of affairs.[56] Under pressure from Moscow and Kyiv, members of these groups strove to prove that they acted as a reliable middle class, responsible for maintaining peace and stability among the 'masses'.

Top Soviet apparatchiks in Moscow and Kyiv observed the developments in Poland with a strong sense of apprehension. By putting pressure on party activists, factory managers and trade union bureaucrats to investigate popular mood among blue-collar workers and other citizens, top CPSU officials made them painfully aware of the unresolved conflict between the ideal of harmony and the reality of social disunity in Soviet-style regimes. On the one hand, this increased among these groups a sense of distinctiveness from the 'masses', whilst also encouraging them to create spaces where citizens could press their demands from Soviet officials in the name of their workers' collectives. On the other hand, as portrayals of Solidarity pointed towards national animosities in Eastern Europe and Soviet superiority in the region, they encouraged residents of Ukraine to articulate a sense of Soviet patriotism. This evoked two distinct types of reaction to the rise and fall of Solidarity in Ukraine. Members of the Soviet middle class took advantage of the various official meetings which they organised to present themselves as the vanguard of

---

[55] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 12-14.
[56] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 10-11.

Soviet society and to suggest that they were more reliable patriots than other residents of Ukraine. Meanwhile, partly through escaping the confined environment of public agitation gatherings, numerous blue-collar workers and residents of western Ukraine challenged this elitist vision, seeking to prove that they were equal members of the wider Soviet community who had the right to demand more material benefits from the state.

II. Conservative Patriotism and Elites

The Polish crisis fuelled a sense of superiority among many Soviet citizens in Ukraine. Numerous party activists, leading workers, war veterans, and factory managers portrayed themselves as successful leaders and the most reliable members of Soviet society who protected the interests of socialism. More aware of their own distinctiveness from the 'masses' than in 1968, these proponents of conservative patriotism spoke about the importance of 'social harmony' in Soviet-style regimes. They thus condemned Poland's departure from the Soviet social model, spoke about the great Soviet victory over fascism and exploitation in Eastern Europe, and recalled the social and national inequalities in pre-war Poland. As they discussed the rise of Solidarity, these self-identified members of Soviet elite further expressed support for the idea of the USSR's 'aid' to Poland, explicitly stating that they would back a military intervention in the 'brotherly socialist state'.

Participants in the public agitation meetings who spoke between August 1980 and December 1981 became increasingly keen to underline that they condemned developments in Poland. In the autumn of 1980, numerous *trudiashchiesia* expressed concerns that the 'free trade unions' would be untamed and disengaged from the principles of 'working class struggle for socialism and communism' and the 'common interests of the state',[57] and they frequently referred to such stock tropes as 'proletarian internationalism', 'Marxism-Leninism', and the 'strength of the socialist commonwealth'.[58] Public statements about Solidarity became still more hostile in the course of 1981. In May, for example, 'workers of the republic' were dismayed at the

---

[57] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, l. 8.
[58] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88.

free reign of 'nationalist and chauvinist' forces in Poland.[59] A month later, increasing numbers of citizens who spoke in public denounce 'anti-Soviet statements' made on Polish television, especially upset apparently by claims to the effect that the USSR had 'robbed Poland'. This showed that the Poles had forgotten just how much the Soviet Union had done for them.[60] Many residents of Ukraine, including numerous party members and soldiers, claimed that the 'Soviet people' supported the idea of a military intervention in Poland.[61]

Official reports make it difficult to determine who voiced such statements during public meetings. They describe participants in very vague terms, such as the *trudiashchiesia*, but it appears that members of the Soviet middle class were by far the most outspoken participants in public agitation meetings. War veterans, university professors, party activists, and other prominent citizens sought to prove that they were personally offended by the rise of Polish nationalism, particularly through recalling Soviet feats during the Great Patriotic War.[62] In June 1981, for instance, a lieutenant from Zaporizhzhia and honorary citizen of the Polish town of Raciborz called for PUWP leaders to act more decisively, stating that he had fought for the liberation of Poland during the Great Patriotic War and knew what a great price had been paid for its 'honour and freedom'.[63] Similarly, soon after the introduction of martial law, a metal worker from Berdychiv claimed that this was the only possible solution which guaranteed that the gains of socialism in Poland would be preserved. To give credence to his views, he was quick to add that he had fought for the 'liberation of Warsaw'.[64]

Given that party activists and other members of the middle class grew increasingly concerned about social tensions in Soviet-style regimes during this period, it is hardly surprising that public attacks on Solidarity acted as a means through which they both reaffirmed their special status in Soviet society and underscored their links with the 'masses'. An engineer from Volhynia thus spoke in

---

[59] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4.

[60] RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 35-39.

[61] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4; RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 35-39.

[62] A professor from L'viv thus stated that foreign-inspired anti-socialist forces should not be allowed to undermine the foundations of socialism in Poland for which 'such a high price had been paid'. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88.

[63] RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 35-39.

[64] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 51-53.

the name of his 'borderland kolkhoz' in December 1980, pledging support for the Soviet army, but also welcoming the 'timely announcement' by East European leaders that warned off all those seeking to 'turn back the wheel of history' and 'sow hostility between countries of the socialist camp'.[65] Speaking on behalf of entire communities was in fact a common rhetorical device used by advocates of conservative patriotism who sought to present themselves as an elite, allowing a senior factory worker from Kharkiv to claim that he represented workers who were supposedly troubled by the weak position of the Polish leadership; Warsaw continued to negotiate with 'anti-socialist elements' when it was clearly time to 'use force', he stated.[66] Whereas these individuals who spoke during public meetings portrayed themselves as part of the collectives at their places of work, they also acted as self-appointed spokesmen for the 'masses' and highlighted their readiness to defend 'socialist achievements' in Eastern Europe.

Furthermore, while explicit expressions of conservative patriotism were most frequent amongst members of the middle class who spoke during agitation meetings, numerous other inhabitants of Ukraine manifested both their commitment to Soviet unity and their 'special status' in Soviet society by participating in various state-sponsored shock-work projects and international exchanges of workers' collectives. Immediately after the introduction of martial law in Poland, over 2,500 thousand employees of large industrial enterprises, state and party officials in charge of trade and the food industry, lorry drivers, as well as students from technical schools and universities spoke about their 'class solidarity' with Poland as they prepared New Year's presents for children from Katowice. Despite the widespread participation of blue-collar workers in preparing the gifts, the action was a means through which party and Komsomol activists, as well as 'leading workers', both established their patriotic credentials and advanced their 'elitist' claims. Shcherbyts'kyi thus distinguished the Kyiv and Donets'k obkoms for their contribution to the project: he stressed that 'the best drivers' from Kyiv and Kharkiv, who were Party and Komsomol members, delivered the gifts to Poland, where they met prominent state and party officials and received flowers from children, while the Polish press and

---

[65] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88.
[66] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4.

television covered the event.[67] Top party officials believed that the action strengthened citizens' sense of 'unity' and pride vis-à-vis the Poles, and the programme continued in the years to come, with thirteen confectionary factories and ten oblasts preparing around 560,000 gifts for Poland in December 1983.[68] Whether Soviet citizens who contributed to the project believed that they were in fact more hard working or better off than their 'socialist brothers' remains unclear, but local activists manifested an outward commitment to 'socialist labour' and 'Soviet unity' through not only participating in the scheme, but also organising and coordinating it. They thus manifested a link with the 'masses', all the while distinguishing themselves as an elite.

This peculiar mixture of elitist and inclusive, demotic claims of conservative patriotism, already inherent in the ritualised practices of 'staging consent' in 1968, was most palpable during international travel in the early 1980s. Although exchanges of 'production collectives' between Poland and the USSR were severely constrained from the end of 1980, not really picking up again until mid-1983,[69] travel was an important way many members of the middle class manifested a commitment to 'helping' Poland and teaching foreigners about the importance of 'equality' and 'labour'. In the first half of 1981, the number of Soviet people travelling to Poland was cut by 44 per cent, from 45,400 to 24,500. In some ways, this made travel into a more nobilitating experience, as it was mainly war veterans, leading workers, friendship society activists, trade union officials, and amateur artists who continued to visit Poland to 'influence' the situation in their country.[70] Even when tourism picked up in 1983, most Soviet citizens who travelled to Poland were prominent members of their local communities: fifty per cent of Soviet citizens preparing to visit Poland were party members, the great majority was active in the Komsomol, and they included leading students, workers, and sportsmen.[71] Furthermore, travel was now more strictly defined as a means to promote Soviet values abroad. Party leaders instructed republican and local newspapers to write more about the Polish workers' collectives in Ukraine, thus showing how the Poles learnt from Soviet

---

[67] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 1-2.
[68] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2600, ark. 79.
[69] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2600, ark. 79.
[70] RGANI, f.89, 46, d.67, ll. 5-7; DALO, f.P3, op.44, s.77, ark. 2-4; DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.84, ark. 1-2.
[71] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2600, ark. 51.

experience.[72] Because tourist activists were reluctant to send Soviet citizens to 'rest' in Poland, associated as it was with a prolonged stay in the country, they focused on promoting 'educational tourism'.[73] In other words, in the first half of 1981 alone, a large proportion of the carefully vetted 25,000 citizens who travelled to Poland, as well as scores of residents who met the Poles visiting Ukraine, portrayed themselves as Soviet people who taught foreigners about building socialism.

Admittedly, blunders did occur, and some members of the Soviet middle class failed to prove their patriotic credentials upon encountering the Poles. Top CPSU officials reprimanded their subordinates when they failed to adapt to the Poles' requirements. For instance, the Kharkiv branch of the Znanie society organised a series of lectures for Polish building brigades, but their leaders refused to participate in them, claiming that the Polish *trudiashchiesia* 'were not used to this form of information'. At the same time, the society's lecturers did not respond to the Poles' request to address groups of workers about history, geography, politics, and international relations, because (as the report put it) none of them had prepared lectures on these topics. To make matters worse, the Soviet side failed to fulfill their part of the work plans or to guarantee reliable supplies, which gave 'the foreigners' a reason to voice 'demagogic statements'.[74] More often, however, Party officials praised members of Soviet delegations for trying to maintain close contacts with Polish workers, despite the latter's 'negative reactions to the rise of Solidarity', reluctance to socialise, and preponderance for 'anti-socialist' and anti-Soviet opinions.[75] Soviet citizens also resisted the Poles' 'unfounded accusations' that they stole their personal items as well as building materials from the storage.[76] Thus, residents of Ukraine proved their loyalty to the united Soviet community, and

---

[72] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 51.

[73] RGANI, f.89, 46, d.67, ll. 2-3.

[74] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 33-37.

[75] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 33-37; RGANI, f.5, op.89, d.67, ll. 12-14. CPSU officials claimed that their citizens could exert a very positive influence over the Poles: influenced by 'bourgeois propaganda' and demoralised by a system where they were paid by the hour without taking into account the effectiveness of their labour, Polish workers could not keep up with the Soviet citizens' pace of work. This led CPSU leaders to suggest that Soviet workers' collectives should continue to visit Poland to rectify the situation, and their stay should perhaps even be extended from two to three weeks each. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2600, ark. 51.

[76] In Ukraine, top CPU Central Committee officials were alarmed that Polish workers in the republic displayed 'negative attitudes towards Soviet people': in Kyiv, for example, a Polish student brigade leader warned his group that the Soviet staff would search through their personal items in the hotel bedrooms, and encouraged them to demand that the locks on their doors be changed. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, ark. 33-37; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2600, ark. 60-61.

alienation from the Poles, by simply participating in the exchanges. At the same time, international travel and exchanges of workers' collectives in particular were a means for a large section of Ukraine's middle class to demonstrate their political maturity and to reaffirm their status as the most reliable Soviet citizens during the height of the Solidarity crisis.

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the uneasy combination of elitism and egalitarianism did not always hold, fuelling tensions in Soviet Ukrainian society, particularly in the western borderlands. Some 'elitist' locals tried to prove their conservative patriotism by contrasting themselves with what they believed to be unstable citizens. The KGB thus investigated an anonymous letter sent to the L'viv obkom, in which the author described food shortages in the region and blamed 'hostile, subversive actions' by enemies of the Soviet power: 'after all, you can expect anything in western Ukraine'. The author identified himself as a 'good communist', but he was worried that the Polish events could spill over into the region. 'If you only knew, comrade Dobrik', the letter continued, 'what goes on in L'viv, especially after dark'. People come out on the streets and yell out hostile slogans, Polish tourists engage in illegal trade right in front of the opera house and in public toilets, and they all bribe the militia to stay away.[77] Similarly, another letter from 'a war veteran' failed to accept that there was a shortage of flour-based foods in western Ukraine, especially because bread was readily available. The author asked the obkom to 'check out the pasta factory', suspecting that its employees were hoarding products to provoke an outbreak of Polish-style strikes in western Ukraine.[78] These elitist advocates of conservative patriotism who picked up on social tensions in the borderlands were critical of the local authorities, whom they considered too lenient: they should send out more plain-clothes officers onto the streets of L'viv, one letter suggested.[79]

Under pressure to condemn the Polish social upheaval in the name of a harmonious Soviet people, numerous residents of Ukraine explicitly identified with unified and peaceful workers' communities. They thereby reaffirmed their position as important leaders in their local communities, all the while downplaying the idea that Soviet society could become as divided as Poland. Many Party and Komsomol

---

[77] DALO, f.P3, op.44, s.85, ark. 43-46.
[78] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 109.
[79] DALO, f.P3, op.44, s.85, ark. 43-46.

activists, war veterans, leading workers and other members of the middle class used various official forums, such as public agitation gatherings and organised travel, to show that they condemned the strikes in Poland and were ready to 'assist' the Poles in building socialism through defeating 'reactionary forces' and setting a good example for the 'lazy' foreigners. Thus, conformity, participation in ritual representations of Soviet superiority, and outward commitment to 'honest labour' emerged as the main features of elitist conservative patriotism, allowing numerous residents of the republic to underline their special commitment to the Soviet community.

III. Conservative Patriotism in the Borderlands

Many inhabitants of the western borderlands challenged elitist visions of Soviet conservative patriotism. At a time when Party apparatchiks sought to satisfy the needs and demands of workers' collectives in the USSR, they downplayed the importance of social and regional divisions in the USSR. Contrasting Sovietness to 'Polishness' in explicitly national terms, many self-styled patriots in the borderlands argued that they were part of the Soviet collective precisely because they were more exposed to Polish influences than other Soviet citizens. When they discussed the Polish 'threat' to Soviet stability during conversations in shops and on public transport, as well as arguing with Polish tourists in western Ukraine, many people escaped the confines of official agitation meetings. It was in such public sites that they articulated the idea that most residents of the western oblasts were reliable Soviet people, more 'cultured' and hard working than the 'lazy Poles'. This emboldened a large proportion of the local population to criticise the authorities for failing to provide a decent standard of living at home while offering economic aid to Poland. Still, despite dissident attempts to reach out to the disgruntled 'masses', patriotism in the borderlands remained conservative, with popular criticism of the authorities largely limited to the economic sphere.

A few residents of the western oblasts, including former members of nationalist groups, the faithful of the illegal Uniate church, and Roman Catholics, expressed

sympathy for the Polish opposition.[80] According to the L'viv obkom, 'individual citizens' sympathised with the independent trade union movement under the influence of western radio stations, the Polish media, and tourist trips to Poland.[81] By March 1981 the authorities had confiscated 55 bibles, 500 copies of a religious calendar, and 1100 religious books and brochures in Russian and Ukrainian which Polish citizens had posted to private addresses in the USSR, including many in western Ukraine.[82] As members of the Polish clergy transported to Ukraine not only Polish religious literature, but also Ukrainian émigré publications such as *Suchasnist*,[83] the local bureaucrats in L'viv were concerned that contacts between Soviet dissidents and members of Solidarity who distributed 'illegal newspapers and leaflets' in the region would strengthen Ukrainian separatism and religious feelings.[84] Despite such fears, I have found considerably fewer reports about anti-Soviet reactions to the events in Eastern Europe in the early 1980s than in 1956 and 1968. While numerous KGB reports relating to the period are still classified, available evidence nonetheless indicates that residents of west Ukraine remained relatively calm during the rise and fall of Solidarity. For one, the local authorities themselves believed that 'hostile' views were confined to a very small section of society.[85] Just after Jaruzelski introduced martial law, Soviet officials from L'viv surveyed popular opinion in every region and every village, at industrial enterprises and collective farms, educational institutions, halls of residence, as well as market places, bus and railway stations, and on public transport; even then, they concluded that the population voiced 'no negative opinions' in relation to the Polish crisis.[86] Similarly, in November 1980, obkom leaders in Volhynia appeared surprised that even the 'usual suspects', such as members of ethnic minorities, former OUN

---

[80] MS 32/85, 20 September 1985, Document AS 5515: *Khronika katolicheskoi tserkvi na Ukraine. Ekstrennyi vypusk*, Western Ukraine, not earlier than 18 November 1984; MS 40/84, 21 December 1984, Document AS5371: *Khronika katolicheskoi tserkvi na Ukraine* 1, Western Ukraine, not earlier than 1 March 1984; I. Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), 353; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 8-10.
[81] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 84-86.
[82] RGANI, f.89, op.46, d.81, ll. 15-20.
[83] I. Zaitsev, 'Pol's'ka opozytsiia 1970-80-kh rokiv pro zasady ukrains'ko-pol's'koho porozuminnia' in Iurii Slyvka (ed.), *Deportatsii ukraintsiv ta poliakiv: kinets 1939- pochatok 50-kh rokiv* (L'viv, 1998), 57.
[84] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 43.
[85] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2228, ark. 7-14; RGANI, Moscow, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7, 49-53.
[86] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 51-53.

activists, Uniates, and Roman Catholics voiced 'no negative views' about the socio-political changes in Poland.[87]

While the Polish crisis generated conflict and frustration in L'viv society, Party officials seemed to give little credence to the anonymous denunciations concerning the spread of 'anti-social behaviour'. Trouble-makers included *fartsovshchiki*,[88] makers of *samogon*, and 'women of questionable reputation', but these were hardly a specifically west Ukrainian problem, turning up in other parts of the republic that hosted Polish tourists.[89] The local militia also used 'administrative measures' against eighty inhabitants of L'viv who illegally rented out rooms to foreign tourists.[90] Nonetheless, though the apparatchiks were very alarmed about smuggling, their reports placed the blame for such 'non-Soviet' behaviour almost entirely on the Polish tourists visiting the region and hardly mentioned Soviet citizens who engaged in illegal trade with the Poles. The proposed solution was to limit the number of Polish tourists in the region and thereby to bring back peace and stability.[91]

In fact, many residents of the western oblasts proved their status as 'conservative patriots' through defining Sovietness in opposition to 'Polishness' and thus downplaying the importance of social and regional divisions in Ukraine. To put it differently, numerous inhabitants of western Ukraine articulated a vision of patriotism specific to the borderlands, which exposed Soviet-Polish 'national' tensions whilst obscuring conflicts in Ukrainian society. Firstly, in letters to relatives across the border, many citizens in the region recalled the horrors of 'pans' Poland' and expressed concern about Polish 'anti-socialist forces' that laid claims to western Ukraine.[92] They made references to the history of Ukrainian-Polish conflicts in the

---

[87] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 122-128. Similarly, party officials in L'viv were relieved to find that many members of the illegal Uniate church did not become more active during the Pope's 1983 visit to Poland, alienated as they were by what they saw as the Pope's 'Polish nationalism'. RGANI, f.5, op.89, d.82, ll. 37-50.

[88] The terms referred to individuals who illegally purchased products from foreigners to sell them on at a profit.

[89] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 33-37.

[90] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.86, ark. 22-24.

[91] The militia detained the Poles who left the Warsaw-Bucharest train at the L'viv train station and sent them back to Poland. Four groups of officers were given the task of preventing Poles from boarding off the trains by pulling the handbreak or during 'technical breaks' in the middle of nowhere. Over 1,600 officers patrolled the roads leading into L'viv, preventing Polish cars from entering the town, and the gorispolkom reinforced the ranks of militiamen who patrolled the places where Polish tourists gathered, such as the areas surrounding hotels 'L'viv' and 'Intourist'. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 8-10; DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.86, ark. 22-24.

[92] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4; DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 84-86.

region to show their alienation from the opposition movement across the border. While it is difficult to determine whether they knew that the local authorities would pick up on their views, other citizens also spoke about the need to protect Ukrainian national rights against Poland in public. During agitation meetings, for instance, members of workers' collectives from Volhynia, a region with a predominantly Ukrainian-speaking population, complained that 'anti-Soviet attitudes' in Poland forced them to speak Russian and not Ukrainian when they visited their relatives across the border. Others still invoked a manifestly local, borderland identity, underlining that the crisis was particularly worrying as it was taking place nearby.[93] Thus, they turned their 'west Ukrainianness' into a positive marker of Soviet identity.

As articulators of conservative patriotism, numerous residents of the borderlands claimed that they worked hard for the benefit of 'ungrateful' Poles. This is not to suggest that productivity increased, but rather that Soviet citizens spoke about the value of 'honest labour' and the harmfulness and 'foreignness' of strikes. In talking to other people queuing up in front of a shop, a local man from L'viv thus claimed that the Poles were 'idiots' who would harm themselves through not working.[94] Many citizens invoked a national rhetoric when they contrasted the 'lazy' Poles with hard-working Soviet people. The reports do not always specify the context in which they voiced their opinions, but it seems that at least some of the views were made during public meetings. A telephone operator from Luts'k sounded bitter as she stated that the 'chaotic' situation across the border arose because the Poles were used to eating 'tasty food' and living well, but they did not want to work.[95] Similarly, another local woman recalled how Soviet workers in different oblasts and republics of the USSR were eager to help each other during recent floods, but the Poles were not used to honest labour: they enjoyed a jolly life with no worries, expecting Soviet people to work for their benefit.[96] In this way, many inhabitants of western Ukraine spoke about the Polish events to highlight their own industriousness as 'Soviet people'. This may explain why they often claimed to be deeply offended to hear Polish accusations to the effect that the USSR exploited its satellite states

---

[93] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 122-128.
[94] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.
[95] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 49-53.
[96] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 122-128.

economically: individuals who had recently travelled to Poland expressed their shock at rumours that Polish meat had been sent to the USSR for the Moscow Olympics, while sugar and flour left the country through the eastern border in train carriages labeled 'cement'.[97]

Encounters with Polish tourists who visited the region provided a context where many residents of the western oblasts articulated ideas of conservative patriotism. Upon encountering Polish citizens, they often denounced their 'incorrect' opinions about socialism and the USSR. Between January and May 1981, 110,000 Polish citizens passed through the Chernivtsi oblast on the way to and from Romania and Bulgaria,[98] and many 'transit tourists' stopped off to trade and see the sites of L'viv, too. Meanwhile, about 5,000 Poles visited the L'viv oblast between October and December 1980 as part of organised tour groups, although their numbers were significantly slashed in 1981.[99] They talked to 'Soviet people', giving a 'hostile' assessment to the Polish events, spread rumours about the Polish and Ukrainian resistance to Soviet rule, and openly called for the local people to organise Polish-style strikes in the USSR.[100] Moreover, some members of Polish tour groups in the region voiced views critical not only of the PUWP, but also the USSR. They warned their Soviet interlocutors that 'blood would flow' if the USSR invaded Poland, as well as criticising the incorporation of western Ukraine into the USSR in 1939.[101] According to official reports, most locals resisted such 'provocative statements'. Not only did Intourist guides organise additional meetings between Polish tourists and 'leading workers' of the oblast,[102] but 'ordinary' citizens condemned the Poles' anti-Soviet views, too. They were infuriated by the 'shopping trips', during which Polish tourists got drunk and claimed that 'L'viv is Polish'. Indeed, throughout the Solidarity period, members of the local population appealed to the authorities to limit

---

[97] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7.
[98] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 8-10.
[99] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 4-9; RGANI, f.89, 46, d.67, ll. 5-7.
[100] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 84-86.
[101] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 4-9; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 1-4. Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi wrote that Polish tourists were especially outspoken when the USSR celebrated the 42nd anniversary of the Ukrainian 'reunification' on 17 September 1981: they claimed that the Soviet army had occupied western Ukraine (or eastern Poland) in 1939, and asserted that L'viv would once again return to Poland. Allegedly, some tourists became very aggressive, threatening that 'the Poles would slaughter the Russians'. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 4-5.
[102] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 4-9.

the number of Poles in the region,[103] and they continued to complain about the behaviour of Polish tourists in western Ukraine even after the imposition of martial law.[104] When a group of Polish citizens addressed a long queue of local residents in a shop in L'viv, encouraging them to protest against poor supplies just as people did in Poland, 'Soviet citizens' retorted that economic problems only arose because they had to feed 'lazy, speculative' Poles. The tourists left the shop in a hurry and did not try to speak to anyone else.[105] Thus, the queue contrasted the 'cultured' local population of western Ukraine with Polish 'wreckers and 'reactionaries'. Similarly, a party member and a metal worker from L'viv talked about his colleagues' outrage at provocative, anti-Soviet statements voiced by Polish tourists who visited the region.[106] Hence, many citizens defined conservative patriotism against Poland, which enabled residents of west Ukraine to defend themselves against accusation of disloyalty in the full view of Soviet officials during public meetings. Moreover, they also acted as Soviet patriots in their everyday lives, which may suggest that their sense of national superiority vis-à-vis the Poles was rather deep-seated. It was precisely because they lived in the west, so exposed to the 'Polish threat', that they could contrast themselves with the unstable foreigners, highlighting their 'culturedness' and loyalty to the Soviet state.

Paradoxically, even passivity distinguished some residents of the west as reliable patriots. Because Polish tourists visited the region en masse, party leaders recognised the locals' Sovietness when they suffered at the hands of 'unruly' foreigners. For instance, one report praised Soviet customs officials who suffered at the hands of a 30 year-old Polish conductor, who attacked them precisely because they were Soviet citizens and 'Russians'; he 'yelled at them', claimed that the train was 'Polish property', and charged that the 'Russians treated the Poles badly'. His attack thus reaffirmed their belonging to the Russian-led Soviet community. Similarly, militia officers in Chernivtsi faced insults from a drunken Polish couple who compared them to Gestapo officers: they arrested the man and the woman after they left their train at the Chernivtsi station, walked out onto the high street, and started to shout

---

[103] DALO, f.P3, op.46, s.85, ark. 84-86; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100.
[104] DALO, f.P3, op.47, s.62, ark. 15-18.
[105] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100.
[106] RGANI, f.5, op.84, d.76, ll. 35-39.

out 'anti-socialist slogans' such as 'Death to communism'.[107] Obkom officials were ultra-sensitive to any signs of conflict between Polish tourists and Soviet citizens at this time. It is difficult to determine the extent to which party bureaucrats coloured their accounts of similar incidents, or to establish whether Polish 'hooliganism' did indeed become more commonplace during the Solidarity period. What is clear is that the officials made a special effort to report the Poles' 'bad behaviour', even when it was devoid of explicitly political content. For instance, they wrote about three Polish men travelling through western Ukraine by car. They stopped off at the Zelena Dubrava hotel in the Glyboks'kyi region, where, in a state of deep inebriation, they poured water all over the walls and the beds in their rooms, destroying the hotel's paintings and breaking crockery. When the manager asked them to pay for the damages, they swore at him and later declined to give their personal details at the police station. On the very same day, party apparatchiks wrote, eight drunken Polish citizens travelling from Varna to Warsaw refused to show their 'undeclared currency' during the border controls. They started swearing at the Soviet customs officer, after which they threw him to the floor and beat him up. One woman, a member of the rowdy group, bit the militiaman who arrested them.[108] Although it is not possible to determine how the affected individuals perceived Polish tourists or the socio-political developments in Poland, it appears that party apparatchiks recognised members of the local population as 'Soviet people' simply because they faced the foreigners' rude and unpredictable behaviour as they protected the Soviet state and property.

Indeed, conservative patriotism in the borderlands was a potent force, and even the image of 'passive victims' allowed residents of the western oblasts to articulate demands of the Soviet state: although they refrained from voicing explicitly political demands and distanced themselves from the Polish socio-political upheaval, they expected the authorities to guarantee their personal safety and economic stability in the face of the Polish 'threat'. At times, citizens spoke about the need to avoid war at all costs, offering their political acquiescence in return for peace. During public meetings across Ukraine, residents of the republic openly admitted that they were afraid of the Polish crisis escalating into a military conflict and asked lecturers and

---

[107] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 8-10.
[108] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2287, ark. 6, 8-10.

agitators to discuss the possibility of war.[109] Precisely in the borderlands did the spectre of war seem the most threatening, and this inspired residents to voice support for the ideal of Soviet unity. Reporting on conversations in public spaces around L'viv, the KGB concluded that 'many people' supported 'our policy of peace' and were happy to bear the shortages as long as they would help to avoid war.[110] Even the Polish minority in the region reacted 'calmly' to the introduction of the martial law: the officials believed that this was largely because they wanted to 'avoid bloodshed'.[111]

More prominently, at a time when party activists were becoming increasingly determined to increase the living standards of blue-collar workers, proponents of conservative patriotism in the borderlands boldly demanded material benefits from Soviet bureaucrats. These claims were politicised in that residents criticised the performance of the Soviet media and attacked Soviet officials for offering aid to Poland whilst neglecting their own citizens. The events in Poland inspired some people to express their disbelief in the official portrayals of Eastern Europe which suggested that the region was economically successful. Numerous Soviet *trudiashchiesia* asked why 'socialist achievements were jeopardised' in Poland, further probing the reasons for the Polish failure to take more decisive steps to collectivise agriculture and combat religious influences.[112] Agitators found it difficult to answer similar questions, because citizens drew explicit links between the situation across the border and in the USSR itself. In the autumn of 1980, therefore, party members and non-party members alike encouraged party activists to explain what conclusions were being drawn from the Polish experience 'here'.[113] In the spring of 1981, they continued to inquire whether the USSR had foreign debts like Poland, demanding to know how it was planning to pay them off in such case.[114] Apart from demanding more information from state officials, some individuals were more explicit in criticising the inadequacies of the official media when they complained about shortages. One local man queuing outside a shop in L'viv pointed out that supplies deteriorated from year to year, even though the official press

[109] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 5-8; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 84-88.
[110] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.
[111] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2295, ark. 51-53.
[112] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, l. 8; TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 12-13.
[113] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, l. 8.
[114] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2216, ark. 15-18.

claimed that Soviet factories constantly overfulfilled their production targets, while many other residents who talked to each other in public places around the city hoped that the media would provide more 'objective information' about political events and the real state of the economy.[115] However, demands for more information were much fewer in 1980 and 1981 than they had been in 1956 and 1968, and inhabitants of Ukraine were less keen to present themselves as 'active' citizens who deserved to know about the unfolding developments.

It was more common for the west Ukrainian advocates of conservative patriotism to criticise Soviet subsidies to Poland. Some were very circumspect about it, especially when speaking in public: during an agitation meeting in October 1980, a driver and party member from west Ukraine agreed that it was necessary to send economic help to Poland, but quickly added that 'selfless help' could harm the brotherly country which could not even feed itself thirty years after the war.[116] With the escalation of the crisis, some inhabitants of western Ukraine attacked the Soviet state more openly, charging that it neglected the needs of its own hard-working citizens whilst helping the 'foreigners' in Poland. Many residents expressed 'negative' views about the USSR's economic aid in anonymous notes passed to lecturers during agitation meetings, as well as in letters to party officials and newspaper editors.[117] One anonymous letter demanded that the obkom improve the supply of potatoes for the town of L'viv, asking whether it was true that agricultural products were being sent to Poland. After all, the author wrote, transports pick up products from collective farms everyday.[118] Citizens also asked officials to confirm the rumours that the USSR paid off Polish debts with its own natural resources.[119] They thus confronted Soviet bureaucrats whom they suspected of ignoring the population's material needs.

In isolated cases, economic complaints took on a more confrontational form. The authorities in L'viv wrote about the 'hostile' views of an unnamed individual who stated that the policy of sending everything to Poland was 'wrong' and could lead to

---

[115] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 117-118. Likewise, in the aftermath of the Polish disturbances in 1970, L'viv was rife with rumours that prices in the USSR were soon to increase and separate individuals alleged that the retirement age would be raised. TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.355, ark. 58-60.
[116] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 2-7.
[117] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 96-100.
[118] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 108.
[119] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2541, ark. 23-25.

the outbreak of Polish-style strikes 'here'. The same person claimed that Polish workers in Solidarity would successfully defend their rights.[120] Even more daringly, a local resident stated that 'our' *narod* was 'idiotic and scared', while the Poles rose up for their rights just as they had done 'under the Tsar'.[121] In fact, the rise of Solidarity emboldened some dissidents to attempt to reach out to the 'masses' and exploit economic discontent to build a more powerful opposition movement. This was especially true amongst members of the Helsinki groups, who had previously expressed support for the Polish Workers' Defence Committee.[122] In 1980 and 1981, activists of the Russian Union of Solidarists (RSU) and the Free Interprofessional Union of Workers (SMOT), dissidents such as Andrei Sakharov, and even some individual blue-collar workers published articles in *samizdat*, outlining plans to encourage workers to 'draw conclusions from the Polish experience'.[123] However, a mood of pessimism was quick to set in amongst *samizdat* authors, as they contrasted the activism of the Polish trade unions with the Soviet workers' apathy and dissidents' failure to work with 'the masses'.[124] They ascribed the scope of the Polish opposition to the strength of Polish patriotism,[125] thus presenting Solidarity as a specifically Polish phenomenon which was unlikely to spread into the USSR itself. 'Dear Polish comrades, friends, brothers. We cannot help you much, we can only hope for you and believe in you' – stated the *samizdat* appeal of a group of Soviet 'non-conformists' to Polish workers on 14 December

---

[120] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.

[121] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.

[122] KhTS 43, 31 December 1976: Andrei Sakharov, 'Komitetu zashchity pol'skikh rabochikh (20 noiabria 1976g)'.

[123] Russian Solidarity Union, *O ruchu robotnicznym w Rosji i Polsce* (Warsaw, 1985), 30-32, 70-71; MS 35/80, 13 October 1980, Document AS4092: A. Sakharov and 9 other signatures, 'Zaiavlenie Ob''edinennomu mezhzavodskomu stachechnomu komitetu v Gdan'ske', Moscow, probably 30 August 1980; MS 22/81, 8 June 1981, Document AS4321: Mykola Pohyba, a blue-collar worker, 'Otkrytoe pis'mo Ukrainskoi pravozashchitnoi gruppe', st. Bucha, Kyiv oblast, 4 November 1980; MS 33/81, 31 August 1981, Document AS4410: Andrei Sakharov, 'Chto dolzhny sdelat' SshA i SSSR, chtoby sokhranit' mir', Gorkii, 31 March 1981; Materialy MS 36/81, 25 September 1981, Document AS4428: N. Grigorian and others, 'Telegramma profob''edeniiu "Solidarnost"', shortly before 20 January 1981; MS 2/82, 15 January 1982, Document AS4527: 'Annotatsiia Informatsionnogo biulletena SMOTa no.15', Moscow, April-May 1981; KhTS 63:81: 'Informatsionnyi Biulleten' SMOTa no.19', September 1981.

[124] MS 36/81, 25 September 1981, Document AS4429: Mikhail Zotov, member of SMOT, artist, 'Vyderzhki iz pis'ma (noiabr' 1980) o reaktsiiakh tol'iattinskikh rabochikh na pol'skie sobytiia', Moscow, no earlier than 27 January 1981; Russian Solidarity Union, 'O ruchu robotniczym', 51-52.

[125] MS 30/82, 27 August 1982, Document AS4711: 'Informatsionnyi Biulleten' SMOTa no.25', Moscow, December 1981.

1981.[126] The feeling of powerlessness which permeated Soviet underground publications about Solidarity was summed up by a Moscow blue-collar worker, Nikolai Alekseev, who described how his colleagues called for a crackdown on Solidarity even during informal conversations. They criticised the free trade unions as they bitterly pointed out that Soviet workers refrained from strikes that weakened the Warsaw Pact, despite the fact that they did not enjoy a higher standard of living than the Poles.[127]

Indeed, even though economic discontent was widespread in western Ukraine, most residents who complained about their quality of life were far from forming an organised political force. For one, they tended to express their views in spontaneous outbursts: at the 'Okean' fishmonger's store in L'viv, 'two people around the age of forty, probably a husband and wife', raised a fuss about the lack of 'herring and fish'. The man pointed out that that 'we catch more fish now than ever before' and the woman shouted that 'we send it all to our friends abroad'.[128] Secondly, their demands were very concrete and thus limited: they mentioned particular products which were in short supply and suggested simple, but rather temporary solutions to the poor economic situation. Many inhabitants of the borderlands proposed that the local officials should introduce a rationing system so that people would not waste their time in queues whilst meat and potatoes were sent abroad.[129] Similarly, during public agitation meetings, Party, trade union, and Komsomol members, as well as workers at large industrial enterprises raised questions concerning the need to improve the supply of food, especially meat and potatoes, and some consumer goods, including bed sheets, soap, threads, and washing powder.[130] Thirdly, as they invoked ideals of conservative patriotism, inhabitants of the west focused their attacks on local officials rather than top CPSU leaders or the Soviet system itself: two elderly men travelling on a tram in L'viv complained about queues and corruption in shops, blaming the municipal authorities for all economic problems.[131]

---

[126] MS 22/82, 25 June 1982, Document AS4655: 'Sovetskie inakomysliashchie: Obrashchenie k pol'skim rabochim', no place, 14 December 1981; MS 37/82, 14 November 1982, Document AS4752: 'Informatsionnyi Biulleten' SMOTa no.29', December 1981-January 1982.

[127] MS 34/81, 11 September 1981, Document AS4413: Nikolai Alekseev, 'Zametki Rabochego', September 1981.

[128] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.

[129] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 117-121.

[130] RGANI, f.5, op.77, d.105, ll. 49-53.

[131] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 121.

They infused their economic complaints with a sense of Soviet pride, reaffirming their loyalty to the CPSU and the Soviet state at the same time as criticising ineffective officials. When commenting on meat and butter shortages in queues, market places and on public transport, some inhabitants of the borderlands complained that 'their' factories worked to satisfy the needs of Poland, where people 'had no fear anymore' and were 'fascinated by democracy', while they 'went hungry' themselves.[132] Likewise, an anonymous letter posted to the L'viv obkom claimed that strikes were alien to any socialist system, which meant that the Poles were not worthy of Soviet assistance. The Soviet *narod* had earned the right to live well, it argued, but instead the USSR was 'like a dairy cow': the authorities sent meat, eggs, and butter to the Poles who, even though they were allies, were also essentially 'useless'.[133] In this way, these people explicitly rejected the Polish trajectory of reform, as well as hinting at their dissatisfaction with economic aid for Poland.

The Polish crisis reverberated in the western borderlands much more than in other parts of Ukraine. As late as 1986, a Pole from Volhynia reported that the few Ukrainian friends with whom he could discuss politics continued to talk about the events of 1980.[134] It was in the west that many residents discussed the Polish 'threat' to Soviet stability and economic wellbeing, not only during public agitation meetings, but also in 'unofficial' conversations outside shops, on public transport, and in anonymous letters. It was also here that many inhabitants came into contact with Polish tourists, which fuelled national tensions and encouraged 'ordinary' citizens to denounce the Polish path of reform. Many local residents contrasted themselves with the 'lazy' and unreliable foreigners. This allowed them to prove their own patriotic beliefs, downplaying the importance of social and regional divisions in Ukraine, and challenging the elitist vision of Soviet patriotism. As proponents of conservative patriotism, Soviet citizens in west Ukraine were emboldened to attack the 'bureaucracy' for helping ungrateful Poles instead of taking care of their own citizens, but they largely limited their complaints to the economic sphere and refrained from voicing explicitly political demands.

---

[132] TsDAHO, f.1, op.25, s.2048, ark. 114-117.
[133] DALO, f.P3, op.44, s.85, ark. 43-46.
[134] T. Kuzio, 'The Polish Opposition and the Ukrainian Question', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 12:2 (1987), 42.

IV.   Conclusion

During the rise and fall of Solidarity, Poland functioned as an important 'internal elsewhere' among members of the Soviet middle class and inhabitants of the western borderlands. Numerous citizens spoke about socio-political upheavals across the border with a sense of apprehension, contrasting the Polish 'opposition' with a stable and united Soviet community. Apart from some religious individuals and a few scattered dissidents who sought to establish independent trade unions in the USSR, very few residents of Ukraine supported Solidarity's challenge to the Soviet-style regime in Poland. However, this is not to suggest that the others defended the ideological dogmas about Party leadership of the working class; on the contrary, members of the Soviet middle class sought to discourage popular interest in the political developments in Poland, and residents of the western oblasts refrained from articulating explicitly political views in return for material concessions from the state. Many of them distanced themselves from Solidarity precisely because it upset the delicate balance between the acquiescent 'masses' and a benevolent regime: they condemned workers' activism as a destabilising influence which harmed East European economies and inflamed national tensions.

Whereas comparisons with the West fuelled some dissatisfaction with the Soviet economic system, images of Poland reinforced citizens' commitment to Soviet 'unity' and political passivity. Contributors to the autumn 2008 issue of *Kritika* suggest that socialist regimes throughout Eastern Europe increasingly sought to legitimise their rule by contrasting the quality of life under socialism and capitalism. Eastern Europeans compared the extent to which individuals achieved 'happiness' under Soviet-style socialism and in the imagined West. As Gyorgy Peteri emphasises, this undermined the Soviet camp's 'systemic integrity and identity' and inspired popular dissatisfaction with the 'rebellious project of socialism', as it 'failed to provide a workable way toward an alternative modernity'.[135] By contrast, memories of Polish rule in west Ukraine, conflicts between Soviet citizens and Polish tourists in the region, and the belief that Solidarity's strikes led to economic chaos in Poland made numerous inhabitants of Ukraine distrustful of the anti-Soviet

---

[135] G. Peteri, 'The Occident Within', 937, 934-935.

opposition across the border. Consequently, most citizens who commented on the rise and fall of Solidarity spoke in the name of unanimous workers' collectives, whether as successful community leaders or the passive *svoi* who suffered at the hands of 'unruly' foreigners.

During late 1980 and 1981, the great bulk of Soviet citizens articulated a vision of conservative patriotism. They agreed about the importance of 'hard work' and Soviet unity vis-à-vis the foreign 'threat', grounding an idea of patriotism in an outward commitment to 'honest labour' and a sense of national pride as well as on a negative image of 'lazy' Poles. Nevertheless, debates about Solidarity also encouraged residents of Ukraine to speak about social divisions in the USSR. Just as the ritualisation of historical commemorations allowed inhabitants of western Ukraine to emerge as positive protagonists in Soviet historiography, it was precisely the formulaic nature of debates about Solidarity which permitted citizens to invest conservative patriotism with very different meanings. With accusations of disloyalty fewer than in 1956 and 1968, and national unity, equality, and commitment to labour defined clearly as Soviet values, inhabitants of Ukraine invoked these official slogans to advance varying interpretations of what it meant to be a Soviet person, all the while maintaining a semblance of social harmony.

Anxious about the Polish developments, Party and Komsomol activists, 'leading workers', and war veterans grew ever more conscious of forming a class apart in the USSR. In order to keep the 'masses' under control, they made a special effort to monitor popular opinion, improve blue-collar workers' living conditions, as well as making Soviet bureaucrats and institutions more responsive to the material needs of the 'masses'. However, even while they propagated the ideal of Soviet unity, members of the middle class used public agitation gatherings and international exchanges of workers' collectives to prove that they were the most reliable Soviet patriots. They identified themselves as the elite of conservative patriotism, highlighting their support for Soviet economic aid for Poland and declaring readiness to back a military intervention in Eastern Europe, as well as seeking to identify unreliable residents of Ukraine who did not live up to the Soviet ideal.

For their part, many inhabitants of the western borderlands challenged the elitist vision of patriotism and the importance of Ukraine's social and geographical

divisions. I have found little evidence to support Teague's view that '[a]lone among the Soviet Union's national groupings, the populations of the western borderlands-Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic states- proved responsive to the example of Poland's labour unrest'.[136] It would rather appear that many inhabitants of western Ukraine spoke during public meetings in an effort to show that their exposure to the 'Polish threat' increased their loyalty towards the USSR. At the same time, they escaped the narrow context of public agitation gatherings to suggest that they were a crucial part of the wider Soviet community: in anonymous letters and unofficial conversations recorded by the KGB, proponents of conservative patriotism from the borderlands claimed that they had resisted Polish oppression in the past and repudiated Polish tourists' unfounded accusations against the USSR in the present, as well as working hard to assure a bright 'socialist future' for Poland and the socialist camp as a whole. Having thus established their patriotic credentials, such residents of the western oblasts articulated hopes that the Solidarity crisis would not escalate into a military conflict. They also criticised Soviet officials and institutions for failing to inform them about the unfolding developments. Most prominently, however, at a time when Soviet bureaucrats promised to improve the population's standard of living, numerous inhabitants of the borderlands charged that the officials neglected their material needs, all the while sending economic aid to Poland. The rhetoric of Soviet supremacy and 'socialist' solidarity in Eastern Europe was a double-edged sword: not only did it drive home the idea that Soviet workers' rights should be defended more vigorously, but it also suggested that Soviet citizens should work more efficiently to give a good example to the Poles.

The rise and fall of Solidarity encouraged residents of Ukraine to distance themselves from Poland and the socialist camp. Indeed, the Polish events strengthened Soviet isolationism in the physical sense. The border between the two countries was never easy to cross, but a handful of daring individuals used to slip across undetected amongst the European bison. The authorities refrained from building a fence along a narrow stretch of the frontier in the Belovezha nature preserve so as not to disturb the natural habitat of the nearly extinct animals.

---

[136] Teague, *Solidarity*, 323.

However, Solidarity had a detrimental effect on the bison's wellbeing – the USSR finally built a fence in the forest at the height of the Polish crisis.[137]

---

[137] Conversation with Vera Rich, Ukrainian Institute in Great Britain, 26 November 2009.

Conclusion

Between the 1950s and the 1980s, the signs and expressions of Soviet patriotism grew increasingly strong among the population of Ukraine. Describing the people's democracies in various public forums, illegal publications and informal conversations, numerous residents of the republic portrayed themselves as loyal citizens concerned about the USSR's relationship with foreign states and nations. As such, they argued about the desirable direction of Soviet foreign policy and evaluated the claims of reformist forces both in the USSR and in the outer empire. More prominently, by staging consent for Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe and thereby claiming membership in the imagined Soviet community, citizens sought to improve their social standing in the USSR.

Distinct patterns in the evolution of Soviet narratives about the people's democracies helped to shape official notions of Sovietness. On the one hand, top Party leaders were keen to portray Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland as 'brotherly' socialist states, demonstrating thereby that Soviet-style socialism held an international appeal. On the other hand, the authorities also promoted tutelary and imperial narratives: claiming that the USSR and its residents guided 'foreigners' on the path of progress, they juxtaposed Soviet people to other nations in the Soviet bloc. In that sense, top apparatchiks defined Sovietness itself in national terms, outlining in official rhetoric the 'national' characteristics of Soviet people. For one, encouraging inhabitants of Ukraine to distance themselves from 'unreliable' and 'work-shy' foreigners in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, the authorities suggested that reliable Soviet citizens were serious and hard working. Furthermore, especially after the Prague Spring discredited ideas of 'reform socialism', Soviet mass media condemned foreign ideological diversions and departures from the Soviet political, economic and social model. This fuelled the notion that Soviet citizens were supposed to be conservative, suspicious of any attempt to reform Soviet-style regimes. By raising alarm about the spread of 'anti-Soviet', 'anti-Russian', and 'anti-Ukrainian' attitudes in the outer empire, the authorities also increasingly defined Sovietness in ethnically exclusive, East Slavic terms. They suggested that reliable Soviet citizens were Russians and Ukrainians who protected their homeland from both foreign threats and domestic fifth columnists, including

members of ethnic minorities and Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalists' who sought to break up the union of Ukraine and Russia.

These narratives evoked different responses among the population of Soviet Ukraine. On one level, official portrayals of Eastern Europe exerted a strong exlusionary force. Many members of Ukraine's ethnic minorities felt that they did not belong to the East Slavic community which the officials invoked to differentiate Soviet citizens from residents of the satellite states. Some Hungarians and Poles who lived in western Ukraine expressed sympathy towards what they perceived as 'anti-Soviet' national movements in their external homelands, and, during times of unrest, even talked about the possibility of redrawing borders. Meanwhile, some citizens of Jewish origin pointed to the rise of anti-Semitism in the USSR and Eastern Europe, which helped to reinforce demands for the right to emigrate. One can also trace the evolution of particularistic ethnic identities among activists of the Greek Catholic Church and former members of Ukrainian nationalist organisations. While they accepted official notions that reformist and opposition movements in the outer empire constituted a 'nationalist threat' to Soviet stability, they rejected the idea that Ukraine could best defend its national interests in the USSR and in a close union with Russia. Consequently, unrest in the outer empire in 1956 and, to a lesser extent, in 1968, reinforced such demands for Ukrainian independence, particularly in the western borderlands: perceptions of foreign struggle against Soviet occupation inspired a small number of residents to believe that Soviet hegemony in the region would soon come to an end.

'Anti-Soviet' views attracted a small minority of Ukraine's residents. More commonly, official narratives provided codes for people to fashion themselves as loyal patriotic citizens. Although the formulaic surveillance reports projected a distorted image of popular opinion, with bureaucrats imposing official categories on what was probably a wider range of opinions, they still reveal that citizens advanced conflicting visions of what it meant to be Soviet. In 1956 and in 1968, people's views and attitudes could be classified along the spectrum between reformist patriotism and conservative patriotism. In contrast, after the 1968 Warsaw Pact invervention of Czechoslovakia, the authorities registered few expressions of reformist ideas. Most reports indicated that citizens invoked what they believed to be the 'correct' ideas of conservative patriotism both in various public forums and

during informal conversations. While this undoubtedly exposes the difficulties which Soviet officials faced in gauging citizens' views, it also seems that people did grow reluctant to express reformist ideas, afraid of persecution and disillusioned about the prospect of successful reform in the Soviet bloc. By engaging in the practices of staging consent, however, they still advanced different ideas about how Soviet society should work.

Reformist patriotism held that the Soviet Union and its citizens must guide other states towards 'liberalisation', as well as monitoring and copying progressive reforms pursued by communist parties in the outer empire. It was underpinned by a positive image of Ukraine's western neighbours, encouraging some citizens to believe that developments in the USSR and Ukraine should mirror East European 'democratic' changes. In particular, proponents of reformist patriotism called for the Soviet authorities to limit censorship, encourage public debate, and provide more reliable and full information in the Soviet mass media. Reformist patriotism was also closely intertwined with the development of Ukrainian and Jewish identities. Complaining about the rise of anti-Semitism in the USSR and the outer empire, many citizens of Jewish origin called on the authorities to promote cultural freedom and national tolerance. Moreover, demanding cultural autonomy for Ukraine in the USSR, some residents of the republic drew an explicit link between Ukrainian rights and reformist ideas in foreign and domestic policy. They urged the authorities to tolerate 'national' roads to socialism in Eastern Europe and in the USSR itself, defending thereby East European and Soviet reform movements. They also believed that freedom of speech and cultural expression would help to protect Ukrainian national rights.

Meanwhile, conservative patriotism framed the most popular responses to events and developments in Soviet satellite states. Many residents of Ukraine asserted that Moscow should retain strong control over foreign countries and suppress 'unorthodox' practices and ideas both in the outer empire and in the USSR. Party activists, war veterans, leading workers and other members of the aspirational middle class were especially vocal in condemning foreign unrest, which they believed to fuel anti-Soviet attitudes abroad and extremist nationalism and 'hooligan' behaviour at home. While it is difficult to assess levels of genuine belief, it appears that these voices sometimes reflected popular fear of war and instability, which was

especially widespread in the borderlands in 1956. Some citizens who condemned foreign deviations from the Soviet model of socialism during public meetings and informal conversations also appeared to harbour a sense of pride in Soviet 'imperial' power.

More importantly, perhaps, articulations of conservative patriotism were a means of staging consent, which empowered inhabitants of Ukraine to fashion a range of social identities and to press demands on the Soviet state. Contrasting themselves with 'unstable', 'inferior' and 'hostile' foreigners from the people's democracies, some residents of Ukraine claimed a privileged status in Soviet society. Apart from demanding perks such as international travel, these people often criticised inconsistencies and gaps in Soviet mass media, concerned as they were about the spread of malicious rumours and unhealthy attitudes among the 'masses'. At the same time, other citizens increasingly challenged the elitist claims of the aspirational middle class. In order to highlight their status as reliable 'Soviet people', they emphasised that they carried the economic burden of maintaining an outer empire, helping thereby to preserve peace and stability in Eastern Europe. This helped to fuel economic populism and complaints against poor living standards in Ukraine, as people underlined that they deserved to live well in return for their hard work.

Staging consent also allowed citizens to articulate Ukrainian identities in the framework of conservative patriotism. Particularly in the western oblasts, residents highlighted the role that Ukrainians played in protecting the wider Soviet and east Slavic community against the backward 'nationalists' from Eastern Europe. In this way, people commonly linked notions of Ukrainianness with conservative 'Soviet' goals and values. As 'Ukrainians', they expressed distrust of their western neighbours, especially Poles, all the while supporting in public the idea of a close union with Russia. Many residents of the western borderlands who identified themselves as Ukrainian sought thereby to pursue their goals in the imagined east Slavic community, expecting to enjoy the full benefits of being part of the Soviet 'socialist' state. They demanded that the authorities live up to their promises to improve the population's material wellbeing, claiming a right to live better than, or at least as well as, the 'foreigners' in the outer empire. As a result, while Ukrainian identities ran strong in the western borderlands, western Ukraine turned into a

breeding ground for conservative patriotism, as well as reformist patriotism and 'anti-Soviet' Ukrainian nationalism.

A conservative version of Soviet patriotism triumphed in Ukraine by the end of the Brezhnev era. Yet in December 1991 residents of the republic voted overwhelmingly in favour of Ukrainian independence.[1] This raises important questions about the relationship between Soviet and Ukrainian identities after the mid-1980s: what hopes did people associate with independence, and to what extent have Soviet identities survived in contemporary Ukraine?

Because *glasnost'* permitted people to debate what constituted their different collective goals and values, ideas inherent in staging consent shaped Ukrainian debates about policy during the Gorbachev era. As Alexei Yurchak argues, Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms allowed people to articulate 'in a metadiscourse something that had already happened and had been lived by everyone- the mutation and internal shift of the system's discursive parameters'.[2] In other words, people could identify different, potentially contrasting 'national' aims and loyalties, having earlier developed diverse visions of Sovietness: not only by debating the advantages and benefits of reform and, in some cases, drawing on rival discourses of populism and nationalism, but also, more importantly, by performing various social and national identities in the officially approved, formulaic rhetoric.

In this way, the radical changes of the late 1980s and the 1990s threw into sharp relief the different notions of Ukrainianness which Soviet citizens had developed in the frameworks of 'anti-Soviet' resistance, reformist Soviet patriotism, and conservative Soviet patriotism. On one level, legacies of 'anti-Soviet' nationalism shaped attitudes among a small number of Ukraine's residents. Emboldened by the East European revolutions of 1989, these proponents of Ukrainian independence believed that the end of Soviet power and Russian domination was fast approaching.[3] Interactions with Eastern Europe during the Soviet era had exerted an important influence on the claims that 'anti-Soviet' Ukrainian nationalists made during the late 1980s and the 1990s. While rejecting Soviet power in Ukraine as 'foreign', some

---

[1] A. Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s : A Minority Faith* (Cambridge, 1997), 126.

[2] A. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006), 295.

[3] C. Wanner, *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in post-Soviet Ukraine* (University Park, 1998), xxiii.

people continued to voice distrust of Poland as Ukraine's 'national nemesis', but it seems that many others now perceived an independent Poland as a precondition and guarantee of Ukrainian sovereignty.[4] Moreover, the legalisation of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia in 1968, as well as the prominent role that the Roman Catholic Church played in fuelling the Polish dissident movement and Solidarity, reinforced in the popular imagination the link between nationalism and religion. Partly as a result of this, some advocates of Ukrainian independence grew to believe that religion could help to mobilise the population behind their cause, as well as underlining that religious belief should flourish in post-Soviet Ukraine.[5] Since 1991, some of these former anti-Soviet nationalists have also adopted an anti-Western rhetoric, suggesting that religion must provide a buffer against what they perceive as negative features of the West, including violence, pornography, and homosexuality.[6]

More prominently, notions of reformist patriotism re-emerged in public rhetoric during the late 1980s, helping to shape popular opinion about national rights, foreign policy, and democratisation. Serhii Yekelchyk suggests that an increasing number of Ukraine's residents believed that deep reform was necessary and, especially after 1989, began to doubt the legitimacy of communist rule in the republic. Once again, Eastern Europe provided an important stimulus for the rise of reformist ideas: as Yekelchyk puts it, many 'ordinary Ukrainians' saw the collapse of communism in neighbouring Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia as the writing on the wall for the CPU'.[7] Just as 'reformist patriotism' had earlier advocated change in the USSR, proponents of reform during the Gorbachev period did not at first attack the Soviet state: even the biggest 'opposition movement of the late Soviet era, Rukh, saw Ukraine as part of a revamped Soviet federation as late as 1990'.[8] At the same time, drawing on aspects of reformist patriotism, some top party apparatchiks in Kyiv began to promote the notion that Ukrainians should enjoy cultural autonomy in the

---

[4] T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven, 2003), 218.

[5] T. Kuzio and A. Wilson, *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence* (London., 1999), 77.

[6] S. Shulman, 'Cultures in Competition: Ukrainian Foreign Policy and the "Cultural Threat" from Abroad', *Europe-Asia Studies* 50:2 (March 1998), p. 293.

[7] S. Yekelchyk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford, New York, 2007), p. 184.

[8] Z. Gitelman, 'Ethnopolitics and the Future of the Former Soviet Union' in Zvi Gitelman (ed.), *The Politics of Nationality and the Erosion of the USSR: Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Harrogate, 1990* (London, 1992), 18.

USSR, which allowed them to rebrand themselves as 'national communists'. Escaping the sinking ship, as Taras Kuzio and Andrew Wilson demonstrate, it was they who eventually made the decisive contribution to the cause of independence in 1991.[9]

Legacies of reformist patriotism have also exerted an important influence on Ukrainian policy and popular opinion since Soviet collapse. The country's first president, Leonid Kravchuk, formerly in charge of propaganda at the CPU Central Committee during the Brezhnev era, stressed the need to protect Ukrainian linguistic rights and confined Russian to the status of a minority language, which has ever since evoked heated debates among the population.[10] Furthermore, some Ukrainian leaders, intellectuals and ordinary citizens like to recall Ukraine's historical links with 'Central Europe', especially the Habsburg Empire,[11] and to claim that the country should follow the 'European' path of reform pursued in the former satellite states.[12] Mirroring earlier patterns, these attitudes are especially widespread among the creative intelligentsia and residents of the western oblasts, helping to reinforce their sense of distinctiveness. In this way, reformist Soviet patriotism has evolved into a 'liberal' version of Ukrainian patriotism, with citizens advocating the cause of independence without necessarily adopting the more aggressive and conservative rhetoric of the former 'anti-Soviet' nationalists.

At the same time, conservative patriotism has also left a lasting legacy in Ukraine. In line with the conservative suspicion of 'anti-Russian' and 'anti-Soviet' nationalism, few inhabitants of Ukraine showed interest in the cause of protecting Ukrainian national rights during the Gorbachev era.[13] Furthermore, as Catherine Wanner demonstrates, despite widespread support for independence, many living in Ukraine were less supportive of the cultural changes that followed new state formation, at least during the 1990s.[14] Meanwhile, without necessarily undermining

---

[9] Kuzio and Wilson, *Ukraine,* 3, 63, 127. See also J. Breuilly, *Nationalism and the state* (Manchester, New York, 1993), p. 347; A. Motyl, *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine after Totalitarianism* (New York, 1993), 36-37.

[10] Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 132-143.

[11] O. Hnatiuk, *Pozegnanie z imperium: ukrainskie dyskusje o tozsamosci* (Lublin, 2003), 195.

[12] Gitelman, 'Ethnopolitics', 7.

[13] A. Wilson, 'Ukraine and Post-Soviet Europe: Authoritarian Consolidation or Renewed Reform?', in Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis (eds.), *Developments in Central and East European Politics 3*, (Basingstoke, 2003), p. 104.

[14] Wanner, *Burden of Dreams*, 47.

people's sense of belonging to the Ukranian nation, concepts of conservative patriotism have ensured the survival of some Soviet attitudes and ideas in Ukraine. A distinct Soviet identity sometimes manifests itself openly in the form of Soviet nostalgia and popular calls for a closer union with Russia, as the 'masses' show more interest in Kyiv's relationship to Moscow than the West.[15] As Iurii Andrukhovych suggests, negative perceptions of Ukraine's western neighbours also underpin hostile attitudes towards the 'European' path of reform among the Ukrainian population.[16] More importantly, perhaps, elitist claims inherent in the practices of staging consent can be seen as an important prelude to the deep social rifts which emerged in Ukraine after 1991, helping to shape popular notions of class and status, while passive attitudes towards the state which characterised conservative patriotism seem to have resulted in a strong degree of political and social apathy. In this sense, it could be argued that the former advocates of conservative patriotism have evolved into what Mykola Riabchouk describes as the 'third Ukraine': for 'the most part invisible, mute, uncertain, undecided, ideologically ambivalent and ambiguous' majority.[17]

Still, while retaining some 'Soviet' ideas and attitudes, the great majority of the Ukrainian population does not question the legitimacy of the Ukrainian state. In part, this can be explained by the fact that notions of Ukrainianness are not incompatible with old conservative ideas of Soviet patriotism. Moreover, widespread support for independence which manifested itself in 1991 had arisen as two important pillars of conservative patriotism collapsed. Firstly, as Mark Kramer suggests, Gorbachev's 'loss' of Eastern Europe acted to discredit the Soviet state as the leader of world socialism, undermining the sense of 'imperial' pride which had underpinned patriotic attitudes throughout the post-war period.[18] Secondly, whereas citizens had earlier offered obedience in return for material rewards and other perks, Gorbachev failed to deliver the kind of living conditions which the state promised to loyal citizens. At the same time, some people began to claim that the newly independent states of Eastern

---

[15] S. Shulman, 'National Identity and Public Support for Political and Economic Reform in Ukraine', *Slavic Review* 64:1 (2005), 85.

[16] I. Andrukhovych, 'Kraina mrii', *Krytyka* 9-10 (2004), pp. 2-3. See also Motyl, *Dilemmas*, 51-52.

[17] M. Riabchouk, *Dvi Ukrainy: real'ni mezhi, virtual'ni viiny* (Kyiv, 2003), 304.

[18] M. Kramer, 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union: Part Three', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7:1 (2005), 67.

Europe guaranteed 'social justice' more effectively than Soviet-style regimes.[19] This helped to give rise to the notion that a sovereign Ukrainian state would fulfil citizens' material expectations better than the USSR.[20] In other words, citizens hoped that Kyiv would now satisfy the kind of demands which they had earlier articulated through staging consent for Moscow, creating a notion of Ukrainianness which transcended the east-west divide. While the sense of material entitlement which underpinned Ukrainian identities resulted in much disappointment during the 1990s, it also seems that it encouraged citizens in the different regions to claim that the state must represent their rights. Legacies of conservative patriotism may even partly explain the growth of civil society which manifested itself during the Orange Revolution of 2004: many citizens linked media censorship to economic hardship and political corruption, building perhaps on both reformist and conservative criticisms of Soviet mass media.[21]

The 'diffusion' of ideas across borders was a crucial factor which shaped both the expression of particularistic identities but, equally importantly, the rise of Soviet patriotism in Ukraine. This tension illuminates the persistence of Soviet-shaped identities in contemporary Ukraine, challenging the absolute nature of the East-West divide, and tracing the development of various Ukrainian attitudes towards their western neighbours, 'Europe', social welfare, and the role of the state.

---

[19] M. Kramer, 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union: Part One', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 5:4 (2003), 230.
[20] Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 128.
[21] See A. Wilson, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution* (New Haven, 2005).

Appendix A

The table below was compiled by the head of the KGB by the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, V. Nikitchenko, on 12 September 1968. It sums up the information about critical opinions concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia which the KGB had registered between 21 August and 7 September 1968. Introducing the table, Nikitchenko underlined that the majority of the republic's population supported the military intervention in Czechoslovakia.

There are some apparent inaccuracies in the data as outlined below. Unfortunately, I have not been able to access the archives to determine whether they had crept into the original report, or if they only appeared during the publication of the document in 2008. The table was originally published in Russian by the SBU archive in Kyiv.[1]

---

[1] O. Bazhan (ed.), ''Praz'ka Vesna'' u dokumentakh Galuzevoho derzhavnoho arkivu Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008), pp. 111-114.

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
1	Opinions critical of the military intervention, criticism of interference in Czechoslovak affairs	303	25.8	105	25	168	10	13	6	284
2	Fears of a possible outbreak of the Third World War	214	18.1	39	55	64	2	3	-	211
3	Statements to the effect that the military measures adopted by the USSR and other socialist countries amount to the violation of Czechoslovak sovereignty, an 'occupation', an 'intervention', 'gendarme measures'	209	17.8	38	15	115	9	7	2	200

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
4	Threats to 'deal' with communists in case the situation in the country becomes more complicated	89	7.7	34	43	8	2	-	-	89
5	Demands to take the army into Romania and Yugoslavia	56	4.8	20	4	32	-	13	-	56
6	Opinions to the effect that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia undermine the prestige of the USSR in the eyes of other socialist countries	41	3.5	11	3	27	1	3	-	38

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
7	Opinions voiced by former members of the nationalist underground, claiming that the events in Czechoslovakia will strengthen nationalist tendencies in the republic, and thus fuel the fight for so-called 'independent Ukraine'	32	2.8	46	9	7	-	-	-	32
8	Opinions voiced by individual representatives of the intelligentsia, workers, the youth, and other social groups about the need to introduce policies analogous to Czechoslovak 'democratisation' in our country	33	2.8	16	-	13	9	-	-	33

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
9	Information about instances of spreading anti-Soviet leaflets and anonymous documents which deal with the military intervention in Czechoslovakia	23	2.2	1	-	-	2	-	2	1
10	Spreading provocative rumours about the events in Czechoslovakia	8	0.8	2	-	4	1	1	-	7
11	Opinions to the effect that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia undermine the USSR's prestige in the eyes of communist and workers' parties of capitalist countries	25	2	2	8	13	2	1	2	22

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
12	Opinions to the effect that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia will encourage other countries to leave the socialist camp	21	1.9	11	5	8	-	-	-	21
13	Opinions to the effect that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia undermine the USSR's prestige in the eyes of the working class of capitalist countries	14	1.2	4	-	10	-	1	-	13
14	Information about instances of panic buying	14	1.2	3	6	5	-	-	1	13

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
15	Opinions to the effect that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia undermine the USSR's prestige in the eyes of the national liberation movements of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.	12	1.1	3	-	8	1	1	2	9
16	Information about negative reactions of Jewish nationalists to the military intervention in Czechoslovakia	13	1.1	2	-	9	-	2	-	11
17	Information about anti-Soviet graffiti which appeared in response to the military intervention in Czechoslovakia	10	0.9	-	-	-	1	-	1	2

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
18	Opinions that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia make it more difficult to organise the international congress of communist and workers' parties	8	0.8	2	-	4	1	1	-	7
19	Negative reactions to the intervention amongst churchmen and members of religious sects	8	0.7	2	4	2	-	-	-	8
20	Public expressions of support for the Czechoslovak revolution	5	0.4	1	1	3	-	-	-	5
21	Refusals to serve in the army explained with reference to the military intervention in Czechoslovakia	5	0.4	2	3	-	-	-	-	5

		All Signals	%	Blue Collar Workers	Collective Farmers	White Collar Workers	Students	Members and candidate members of the CPSU	Komsomol Members	Non-party members
22	Opinions that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia will reinforce the military measures of American imperialists in Vietnam	4	0.3	1	-	3	-	-	-	4
23	Opinions that the measures undertaken in Czechoslovakia will strengthen Israeli aggression against Arab countries	5	0.4	1	-	-	4	-	-	5

Zbigniew Wojnowski

<u>Bibliography</u>

Primary Sources

Archival Sources

Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kyivs'koi oblasti (DAKO), Kyiv

f.P5   Kyiv oblast committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine
Opisi: 6, 7, 47, 60, 76, 86, 90, 100

Derzhavnyi arkhiv L'vivs'koi oblasti (DALO), L'viv

f.P3   L'viv oblast committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine
Opisi: 5, 6, 10, 13, 44, 46,47, 53

Derzhavnyi arkhiv Odes'koi oblasti (DAOO), Odesa

f.P11   Odesa oblast committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine
Opisi:15, 18, 19, 20, 126, 129, 132, 150, 151, 153

Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GARF), Moscow

f. 6903   USSR state committee for television and radio (Gosteleradio), 1933-1991
Opisi: 2, 32, 33, 37

f.9425   Supreme office for the protection of state secrets in publications by the USSR Supreme Soviet (Glavlit), 1922-1991
Opisi: 1, 2

f.9576   The union of Soviet societies for friendship and cultural relations with foreign countries (SSOD), 1958-1992
Opis 4

f.9612   Organisations for the management of foreign travel in the USSR, 1929-1991
Opis 3

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (RGANI), Moscow

f.5   Apparatus of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
op.28   Department for relations with foreign communist parties
op.31   Department for union republics
op.33   Department of propaganda and agitation
op.55   Ideological commission
Opisi 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 68, 73, 75, 77, 84, 88, 89, 90: Apparatus documents organised by year, 1966-1984

f.89   Collection of de-classified documents

Zbigniew Wojnowski

<u>Stowarzyszenie wspolpracy Polska-Wschod (SWPW), Warsaw</u>

Files of the Polish-Soviet friendship society:
41/121; 41/144; 41/145; 41/176; 41/180; 41/181; 41/191; 41/202; 41/206; 41/219; 41/225

<u>Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromads'kykh ob''ednan' Ukrainy (TsDAHO), Kyiv</u>

f.1 **Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine**
op.24 General department, secret part, 1950-1967
op.25 General department, secret part, 1967-1988
op.31 General department, non-secret part, 1955-1970
op.32 General department, non-secret part, 1970-1991

Samizdat Materials

Khronika tekushchikh sobytii, issues 1-27 (Amsterdam, 1979)

Khronika tekushchikh sobytii, issues, 28-63 (New York, 1974-1983)

Materialy samizdata (Munich, 1972-1991)

Sobranie dokumentov samizdata, volumes 1-16 (Munich, 1973)

Russian Solidarity Union, *O ruchu robotnicznym w Rosji i Polsce* (Warsaw, 1985)

Ukrains'kyi visnyk, issues 1-8 (Baltimore, 1970-1974)

Official Soviet Publications and Compilations of the Soviet Press

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, volumes 8-27 (Columbus, Ohio, 1956-1985)

Digest of the Soviet Ukrainian Press, volumes 5-13 (Munich, 1961-1969)

NECHKINA, M.V. and LEIBENGRUB, P.S., *Istoriia SSSR: Uchebnik dlia 7-go klassa* (Moscow, 1982)

KONDUFOR, Iu. Iu., *Istoriia Ukrains'koi RSR: Korotkyi narys* (Kyiv, 1981)

Memoirs

SHELEST, P., *Spravzhnii sud istorii shche poperedu. Spohady, shchodennyky, dokumenty, materialy* (edited by Iurii Shapoval, Kyiv, 2003)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

Source collections

BAZHAN, O. (ed.), '"Praz'ka Vesna" u dokumentakh Galuzevoho derzhavnoho arkivu Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008)

FURSENKO, A.A., *Prezidium TsK KPSS 1954-1964: chernovye protokol'nye zapisi zasedanii, stenogrammy, postanovleniia: v 3 tomakh* (Moscow, 2003-2008)

KARNER, S., TOMILINA, N., TSCHUBARJAN, A. et al. (eds), *Prager Fruhling: Das internationale Krisenjahr 1968* (Bohlau, 2008)

Secondary Sources

Books

AKSIUTIN, Iu., *Khrushchevskaia "Ottepel'" i obshchestvennye nastroeniia v SSSR v 1953-1964 gg.* (Moscow, 2004)

ALEKSEEVA, G.D., *Istoricheskaia nauka v Rossii. Ideologiia. Politika (60-80-e gody XX veka)* (Moscow, 2003)

ANDERSON, B., *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 2006)

ARMSTRONG, J., *Ukrainian Nationalism* (Englewood, 1990)

BARAN, V., *Ukraina: Novitnia istoriia* (L'viv, 2003)

BASARAB, J., *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton, 1982)

BEISSINGER, M., *Nationalist Mobilisation and the Collapse of the Soviet State* (Cambridge, 2002)

BILINSKY, Y., *The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine after World War II* (New Brunswick, 1964)

BLIUM, A., *A Self-Administered Poison: The System and Functions of Soviet Censorship* (Oxford, 2003)

BLOOM, W., *Personal Identity, National Identity, and International Relations* (Cambridge, 1990)

BOCIURKIW, B., *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)* (Toronto, 1996)

BREUILLY, J., *Nationalism and the State* (Manchester, 1993)

BROOKS, J., *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!: Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton, 1999)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

BROWN, K., *A Biography of no Place: From Ethnic Borderland to Soviet Heartland* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004)

CLARK, K., *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Bloomington, 2000)

COOK, L., *The Soviet Social Contract and Why It Failed: Welfare Policy and Workers' Politics from Brezhnev to Yeltsin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993)

DAVIES, S., *Popular Opinion in Stalin's Russia:Terror, Propaganda, and Dissent, 1934-1941* (Cambridge, 1997)

DMYTRUK, V., *Ukraina ne movchala: Reaktsiia ukrains'koho suspil'stva na podii 1968 roku v Chekhoslovachchyni* (Kyiv, 2004)

DOBSON, M., *Khrushchev's Cold Summer: Gulag Returnees, Crime, and the Fate of Reform after Stalin* (Ithaca, 2009)

DRACHMAN, E.R., *Challenging the Kremlin: The Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990* (New York, 1991)

DUDZINSKAIA, E.A., *Mezhdunarodnye nauchnye sviazi sovetskikh istorikov* (Moscow, 1978)

DVORNICHENKO, V. V., *Turizm v SSSR i deiatel'nost' sovetskikh profsoiuzov po ego razvitiiu (1917-1984 gg.)* (Moscow, 1985)

DUNHAM, V., *In Stalin's Time: Middleclass Values in Soviet Fiction* (Durham, 1990)

EBON, M., *The Soviet Propaganda Machine* (New York, 1986)

EDELE, M., *Soviet Veterans of the Second World War: A Popular Movement in an Authoritarian Society, 1941-1991* (Oxford, 2008)

FARMER, K., *Ukrainian Nationalism in the post-Stalin Era: Myth, Symbols, and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (The Hague, 1980)

FATEEV, A., *Obraz vraga v sovetskoi propagande: 1945-1954* (Moscow, 1999)

FILTZER, D., *Soviet Workers and de-Stalinisation: The Consolidation of the Modern System of Soviet Production Relations, 1953-1964* (Cambridge, 1992)

FITZPATRICK, S., *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times, Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York, 1999)

FITZPATRICK, S., *Tear Off the Masks!: Identity and Imposture in Twentieth Century Russia* (Princeton, 2005)

FRANKEL, E., *Novyi Mir: A Case Study in the Politics of Literature 1952-1958* (Cambridge, 1981)

GARTON-ASH, T., *The Polish Revolution: Solidarity* (New Haven, 2002)

GELLNER, E., *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 2006)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

GITELMAN, Z., *Bespokoinyi vek: Evrei Rossii i Sovetskogo Soiuza s 1881 g. do nashikh dnei* (Moscow, 2008)

GOODE, L., *Jürgen Habermas: Democracy and the Public Sphere* (London, 2005)

HABERMAS, J., *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, 1989)

HALFIN, I., *From Darkness to Light: Class, Consciousness, and Salvation in Revolutionary Russia* (Pittsburgh, 2000)

HAZAN, B., *Soviet Impregnational Propaganda* (Ann Arbor, 1982)

HIXSON, W., *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (Basingstoke, 1997)

HNATIUK, O., *Pozegnanie z imperium: ukrainskie dyskusje o tozsamosci* (Lublin, 2003)

HODNETT, G. and POTICHNYJ, P., *The Ukraine and the Czechoslovak Crisis* (Canberra, 1970)

HOSKING, G., *Beyond Socialist Realism: Soviet Fiction since Ivan Denisovich* (London, 1980)

HOSKING, G., *Rulers and Victims: The Russians in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006)

HOSKING, G., *A History of the Soviet Union* (London, 1990)

KAISER, R., *The Geography of Nationalism in Russia and the USSR* (Princeton, 1994)

KAS'IANOV, H., *Nezhodni: Ukrains'ka intelihentsiia v rusi oporu 1960x-80x rokiv* (Kyiv, 1995)

KEMP, W., *Nationalism and Communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union: A Basic Contradiction?* (Basingstoke, 1999)

KENEZ, P., *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilisation, 1917-1929* (Cambridge, 1985)

KOMKOV, G.D., LEVSHIN, B.V., SEMENOV, L.K., *Akademiia Nauk SSSR: Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk, Tom Vtoroi, 1917-1976* (Moscow, 1977)

KOTKIN, S., *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilisation* (Berkeley, 1995)

KOZLOV, V.A., *Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the post-Stalin Years* (London, 2002)

KUROMIYA, H., *Freedom and Terror in the Donbas: A Ukrainian-Russian Borderland, 1870s-1990s* (Cambridge, 1998)

KUZIO, T. and WILSON, A., *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence* (London, 1999)

LEBINA, N.B., *Povsednevnaia zhizn' sovetskogo goroda: normy i anomalii, 1920-1930 gody* (St. Petersburg, 1999)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

LEWIN, M., *The Soviet Century* (London, New York, 2005)

LEWYTZKYJ, B., *Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine, 1953-1980* (Edmonton, 1984)

LITVIN, A.L., *Writing History in Twentieth-Century Russia: A View from Within* (New York, 2001)

LOIKO, L.V., *Ispytanie na prochnost'. Obshchestvo pol'sko-sovetskoi druzhby: stanovlenie, razvitie* (Minsk, 1989)

MACHCEWICZ, P., *Polski rok 1956* (Warsaw, 1993)

MAGOSCI, P., *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (Toronto, 2002)

MARKWICK, R.D., *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia: The Politics of Revisionist Historiography, 1956-1974* (New York, 2001)

MARPLES, D.R., *Heroes and Villains: Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine* (Budapest, 2007)

MARTIN, T., *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939* (Ithaca, 2001)

MATTHEWS, M., *Education in the Soviet Union: Policies and Institutions since Stalin* (London, 1982)

McKENNA, K, *All the Views Fit to Print: Changing Images of the U.S. in* Pravda *Political Cartoons, 1917-1991* (New York, 1991)

MITROKHIN, N., *Russkaia partiia: Dvizhenie russkikh natsionalistov v SSSR 1953-1985* (Moscow, 2003)

MOTYL, A., *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine after Totalitarianism* (New York, 1993)

OST, D., *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics: Opposition and Reform in Poland since 1968* (Philadelphia, 1990)

PLOKHY, S., *Ukraine and Russia: Representations of the Past* (Toronto, 2008)

PRIZEL, I., *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998)

REMINGTON, T., *The Truth of Authority: Ideology and Communication in the Soviet Union* (Pittsburgh, 1988)

RIABCHOUK, M., *Dvi Ukrainy: real'ni mezhi, virtual'ni viiny* (Kyiv, 2003)

ROSZKOWSKI, W., *Najnowsza historia Polski 1945-1980* (Warsaw, 2003)

SMITH, A., *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford, 1986)

SNYDER, T., *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven, 2003)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

SOLOMON, P., *Soviet Criminologists and Criminal Policy: Specialists in Policy Making* (London, 1978)

SOWINSKI, P., *Wakacje w Polsce Ludowej. Polityka władz i ruch turystyczny (1945-1989)* (Warsaw, 2005)

SPECHLER, D., *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novyi Mir and the Soviet Regime* (New York, 1982)

SUNY, R., *The Revenge of the Past: Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of the Soviet Union* (Stanford, 1993)

SZPORLUK, R., *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx Versus Friedrich List* (New York, 1998)

TEAGUE, E., *Solidarity and the Soviet Worker: The Impact of the Polish Events of 1980 on Soviet Internal Politics* (London, 1988)

THOMASSEN, L., *Habermas: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London, 2010)

TILLETT, L., *The Great Friendship: Soviet Historians on the non-Russian Nationalities* (Durham, 1969)

VELYCHENKO, S., *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914-1991* (New York, 1993)

WANNER, C., *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in post-Soviet Ukraine* (University Park, 1998)

WEDGWOOD BENN, D., *Persuasion and Soviet Politics* (Oxford, 1989)

WEINER, A., *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton, 2001)

WILSON, A., *Ukraine's Orange Revolution* (New Haven, 2005)

WILSON, A., *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s : A Minority Faith* (Cambridge, 1997)

WILSON, A., *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation* (New Haven, 2002)

YEKELCHYK, S., *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto, 2004)

YEKELCHYK, S., *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford, 2007)

YURCHAK, A., *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006)

ZISSERMAN-BRODSKY, D., *Constructing Ethnopolitics in the Soviet Union: Samizdat, Deprivation, and the Rise of Ethnic Nationalism* (New York, 2003)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

Journal Articles and Chapters in Books

ANDRUKHOVYCH, I., 'Kraina mrii', *Krytyka* 9-10 (2004)

BABIRACKI, P., 'Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-57', *Ab Imperio: Studies of New Imperial History and Nationalism in the post-Soviet Space* 4 (2007)

BAKER, K.M., 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas' in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere: Conference Papers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992)

BAZHAN, O., 'Represyvni zakhody radians'koi vlady shchodo hromadian evreis'koi natsional'nosti v URSR (1960ti-1980ti rr.)', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2004)

BAZHAN, O., 'Suspil'ni nastroi v Ukraini u khodi chekhoslovats'koi kryzy 1968 roku za donesenniamy radians'kykh spetssluzhb', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008)

BAZHAN, O., 'Zovnishn'o-politychni aktsii SRSR u 50-80-ti rr. ta ix vplyv na rozvytok opozytsiinoho rukhu v Ukraini', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000)

BIALER, S., 'The Solidarity and the Soviet Union' in Steve Reiquam (ed.), *Solidarity and Poland: Impacts East and West* (Washington, D.C., 1988)

BILINSKY, Y., 'The Incorporation of Western Ukraine and Its Impact on Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine' in Roman Szporluk (ed.), *The Influence of Eastern Europe and the Soviet West on the USSR* (New York, 1976)

BONIN, P., 'Failures Compared: The State Nationalisms of Non-National States in Socialist Europe' in E. Jahn (ed.), *Nationalism in Late and Post-Communist Europe. Volume 1: The Failed Nationalism of the Multinational and Partial National States* (Nomos, 2008)

BREUILLY, J., 'Introduction' in E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 2006)

BROMKE, A., 'Ukraine and Poland in an Interdependent Europe' in P.J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present* (Edmonton, 1980)

BROOKS, J., 'Socialist Realism in Pravda: Read All About It!', *Slavic Review* 53:4 (1994)

BUDUROWYCZ, B., 'Poland and the Ukrainian Problem, 1921-1939', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 25:4 (1983)

CALHOUN, C., 'Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere' in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere: Conference Papers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992)

CORNER, P., 'Introduction' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

COSTANZO, S., 'Amateur Theatres and Amateur Publics in the Russian Republic, 1958-71', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

DANYLIUK, Iu. Z., 'Vidrodzhuiuchy storinky mynuloho' in O.G. Bazhan et. al. (eds), *Zberezhemo tuiu slavu: hromads'kyi rukh za uvichnennia istorii ukrains'koho kozatstva w druhii polovyni 50x-80x rr. XX st.* (Kyiv, 1997)

DAVIES, S., '"Us Against Them": Social Identity in Soviet Russia, 1934-41' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions* (London, 2000)

DMYTRUK, V., 'Nelehal'na informatsiina merezha v Chekhoslovachchyni ta ii vplyv na formuvannia opozytsiinykh nastroiv v Ukraini (kinets 60x – pochatok 70-x rr.)', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 2/4 (2000)

DMYTRUK, V., '"Praz'ka vesna" i Ukraina', *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 1/2 (2008)

DOBSON, M., '"Show the Bandit-Enemies No Mercy!": Amnesty, Criminality and Public Response in 1953' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

EKIERT, G., 'Rebellious Poles: Political Crises and Popular Protest under State Socialism, 1945-89', *East European Politics and Societies* 11:2 (1997)

EPSTEIN, D., 'Soviet Patriotism: 1985-1991' in E. Jahn (ed.), *Nationalism in Late and Post-Communist Europe. Volume 1: The Failed Nationalism of the Multinational and Partial National States* (Nomos, 2008)

FEHER, F., 'Eastern Europe's Long Revolution against Yalta', *East European Politics and Societies* 2:1 (1987)

FILTZER, D., 'From Mobilised to Free Labour: De-Stalinisation and the Changing Legal Status of Workers' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

FITZPATRICK, S., 'Popular Opinion in Russia under Pre-war Stalinism' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

FITZPATRICK, S., 'Stalin and the Making of a New Elite, 1928-1939', *Slavic Review* 38:3 (1979)

FURST, J., JONES, P., and MORRISSEY, S., 'The Relaunch of the Soviet Project, 1945-1964', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008)

GITELMAN, Z., 'The Diffusion of Political Innovation: From East Europe to the Soviet Union' in Roman Szporluk (ed.), *The influence of Eastern Europe and the Soviet west on the USSR* (New York, 1976)

GITELMAN, Z., 'Ethnopolitics and the Future of the Former Soviet Union' in Zvi Gitelman (ed.), *The Politics of Nationality and the Erosion of the USSR: Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Harrogate, 1990* (London, 1992)

GORENBURG, D., 'Soviet Nationalities Policy and Assimilation' in Dominique Arel and Blair A. Ruble (eds), *Rebounding Identities: The Politics of Identity in Russia and Ukraine* (Washington, D.C., 2006)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

GORSUCH, A.E., '"There's No Place Like Home": Soviet Tourism in Late Stalinism', *Slavic Review* 62:4 (2003)

GORSUCH, A.E., 'Time Travellers: Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe' in A.E. Gorsuch and D.P. Koenker (eds), *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca, 2006)

GRANVILLE, J., 'Poland and Hungary, 1956: A Comparative Essay Based on New Archival Findings', *The Australian Journal of Politics and History* 48:3 (2002)

HABERMAS, J., 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere' in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere: Conference Papers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992)

HAYWARD, M., 'Introduction' in Leopold Labedz and Max Hayward (eds), *On Trial. The Case of Siniavskii-Tertz and Daniel-Arzhak* (London, 1967)

HELLBECK, J., 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions* (London, 2000)

HELLBECK, J., 'Speaking Out: Languages of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia' in Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist and Marshall Poe (eds), *The Resistance Debate in Russian and Soviet History* (Bloomington, 2003)

HESSLER, J., 'Cultured Trade: The Stalinist Turn to Consumerism' in S. Fitzpatrick (ed) *Stalinism: New Directions* (London, 2000)

HIMKA, J., 'The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772-1918', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8:3-4 (1984)

HOFFMANN, D., 'Was There a Great Retreat from Soviet Socialism?' *Kritika* 5:4 (2004)

HOOPER, C., 'Terror of Intimacy: Family Politics in the 1930s Soviet Union' in C. Kiaer and E. Naiman (eds), *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia: Taking the Revolution Inside* (Bloomington, 2006)

HOOPER, C., 'What Can and Cannot be Said: Between the Stalinist Past and New Soviet Future', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008)

JONES, P., 'From the Secret Speech to the Burial of Stalin: Real and Ideal Responses to de-Stalinisation' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

JONES, P., 'Introduction: The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

KOENKER, D.P., 'The Proletarian Tourist in the 1930s: Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape' in A.E. Gorsuch and D.P. Koenker (eds), *Turizm: the Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca, 2006)

KOENKER, D.P., 'Travel to Work, Travel to Play: on Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure', *Slavic Review* 62:4 (2003)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

KOLANKIEWICZ, G., 'The Polish Question: Andropov's Answer?' in Leonard Schapiro and Joseph Godson (eds), *The Soviet Worker: from Lenin to Andropov* (London, 1984)

KOZLOV, D., 'Naming the Social Evil: The Readers of *Novyi Mir* and Vladimir Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*, 1956-59 and Beyond' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

KRAMER, M., 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union: Part One', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 5:4 (2003)

KRAMER, M., 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union: Part Two', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 6:4 (2004)

KRAMER, M., 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union: Part Three', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7:1 (2005)

KRAMER, M., 'The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine' in Carol Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker (eds), *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge, 1998)

KRAMER, M., 'The Early post-Stalin Succession Struggle and Upheavals in East-Central Europe: Internal-External Linkages in Soviet Policy-Making: Part Three', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1:3 (1999)

KRAMER, M., 'Soviet Policy during the Polish and Hungarian Crises of 1956: Reassessments and New Findings', *Journal of Contemporary History* 33:2 (1998)

KRAMER, M., 'Spill over from the Prague Spring – a KGB Report', *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 4 (1994)

KULA, M., 'Poland: The Silence of Those Deprived of Voice' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

KUPCZAK, J., 'Pojednanie polsko-ukrainskie na tle politycznej wizji Jerzego Giedroycia' in T. Zaretskaia (ed.), *Rola Kultury paryskiej w ksztaltowaniu ukrainsko-polskiego zrozumienia wzajemnego* (Kyiv, 2002)

KUZIO, T., 'The Polish Opposition and the Ukrainian Question', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 12:2 (1987)

LAPIERRE, B., 'Making Hooliganism on a Mass Scale: The Campaign Against Petty Hooliganism in the Soviet Union, 1956-1964', *Cahiers du monde russe* 47:1-2 (2006)

LAPIERRE, B., 'Private Matters or Public Crimes: The Rise of Domestic Hooliganism in the Soviet Union, 1939-1966' in Lewis H. Siegelbaum (ed.), *Borders of Socialism: Private Spheres of Soviet Russia* (New York, 2006)

LEWYTZKYJ, B., 'Political and Cultural Cooperation between the People's Republic of Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic' in P.J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present* (Edmonton, 1980)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

LINDENBERGER, T., 'Tacit Minimal Consensus: The Always Precarious East German Dictatorship' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

LIPOWSKI, M., 'Rewindykacja spoleczenstwa' in T. Zaretskaia (ed.), *Rola Kultury paryskiej w ksztaltowaniu ukrainsko-polskiego zrozumienia wzajemnego* (Kyiv, 2002)

LIVSCHIZ, A., 'De-Stalinising Soviet Childhood: The Quest for Moral Rebirth, 1953-58' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

MARKUS, V., 'Religion and Nationality: the Uniates of Ukraine' in Bohdan R. Bociurkiw and John W. Strong (eds), *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (London, 1975)

McDERMOTT, K., 'Archives, Power and the "Cultural Turn": Reflections on Stalin and Stalinism', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 5:1 (2004)

McDERMOTT, K., 'Stalinism "From Below"?: Social Preconditions of and Popular Responses to the Great Terror', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8:3 (2007)

MASON, D., 'Solidarity as a New Social Movement', *Political Science Quarterly*, 104:1 (1989)

NEUMANN, I., 'Russia as Central Europe's Constituting Other', *East European Politics and Societies* 7:2 (1993)

PASTOR, P., 'Official Nationalism' in Gerasimos Augustinos (ed.), *The National Idea in Eastern Europe: the Politics of Ethnic and Civic Community* (Lexington, 1996)

PAULY, M., 'Soviet Polonophobia and the Formulation of Nationalities Policy in the Ukrainian SSR 1927-1934' in David Ransel and Bozena Shallcross (eds), *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity* (Bloomington, 2005)

PETERI, G., 'The Occident Within – or the Drive for Exceptionalism and Modernity', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9:4 (2008)

PLAMPER, J., 'Beyond Binaries: Popular Opinion in Stalinism' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

PLOKHY, S., 'In the Shadow of Yalta: International Politics and the Soviet Liquidation of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church' in Serhii Plokhy and Frank E. Sysyn (eds), *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton, 2003)

POLLOCK, E., '"Real Men Go to the Bania": Postwar Soviet Masculinities and the Bathhouse', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 11:1 (2010)

RALIS, M., 'Workers' Social Perceptions' in Leonard Schapiro and Joseph Godson (eds), *The Soviet Worker: from Lenin to Andropov* (London, 1984)

RAMET, P., 'The Interplay of Religious Policy and Nationalities Policy in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe' in Pedro Ramet (ed.), *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics* (Durham, 1989)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

REDDAWAY, P., 'Policy towards Dissent since Khrushchev' in T. Rigby et al (eds), *Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR* (London, 1980)

REID, S.E., 'Who Will Beat Whom? Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9:4 (2008)

RIGBY, T.H., 'Soviet Communist Party Membership under Brezhnev', *Soviet Studies* 28:3 (1976)

ROTH-EY, K.J., 'Finding a Home for Television in the USSR, 1950-1970', *Slavic Review* 66:2 (2007)

ROTKIRCH, A., 'Traveling Maidens and Men with Parallel Lives – Journeys as Private Space during Late Socialism' in J. Smith (ed.), *Beyond the Limits: The Concept of Space in Russian History and Culture* (Helsinki, 1999)

ROZENBAUM, W., 'The March Events: Targetting the Jews', *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry* 21 (2009)

RUSNACHENKO, A., 'Sprotyv robitnytstva ta robitnychi protesty v Ukraini (kin. 50kh- poch. 80kh rr)', *Rozbudova derzhavy* 4 (1996)

SABROW, M., 'Consent in the Communist GDR' in Paul Corner (ed.), *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism* (Oxford, 2009)

SCHATTENBERG, S., '"Democracy" or "Despotism"? How the Secret Speech Was Translated into Everyday Life' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

SERBYN, R., 'Managing Memory in post-Soviet Ukraine: "Victory Day" or "Remembrance Day"' in S. Velychenko (ed.), *Ukraine, the EU and Russia: History, Culture and International Relations* (Basingstoke, 2007)

SHULMAN, S., 'Cultures in Competition: Ukrainian Foreign Policy and the "Cultural Threat" from Abroad', *Europe-Asia Studies* 50:2 (1998)

SHULMAN, S., 'National Identity and Public Support for Political and Economic Reform in Ukraine', *Slavic Review* 64:1 (2005)

SLEZKINE, Y., 'The USSR as Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism', *Slavic Review* 53:2 (1994)

SOLCHANYK, R., 'Polska a sowiecki zachod', *Suchasnist: zeszyt w jezyku polskim* 1-2 (1985)

SURI, J., 'The Promise and Failure of "Developed Socialism": the Soviet 'Thaw' and the Crucible of the Prague Spring, 1964–1972', *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006)

SYSYN, F., 'The Changing Image of the Hetman: on the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising', *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas* 46:4 (1998)

SZPORLUK, R., 'Introduction' in Roman Szporluk (ed.), *The Influence of Eastern Europe and the Soviet West on the USSR* (New York, 1976)

SZPORLUK, R., 'The Making of Modern Ukraine: The Western Dimension', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25:1-2 (2001)

Zbigniew Wojnowski

SZPORLUK, R., 'The Role of the Press in Polish-Ukrainian Relations' in P.J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present* (Edmonton, 1980)

SZPORLUK, R., 'The Soviet West – or Far Eastern Europe?', *East European Politics and Societies* 5:3 (1991)

SZPORLUK, R., 'The Strange Politics of L'viv: An Essay in Search of an Explanation' in Zvi Gitelman (ed.), *The Politics of Nationality and the Erosion of the USSR: Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Harrogate, 1990* (London, 1992)

SZPORLUK, R., 'Ukraina: od imperialnej peryferii do suwerennego panstwa' in Roman Szporluk, *Imperium, komunizm i narody: wybor esejow* (Krakow, 2003)

TROMLY, B., 'Soviet Patriotism and its Discontents among Higher Education Students in Khrushchev-era Russia and Ukraine', *Nationalities Papers* 37:3 (2009)

VARGA-HARRIS, C., 'Forging Citizenship on the Home Front: Reviving the Socialist Contract and Constructing Soviet Identity during the Thaw' in Polly Jones (ed.), *The Dilemmas of de-Stalinisation: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era* (London, 2005)

VELYCHENKO, S., 'Post-Colonialism and Ukrainian History', *Ab Imperio* 1 (2004)

VIOLA, L., 'Popular Resistance in the Stalinist 1930s: Soliloquy of a Devil's Advocate' in Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist and Marshall Poe (eds), *The Resistance Debate in Russian and Soviet History* (Bloomington, 2003)

WEINER, A., "Déjà Vu All Over Again: Prague Spring, Romanian Summer, and Soviet Autumn on Russia's Western Frontier," *Contemporary European History* 15:2 (2006)

WEINER, A., 'The Empires Pay a Visit: Gulag Returnees, East European Rebellions, and Soviet Frontier Politics', *The Journal of Modern History* 78:2 (2006)

WEINER, A., 'Robust Revolution to Retiring Revolution: The Life Cycle of the Soviet Revolution, 1945-1968', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86:2 (2008)

WILSON, A., 'Ukraine and Post-Soviet Europe: Authoritarian Consolidation or Renewed Reform?' in Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis (eds), *Developments in Central and East European Politics 3* (Basingstoke, 2003)

YEKELCHYK, S., 'Diktat and Dialogue in Stalinist Culture: Staging Patriotic Historical Opera in Soviet Ukraine, 1936-1954', *Slavic Review* 59:3 (2000)

YEKELCHYK, S., 'The Location of Nation: Postcolonial Perspectives on Ukrainian Historical Debates', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 11:1-2 (1997)

ZAITSEV, I., 'Pol's'ka opozytsiia 1970-80-kh rokiv pro zasady ukrains'ko-pol's'koho porozuminnia' in Iurii Slyvka (ed.), *Deportatsii ukraintsiv ta poliakiv: kinets 1939- pochatok 50-kh rokiv* (L'viv, 1998)