

UDC 930.1:94(477)-058.243<1946–1965>
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130665

Dmytro NEFYODOV,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1992-7271

*Ph D hab. (History), Postdoctoral student of Department of History of
Mykolaiv V. O. Sukhomlynsky National University
(Ukraine, Mykolaiv) nefyodovdv@gmail.com*

THE UKRAINIAN SSR POSTWAR WORKING CLASS (1946 – 1965) IN THE EVALUATION OF THE SOVIETOLOGY IN THE WEST

The article describes the most important tendencies in the study of the history of the Ukrainian Soviet working class of the postwar period (1946 – 1965) in Western historiography. The achievements, main ideas and peculiarities of the historiographical process, methods of historical research, influence of socio-political phenomena on the themes and content of works of Sovietologists are determined.

The main thesis of the article is the statement that Western historical science paid much attention to the study of the Ukrainian Soviet society of postwar twenty years, in particular to the study of the situation of the Soviet workers as the most mass class of the society.

The key thesis of the Western Sovietology regarding the problems of Ukrainian Soviet postwar working class was the emphasis on the complete lack of workers' rights. According the Sovietologists, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union pursued a policy of industrial totalitarianism towards the Soviet working class, imposing on workers the orientation of accelerated forced industrial development at any cost, causing the workers a direct material as well as indirect social and moral damage.

One of the central places in the study of the situation of Ukrainian working class in the first postwar twenty years is obtained by the conclusion of the Western scholars regarding the strengthening of the targeted Russification policy of Moscow, including the method of relocating a significant number of Russian workers to the cities of South-Eastern Ukraine.

Key words: Ukrainian SSR, working class, historiography, Sovietology.

Дмитро НЕФЬОДОВ,

*кандидат історичних наук, докторант кафедри історії
Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського
(Україна, Миколаїв)
nefyodovdv@gmail.com*

ПОВОЄННЕ РОБІТНИЦТВО УРСР (1946 – 1965 рр.) В ОЦІНЦІ ЗАХІДНОЇ РАДЯНОЛОГІЇ

У статті охарактеризовано найважливіші тенденції дослідження історії українського робітництва повоєнного періоду (1946 – 1965 рр.) в західній історіографії. Визначено досягнення, головні ідеї та особливості історіографічного процесу, методи історичного дослідження, вплив суспільно-політичних явищ на тематику та зміст праць радянологів.

Основною тезою статті є твердження про те, що західна історична наука велику увагу приділяла вивченю українського робітництва в повоєнне двадцятиріччя, зокрема дослідженю становища радянських робітників як найбільш масового класу соціуму.

Ключовими тезами західної радянології стосовно проблематики українського робітництва стало акцентування уваги на повному безправ'ї робітників. На переважання радянологів, стосовно робітництва КПРС проводила політику індустриального тоталітаризму, нав'язуючи робітникам установки пришивданого форсованого інду-

стріального розвитку будь-якою ціною, завдаючи робітникам як прямого матеріального, так і непрямого соціального та морального збитку.

Одне з центральних місць при дослідженні становища українського робітництва в період повоєнне двадцятиріччя займає висновок західних науковців щодо посилення цілеспрямованої політики русифікації з боку Москви у тому числі методом переселення значної кількості російських робітників до міст Південно-Східної України.

Ключові слова: УРСР, робітництво, історіографія, радянологія.

The statement of the problem. The historiographic development of the situation of the Ukrainian SSR working class during postwar twenty years is incomplete without analyzing the achievements of foreign historical science. Democratic conditions for the development of the historical science in the western world and the absence of populist barriers became the main condition for the high effectiveness of foreign scientists' scientific creativity. In addition, the entry of domestic Clio to the world scientific community requires carrying out of holistic and complex historiographical studies involving the entire array of available sources, but not only with the use of domestic works.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. Having analyzed the state of the scientific development of the problem, we must emphasize the fact that the historiographical works on the subject of the Soviet working class with the use of works by Western researchers are in fact absent in modern Ukrainian historical science. On the related issue, the attention is drawn to the dissertation of the researcher N. Laas (Laas, 2009), which is devoted to a broader topic, i.e., the determination of the level of Sovietology on the problems of social and cultural history of Ukraine during the postwar period on the basis of the analysis of English-language works. N. Laas paid special attention to the analysis of Sovietologist concepts of Ukrainian Soviet society and social stratification. The dissertation partly presents the working class topic. Certain All-Union working class topics were discovered in the dissertations of such Russian researchers as V. Drozdov (Drozdov, 1998), Ye. Kodin (Kodin, 1998), and A. Nekrasov (Nekrasov, 2001) devoted to the analysis of the Sovietology level.

Thus, in modern historical science there is no historiographical development of the situation of the Ukrainian Soviet working class in the postwar period based on the analysis of Sovietology scientific works by Western scholars.

The publication's purpose is to characterize the most important tendencies in the study of the Ukrainian SSR postwar working class (1946 – 1965) by Western historical science, to determine the achievements, the main ideas and the peculiarities of the historiographical process, the methods of historical research, the influence of socio-political phenomena on the subject and content of Sovietologists' works.

Statement of the basic material. The establishment of Western Sovietology began in the context of the Cold War development, which led to a corresponding vector of Soviet studies in integration of the academic sciences of the socio-humanitarian spectrum with military specialist programs. At the initial stage of the development, Sovietology had to provide the applied data for a more precise study of the potential enemy and understanding of the situation in which large social groups of the Soviet society, including the Soviet working class, were at that time. Measures of a victorious nature were to be used in propaganda against the USSR and the countries of the socialist camp, as well as in order to curb the further spread of the «communist threat» across the Atlantic Ocean. The pragmatic nature and participation in creating «the image of the enemy» in the subconscious of ordinary Americans led to a significant politicization of the Sovietology works of the first postwar years. However, these

circumstances did not become fatal for the Western historical science and did not drastically lower the professional level of the first works.

The similar approaches of the historians of Great Britain and the USA to the study of post-war Soviet society allowed us to define in our study the term «Sovietology» as the works, first and foremost, of the representatives of English-speaking Western historiography. It should be noted that the American Sovietology goes beyond the US boundaries because of the fact that the US Sovietology was directly developing in close connection with the historical and political sciences of Great Britain and Canada and which had a great influence on it. In subsequent postwar decades, scientists from Australia, France, Germany, Japan and several other countries of the world also studied the USSR, but the primacy throughout the studied period was kept by the English-language science.

In the second half of the 1940s – early 1950s, primarily through the efforts of the US government, as well as the grant support of a number of philanthropic foundations at the universities of the United States and Great Britain, a number of specialized centers for the study of both the USSR as a whole and the Ukrainian SSR in particular were created. The preference was given, first of all, to the study of the Russian and Ukrainian languages, the study of the Soviet economy, the situation of large social groups (first of all, the working class). In addition to the methodological tools of purely historical science, the study of Soviet society actively used means of economics, political science, sociology, and cultural studies. Lack of access to Soviet archives, the need to use open Soviet data with their secondary analysis led to the formation of a specific multidisciplinary methodological tool.

The totalitarian paradigm became the first universal Sovietology concept, designed to answer any question regarding the Soviet reality. Aimed at ensuring the national interests of the United States and supporting the evidence base of the advantage of the Western capitalist world over the Soviet socialism it was actively used in applied political research, providing support for US foreign policy towards confrontation with the USSR.

In 1951, the first book of the researcher H. Arendt «Sources of Totalitarianism» was published in the United States (Arendt, 1951). With the reissue in 1958, 1966, 1968, 1973, 1976, 1979 in the United States and a huge number of reprints in other countries, this work became an indispensable guide of the totalitarian direction of Sovietology. According to H. Arendt, totalitarianism led to the destruction of all social, legislative and political traditions in the USSR, the elimination of classes and the creation of a classless society took place. Only in a classless society, according to H. Arendt, totalitarianism is possible (Arendt, 1951: 459).

The analysis of the «anatomy» of Soviet totalitarianism is highlighted in the work of Professor M. Fainsod «How is Russia Ruled» (Fainsod, 1963), published in 1953 and which also got through a large number of reprints. This work greatly strengthened the position of the totalitarian direction in Sovietology and became a peculiar beacon for all subsequent works of this school. According to historian A. Gleason, the work of M. Fainsod not only «defined the strategic thinking of American Sovietologists about the USSR for twenty years ahead», but also created a «totalitarianism syndrome with a culmination in the form of a totalitarian model of American Sovietology» (Gleason, 1984: 151).

In 1953, Professor of Harvard University C. Friedrich organized a scientific conference on totalitarianism, in which such Sovietologists as B. Wolf, G. Kennan, A. Ulam and M. Fainsod took part. Soon, a specialist from the USSR Z. Brzezinski joined the group, and in the co-authorship of C. Friedrich and Z. Brzezinski, a third peculiar pillar of the totalitarian concept was created, i.e. the book «Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy» (Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956).

The official Washington highly praised the work of the Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction, as evidenced by their involvement in the service as presidential advisers. So, in J. Carter's administration Z. Brzezinski worked as a National Security Adviser, M. Schulman worked as a USSR adviser. The private negative attitude towards the USSR manifested itself both in the political sphere and in scientific opinions on the pages of Sovietology studies.

According to this concept, the Soviet government has a pronounced totalitarian nature and periods that change each other, which is just a succession of generations. Characterizing the Post-Stalin decade, the representatives of the totalitarian direction call it «developed totalitarianism» (by analogy with the Soviet concept of the transition period of «developed socialism»), and «the internal logic of totalitarianism» is called the driving force of the Soviet society development (Cohen, 1985: 42). Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction explain the partial liberalization and democratization of socio-political life in the USSR during M. Khrushchov's rule by the lack of the need for the continuation of mass political repression through the destruction of any opposition in principle. In general, «totalitarians» emphasize that the Soviet power had the anti-people nature and was supported not by the working class, as declared in all party documents and speeches, but by the so-called narrow stratum of the party's «ruling elite» (Fainsod, 1963: 375).

The partial liberalization of all spheres of social and political life in the USSR, connected with M. Khrushchov's coming to power and the political crisis in the USA itself, led to the weakening of the positions of the Sovietology totalitarian direction. The desire of the younger generation of professional historians to oppose totalitarian historians who came to science after service in intelligence agencies and the desire to reduce the level of politicization of historical science led to actualization of the study of the socio-economic history of the USSR, the strengthening of the position of representatives of the Sovietology revisionist direction. In the works of Sh. Fitzpatrick, A. Meyer, W. Chase, H. Kumor, L. Siegelbaum, the monotheistic conception of the Soviet system is denied, the attention is focused on social history and the situation of Soviet workers. Unlike historians of totalitarian direction, who viewed the Soviet social system as a unique phenomenon in the organization of human civilization, the revisionists sought to find common ground between the situation of working class in the USSR and the West.

The new wave of intensification of Sovietophobia in the 1970s was caused by sending in Soviet troops to Afghanistan and a new turning point in the fight against the «evil empire» headed by the US President R. Reagan. Again a powerful funding of Sovietology think tanks and strengthening of the totalitarian direction in Sovietology began.

In 1983, the US Congress passed the Act on Soviet-East European Studies and training of specialists with financial federal support from American universities. As a result, in the late 1980s, 250 universities in the United States contained about two thousand teachers and 7,000 courses devoted mainly to the recent history of the USSR.

A great financial support to the Sovietology think tanks of the United States and Great Britain was provided by the so-called «philanthropic foundations». In the USA, about 30 thousand funds with a total capital of over 30 billion dollars annually appropriates more than 2 billion dollars to fund 150 institutions and 200 university departments. Thus, the Ford Foundation provides support to 107 of the 200 US Sovietology Centers, the Rockefeller Foundation provides support to 18 and the Carnegie Corporation to 17 Sovietology Centers. Funded by the Ford Foundation in 1967, the Center for International Studies of the School of Economic Sciences in London was founded.

The theme of the social structure of the Soviet society remained the very topical direction of the Western Sovietology research throughout the period under study. Contrasted with other themes, the working class attracted the greatest attention as the largest social group and the driving force of the industrial development of the USSR. A special interest in the study of the Soviet working class is observed in the revisionists' community, for which in the Sovietology the latter received appreciation of social historians of the USSR.

One of the first English-language works devoted to the analysis of the political situation of Ukraine under the authority of the USSR is the monograph by C. Manning «Ukraine under the Soviets» (Manning, 1953), on the pages of which Ukraine and the Ukrainian population are presented as an experimental field in the hands of the Soviet regime, in which they polished methods that were later used in the Baltic and Eastern European countries.

An important conceptual component of Sovietology studies of the first postwar five-year plans was the thesis about the nature of the relations between the Ukrainian SSR and Moscow in the «metropolis-colony» wake. Western researchers focus on the fact that during the fourth five-year plan they set the hidden task to further link the Ukrainian economy to the center, increase the percentage of the raw materials of the Ukrainian industry. Also, the scientists pay attention to the slow pace of rebuilding work, the frank failure in the industry of group «B», which was deliberate in their opinion, the containment of the industrial development of the Ukrainian SSR at the expense of the predominant development of the RSFSR eastern regions.

A number of Western Sovietologists focus on the fact that the rapid rebuilding of the Ukrainian SSR heavy industry did not correspond to the interests of the Ukrainian population. But at the same time, T. Dunmore emphasizes that efforts were focused on the reconstruction of the civilian sectors of heavy industry, while in the eastern RSFSR defense enterprises were of greater importance (Dunmore, 1980: 37).

Evaluating the level of development of «B» industries, aimed at the production of consumer goods and services, Western Sovietologists state that they are secondary in comparison with heavy industry, military and space industries. According to A. Nove, during postwar twenty years the light industry suffered heavy losses and was funded by the residual principle owing to the fact that the Soviet political leaders and planners chose to develop the economic growth and military weapons. Bringing a number of industries to the rank of «non-priority» led to the fact that they could not claim to get proper attention and funding (Nove, 1978: 70). Researcher B. Gwertzman does not exclude a deliberate policy, targeted to curb the development of the service sector in the USSR (Gwertzman, 1982: 11).

Western Sovietology denies the class nature of the CPSU. Thus, professor of the University of California R. Gripp argues that the analysis of the CPSU structure does not provide any ground for expressions of interest of the working class (Gripp, 1973: 180). In the interpretation of the Western Sovietologists the Communist Party represented itself as a narrow group of party leaders, separated from the people and having no relation to society in its goals and objectives (Pethybridge, 1974: 3).

The representatives of the American and Western European Sovietology suggested replacing the concept of «vanguard», which is often used by Soviet historical-party science, by a much more objective term, namely «elite». Thus, according to Sovietologist J. Blondel, the Communist Party is proclaimed to be the vanguard of the proletariat, therefore, it is not a mere representative of the people and Soviet workers, but represents the elite of the Soviet society (Blondel, 1973: 191).

J. Armstrong emphasizes that the Communist Party, by virtue of its monopoly position in the Soviet society and the authoritarian nature of governance, does not express in its policy the interests of the grass-roots (Armstrong, 1974: 135). In particular, researchers exclude any opportunities for the bottom-up initiative of the working class (Duverger, 1972: 14). F. Parkin, a professor at the University of Kent, develops in more detail the concept that socialist societies have a totalitarian power structure in which the party monopolizes the process of making practical decisions at all levels and denies the independence of other political organizations of society (Parkin, 1968: 140). Research scientist of the Emory University R. Blackwell supports this concept and denies any significant influence of workers on decision making within the CPSU (Blackwell, 1972: 137).

According to the Western Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction, the working class in the Soviet society can be exploited, and as a consequence, its leading role is out of the question. Researcher M. Harrington comes to the conclusion that «the Bolsheviks did not create the society that would free workers from exploitation» (Harrington, 1972: 155). Western scholars categorically disagree with the thesis of the Soviet historical science on the fact that state ownership of the main means of production is the economic basis of the leading role of the working class. Thus, Sovietologist M. Markovic draws attention to the fact that the presence of labor exploitation in the USSR and other countries of the socialist camp results primarily from the fact that the means of production are nationalized, but they have never really become public property, but are still alienated from the producers and are in the hands of the ruling elite (Markovic, 1974: 196). Such situation, according to Sovietologists, was established due to the fact that the ruling regime departed from the Marxism postulates and did not transfer the means of production to the direct ownership of producers' cooperatives.

Researchers emphasize that the situation of workers in the USSR does not differ from the position of workers in the countries of the Western capitalist world, and that, as a result of the socialist revolution, the working class's positions did not improve at all (Hollander, 1978: 112). Moreover, Western researchers argue that it is impossible for the working class to play a leading role because of the existence in the USSR of the alienation of producers from the results of their work and the resulting disinterest of the Soviet workers in production. According to scientists, such alienation is inherent in both capitalist and socialist systems, but contrary to the Soviet propaganda, the alienation in the USSR was not only not overcome, but rather intensified, and the worker was transformed into a mere appendage of the technological process. This explains the facts of dishonest attitude to labor and violation of labor discipline (Knight, 1978: 58).

The Western Sovietologists devoted much attention to the debunking of Soviet propaganda's assertion about the «central role» of workers in the management of the state and production, known in Soviet science under the set expression, namely «the development of the social and political activity of the working class». American political scientists and historians Z. Brzezinski, L. Bauman, R. Knight, M. Helen argue that the party and Soviet governmental bodies are isolated from the grass-roots, and the working class does not have democratic rights and is excluded from participation in political processes, and from production management (Bauman, 1976: 92). It is the party leadership, according to Western Sovietologists, which is an insurmountable obstacle for the working class to express true democracy, for the true manifestation of initiatives by the councils in solving problems within their competence (Armstrong, 1974: 84). Councils are viewed by Western researchers as auxiliary agents, which don't make decisions, peculiar symbols of local democracy, which

only legitimize and coordinate decisions that emanate from a monopoly comprehensive party power, and are actually an appendage of the party apparatus (Schapiro, 1970: 78).

Evaluating the participation of the working class in the production management, Western researchers proclaim the removal of Soviet workers from production management in principle (Nove, 1978: 227). In their view, the Soviet working class has no say in the solution of production issues (Conquest, 1967: 7). According to researcher R. Gripp, the participation of workers in production management depends on the boundaries set by the Communist Party (Gripp, 1973: 139).

In general, Western historiography of the totalitarian direction treats the economic policy of the CPSU and the attitude towards the representatives of the working class from the standpoint of an elitist concept. According to Sovietologists, the party's economic policy is subordinated not to the interests of the workers, but to the interests of the ruling elite (Pallet, Shaw, 1981: 28).

The classical «orthodox» model of the Soviet social organization is considered to be presented by the division proposed by the famous representative of the totalitarian direction of Soviet science A. Inkeles. The scientist distinguished the parts of the working class: the so-called «labor aristocracy», represented by workers of higher qualification, «middle workers», low-income workers, as well as workers of concentration camps, which he equated with state slaves (Inkeles, 1968: 152). In the division proposed by A. Inkeles profit plays the decisive role in the stratification.

This concept was used by Sovietologists during the 1960s in the period of the total domination of a totalitarian model of studying Soviet reality. In the 1970s, with the development of the revisionist concept with its bias in sociological science and the use of data from the Soviet population census in 1959, the interest of Sovietologists in the Soviet society class structure increased markedly. The concept of the researcher M. Matthews, who believes that the division of the «inhabitants» of the Soviet «world» into the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia is very simplistic, became popular. According to the scholar, each of these vast social groups consisted of more compact levels in terms of education, professional activity, lifestyle and regional ethnicity (Matthews, 1972: 78).

Describing the intraclass structure of the Soviet working class, a number of Western Sovietologists distinguish in it a series of strata arranged vertically on the basis of the presence or absence of privileges, which is referred in the first place to a high level of remuneration. Thus, the German Sovietologist W. Teckenberg points out the existence of a labor aristocracy in the USSR (Teckenberg, 1981 – 1982: 90). At the same time, according to the researcher, the number of unskilled and auxiliary workers in the USSR is constantly increasing.

Having provided a comprehensive analysis of such strategically important direction of Soviet reality and propaganda as a socialist competition, Western scholars are extremely critical of its true nature and essence. Scientists J. Armstrong (Armstrong, 1974: 70) and J. Berliner (Berliner, 1978: 120) proclaim the fundamental impossibility of productive competition in a socialist society, justifying their point of view by arguing that competition is possible only in the presence of private entrepreneurship. The researchers argue about the impossibility of a genuine competition in the USSR as a result of the state monopoly on means of production that constrains the competition, gives it an artificial character and deprives of the incentives for development (Krylov, 1979: 146). Proclaiming the ruthless exploitation of Soviet workers by the party elite, one of the main methods of this process is recognized by the Sovietologists as a socialist competition (Nove, 1978: 227).

The main idea of the monograph by the British Sovietologist T. Dunmore, which is considered to be a profound and thorough work not only in the Western but also in the World historiography on the subject of the Soviet postwar economy, is the assertion that during the late Stalinist postwar period, the Soviet Union's command economy reached its peak, but at the same time, the economic policy of enterprises was not always determined by the administrative center. This affected workers' situation: the real labor market was significantly different from the theoretical one, specified in government and party documents. So, as T. Dunmore points out, despite the prohibition of changing jobs, during the first postwar years, the level of staff turnover was quite high. The ministries, ignoring the party directives, competed for the workforce and violated the centralized rates of wages. According to the researcher, this factor became one of the reasons for very significant differences in remuneration for the same work in various areas (Dunmore, 1980: 147).

The work of the American economist J. Berliner «Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev» (Berliner, 1988), an appropriate paragraph of the monograph by British researcher A. Nove (Nove, 1970: 322–368), a collective monograph «Khrushchev and Khrushchevism», published in 1987 under the general editorship of M. McCauley (Khrushchev and Khrushchevism, 1987) and an analytical article by D. Filtzer, devoted to the study of the tariff reform of 1956 (Filtzer, 1989), are of great significance for all further development of Western historiography on the problem of M. Khrushchov's economic policy and the situation of workers in the second postwar decade. The most important conclusion obtained in the process of studying the economic causes of M. Khrushchov's reforms was the one about the need to meet the basic material needs of the population. The research confirms the fact that by the middle of the 1950s the limit in «tightening belts» had been reached and a further development of the Soviet state became impossible without reforms aimed at the material interests of workers. Also, in connection with the expansion of labor freedom in the choice of jobs, the problem of more effective use of the limited resources emerged, that led to the crisis of the planned economy and attempts to find a way out of it (Nove, 1970: 357).

Assessing Khrushchov's social policy, Western scholars state that in this regard the Soviet government «resolutely broke away from the Stalinist past» (MsAuleu, 1979: 149), positively evaluate the role of trade unions, the increase of the quantity and quality of consumer goods, and the growth of real wages. Having studied the tariff reform of 1956, Western scholars consider it as the most important part of M. Khrushchov's social policy aimed at ensuring productivity growth during the abolition of Stalin's labor legislation in 1940 as well as legitimization of the regime in the eyes of the public (Filtzer, 1989: 95).

At the same time, despite the growth of wages and security of the correspondence of actual and planned growth rates of workers' incomes, historian D. Filtzer states the failure of the tariff reform in many aspects. In particular, the researcher negatively evaluates the process of converting premiums into a permanent part of earnings and as a consequence the decrease of workers' interest to overfulfil the norms. Based on the analysis of the failures of the tariff reform, D. Filtzer comes to the conclusion that it is impossible in principle to create in the Soviet economy a system of economic incentives aimed at the fulfilment and overfulfilment of production norms. According to the scientist, the most important reason for this, besides the absence of a mechanism of market relations, are factors that do not depend on the will of the workers, namely interruptions in the supply of materials to productions, different levels of mechanization and automation of production, irrational division of labor (Filtzer, 1989: 104). Paying great attention to the negative tendencies in the tariff reform, A. McCauley, in the first place, indicates

an insufficient increase in wages, in the result of which the workers had to survive and were not able to keep their families (McAuley, 1979: 151). Scientist M. Kaser points out that the declared increase in wages of low-paid categories of workers during the tariff reform of 1956 was largely offset by rising prices in the following 1958 – 1962 (Kaser, 1970: 143).

In their research, Western Sovietologists constantly emphasize the total lack of Soviet workers' rights (Giddens 1973: 249; Bergson, 1978: 12) and the ineffectiveness of the Soviet economy (Katsenelinboigen, 1978: 28). According to Western researchers, the CPSU pursued a policy of industrial totalitarianism, being a dictator in the field of industrial production, and imposing on the Soviet workers completely alien goals for accelerated economic growth at all costs (Millar, 1981: 64). Typically, the representatives of the totalitarian direction of Sovietology, evaluating the economic policy of the Communist Party in the USSR, identify it with the economy of Hitler's Germany and Nazi Italy (Society and Politics, 1976: 21).

According to Western scholars, the CPSU owned a monopoly on means of production (Neuberger, Duffy, 1976: 177), and workers were completely deprived of their rights (Neuberger, Duffy, 1976: 236). Soviet workers are identified by Sovietologists with workers from Western countries and act, in their opinion, as a workforce (Millar, 1981: 105). Proclaiming the complete removal of workers from property, Western economists and historians proclaim the existence in the USSR of an advanced bureaucracy, which has the right to own means of production. The centralized planning regime, controlled by engineering and technical bureaucracy, is proclaimed by researchers as one of the key factors that deprives workers in the USSR of any real opportunity to participate in production management (Fisk, 1980: 259).

Conclusions. Thus, Western historical science paid a lot of attention to the study of the Ukrainian Soviet society in the postwar twenty years, the study of the situation of Soviet workers as the most mass class of the society in particular.

The peculiarity of Western European and American historiography is the consideration of these issues through the prism of the analysis of the USSR economy, as well as social history. Describing the first postwar decade as the peak of Stalin's conservative economic policy and recognizing the outstanding achievements in the process of the Soviet economic recovery, Western scholars observed the return to the economic model of the 1930s with the accelerated development of industry and an even more significant deterioration in the standard of Soviet workers' living standards. According to Western researchers, during the period of the first two postwar five-year plans, the crisis of the Stalinist economy was clearly established.

Deeply analyzing the reasons and preconditions for economic reforms by M. Khrushchov, the representatives of Western historiography note their positive influence on the workers' situation. In general, Western scholars more objectively evaluate the economic policy of M. Khrushchov than Soviet scholars, and its failures are connected with factors of a systemic nature.

Considering the problems of economic development of the USSR republics, and, accordingly, the situation of workers in these republics, most Western scholars state the imperial character of the center and Moscow's center-periphery colonial policy.

The formation of Sovietology took place under extremely tense conditions of the Cold War mongering. Due to the high level of politicization, Western researchers were set the task to study the state of the Soviet society, including its most numerous representative, namely working class. In the works of A. Meyer, R. Aron, W. Rostow, they formed the concept of «dissolution» of the Soviet working class in the so-called middle class and the final displacement of workers from the sphere of management.

A further evolutionary development of Sovietology and the formation of the younger generation of historians led to the loss of a totalitarian direction's positions and the strengthening of the revisionist direction. In the writings of Sh. Fitzpatrick, A. Meyer, W. Chase, H. Kumor, L. Siegelbaum, the monotheistic conception of the Soviet system is denied, the attention is focused on the social history, the situation of Soviet workers. Unlike historians of the totalitarian direction, who viewed the Soviet social system as a unique phenomenon in the organization of human civilization, the revisionists sought to find common ground between the workers' situation in the USSR and the West.

The 1970s are characterized by a new turn of tension in the international environment and as a consequence of the strengthening of the Sovietology totalitarian direction. In the works of Z. Brzezinski, R. Pipes, A. Ulam, A. Nove, L. Shapiro, R. Aron the concept of stratification of the Soviet working class is formed. According to Western researchers, in the postwar decades the differentiation among the Soviet workers, the formation of the so-called «labor aristocracy» and the reduction of the total number of the working class under the influence of processes of mechanization and automation of production, scientific and technological progress, took place. Much attention of Western researchers was devoted to the search for elements of a market economy and the formation of contradictions in the working environment as a result of hidden unemployment and equal pay.

In the 1980s – 2010s, in Sovietology a whole series of new sociological concepts of studying Soviet society and the workers' situation replaced the confrontation between totalitarianism and revisionism. Among the large number of paradigms, particular attention should be paid to the theory of «convergence», «united industrial society», and «post-industrial society», whose representatives tried to prove the existence of stratification in the Soviet working class and rebirth for the capitalist formation. At the same time, the focus was focused on the totalitarian bureaucratic system and the elitist nature of the USSR power.

One of the central places in the study of the situation of Ukrainian workers in the first postwar twenty years belongs to the conclusion of Western scholars regarding the strengthening of the targeted Russianization policy of Moscow, including the method of relocating a significant number of Russian workers to the cities of Southeast Ukraine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Дроздов, 1998 – Дроздов В. В. Современная зарубежная историография экономической политики СССР в 1946 – 1985 гг.: Дис. ... доктора экон. наук: 08.00.02; 08.00.03 / Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова. Москва, 1998. 466 с.

Кодин, 1998 – Кодин Е. В. Американская послевоенная советология: методология и источниковая база: Дис. ... доктора ист. наук: 07.00.09 / Смоленский государственный педагогический университет. Москва, 1998. 510 с.

Лаас, 2009 – Лаас Н. О. Проблеми соціальної історії України другої половини 40-х – середини 60-х рр. ХХ ст. в англомовній історіографії: Дис. ... кандидата ист. наук: 07.00.06 / Інститут історії України НАН України. Київ, 2009. 245 с.

Некрасов, 2001 – Некрасов А. А. Становление и этапы развития англо-американской советологии: Дис. ... кандидата ист. наук: 07.00.09 / Ярославский государственный университет им. П. Г. Демидова. Ярославль, 2001. 181 с.

Arendt, 1951 – Arendt H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1951. 477 p.

Armstrong, 1974 – Armstrong J. *Ideology, Politics and Government in the Soviet Union*. London: Nelson, 1974. 236 p.

Bauman, 1976 – Bauman Z. *Socialism. The Active Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1976. 154 p.

Bergson, 1978 – Bergson A. *Productivity and the Social System: The USSR and the West*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1978. 256 p.

- Berliner, 1978 – Berliner J. The Innovation Decision in the Soviet Industry. Cambridge (Mass.); London: MIT Press, 1978. 561 p.
- Berliner, 1988 – Berliner J. S. Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev. Essays on Management and Innovation. Gower House et al., 1988. 327 p.
- Blackwell, 1972 – Blackwell R. Elite Recruitment and Functional Change: In Analysis of the Soviet Obkom Elite // Journal of Politics. 1972. № 1. P. 124–152.
- Blondel, 1973 – Blondel J. Comparing Political System. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. 260 p.
- Cohen, 1985 – Cohen S. F. Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. 211 p.
- Conquest, 1967 – Conquest R. Industrial Workers in the USSR. London: Bodley Head, 1967. 359 p.
- Dunmore, 1980 – Dunmore T. The Stalinist Command Economy. The Soviet state apparatus and economic policy 1945–53. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1980. 176 p.
- Duverger, 1972 – Duverger M. Party Politics and Pressure Groups. A Comparative Introduction. New York: Crowell, 1972. 158 p.
- Fainsod, 1963 – Fainsod M. How Russia Is Ruled. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963. 411 p.
- Filtzer, 1989 – Filtzer D. A. The Soviet wage reform of 1956 – 1962 // Soviet Studies. 1989. Vol. XLI. № 1. P. 88–110.
- Fisk, 1980 – Fisk M. Ethics and Society. A Marxist Interpretation of Value. Indiana univ.; The Harvester press, 1980. 268 p.
- Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956 – Friedrich C., Brzezinski Z. Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. 456 p.
- Giddens, 1973 – Giddens A. The Glass Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson univ. library, 1973. 336 p.
- Gleaso, 1984 – Gleaso A. «Totalitarianism» in 1984 // Russian Review. 1984. № 43, P. 145–159.
- Gripp, 1973 – Gripp R. C. The Political System of Communism, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973. 209 p.
- Gwertzman, 1982 – Gwertzman B. U.S. Survey Shows a Steady Growth in Soviets G.N.P. // The New York Times. December 26. 1982. P. A6.
- Harrington, 1972 – Harrington M. Socialism: Past and Future. New York: Bantam, 1972. 336 p.
- Hollander, 1978 – Hollander P. Soviet and American Society. A Comparison. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 496 p.
- Inkeles, 1968 – Inkeles A. Social Change in Soviet Russia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. 475 p.
- Kaser, 1970 – Kaser M. Soviet economics. London: Routledge, 1970. 311 p.
- Katsenelinboigen, 1978 – Katsenelinboigen A. Studies in Soviet Economic Planning. New York: White Plains, 1978. 229 p.
- Khrushchev and khrushchevism, 1987 – Khrushchev and khrushchevism / Ed. by M. McCauley. Houndsills et al., 1987. 391 p.
- Knight, 1978 – Knight R. Why Workers Want to flee USSR // US News and World Report. 1978. Vol. 84. № 21. P. 51–60.
- Krylov, 1979 – Krylov C. A. The Soviet Economy: How It Really Works. Lexington (Massach.): Lexington Books; Heath and Company, 1979. 257 p.
- Manning, 1953 – Manning C. Ukraine under the Soviets. New York: Bookman associates, 1953. 223 p.
- Markovic, 1974 – Markovic M. The Contemporary Marx. Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974. 217 p.
- Matthews, 1972 – Matthews M. Class and society in Soviet Russia. London: Penguin, 1972. 366 p.
- Millar, 1981 – Millar J. R. The ABC's of Soviet Socialism. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois press, 1981. 215 p.
- McAuley, 1979 – McAuley A. Economic Welfare in the Soviet Union. Madison, 1979. 269 p.
- Neuberger, Duffy, 1976 – Neuberger E., Duffy W. Comparative Economic Systems: A Decision – making Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. 354 p.
- Nove, 1970 – Nove A. An Economic History of the U.S.S.R. London: Penguin, 1970. 448 p.
- Nove, 1978 – Nove A. The Soviet Economic System. London: Allen and Unwin, 1978. 318 p.
- Pallet, Shaw, 1981 – Pallet J., Shaw D. Planning in the Soviet Union. London: George Allen a. Unwin, 1981. 250 p.
- Parkin, 1968 – Parkin F. Middle Class Radicalism. The Social Basis of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Manchester: University Press, 1968. 207 p.

- Pethybridge, 1974 – Pethybridge R. The Social Prelude to Stalinism London: Macmillan, 1974. 343 p.
Schapiro, 1970 – Schapiro L. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. London: University Paperbacks, 1970. 631 p.
Society and Politics, 1976 – Society and Politics. Ed. by R. G. Braungert. New Jersey: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1976. 368 p.
Teckenberg, 1981–1982 – Teckenberg W. The Social Structure of the Soviet Working Class. Toward an Estatist Society? // International Journal of Sociology. 1981 – 1982. Vol. XI. № 4. P. 1–163.

REFERENCES

- Drozdov, 1998 – Drozdov V. V. Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya istoriografiya ekonomicheskoy politiki SSSR v 1946–1985 gg. [Modern foreign historiography of the USSR economic policy in 1946–1985]: Dis. ... doktora ekonom. nauk: 08.00.02; 08.00.03 / Moskovskiy gosudarstvennyiy universitet imeni M. V. Lomonosova. Moskva, 1998. 466 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kodin, 1998 – Kodin E. V. Amerikanskaya poslevoennaya sovetologiya: metodologiya i istochnikovaya baza [American postwar Sovietology: methodology and source base]: Dis. ... doktora ist. nauk: 07.00.09 / Smolenskiy gosudarstvennyiy pedagogicheskiy universitet. Moskva, 1998. 510 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Laas, 2009 – Laas N. O. Problemy sotsialnoi istorii Ukrayiny druhoi polovyny 40-kh – seredyny 60-kh rr. XX st. v anhlomovnii istoriohrafii [Problems of the Ukrainian social history of the second half of the 1940s – the middle of the 1960s in English-language historiography]: Dys. ... kandydata ist. nauk: 07.00.06 / Instytut istorii Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny. Kyiv, 2009. 245 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Nekrasov, 2001 – Nekrasov A. A. Stanovlenie i etapy razvitiya anglo-amerikanskoy sovetologii [Formation and stages of Anglo-American Sovietology development]: Dis. ... kandidata ist. nauk: 07.00.09 / Yaroslavskiy gosudarstvennyiy universitet im. P. G. Demidova. Yaroslavl, 2001. 181 p. [in Russian]
- Arendt, 1951 – Arendt H. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1951. 477 p. [in English]
- Armstrong, 1974 – Armstrong J. Ideology, Politics and Government in the Soviet Union. London: Nelson, 1974. 236 p. [in English]
- Bauman, 1976 – Bauman Z. Socialism. The Active Utopia. London: Routledge, 1976. 154 p. [in English]
- Bergson, 1978 – Bergson A. Productivity and the Social System: The USSR and the West. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1978. 256 p. [in English]
- Berliner, 1978 – Berliner J. The Innovation Decision in the Soviet Industry. Cambridge (Mass.); London: MIT Press, 1978. 561 p. [in English]
- Berliner, 1988 – Berliner J. S. Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev. Essays on Management and Innovation. Gower House et al., 1988. 327 p. [in English]
- Blackwell, 1972 – Blackwell R. Elite Recruitment and Functional Change: In Analysis of the Soviet Obkom Elite // Journal of Politics. 1972. № 1. P. 124–152. [in English]
- Blondel, 1973 – Blondel J. Comparing Political System. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. 260 p. [in English]
- Cohen, 1985 – Cohen S. F. Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. 211 p. [in English]
- Conquest, 1967 – Conquest R. Industrial Workers in the USSR. London: Bodley Head, 1967. 359 p. [in English]
- Dunmore, 1980 – Dunmore T. The Stalinist Command Economy. The Soviet state apparatus and economic policy 1945–53. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1980. 176 p. [in English]
- Duverger, 1972 – Duverger M. Party Politics and Pressure Groups. A Comparative Introduction. New York: Crowell, 1972. 158 p. [in English]
- Fainsod, 1963 – Fainsod M. How Russia Is Ruled. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963. 411 p. [in English]
- Filtzer, 1989 – Filtzer D. A. The Soviet wage reform of 1956 – 1962 // Soviet Studies. 1989. Vol. XLI. № 1. P. 88–110.
- Fisk, 1980 – Fisk M. Ethics and Society. A Marxist Interpretation of Value. Indiana univ.; The Harvester press, 1980. 268 p. [in English]
- Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956 – Friedrich C., Brzezinski Z. Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. 456 p. [in English]

- Giddens, 1973 – Giddens A. The Glass Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson univ. library, 1973. 336 p. [in English]
- Gleaso, 1984 – Gleaso A. «Totalitarianism» in 1984 // Russian Review. 1984. № 43, P. 145–159. [in English]
- Gripp, 1973 – Gripp R. C. The Political System of Communism, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973. 209 p. [in English]
- Gwertzman, 1982 – Gwertzman B. U.S. Survey Shows a Steady Growth in Soviets G.N.P. // The New York Times. December 26. 1982. P. A6. [in English]
- Harrington, 1972 – Harrington M. Socialism: Past and Future. New York: Bantam, 1972. 336 p. [in English]
- Hollander, 1978 – Hollander P. Soviet and American Society. A Comparison. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 496 p. [in English]
- Inkeles, 1968 – Inkeles A. Social Change in Soviet Russia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. 475 p. [in English]
- Kaser, 1970 – Kaser M. Soviet economics. London: Routledge, 1970. 311 p. [in English]
- Katsenelinboigen, 1978 – Katsenelinboigen A. Studies in Soviet Economic Planning. New York: White Plains, 1978. 229 p. [in English]
- Khrushchev and khrushchevism, 1987 – Khrushchev and khrushchevism / Ed. by M. McCauley. Houndsills et al., 1987. 391 p. [in English]
- Knight, 1978 – Knight R. Why Workers Want to flee USSR // US News and World Report. 1978. Vol. 84. № 21. Pp. 51–60. [in English]
- Krylov, 1979 – Krylov C. A. The Soviet Economy: How It Really Works. Lexington (Massach.): Lexington Books; Heath and Company, 1979. 257 p. [in English]
- Manning, 1953 – Manning C. Ukraine under the Soviets. New York: Bookman associates, 1953. 223 p. [in English]
- Markovic, 1974 – Markovic M. The Contemporary Marx. Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974. 217 p. [in English]
- Matthews, 1972 – Matthews M. Class and society in Soviet Russia. London: Penguin, 1972. 366 p. [in English]
- Millar, 1981 – Millar J. R. The ABC's of Soviet Socialism. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois press, 1981. 215 p. [in English]
- McAuley, 1979 – McAuley A. Economic Welfare in the Soviet Union. Madison, 1979. 269 p. [in English]
- Neuberger, Duffy, 1976 – Neuberger E., Duffy W. Comparative Economic Systems: A Decision – making Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. 354 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1970 – Nove A. An Economic History of the U.S.S.R. London: Penguin, 1970. 448 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1978 – Nove A. The Soviet Economic System. London: Allen and Unwin, 1978. 318 p. [in English]
- Pallet, Shaw, 1981 – Pallet J., Shaw D. Planning in the Soviet Union. London: George Allen a. Unwin, 1981. 250 p. [in English]
- Parkin, 1968 – Parkin F. Middle Class Radicalism. The Social Basis of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Manchester: University Press, 1968. 207 p. [in English]
- Pethybridge, 1974 – Pethybridge R. The Social Prelude to Stalinism London: Macmillan, 1974. 343 p. [in English]
- Schapiro, 1970 – Schapiro L. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. London: University Paperbacks, 1970. 631 p. [in English]
- Society and Politics, 1976 – Society and Politics. Ed. by R. G. Braungert. New Jersey: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1976. 368 p. [in English]
- Teckenberg, 1981–1982 – Teckenberg W. The Social Structure of the Soviet Working Class. Toward an Estatist Society? // International Journal of Sociology. 1981 – 1982. Vol. XI. № 4. P. 1–163. [in English]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477.83)«1945/1954»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131213

Vasyl ILNYTSKYI,

orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X

Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of Department of Ukraine's History of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) vilnickiy@gmail.com

Natalia KANTOR,

orcid.org/0000-0001-9533-0851

Senior Lecturer of Law, Sociology and Political Science Departament, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) natali.kantor@gmail.com

REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET ADMINISTRATION AGAINST FAMILIES OF INSURGENTS IN KARPATSKYI KRAI OF THE OUN (1945 – 1954)¹

In the article on the basis of unknown and little-known documents the problem of use of families of nationalists in the combinations of Soviet law enforcement agencies is investigated for the first time. The basic directions of this policy of the repressive bodies are singled out. The author has proved that this line of activity of the special agents was an extremely important factor to play.

Key words: Karpatskyi Krai of the OUN, liberation movement, nationalists, families, repressive bodies.

Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ,

доктор історичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри історії України Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) vilnickiy@gmail.com

Наталія КАНТОР,

старший викладач кафедри правознавства, соціології та політології Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) natali.kantor@gmail.com

РЕПРЕСІЇ РАДЯНСЬКОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ПРОТИ РОДИН ПОВСТАНЦІВ У КАРПАТСЬКОМУ КРАЇ ОУН (1945 – 1954)

У статті вперше на основі невідомих та маловідомих документів досліджується проблема використання сімей націоналістів в агентурних комбінаціях. Виокремлюються основні напрями цієї політики репресивно-каральних органів. Автор довів, що цей напрям діяльності спецорганів відігравав надзвичайно важливу роль.

Ключові слова: Карпатський край ОУН, визвольний рух, націоналісти, родини, репресивно-каральні органи.

The statement of the problem. It is difficult enough to describe in words the tragic situation in which Western Ukraine's population found itself in the 1940s – 1950s. The antago-

¹ Публікація містить результати досліджень, проведених при грантовій підтримці Державного фонду фундаментальних досліджень за конкурсним проектом Ф77/80 – 2018 (договір від 29.03.2018)

nism in the society which the Soviet administration tried in all possible ways to ignite during that period eventually reached its peak. Not only the direct participants of the liberation movement and its sympathizer, but also their families became the victims of cruel reprisals. The scales of reprisals of the Soviet administration against families of nationalists are literally unimaginable.

The analysis of researches. Whereas the deportation policy has already been reflected in a number of works, the problem of the use by repressive bodies of families of insurgents as hostages, and recruitments of their relatives for the control over the underground is practically not elucidated. This question has been sporadically studied by such researchers as I. Bilas, D. Vedeneyev and H. Bystrukhin, A. Kentiy, Y. Kyrychuk, and A. Rusnachenko in generalising works on the history of the Ukrainian liberation movement (Bilas, 1994; Vedeneyev, Bystrukhin, 2007; Kentiy, 1999a; Kentiy, 1999b; Kyrychuk, 2003; Rusnachenko, 2002). V. Serhiychuk was the first to publish a fundamental documentary base for the study of the question of reprisals against members of families of OUN and UPA fighters (Roman Shukhevych, 2007a; Roman Shukhevych, 2007b; Serhiychuk, 2006; Serhiychuk, 2005). Deportation, that most widespread form of the repressive policy of the Soviet administration has found expression in Y. Nadolskyi's investigation (Nadolskyi, 2008), in which the author analyzes the reasons, methods and stages of carrying out of deportations. T. Vrons'ka compiled a serious theoretical-methodological and archeographical work devoted to reprisals against families of insurgents (Vrons'ka, 2009). However, a complex research of the Soviet administration's repressive policy against families of nationalists in the Carpathian area (alias Karpatskyi Krai) of the OUN is still absent.

The article's purpose is – on the basis of unknown documents and materials to shed more light on the repressive policy against families of the Ukrainian nationalists as one of forms of struggle of the retaliatory system against movements for Ukrainian independence. At the same time, the author intentionally pays little attention to deportation campaigns as they make up a separate matter which deserves special research.

The statement of the basic material. The love and support of the near and dear ones in difficult conditions of the underground were – and have always been – of enormous moral and psychological value, and the leaders of the underground well understood that. Sharing common views, the wives of insurgents sacrificed all they could in order not only to support their husbands and be near them, but also to conduct the struggle together with them. As a matter of fact, it is necessary to underline, that families were the most sensitive point of the nationalists. The special organs well understood that and effectively used that.

Almost all the commanders of regional, district, and county leaderships were married men (BSA SSU (the Branch State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine). File 2. Description 59 (1953). Case 5. Vol. 4. Page 142; D. 34 (1960). C. 18. P. 72–73). In somewhat lesser degree the managerial personnel of regional and sectional leadership married. That situation, first of all, is explained that they were of considerably younger age in comparison with the former. It is necessary to notice, that in the underground a marriage took place with the permission of the leadership members. In particular, V. Livyi, a security service responsible of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of OUN informed the leader of this area V. Sydor-«Shelest» on August 19th, 1948, that OUN's security service responsible in Drohobych district Vasyl Shevaniuk-«Zaliznyi» («Iron-made») had asked of the permission to marry Natalia Posatska-«Uliana» and received such a permission (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 98 (1954). C. 8. P. 83). Such situations were caused by difficult conditions of struggle and possibilities of influencing underground members through families.

In most cases wives of underground members, especially, of their leaders, worked side-by-side with them, like, for example, typists, combating with them and, unfortunately, perishing together with their husbands. For instance, like Mykola Tverdokhlib-«Hrim» («Thunder») with his wife Olha Herasymovych (both lost their lives on 5 May 1954), or Volodymyr Livyi-«Jordan» and his wife Dariya Tsymbalist-«Olia» (perished on 12 April 1948, in the village of Topilske of Rozhniativ district), like Ivan Lavriv-«Nechai» together with Haly-na Moroka-«Of the steppe», the Ukrainian Red Cross (further on referred to as URC) responsible Nadvirna county leadership of OUN Mariya Mytsko-«Mariya» in the underground married «Kolia», Mykola Korzhenivskyi, deputy responsible of SS of Bukovyna district leadership of OUN, and the SS' responsible person in Drohobych regional leadership of OUN Vasyl' Medvid-«Vasylchenko» was married to Vasyl' Kuk-«Lemish» sister (BSA SSU. F. 5. C. 67448. V. 1. P. 37. P. 37; F. 2. D. 56 (1953). C. 6., V. 5., P. 112; D. 60 (1953). C. 14. P. 245-246; D. 93 (1954). C. 2. P. 45; D. 110 (1954). C. 2. V. 5. P. 135; F. 13. C. 372. V. 95. P. 164-165; F. 65. C. 9112. V. 2. P. 145). The responsible for propagation of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of the OUN Mykhailo Diachenko was married to Maria Savchuk (in 1942 their son Sviatoslav was born) (Kohut, 2002: 20-21).

The majority of the administrative board got married during the German occupation. The nationalists often married in the conditions of the underground.

The repressive-retaliatory bodies mainly carried out their influence on the underground members through their families. For this purpose, first of all, arrests, recruitments, blackmails, hostage taking, and deportations of whole families were carried out. In particular, the Cheka agents, having learnt that the SS responsible «Cossack» of Kolomyia district leadership of the OUN had married one Nadiya, they – on condition of no possibility of catching «Cossack» – but began searching for his wife. During a searching operation on July 28th, 1951 she was captured wounded. During the interrogation «Nadia» had to confess that she and «Cossack» had a son, whose name was Stepan and who lived with her parents. Further on, the investigators learnt that «Cossack» loved his wife and son very much and for their sake was ready to fulfil any possible requirements, even to begin all sorts of cooperation. Having checked up this information, the Cheka agents captured «Cossack's» security bodyguards of and by means of correspondence convinced him to the cooperation with them. In «Cossack's» first letter to the special agencies the depth of his feelings is felt, which tore his heart apart and because of which he turned to such extreme actions: «I answer the raised question... What concerns Nadia, I may agree that there are drawbacks with her, but let's do all that all would be al right. It is enough for me that she is alive and recovering. Of course, you can organize a meeting with the parents, but not for the sake of convincing me, but in order that Nadia could console them. I am very sorry for them, for me they are the next after Stepanko.... I wish our personal meeting happened as quick as possible, so that everything could have been fixed, including the discussion of the communication plan, code numbers, and protection signs» (BSA SSU. F. 13. C. 372. V. 56. P. 185-187; F. 2. D. 28 (1960). C. 18. P. 200).

The policy of the Soviet power concerning nationalists was a terrorist one, as to families of insurgents not only reprisals were implemented, but they also used them as banal hostages. The Cheka agents tried to play on holy parental feelings. So, while carrying out the search of Mykola Tverdohlib-«Hrim», the Chekists determined that in 1948 his wife Olha Herasymovych, having passed to an illegal position, had left her son Yarema in the care of her sister Ivanna Herasymovych. In August, 1949, for her links with the underground, Ivanna Herasymovych was exiled in Khabarovsk region, whereas «Hrim's» son was placed in a

children's home in Rohatyn wherein he lived and studied in the first grade under the name Yakiv Oleksandrovych Dyhin. M. Tverdokhlib asked Anna Dmytriv to kidnap his son. The Cheka agent wanted to use «Hrim's» and Olha Herasymovych' parental feelings to their son and to carry out actions (simultaneously promising to him of the preservation of his son's life and return) which would make «Hrim» to cooperation with the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. With that end in view the investigators photographed his son in different foreshortenings, and then – with the help of the teacher – wrote a letter (forging his son's handwriting) to the father and mother, passing it to «Hrim» together with the photos (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 19 (1959). C. 6. P. 6).

As the majority of the managerial cadres in Karpatskyi Krai were married and had children, they tried to secure them as much as possible against possible reprisals, and – in the future – against the use of them by the repressive organs for an influence on their parents. An awful tragedy happened to Bohdan Yatskiv-«Safron» alias «Denys», the assistant of the responsible of the OUN SS member of the Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership. In May 1949 his wife was killed during a special operation, and the Soviet bodies allocated his 4 year old son into a children's home in Stanislaviv. The Chekists – for the purpose of capturing «Safron» – tried to make use of his ten year old daughter who was hiding in Lviv in her uncle Dmytro's dwelling. However, despite his great love of children, they could not make Bohdan Yatskiv to agree to a cooperation with them (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 110 (1954). C. 2. V. 5. P. 367–370).

The Chekists were also chasing the wife of the last leader of Bukovyna county Yulian Matviyiv-«Nedobytyi». In the night from the 2nd to the 3rd of February, 1951 his wife – Liubov Mykhailivna Matviyiv-Dytsio-Kubranovych (b. 1911 in the town of Kuty, Stanislaviv region) was arrested in the town of Stryi. At the interrogation she told nothing, therefore the Chekists decided to «elaborate» her by help of the internal agents. After a chain of attempts, it became clear that she had married Y. Matviyiv yet in 1939. Then, for conspiracy reasons in view of the repressive organs, she announced her fictitious marriage with a Pole, Ditsio. After the re-conspiration L. Matviyiv was necessitated to move to the town of Stryi. With Yulian she had children, of whose health the father constantly showed his interested in letters. In November of 1950 «Nedobytyi» gave 2 thousand roubles to his wife through mediators. After his arrest the Cheka agents wanted – through the forced influence of his wife – to make Yulian Matviyiv to confess his guilt. However, that brought about no results (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 34 (1960). C. 15. P. 38–39; D. 59 (1953). C. 5. V. 6. P. 239; D. 98 (1954). C. 5. V. 1. P. 24–26; T. 2. P. 175–177; D. 99 (1954). C. 15. P. 62–81).

A practice of the Soviet bodies to find out and through the relatives to enlist the insurgents into their case or make them confess their guilt lasted for long. In all complex inquiries concerning the secret agents' cases on administrative boards of some or other leadership, all their relation links, places of residence, and the agents directed to the «elaboration» of the latter were fully described, the relatives who had already suffered reprisals were notified, as well as possible secret-service combinations concerning those who had necessarily be subjected to repressions (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60. C. 16. P. 2–7, 319–320; D. 99. C. 2. V. 3. P. 263–265). The Cheka agents, knowing the vulnerable points of underground activists, i. e., their families and relations, constantly conducted searches.

The families of nationalists were sieged by agents from their nearest environment which could not even be suspected in the cooperation with the Soviet power (BSA SSU. F. 71. D. 6. C. 387. V. 1. P. 175–176). The Cheka agents were not particularly selective in methods

applied to an influence on underground workers. Members of OUN and commanders of UPA were but usual people who loved, married, had children, and wanted to live in the independent Ukrainian state.

Throughout 1945 – 1950s the Cheka agents actively arrested the relatives of underground members whom they tried to use for their special purposes. The fates of relatives and even of the children of the killed leaders were rather tragic. As a rule, those were adopted by the families of the Soviet administration workers or the security officers. On 29 April 1956 Yevheniya Andrusiak had been released from imprisonment and she began searching for her son. After titanic efforts, she managed to find out that her son was adopted by a family of the KGB officer Korsakov. The latter, after moving from Stanislaviv, lived in the town of Yeln in Smolensk region (Russia) (Kohut, 2001: 33).

Almost each underground worker had to risk not only his own life and health, but also the life and health of his relatives. The Cheka agents carefully worked over revealing not only the wives and children, but also the parents and close relatives of the leaders of the underground of Karpatskyi Krai of OUN. The parents and relatives of almost all underground leaders were subjected to repressions in different ways. In particular, the Cheka agents yet in 1941 found the father of the chief of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of the OUN Mykola Melnyk (b. 1891, in the village of Berezhnytsia) who worked as a deacon. Before he should be moved out, he was transferred into an illegal position, and during the German occupation he worked as the head of a rural government. With the arrival of the Bolsheviks he passed to an illegal position. The mother of «Robert», Melnyk Ustyna Andriyivna (b. 1893, the resident of the village of Berezhnytsia), in May, 1941 was sent into exile in the remote areas of the USSR (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 55 (1953). C. 6. V. 1. P. 399, 401). Already after the German-Soviet war in the village of Berezhnytsia four uncle of Ya. Melnyk were found out: Andriy Melnyk (a smith), Yuriy Melnyk (an office worker of the local village Soviet), Dmytro Melnyk and Petro Melnyk (farmers) (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 55 (1953). C. 6. V. 1. P. 399–401). In 1949 the Cheka agents carried out an active search for Ya. Melnyk's sister, Volodymyra Mykolayivna Melnyk who in February 1948 fled from a special detention settlement and illegally lived in the village of Broshniv. Furthermore, after all the tests which that woman had to suffer, she did not change her outlook. Having arrived at the village of Berezhnytsia she began a vigorous activity in support of the underground, gathering combat intelligence information, delivering foodstuff, etc. (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 98 (1954). C. 1. V. 2. P. 30–31).

Many members of families of underground workers could not stand severe realities of everyday life and ended in giving up their underground work, so to say, coming with cap in hand. However, such give-ups were caused by the objective reasons. So, operational agents of MMSS (Management of Ministry of State Security) of Chernivtsi region on April 2nd, 1949 forced Mykola Dmytriuk-«Quick» alias «Ruban», the commander of Sadhirya district leadership of the OUN, to legalize. However, it was preceded by an arrest and sentence of his father Vasyl Dmytriuk. Eventually, the father had appeared a hostage, and after his son's confession of his guilt, V. Dmytriuk was released (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60 (1953). C. 4. V. 2. P. 240–242; F. 13. C. 372. V. 86. P. 121–122). Special agents intentionally made use of strong filial and parental feelings of the underground workers which allowed them to manipulate the latter.

Attempts of enlisting of family members and distant relatives and through them to influence the underground made up an important direction of the repressive policy of the Soviet power. However, such an activity in very many cases was ineffectual. Not many people gave in to recruitment.

Usually, those on whom pressure was made, changed their position into the illegal one. So, in January of 1950 Victoria Valihura, the wife of S. Khodok-«Spartak», the responsible of the SS of Drohobych county leadership of OUN, came to the 2nd police station of Drohobych to confess her guilt. Prior to 1947 V. Valihura had lived legally in Drohobych together with her mother, and after an attempt to enlist her she immediately passed to an illegal position. By the way, after the underground had learnt about that, it forbade «Spartak» to meet with the wife. However, the her husband ignored the prohibition. The chekists considered two variants of the succession of events. The first, – due to the close common ties of «Spartak» and Valihura, the possibility of their secret meetings was absolutely real. The second implied that all the materials and facts should be used for the sake of compromising of «Spartak» (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60. C. 16. P. 288–290).

It was through an active operational work of special agents the underground's leadership did not approve of insurgents' meetings with their families and relatives who lived legally.

In was a particularly hard time for the wives of the underground leaders, because their wives frequently became objects of repressive measures. Here again not only arrests, recruitment, or blackmail of the health and life of children took place, but the percent of destruction of wives of the underground members was high.

Not seldom the whole families worked in the underground and, unfortunately, together they also perished. There were cases with the underground activists that matrimonial member had to suffer the pain of the loss of his or her dear, beloved, or close ones.

Actually, almost each nationalist had to endure a personal tragedy. Someone's relatives were evicted into the remote areas of the Soviet Union, some others' relatives perished, cases of destruction of the underground leaders together with their wives were widespread.

The destruction of children of underground workers, without doubt, was the greatest tragedy. For the parents of West Ukrainian region in he 1940s – 1950s losses of their children became an almost usual event. During a special operation on 25 December, 1950 Zenoviy-Peter-«Bohdan» was killed (b. 1930, the security guard of a technical link of Stanislaviv district leadership of OUN): he was the son of Kostiantyn Peter, the head of this structure (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60 (1953). C. 3. V. 5. P. 194).

In the end of the 1940s – beginning of the 1950s deported families of nationalists started returning from their exile. Having arrived back to their native places, members of families started restoring their former links with the underground. Among nationalists they enjoyed great trust, and – in their turn – their families gave a considerable aid to the underground. In other words, neither terror, nor reprisals, humiliation, and physical tortures could break and «re-educate» the people. For example, in the beginning of 1946 the family (father, mother, and brother) of Hryhoriy Sokolyk-«Zymnyi», head of Sambir county leadership of OUN, came back in the village of Bereznyzia. from exile, which had been sent out in 1940 – 1941. Yuliya Hanushchak's family (mother and sister) also returned from exile. In even larger scales families of ordinary underground members came back and at once started working on in the underground. That is to say, that despite all miseries, troubles, losses of family members and relations, the Soviet power was no success in suppressing and breaking of the patriotic feelings (BSA SSU. F. 71. D. 6. C. 105. P. 154–155). That all effected in a desperate act of V. Maistruk, the chief of MMSS of Drohobych region, who addressed a suggestion of prohibiting returns of families of the exiled nationalists to the ministry.

The conclusions. The family and a circle of relations are the greatest values which each person has. In its struggle against the underground, the repressive system, using all possible mean methods, fought with the Ukrainian liberation movement even by means of reprisals

against their families, its agencies used even the near and dear ones in their operational combinations. The majority of these actions contradicted the international conventions and moral-ethical bases. In other words, the Soviet power combated not only direct participants of the liberation movement, but also their families. In fact, the official power at the state level carried out terrorist policy. Such actions of the administration in a still greater extent ignited the local population's anger. Studies of the other forms of struggle against insurgents in the Carpathian area alias Karpatskyi Krai of the OUN form a perspective direction of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Білас, 1994 – Білас І. Репресивно-каральна система в Україні 1917 – 1953. Суспільно-політичний та історико-правовий аналіз. У двох книгах. Книга перша. К.: Либідь; Військо України, 1994. 432 с.
- Веденєєв, Биструхін, 2007 – Веденєєв Д., Биструхін Г. Двобій без компромісів. Протиборство спецпідрозділів ОУН та радянських сил спецоперацій. 1945 – 1980-ті роки: Монографія. К.: К.І.С., 2007. 568 с.
- Вронська, 2009 – Вронська Т. Заручники тоталітарного режиму: репресії проти родин «ворогів народу» в Україні (1917 – 1953 рр.). К.: Інститут історії України, 2009. 486 с.
- ГДА СБУ – Галузевий державний архів Служби безпеки України.
- Кентій, 1999а – Кентій А. Нарис боротьби ОУН–УПА в Україні (1946 – 1956 pp.). К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 1999. 111 с.
- Кентій, 1999б – Кентій А. Українська повстанська армія в 1944 – 1945 pp.. К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 1999. 220 с.
- Киричук, 2003 – Киричук Ю. Український національний рух 40–50-х років ХХ століття: ідеологія та практика. Львів: Добра справа, 2003. 464 с.
- Когут, 2002 – Когут М. Герої не вмирають... Кн. 2. Калуш: «Артекс», 2002. 72 с.
- Когут, 2001а – Когут М. Командир Різун. Дрогобич: Видавничча фірма «Відродження», 2001. 38 с.
- Когут, 2001б – Когут М. Герої не вмирають... Кн. 1. Дрогобич: Видавничча фірма «Відродження», 2001. 62 с.
- Літопис УПА, 1995 – Літопис УПА. Т. 28: Марія Савчин: Тисяча доріг. (Спомини). Торонто – Львів: Видавництво Літопис УПА, 1995. 598 с.
- Надольський Й. Е. Депортаційна політика сталінського тоталітарного режиму в західних областях України (1939 – 1953 pp.). Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа» Волин. нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки, 2008. 260 с.
- Роман Шухевич, 2007а – Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940 – 1950). К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. Т. 1. 640 с.
- Роман Шухевич, 2007б – Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940 – 1950). К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. Т. 2. 584 с.
- Русначенко, 2002 – Русначенко А. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940 – 50-х роках / Анатолій Русначенко. К.: Університетське видавництво «Пульсарія», 2002. 519 с.
- Сергійчук, 2006 – Сергійчук В. Таврючи визвольний прапор. Діяльність агентури та спецбюков НКВС-НКДБ під виглядом ОУН-УПА. Видання друге, доповнене. К.: ПП Сергійчук М.І., 2006. 184 с.
- Сергійчук, 2005 – Сергійчук В. Український здвиг: Прикарпаття. 1939 – 1955 pp. К.: Українська Видавничча Спілка, 2005. 840 с.
- Стародубець, 2006 – Стародубець Г. Українське повстанське запілля (друга пол. 1943 – поч. 1946 років). Тернопіль: Підручники і посібники, 2006. 527 с.

REFERENCES

- Bilas, 1994 – Bilas I. Represivno-karalna sistema v Ukrayini 1917 – 1953 [The repressive system in Ukraine in 1917 – 1953]. Suspilno-politychnyi ta istoryko-pravovyi analiz. U dvokh knyhakh. K.: Lybid; Viisko Ukrayiny, 1994. Kn. 1. 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

Viedenieiev, Bystrukhin, 2007 – Viedenieiev D., Bystrukhin H. Dvobii bez kompromisiv. Protyborstvo spetspidrozdiliv OUN ta radianskykh syl spetsoperatsii [An Uncompromising Combat. The Opposition of Special Subdivisions of OUN with Soviet Special Operations Forces]. 1945 – 1980-ti roky. Kyiv: K.I.S., 2007. 568 p. [in Ukrainian]

Vronska, 2009 – Vronska T. Zaruchnyky totalitarnoho rezhymu: represii proty rodyn «vorohiv narodu» v Ukraini (1917 – 1953 pp.) [Hostages of the totalitarian regime: reprisals against families of «enemies of the people» in Ukraine (1917 – 1953)]. K.: Instytut istorii Ukrainskoy, 2009. 486 p.

HDA SBU – Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainskoy [Sectoral State Archive of Security Service of Ukraine]. [in Ukrainian].

Kentii, 1999a – Kentii A. Narys borotby OUN–UPA v Ukraini (1946 – 1956 rr.) [On functioning of UPA departments in Chernivtsi land; An outline of the struggle of OUN-UPA in Ukraine (1946 – 1956)]. Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainskoy NAN Ukrainskoy, 1999. 111 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kentii, 1999b – Kentii A. V. Ukrainska povstanska armiya v 1944 – 1945 rr. [Ukrainian Insurgent Army in 1944 – 1945] Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainskoy NAN Ukrainskoy, 1999. 220 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kyrychuk, 2003 – Kyrychuk Yu. Ukrainskyi natsionalnyi rukh 40–50-kh rokiv XX stolittia: ideolohiia ta praktyka [Ukrainian Nationalist Movement of 1940s-1950s: Ideology and Practice]. Lviv, Dobra sprava, 2003. 464 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kohut, 2001a – Kohut M. Heroi ne vmyriau... [Heroes Do Not Die] Kn. 1. Drohobych: Vidrodzhennia, 2001. 62 p. [in Ukrainian].

Kohut, 2001b – Kohut M. Komandyr Rizun [Commander Rizun]. Drohobych: Vyadvnycha firma «Vidrodzhennia», 2001. 38 p.

Kohut, 2002 – Kohut M. Heroi ne vmyriau... [Heroes Do Not Die] Kn. 2. Kalush: Arteks, 2002. 72 p. [in Ukrainian].

Litopys UPA, 1995 – Litopys UPA. T. 28: Mariia Savchyn: Tysiacha dorih. (Spomyny) [Mariya Savchyn: a thousand of ways. (Recollections)]. Toronto – Lviv: Vyadvnytstvo Litopys UPA, 1995. 598 p.

Nadolskyi Y. E. Deportatsiina polityka stalinskoho totalitarnoho rezhymu v zakhidnykh oblastiakh Ukrainskoy (1939 – 1953 rr.) [Deportation policy of Stalin totalitarian regime in western areas of Ukraine (1939 – 1953)]. Lutsk: RVV «Vezha» Volyn. nats. un-tu im. Lesi Ukrainskoy, 2008. 260 p.

Roman Shukhevych, 2007a – Roman Shukhevych u dokumentakh radianskykh orhaniv derzhavnoi bezpeky (1940 – 1950) [Roman Shukhevych in documents of the Soviet agencies of state security (1940 – 1950)]. K.: PP Serhiichuk M. I., 2007. T. 1. 640 p.

Roman Shukhevych, 2007b – Roman Shukhevych u dokumentakh radianskykh orhaniv derzhavnoi bezpeky (1940 – 1950) [Roman Shukhevych in documents of the Soviet agencies of state security (1940 – 1950)]. K.: PP Serhiichuk M. I., 2007. T. 2. 584 p.

Rusnachenko, 2002 – Rusnachenko A. Narod zburenii: Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukrainskoy i natsionalni rukhy oporu v Bilorusii, Lytvi, Latvii, Estonii u 1940 – 50-kh rokakh [The Revolted People: National liberation movement in Ukraine and national resistance movements in Belarus', Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the 1940s – 1950s]. Kyiv, Universytetske vyadvnytstvo «Pulsary», 2002. 519 p. [in Ukrainian]

Serhiichuk, 2006 – Serhiichuk V. Tavruiuchy vyzvolnyi prapor. Diialnist ahentury ta spetsboivok NKVS-NKDB pid vyliadom OUN-UPA [Blaspheming the flag of liberation. The activity of agencies and special groups of NKVS-NKGB under the image of OUN-UPA]. Vydannia druhе, dopovnene. K.: PP Serhiichuk M.I., 2006. 184 p.

Serhiichuk, 2005 – Serhiichuk V. Ukrainskyi zdvyh: Prykarpattia [the Ukrainian revolt: Sub-Carpathia]. 1939 – 1955 rr. K.: Ukrainska Vyadvnycha Spilka, 2005. 840 p. [in Ukrainian]

Starodubets, 2006 – Starodubets H. Ukrainske povstanske zapillia (druha pol. 1943 – poch. 1946 rokiv) [Ukrainian insurgent underground (the second half of 1943 – beginning of 1946)]. Ternopil: Pidruchnyky i posibnyky, 2006. 527 p.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.04.2018 р.