

The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1906

Sergei I. Zhuk

**Popular Culture,
Identity, and Soviet Youth
in Dniepropetrovsk,
1959–84**



The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1906

Sergei I. Zhuk

**Popular Culture,
Identity, and Soviet Youth
in Dnepropetrovsk,
1959–84**

Sergei I. Zhuk is Associate Professor of Russian and East European History at Ball State University. His paper is part of a new research project, “The West in the ‘Closed City’: Cultural Consumption, Identities, and Ideology of Late Socialism in Soviet Ukraine, 1964–84.” Formerly a Professor of American History at Dnipropetrovsk University in Ukraine, he completed his doctorate degree in Russian History at the Johns Hopkins University in 2002 and recently published *Russia’s Lost Reformation: Peasants, Millennialism, and Radical Sects in Southern Russia and Ukraine, 1830–1917* (2004).

No. 1906, June 2008

© 2008 by The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh

ISSN 0889-275X

Image from cover: Rock performance by Dnieprians near the main building of Dnipropetrovsk University, August 31, 1980. Photograph taken by author.

The Carl Beck Papers

Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden

Managing Editor: Eileen O’Malley

Editorial Assistant: Vera Dorosh Sebulsky

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and between 40 and 90 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4400 Wesley W. Posvar Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Abstract

This paper explores the connections between cultural consumption, ideology, and identity formation in one particular city of the Soviet Ukraine during the Brezhnev era before perestroika. This industrial city, Dniepropetrovsk, was closed to foreigner visits by the KGB in 1959 because it became the location for one of the biggest missile factories in the Soviet Union. Given its closed, sheltered existence, Dniepropetrovsk became a unique Soviet social and cultural laboratory in which various patterns of late socialism collided with the new Western cultural influences. Using archival documents, periodicals, personal diaries and interviews as historical sources, this paper focuses on how various aspects of cultural consumption (reading books, listening and dancing to Western music) among the youth of the Soviet “closed city” contributed to various forms of cultural identification, which eventually became elements of post-Soviet Ukrainian national identity.

Question: “Who was Brezhnev?”

Response: “The insignificant Soviet political leader during the era of the Beatles and Alla Pugacheva.”

—Soviet joke from the 1970s

In January 1969, Oleksii Vatchenko, the first secretary of the regional committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in Dnepropetrovsk, explained to Komsomol activists that the essence of “socialist cultural” consumption was the ability of young Soviet consumers to give a “correct class evaluation of bourgeois art and music and avoid noncritical attitudes eulogizing the capitalist way of life.”¹ He emphasized that a Marxist ideological approach would help Dnepropetrovsk consumers make good cultural consumption choices. Komsomol members should use the most progressive patterns of Ukrainian socialist culture in the struggle against degenerate Western influences.² In April 1970, Zinaida Soumina, a representative of the city administration in Dnepropetrovsk, elaborated this theme further: “We are not against consumption. But this should be a *cultured* consumption. Take a look at our city offices of music recording and what our youth is consuming there as ‘music.’ They are recording the tapes with songs of Vysotsky, music by the Beatles [*bitlov*]. Where is the real cultural consumption here? You can see that our young people are not recording classical music by Tchaikovsky or Glinka. They still prefer dances with boogie-woogie to concerts of classical music. In searching for recordings of their Western idols, young people forget their national roots, their own national culture.”³

Soviet apparatchiks, who experienced real problems with the new consumerist, post-Stalinist society, tried to make a distinction between cultural (good) and non-cultural (bad) consumption. Their most serious problem was to identify such forms of consumption and protect socialist national culture from “the ideological pollution of cosmopolitan bourgeois influences.” They clearly understood the links between cultural consumption and identity formation, and to some extent tried to protect the ideal of Soviet cultural identity. Protection from ideological pollution was especially important in the Ukrainian city of Dnepropetrovsk, a large industrial city with a young, multinational, predominantly Russian-speaking population, which grew from 917,074 inhabitants in 1970 to 1,191,971 in 1989.⁴

New forms of cultural consumption among the youth of this city created problems for Soviet ideologists and the KGB because Dnepropetrovsk had a special strategic importance for the entire Soviet regime. This city was officially closed to foreigners by the KGB in 1959 because it was the site of Yuzhmash, one of the biggest missile factories in the Soviet Union. The most powerful rocket engines made for the Soviet military were manufactured in Dnepropetrovsk, which was called by inhabitants “the closed rocket city.”⁵ At the same time, this city became a launching ground for the political careers of many Soviet politicians in Ukraine and in Moscow, and it was known particularly as the power base of the Brezhnev clan. Before perestroika more than 53 percent of all political leaders in Kyiv came from Dnepropetrovsk. By 1996, 80 percent of post-Soviet Ukrainian politicians began their careers in the rocket city.⁶

In this essay I explore the connections among cultural consumption, ideology, and identity formation in one particular city of Soviet Ukraine during the late socialist period before the Gorbachev reforms. Given its closed, sheltered existence, Dniepropetrovsk became a unique Soviet social and cultural laboratory in which various patterns of late socialism collided with new Western cultural influences. Using archival documents, periodicals, personal diaries, and interviews as historical sources, I will focus on how different moments of cultural consumption among the youth of the “closed city” contributed to various forms of cultural identification, which eventually became elements of the post-Soviet Ukrainian national identity.⁷

I will also consider how Soviet consumption of Western popular culture, ideology, and the practices of late socialism contributed to unmaking Soviet civilization before perestroika. Recent studies of post-Stalin socialism in the Soviet Union examine the interaction of ideology with various forms of cultural production and consumption. Yet the overwhelming majority of these studies (such as works by Svetlana Boym, Hilary Pilkington, Thomas Cushman, Alexei Yurchak, and William J. Risch) are based on material from the Westernized cities of the USSR (Moscow, Leningrad, and L’viv) which were most exposed to foreign tourists, journalists, and other Western influences.⁸ The best studies about popular music consumption in the Soviet Union focus mainly on “indigenous” popular music *production* by famous Soviet and post-Soviet bands in the major capital cities and ignore the details of the everyday music *consumption* by nonmusicians in provincial cities.⁹ As a result, the history of cultural consumption (including pop music) in Soviet provincial cities and villages without foreign guests is missing from the analysis. It is difficult to generalize about the social and cultural history of the Soviet Union when the focus is only on Moscow and Leningrad.¹⁰ Through historical analysis of Dniepropetrovsk, a more typical Soviet city than the Westernized capitals, this essay intends to add new material and new directions to the study of Soviet politics and cultural consumption.

This essay also adds significantly to the study of Ukrainian history in the last decades of the twentieth century. During perestroika and after the collapse of the Soviet Union, various Ukrainian and Western historians, anthropologists, and political scientists explored different aspects of Ukrainian history and the evolution of Ukrainian politics, culture, and identities during the transition from late socialism to independence.¹¹ Missing from this literature is a concrete, detailed, historical analysis of cultural consumption and identity formation in Dniepropetrovsk, one of the most influential regions in Soviet and post-Soviet Ukraine.¹²

My analysis draws on various British cultural studies about cultural consumption and identity. According to John Storey, “it is important to include cultural consumption in a discussion of identities because human identities are formed out of people’s

everyday actions and interaction in different forms of consumption.”¹³ As Madan Sarup observes:

Cultural consumption is a mode of being, a way of gaining identity. Our identities are in part constructed out of the things we consume—what we listen to, what we watch, what we read, what we wear, etc. In this way, the market . . . offers tools of identity-making. Our identities are in part a result of what we consume. Or to put it another way, what we consume and how we consume it says a great deal about who we are, who we want to be, and how others see us. Cultural consumption is perhaps one of the most significant ways we perform our sense of self. This does not mean that we are what we consume, that our cultural consumption practices determine our social being; but it does mean that what we consume provides us with a script with which we can stage and perform in a variety of ways the drama of who we are.¹⁴

According to British scholars, the “human self is envisaged as neither the product of an external symbolic system, nor as a fixed entity which the individual can immediately and directly grasp; rather the self is a symbolic project that the individual actively constructs out of the symbolic materials which are available to him or her, materials which the individual weaves into a coherent account of who he or she is, a narrative of self-identity.”¹⁵ Simon Frith emphasized that consumption of books, music, and films “constructs the human sense of identity through the direct experiences it offers of the body, time and sociability, experiences which enable people to place themselves in imaginative cultural narratives.”¹⁶ As John B. Thompson noted, “these are narratives which people will change over time as they draw on new symbolic materials, encounter new experiences and gradually redefine their identity in the course of a life trajectory.”¹⁷

The Ideology of Consumption, Mature Socialism, and KGB Problems in the Closed City

Khrushchev’s reforms and his attempt to develop a higher standard of living in Soviet society and a higher level of everyday consumption among Soviet citizens started a new period in the history of Soviet socialism.¹⁸ After 1959, his emphasis on better living and higher standards for production and consumption as the main objectives of mature socialism opened a door for a new interpretation of socialist consumption. “Socialist consumption,” including “cultural consumption,” thus became part of the ideological discourse of late socialism in the Soviet Union.

Leonid Brezhnev replaced Khrushchev as the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU in October 1964. His rule (1964–82) began a new chapter in socialist consumption in the Soviet Union.¹⁹ Brezhnev became the first Soviet leader to point out that the production of consumer goods should be the main goal of the entire

socialist economy. During the twenty-fourth Party Congress in March–April 1971, he introduced important changes in the directives of the USSR’s ninth Five-Year Plan. Instead of heavy industry as a top priority, the Soviet leadership turned its attention to goods for mass consumption. Therefore, at least in official Soviet discourse, Brezhnev introduced “Soviet consumerism” as a legitimate precondition of what communist ideologists had been already calling “developed [or mature] socialism” since 1967.²⁰ During the 1960s and 1970s, Soviet ideologists paid more attention to the organization of leisure time and cultural consumption (reading, watching films, listening to music, etc.) among the Soviet population. Soviet consumers were to be provided not only with consumer goods, but also with new services and new healthy goals for consumption. According to the ideological requirements of developed socialism, socialist consumption had to differ from capitalist consumption, excluding notions of individual profitability or the accumulation of wealth. Soviet ideologists tried to combine traditional Stalinist goals of “rational consumption” and the “rational use of leisure” with the new requirements of developed socialism. Stalin’s “noble objectives of education and cultural growth of Soviet citizens” still dominated the ideological discourse of the Brezhnev era.²¹

Especially in the closed city of Dnepropetrovsk, KGB officers worried about new forms of cultural consumption that could breach the system of secrecy surrounding Yuzhmash. Each month a KGB representative reported the ideological situation in the city to the regional Communist party committee. The main ideological crimes recorded by KGB officers were related to the consumption of new cultural products by the regional population, whose standard of living had improved since the beginning of Khrushchev’s policy of de-Stalinization and the liberalization of Soviet society. The growing usage of such products as radios and tape recorders created problems for the KGB as early as the 1960s.

Technical progress and technical-scientific education were principal themes of Communist party propaganda from the first days of the Soviet regime. All Soviet leaders, from Lenin and Stalin to Khrushchev and Brezhnev, mentioned this in their reports, and all the congresses of the CPSU included this theme in their documents. This interest in new technology brought some unwelcome results among Soviet youth. In Dnepropetrovsk during the late 1950s and early 1960s, thousands of students from high schools and local colleges became enthusiastic designers of amateur radio sets and other radio devices. Some of them even broadcast their own improvised radio shows without permission from the state authorities. The KGB tried to prevent these activities, deemed “radio hooliganism.” Moreover, Soviet police worried not only about the radio hooligans’ interference with officially controlled radio waves, but also about their listening to “bourgeois radio stations” and “spreading dangerous bourgeois propaganda” among the Soviet population. A criminal case in the KGB file from July

30, 1962, reported to the Dnepropetrovsk regional Party organization, described the “anti-Soviet” behavior of three students from Dnepropetrovsk State University (A. Duplishchev, P. Belonozhko, and E. Boiko), who, in 1960, designed special radio devices which allowed them to listen to foreign music and “anti-Soviet information” and then to broadcast their own improvised shows. As it turned out, all the radio hooligans arrested in the 1960s recorded the chart-topping popular music of capitalist countries and eventually broadcast this music for local radio audiences.²²

Using information from agents among the students, the secret police reported to the regional secretary of the CPSU how “bourgeois radio stations” were shaping the behavior of Soviet youth. KGB informers repeated Soviet propagandist clichés when they pointed out that everything bad in “Soviet real life” came only from the capitalist West and not from Soviet life itself. Thus a KGB report from December 1962 noted that “some students in the student hostels listened to anti-Soviet broadcasting, blindly imitated melodies of American rock’n’roll, played cards for money, drank alcohol, met women of easy virtue, [and] some of them even blamed Soviet power for all their financial problems.”²³

In reports to their KGB supervisors, Komsomol leaders also deplored the Western, anti-Soviet influences that came through foreign music and radio: “an excessive consumption of foreign music” led to a rise in alcohol drinking among adolescents (35 percent increase for 1964) and college students. Their major complaint was about intoxicated, Westernized students who attacked and physically abused the representatives of college authorities. After their raids in the student dorms in 1965, Komsomol officials noted that “students demonstrated their apathy toward public life and understood incorrectly the questions of contemporary international and domestic situation(s).” But the most dangerous fact for apparatchiks was that all student rooms had obvious signs of capitalist cultural influence such as audiotapes of “beat music” and pictures of the Beatles and Rolling Stones. In some rooms students listened regularly to foreign radio stations and recorded foreign music on their tape recorders.²⁴

In January 1968, KGB officials analyzed data about how inhabitants of Dnepropetrovsk consumed information from foreign radio stations. Police checked at least one thousand letters sent to different radio stations throughout the world by listeners from the region of Dnepropetrovsk during 1967. According to their analysis, 36 percent of all letters were sent to radio stations in Canada, 31 percent to stations in the United States and 29 percent to England. The overwhelming majority of correspondents were young people: 38.8 percent were younger than eighteen, 28 percent were between eighteen and twenty-eight, and 32.2 percent were older than twenty-eight.²⁵ As KGB analyzers noted in 1968, 37 percent of the listeners (and consumers of Western radio information) asked in their letters for radio stations to send them music records, albums,

manuals of fashionable dances, or radio guides with a timetable of different Western radio stations. Nearly 25.5 percent asked stations to “fulfill their musical request” to play their favorite song, 13.7 percent asked for help establishing “friendship with citizens of other countries,” and 23.5 percent of the letters contained answers to various contests and quizzes organized by the stations.²⁶

This analysis reveals the main character of cultural consumption among listeners to Western radio in the Dniepropetrovsk region. An overwhelming majority were mainly interested in new music and popular culture, in fashions but not in politics. It is noteworthy that KGB censors could not find any critical anti-Soviet comments, any ironical or skeptical attitudes toward Soviet values in these letters. They did, however, note some negative influences: A student from the Engineering Construction Institute, Stanislav Bandurystyi, told his classmates during a discussion about the Vietnam War that he regularly listened to Voice of America, and he disagreed with the interpretation offered by the Soviet media. But Evgenii Chaika, a sixteen-year-old student at Dniepropetrovsk High School No. 42, was more typical. He wrote numerous letters to the BBC about his love of rock’n’roll music. “It is impossible not to love the Beatles,” he wrote in one of his letters. “I have listened to their music since 1963. I want to hear their song ‘19th Nervous Breakdown’ again. And I have something else in mind. Please send me chewing gum as well.” Another listener, nineteen-year-old Vladimir Dmitriev, who worked as a technician in the Dniepropetrovsk House of Technique, asked radio stations in the United States and England to help him organize correspondence with the citizens of these countries. His main requests were about records with jazz and rock music.²⁷

In 1969 the KGB organized a special public campaign in local periodicals to stop “the radio hooligans” who “polluted the city radio waves with musical cacophony” of “heinous” rock’n’roll.²⁸ According to the Dniepropetrovsk police, local radio hooligans still recorded and then broadcast foreign music on a regular basis for local audiences during the 1970s and 1980s. The number of radio hooligans increased from 475 in 1970 to 685 in 1971, and continued to rise. The KGB recorded three thousand cases of illegal radio broadcasting from almost seven hundred local amateur radio stations annually. During 1971 in Dnieprodzerzhinsk, the second largest industrial city of the region, local police organized more than one hundred fifty raids, arrested one hundred twenty radio hooligans and confiscated their radio and sound recording equipment, which cost on average more than thirty-five hundred rubles. More than 90 percent of these “radio music criminals” were very young people (under twenty-five).²⁹

The spreading popularity of Western pop music became a major problem for both the local police and communist ideologists. Over a six-month period in 1972, Komsomol activists and police organized more than one hundred raids against hippies and people who traded foreign music records in downtown Dniepropetrovsk. More

than two hundred music *fartsovshchiki* (black marketeers) were arrested during those raids. The police confiscated hundreds of foreign records, thousands of audiotapes with Western popular music, and “264 copies of illegal printed material, called *samizdat*.” KGB officers noted the role played by the Western Ukrainian city of L’viv as a major source of Western music records and illegal printed material of “undisguised anti-Soviet nature” for Dniepropetrovsk’s black market. After 1972, Dniepropetrovsk leaders still complained about a rapid increase of rock music consumption. At the beginning of the 1980s, KGB reports had to admit the failure of all ideological efforts to halt the spread of Western pop music in the region and city of Dniepropetrovsk.³⁰

Annual reports of KGB officials to the regional committee of the CPSU made a clear connection between anti-Soviet behavior and the unhealthy enthusiasm for Western mass culture.³¹ Between 1962 and 1984 the new “bourgeois” forms of cultural consumption became major transgressions of late socialism in Dniepropetrovsk, affecting not only young enthusiasts of Western mass culture, but also KGB officials and party apparatchiks. By 1984 both the elitist families of the Soviet *nomenklatura* and ordinary families of local workers and intellectuals had embraced forms of cultural consumption that had nothing to do with what party ideologists called “the Soviet style of life.” It is noteworthy that KGB officers and Communist ideologists emphasized the negative influence of L’viv on local youth, an image that would later influence all ideological campaigns against Western “bourgeois” cultural consumption in Dniepropetrovsk.³²

On July 4, 1968, N. Mazhara, head of the Dniepropetrovsk department of the KGB, sent to the first secretary of the regional committee of the CPSU secret information about the ideological situation in the region. In this report, a KGB officer noted that in six months of 1968 the police discovered 183 printed documents with “anti-Soviet content” which had circulated widely throughout the region. Of those documents, 95 derived from Ukrainian nationalist organizations, 14 from Russian anticommunist organizations, 61 from various religious organizations, and 14 from “socialist revisionist international organizations,” mainly from Albania. Many had reached Dniepropetrovsk from L’viv. The KGB detected an increase of anti-Soviet and “politically harmful” activity in the region of Dniepropetrovsk: there were 60 such cases for the whole year of 1967, but for only five months of 1968 there were 194.³³

This document is good testimony for the growth of a new kind of cultural consumption during 1967–68. The most popular types of forbidden literature were pamphlets by Ukrainian nationalists (95 cases) and religious publications (61 cases). Of the 194 detected cases of anti-Soviet activity during five months of 1968, the most frequent were “dissemination of foreign anti-Soviet literature” (183 cases), the “spread of ideologically and politically harmful notions, slander about Soviet reality” (62), “manifestations of a nationalist character” (47), “antisocietal acts of a religious ten-

gency” (20), and “circulation of and keeping at home, handwritten and printed material of anti-Soviet and politically harmful content” (12).³⁴ A majority of “anti-Soviet criminals” (56 percent, or 109 of 194) were intellectuals (31 students, 27 college teachers, 30 representatives of the “creative intelligentsia,” and 21 of the “technical intelligentsia”). Those who were the most active in cultural production and consumption in the region became the main violators of Soviet consumption rules. Other KGB reports during the 1970s emphasized and repeated similar trends in ideological crimes connected to cultural consumption among Dnepropetrovsk youth. The first trend was “overzealous” rock music consumption; the other one was the consumption of Ukrainian nationalist literature. All KGB reports during the 1960s and 1970s emphasized the negative role of the city of L’viv in providing Dnepropetrovsk with ideologically dangerous products. Given the strategic importance of Dnepropetrovsk for the Soviet military-industrial complex, the increase in anti-Soviet cultural production and consumption required the special attention of all branches of the local administration—not only the political police, but also the ideological and educational organs of power.

Ukrainian Literary Classics and Problems of Nationalism

A dangerous problem, related to the “Khrushchev thaw,” was a rising interest in Ukrainian history and national traditions among loyal Soviet intellectuals and members of the Communist party and Komsomol. KGB operatives interpreted this as Ukrainian nationalism and regarded Dnepropetrovsk State University (DGU), and particularly the historical-philological department, as its source.³⁵ The first KGB case directly related to cultural consumption concerned A. Ovcharenko, a student from this department.³⁶ In 1960 he wrote a master’s thesis (*diplomnaia rabota*) about a controversial poem by Taras Shevchenko, a nineteenth-century Ukrainian poet and the founding father of the Ukrainian literary tradition. Shevchenko wrote “A Poem-Fantasy” (*Mysteria*) entitled “A Great Cellar” (*Velykyi Liokh*) in 1845. This poem is about a tragedy of Ukrainian history portrayed through laments of “three souls, three crows, and three kobza-players.” According to Shevchenko, these images symbolized all Ukrainians who died after the annexation of Ukraine by the Russian Empire. The main idea of the poem is that Bohdan Khmel’nytsky, a Ukrainian Cossack leader (*hetman*), made a dangerous mistake when in Pereiaslav in 1654 he signed an agreement that approved the joining of Ukraine to Russia. After this alliance Ukrainians became slaves of the Russian tsars; Peter I and Catherine II, “the worst enemies of Ukraine,” annihilated the freedoms and privileges of Ukrainian Cossacks and destroyed Zaporizhian Sich, Baturin, and other centers of Cossack power in Ukraine. After this, Russian rulers (*moskali* and *katsapy* in the poem) exploited and humiliated Ukrainians. Thousands died while building the city of

St. Petersburg, railroads, and other construction projects for the Russian crown. Due to these tragic events, the souls of dead Ukrainians still meet in Subotiv, a residence of Khmel'nytsky near Chyhyryn, to lament and denounce his decision to betray the independence of Ukraine and join Russia. Shevchenko used the metaphor of “the Great Cellar” or “the Great Coffin” to portray a Ukraine enslaved: After 1654, the Russians dug a “huge cellar [*liokh*] of slavery” for Ukrainians. The Russian Empire became a “cold and oppressive underground prison.” And Khmel'nytsky's church in Subotiv, in the poetic imagination of Shevchenko, was transformed into a symbol of slavery and death (“a burial place”) for all of Ukraine. According to Shevchenko, Khmel'nytsky, a “friend” of Tsar Alexis's, betrayed and humiliated Ukraine: “All nations of the world now are laughing at Ukraine and making fun of Ukrainians who, by their own will, have traded their freedoms for slavery in Russia.” The ending of the poem is very optimistic and prophetic, however: “Do not laugh, strangers, at poor orphan Ukraine, because this Church-Coffin will fall apart and from its ruins the free Ukraine will arise! And this Ukraine will remove a darkness of slavery, and then turn the light of Truth on, and the Ukraine's oppressed children will pray in freedom at last!”³⁷

Shevchenko's poem offered a historical concept which differed sharply from the traditional interpretations of Soviet historiography.³⁸ In contrast to a positive portrayal of the Pereyaslav agreement as a symbol of friendship of two brotherly Slavic nations, Shevchenko described it as a tragic act of betrayal and humiliation for Ukraine. The great modernizers of Imperial Russia, Peter I and Catherine II, were presented by Shevchenko as the most brutal executioners and torturers of the Ukrainians; ending all hopes for an independent Ukraine. Of course, the very fact that Ovcharenko chose this poem for his research raised some suspicions among his classmates, who denounced him to KGB officers. As a result, the KGB considered Ovcharenko's thesis “a nationalistic deviation” and complained about it to his professors. Despite KGB pressure, his professors not only tried to avoid any ideological criticism of Ovcharenko's work, but fully supported his thesis. Moreover, Ovcharenko's mentor Dmukhovsky, an associate professor in the philological department, suggested that he just remove some sentences “that looked too nationalistic” and eventually awarded the thesis a B grade.³⁹

The KGB officials, who were outraged by the indifference shown by university professors to such nationalistic transgressions, organized a special investigation. They discovered that in 1960, Ovcharenko, with his classmates Zavgorodnii and Trush from the philological department and Leliukh, a student from the Dnipropetrovsk Medical Institute, were part of Dnipro, a student group at the university. They read books on Ukrainian history and culture, recited Ukrainian poetry, and studied Taras Shevchenko's works. As it turned out, Leliukh organized this group and composed its program and rules. According to KGB records, he was notorious among his classmates for his anti-

Soviet remarks and nationalistic ideas. In 1959, during a seminar on political economy at his institute, Leliukh used his own interpretation of Marxist theory to prove the necessity of economic autonomy for Ukraine in the USSR. In 1960 he used the same ideas in his program for Dnipro. As the KGB described it, Leliukh “included the idea of a separation of Ukraine from the Soviet Union.” It was fortunate for other participants of this group that they had no time to discuss this document; in 1962 after graduation from the university, they left Dniepropetrovsk for their new job assignments. This departure spared them from arrest. As the main organizer of the group, Leliukh was eventually arrested and sent to jail in November 1962 for “nationalistic propaganda.”⁴⁰

It is noteworthy that Leliukh’s group attracted loyal Komsomol members, whose interest in Ukrainian history and traditions was stimulated by two developments in cultural production and consumption in Soviet Ukraine during 1959 and 1961, which were connected to official discourse of post-Stalin socialism. First, the assigned readings for students in the philological department now included more books in Ukrainian written by classical Ukrainian writers like Taras Shevchenko. Second, the Communist party’s cultural program under Khrushchev stressed the creation of a new Soviet humanistic culture, “socialist in essence” and “national in form.” This led to state sponsorship of ideological campaigns to celebrate national poets, such as Taras Shevchenko, who were “opponents of the oppressive tsarist regime.”⁴¹ Shevchenko’s anniversaries (in 1954 and 1961) were marked by publication of multivolume collections of his works in Ukrainian. The reading of Shevchenko’s controversial poetry (both anti-Russian and pro-Ukrainian) in the Ukrainian schools by millions of students led to an interest in Ukrainian history in forms which differed from the ideology of Soviet internationalism. Some of these were labeled nationalistic deviations by KGB.⁴²

At the beginning of 1960 another group of young, patriotically inclined poets attracted the attention of the KGB. Most were DGU students who joined the literary workshop at the Palace of Students in Dniepropetrovsk. According to KGB reports, these young, talented poets denied “traditions of socialist realism,” insisted on the new “revolutionary approaches to a changing reality,” and called themselves “a generation of the 60s” (*shistydesiatnyky*). KGB officers discovered they also experimented with nationalist ideas, reading and disseminating texts written by famous figures in Ukrainian national movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁴³ Although their ideas of national history were expressed in traditionally accepted Marxist forms—none of these “experimental poets” denied the theory of “class struggle” or the progressive character of socialism—they were interpreted by the police as “nationalist propaganda.” In 1965 this group of young poets attracted new members, including Oleksandr Vodolazhchenko, who said publicly: “We must fight not only for preservation of the Ukrainian language, because this is not a very important question for this given period,

but we must struggle for preservation of the nation, national cadres. It is necessary that Ukrainians stay to work in Ukraine, that we have fewer ethnically mixed marriages. We must work hard in this direction.”⁴⁴ According to KGB reports, similar ideas were shared by many people in the philological and the physical-technical departments of DGU, at the Engineering and Construction Institute of Dniepropetrovsk (DISI) and among young artists and men and women of letters.

On the eve of the new year, 1966, DGU students, including Vodolazhchenko and Ivan Sokul’sky, organized a group of sixteen young people to meet in classrooms of the agricultural institute (DSKHI) and the DGU for recitals of national Ukrainian Christmas and New Year songs (called *koliadky* and *shchedrivky* in Ukrainian). They had official permission from the DGU party committee and the Komsomol regional committee to meet and recite *koliadky*,⁴⁵ and they borrowed Ukrainian national costumes from the Palace of Students. Late in the evening on December 31, 1965, they donned their costumes and visited the apartments of their professors from DGU, DISI, and DSKHI, where they staged the national rituals of Ukrainian New Year celebrations. When the young people tried to visit officials of the regional party committee in a special residence building in downtown Dniepropetrovsk, they were stopped by the police. It is noteworthy that the KGB report emphasized that the “lyrics of the *koliadky* had no bad or harmful content.”⁴⁶ The report also noted that Vodolazhchenko and Sokul’sky—both quite intoxicated—called each other “pan” (“my lord” in Ukrainian). “They began to express their admiration and joy,” the KGB officer wrote, “at what they had done. They declared that their activities would be recorded in the history books because they were the first people who got permission to perform Ukrainian *koliadky* in public. They regarded this as a big victory for Ukrainian culture. Vodolazhchenko even suggested writing about this to the Polish periodical *Our Word*, ‘which could inform the Ukrainians abroad, in Canada and other countries.’”⁴⁷ They expected that all progressively minded people in the West would support their actions and approve them.⁴⁸ These young Soviet Ukrainian patriots obviously idealized the level of support for Ukrainian nationalism in the “progressive West.”

Groups of Ukrainian culture enthusiasts mainly consisted of college students and young female workers from local factories. On January 7, 1966, many students joined a group of *koliadky* singers to celebrate Orthodox Christmas, using old Ukrainian rituals and songs. The local Komsomol periodical published an article that same day, praising “an important cultural initiative of young people who tried to restore local customs of ordinary people who settled in the Dnipro region many years ago and who laid the foundation for a modern Ukrainian socialist civilization.”⁴⁹

The DGU, pressured by the KGB, then tried to accuse one of the main organizers of this group, Ivan Sokul'sky, a fourth-year student (a junior) in the philological department, of what they called "Ukrainian nationalism." When the local Dnepropetrovsk TV station prepared a special show devoted to the poets, like Sokul'sky, who belonged to a university literary association called Gart ("tempering" in Ukrainian), KGB officials insisted on the removal of Sokul'sky's name from the script. Moreover, they used Sokul'sky's classmates to denounce him and other participants in the performance of *koliadky* rituals. The officers suspected that a Gart newspaper resisted their pressure and kept publishing poetry by Sokul'sky and his friends. Eventually, under pressure from the KGB, on May 5, 1966, Ivan Sokul'sky was expelled from the section of Ukrainian language and literature in the department of philology for the "nationalistic ideas he put in his poems."⁵⁰ According to the KGB reports, Sokul'sky and his friends disseminated "ideologically dangerous literature" and advocated releasing all people arrested for "nationalistic activities" from jail. After a long interrogation, the KGB "persuaded" Sokul'sky to stop his patriotic activities. After 1966, he worked in different places in various positions, including as proof-reader at the local energy plant's newspaper. Another friend of Sokul'sky's, O. Zavgorodnii, was also persecuted by the KGB. In conversations with KGB officers Zavgorodnii, who worked as a journalist at the district newspaper, always tried to defend his poetry as "an expression of normal Soviet patriotism."⁵¹

It is noteworthy that the cases of so-called anti-Soviet behavior in KGB files were about the idealistic attempts of young people to cleanse socialist reality from the "distortions" and "deviations" of communist ideals and to make a life under socialism better and closer to the Leninist ideal of mature socialism. This kind of discourse existed in Soviet society all the time, but Khrushchev's de-Stalinization campaign and his romantic attempt to build communism in the near future energized and justified this discourse, especially between 1961 and 1968.⁵²

In October 1967, Mikhail Mikhailov, a DGU student, had an intensive correspondence with his close friend Nikolai Polesia, a former DGU student who had moved to Kyiv State University. In their letters they criticized the corruption and immoral behavior of Soviet officials (who accepted bribes and cheated on their colleagues, etc.). They had encountered this kind of corruption when they worked as students at a brick factory and on collective farms. In their vision of communism, this behavior contradicted its major ideals; therefore all honest Soviet citizens should struggle with such distortions of socialism. Polesia suggested that Mikhailov organize a special "ideological" group for "the struggle with everyday, all-suppressing, dull reality" in the name of "the better communist future." Polesia, Mikhailov, and other college students, who were later interrogated by the KGB, wanted to "make Soviet reality fit

the classical Leninist model of socialism.” They tried to defend “the Leninist theory of equality for all nations and national languages under socialism.” Therefore they accused the communist leadership in Dniepropetrovsk of “ignoring Leninism, of organizing an anti-Marxist campaign of Russification and persecution of the socialist Ukrainian national culture.”⁵³

These young Ukrainian idealists just followed the main ideas of official Soviet discourse about nationalities under socialism. As Terry Martin noted:

Soviet policy did systematically promote the distinctive national identity and national self-consciousness of its non-Russian populations. It did this not only through the formation of national territories staffed by national elites using their own national languages, but also through the aggressive promotion of symbolic markers of national identity: national folklore, museums, dress, food, costumes, opera, poets, progressive historical events, and classic literary works. The long-term goal was that distinctive national identities would coexist peacefully with an emerging all-union socialist culture that would supersede the preexisting national cultures. National identity would be depoliticized through an ostentatious show of respect for the national identities of the non-Russians.⁵⁴

Dniepropetrovsk students just took for granted the major elements of this policy and tried to criticize distortions of it in the closed city.

All the cases of so-called Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism stemmed from the same discourse of improving the “Soviet socialist model” and implementing the Communist party program’s objective: “to create Soviet culture, socialist in its content and national in its forms.”⁵⁵ In October 1967, Vasyl Suiarko, a twenty-one-year-old freshman from the Dniepropetrovsk Mining Institute, planned to form a nationalist organization and put a Ukrainian national flag (yellow and blue) on the main building of his institute on November 7, the thirtieth anniversary of the October Revolution. As the police later discovered, in the summer of 1966, Suiarko came to Dniepropetrovsk to take the admission exams at the mining institute. There he met Oleksandr Golovchun, and they spent time together talking about creating an underground student organization of Ukrainian nationalists. Suiarko boasted that he read books about the history of Ukraine, forbidden by the KGB, and that he had personal contacts with “a writer-nationalist Korzh” from the city of Dniepropetrovsk. As it turned out, Suiarko had invented the entire story for his friend Golovchun to demonstrate how brave he was; his information about Korzh was borrowed from a BBC radio show. He failed his exams in 1966 and was admitted to the institute only the next year. When he returned to Dniepropetrovsk in 1967, Suiarko again met Golovchun and continued to play the role of the “active Ukrainian nationalist” for him. This childish game led to the fantastic project to put a Ukrainian banner on the main building of the institute. This plan was denounced by another student to the KGB.⁵⁶

Suiarko and Golovchun were arrested by the police and later released and expelled from the Komsomol and the institute. As Suiarko admitted in a conversation with a KGB officer, he thought as an ethnic Ukrainian he fit the role as organizer of a Ukrainian nationalistic group. He believed that such an organization would be important for awakening national feelings among local Ukrainians and improving socialist society. In the Ukrainian city of Dnepropetrovsk, he noted, local department stores did not sell Ukrainian national dress or Ukrainian national literature. According to many local Ukrainians, this was a “distortion” of “Leninist national policy” and created “a Russified version” of “socialist cultural consumption” that contradicted the main principles of “mature socialism” as declared by Leonid Brezhnev himself. Suiarko also acknowledged that he borrowed some arguments for his plan from foreign radio broadcasts such as the BBC, the Voice of America and the Voice of Canada for Ukrainians. Cultural consumption—listening to a radio—thus led to an activity which was interpreted by the KGB as “nationalistic” and therefore as a dangerous, “anti-Soviet” crime.⁵⁷

As KGB reports noted, the rise of Ukrainian nationalism in “the rocket city” was a result of demographic and political developments after 1956. According to a KGB decision, former political prisoners who had been indicted for “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” and had served their prison terms in the Gulag were released after the Twentieth Party Congress but were not allowed to return to their homes in Western Ukraine. These prisoners, called *banderovtsy* in official documents, were either members or supporters of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), and/or members of the Ukrainian Catholic Church (Uniate and Ukrainian Greek-rite Catholic Church) from the Trans-Carpathian and Galician regions of Western Ukraine.⁵⁸ When the Soviet army suppressed these patriotic and anti-Soviet movements after 1945, thousands of adherents were sent into exile far from Ukraine—in Siberia and Kazakhstan. KGB officials tried to prevent any contacts between these former political prisoners and their homeland in Western Ukraine and, on their return, to isolate them among the more diverse, more Russified, eastern regions of Ukraine. By 1967, 1,041 former political prisoners who were labeled “Ukrainian nationalists” far from Western Ukraine had settled in the region of Dnepropetrovsk alone.⁵⁹ This posed a danger to ideological and political control of the region because they lived not only in the countryside but also in strategically important cities such as Dnepropetrovsk.

On December 18, 1967, KGB officers discovered that ex-prisoners had established a very active correspondence with the members of their families who migrated abroad after 1945. One emigrant wrote to his relatives from Canada: “I suggest that you join the Communist Party, Komsomol, and please, get more and better education whenever it’s possible. But do not forget in your soul and your heart that you are

Ukrainians. When you get higher offices of government and get higher education, then Ukraine will be free. The more Ukrainians join the Communist Party, the more influence these Ukrainians will get among the ruling elites. Only Ukrainians who will be members of the ruling elite could save our Ukrainian collective farmers [*rabiv-kolgospnykiv*] from the Moscow yoke.”⁶⁰

The KGB established a special surveillance over Oleksandr Kuz’menko, a bus driver from Dniepropetrovsk. During the Nazi occupation he was elected team leader of a nationalist organization in the Dniepropetrovsk district called Lotskamenka. In 1944, when Soviet troops liberated the city, Kuz’menko was sent for eight years into labor camps. In 1956, he came back to Dniepropetrovsk and became a target of a new KGB investigation. Now he was suspected of spreading “anti-Soviet rumors” and criticizing “Soviet reality.” As the KGB discovered, by the beginning of 1968 Kuz’menko had already established in Kyiv close relations with other “nationalistically disposed” people, including Ukrainian writers such as Ivan Dziuba and Oles’ Honchar and descendants of Taras Shevchenko. It is noteworthy that links to Taras Shevchenko’s relatives were considered in official correspondence as “ideologically dangerous.” Among Kuz’menko’s “connections” the KGB discovered people who played an important role in the economic life of the region. One was Ivan Rybalka, a communist and one of the executives of the important research center of the Ministry of Metallurgy of the USSR. Rybalka used his office typewriter for disseminating “nationalistic” literature which he acquired in Kyiv and L’viv. In many cases, as it turned out, patriotic Ukrainian poetry (even by Taras Shevchenko), which was used by Rybalka, aroused suspicion. The KGB worried that local intellectuals like Rybalko had become the intermediaries between ex-prisoners and their nationalist relatives in Western Ukraine.⁶¹

The city of L’viv was always the major source of trouble for KGB operatives from Dniepropetrovsk. During the 1960s, all forbidden nationalist literature, the most popular Western music records of “degenerate rock’n’roll,” and all other “bad” cultural influences came from L’viv. The leaders of the young poets’ group that attracted the attention of the Dniepropetrovsk KGB either had direct contact with L’viv intellectuals or had graduated from L’viv State University. Ivan Sokul’sky took classes there for one year before entering DGU. His close friend and supporter Volodymyr Zarembo, who covered Sokul’sky’s career in his articles in local periodicals, also came to Dniepropetrovsk from L’viv.⁶²

In 1968, KGB investigators concentrated their attention again on a group of young poets connected to Ivan Sokul’sky. The most active members of this group were Bohdan Uniak and Mykhailo and Tatiana Skorik, former undergraduate students, who had been expelled from Kyiv State University for “displays of nationalistic

character” and had settled in Dnipropetrovsk. The Skoriks got jobs at *Zoria*, the main daily newspaper of the region. Uniat began work as a metal rigger at the local energy plant.⁶³

In 1966 workers at the Pridneprovsk Energy Plant created their own literary club at the Palace of Culture in Pridneprovsk, a suburban district of Dnipropetrovsk. By April 1968 this club had disbanded, and the plant’s administration asked Komsomol members to revive it. Ivan Sokul’sky, who worked for the energy plant newspaper part-time, supported this idea with great passion. As a further development he proposed to invite all the young poets in Dnipropetrovsk to “an evening of poetry” at the Pridneprovsk Palace of Culture. This would be the beginning of the new literary organization. Sokul’sky told his friends that he had official approval for this idea. According to Sokul’sky, the new group, which he called “a club of creative youth,” would include sections for poetry and literature, architecture, music, and tourism. He prepared the text of the official invitation for the first meeting on April 13. Mykhailo and Tatiana Skorik and others from the group at Dnipropetrovsk University took an active part in this “evening of poetry,” reading their poems and discussing various cultural problems in public. The next day, April 14, all the participants in this event went to the village of Nikol’ske (district of Solene) where they visited the spot where the legendary Kievan Prince Sviatoslav had been killed by Turkic nomads on his way back from Byzantium in 972. Sokul’sky and others recited their poetry and discussed problems of cultural development in Dnipropetrovsk. According to KGB informers, they also criticized official cultural policy in the city as an expression of “Russian chauvinism.” They complained about the low prestige accorded the Ukrainian language and the Russification of all spheres of life in Ukraine.⁶⁴

On April 24, Dnipropetrovsk regional radio included information about “A Club of Creative Youth” in “the latest radio news.” The radio journalist described the evening of poetry in Pridneprovsk and invited all those who considered themselves “creative young people” to visit.⁶⁵ When Sokul’sky announced the next meeting for May 14, the DGU administration (under pressure from the KGB) organized special “countermeasures” to keep university students busy on campus: they had to stay in their classrooms to clean, repair desks, and so on. Only four students were able to attend the May 14 meeting. Sokul’sky understood the situation and decided again to ask the energy plant administration for help. Komsomol and party leaders responded to the invitation and agreed to participate in a meeting of the “Club of Creative Youth.” The KGB ruined Sokul’sky’s plans, however. On May 16, a KGB officer visited a party committee at the energy plant and urged the local administration to stop the activities of the new club. Its recommendation was very clear: “Because of Sokul’sky’s nationalistic ideas, it is impossible to allow him a leadership role in the literary organization

of Dniepropetrovsk youth.” Moreover, during May 1968, the KGB at least twice held special interviews (called “prophylactic” in KGB reports) of Sokul’sky at the official premises of the KGB on Korolenko Street in downtown Dniepropetrovsk. During the KGB investigation, it turned out that Bohdan Uniat read “anti-Soviet and nationalistic poems and other anti-Soviet literature” at meetings attended by Sokul’sky, Skorik, and others suspected of “nationalistic activities.” Skorik was expelled from the Communist party and Uniat, fearing KGB persecution, quit his job and left Dniepropetrovsk, hoping to avoid arrest and interrogation. Also fearing KGB persecution, Sokul’sky quit his job at the newspaper and tried to avoid any contacts with his friends.⁶⁶

These young Dniepropetrovsk poets were persecuted by the KGB in May 1968 for their attempt to create a new form of cultural consumption among local youth, a club to read and discuss poetry. To some extent this persecution was related to another “antinationalist” campaign in the closed city.

Oles’ Honchar’s Novel and KGB Persecutions

The new ideological campaign pursued by the KGB began as a reaction to another case of cultural consumption—the reading and discussion of one particular novel. In 1968 the publication of Oles’ Honchar’s novel *Sobor* (The Cathedral) became the catalyst for a new wave of repressions and KGB persecutions which involved all those who had already had problems because of “Ukrainian nationalistic activities” in Dniepropetrovsk. *Sobor* was first published in January 1968 in the first issue of the literary magazine *Vitchyzna*; a paperback edition appeared in a special series “Novels and Tales” in March of that same year. Honchar told the story of a small town, Zachiplianka, on the banks of Dnieper, where workers at the local metallurgical plants were trying to preserve an old Cossack cathedral from attempts by local party officials to destroy it. Using a cathedral as a symbol of Ukrainian national and cultural awakening, Honchar addressed a number of important problems for development of the Dnieper region: the threat of industrial pollution and the betrayal of national values and ideals, the role of old Cossack traditions, and the preservation of Ukrainian language, culture, and natural environment.⁶⁷ He based his novel on a real event and a real historical monument—the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in Novomoskovsk near Dniepropetrovsk. A self-taught, Ukrainian Cossack architect, Iakym Pogrebniak, built this cathedral in the 1770s with funds from the Zaporizhian Cossacks. In its construction the workers did not use any iron nails; everything was made of wood.⁶⁸ After the Soviet government closed the church, Dniepropetrovsk party leaders planned to demolish it. Oles’ Honchar was among those patriots of national history who fought to preserve the cathedral. Many of the characters and locations in his novel therefore

have counterparts in the real world. Eventually, under pressure from local intellectuals (including some Communist ideologists), the Dniepropetrovsk regional administration “left the cathedral in peace,” and it was saved.⁶⁹

The first secretary of the Dniepropetrovsk regional party committee, Oleksii Vatchenko, recognized himself in the character, Volodymyr Loboda, a career-minded apparatchik who betrays his father and plans to destroy the cathedral. Vatchenko was enraged, and in March 1968 he began his personal vendetta against Honchar, who was then the head of the Ukrainian Writers’ Union. During the first three months of 1968, the novel received only positive official reviews in Ukrainian periodicals; by the end of March it had become the target of negative and nasty criticism. Moreover, Vatchenko organized an attack on Honchar during a plenum of the Communist party of Ukraine (CPU) in Kyiv on March 29, 1968. He accused Honchar of distortions of socialist reality and the idealization of the Cossack past and nationalism. P. Shelest, the first secretary of the CPU, tried to tone down criticism because Nikolai Podgorny, head of the USSR Supreme Council, supported Honchar. Later on, the state publishing house stopped publication of *Sobor*, and Honchar himself was replaced as head of the Writers’ Union in May 1970. He was never expelled from the Communist party or arrested despite Vatchenko’s efforts to punish him.⁷⁰ In the Dniepropetrovsk region, Vatchenko started a mass ideological campaign against the novel that affected local intellectuals and the cultural life of the city, creating an atmosphere reminiscent of Stalinism.⁷¹

In a special report on May 15, 1968, KGB officials noted that despite official criticism of the novel by party ideologists, a majority of ordinary readers from Dniepropetrovsk condemned the “ideological hunting of the great Ukrainian writer and his masterpiece.” According to KGB informers, during 1968–69, a majority of Dniepropetrovsk intellectuals admired Honchar’s novel as a patriotic anthem “written in the best traditions of Soviet socialist realism.”⁷² One admirer, M. Vorokhatskii, wrote to the regional party committee: “Your ideological campaigns against *The Cathedral* look ridiculous and shameful. They are testimony to your helplessness. Ordinary Soviet people think differently. They respect this honest piece of writing.” Addressing part of his letter to I. Moroz, a DGU professor of philosophy who had published official criticism of *Sobor* in the local party newspaper, the author noted that party critics “tried to judge the novel by standards of the ‘cult of personality’ time, and carried out a black and dirty mission of denunciation, which does not suit educated people.” And he suggested to local ideologists that they “implement a real Leninist national policy in Dniepropetrovsk and publish a serious article about Leninist national policy in Ukraine and how local leaders ignore this policy nowadays.”⁷³

During the spring of 1968, *Sobor* became the most popular book among young intellectuals of the Dniepropetrovsk region, especially university students. According to

the KGB, students called Honchar's novel "an epoch-making book" which was "widely read even during classes by everyone."⁷⁴ Suddenly a local newspaper published an "Open Letter of the University Freshmen from the Department of History" expressing very negative criticism of Honchar's novel. For many students from the same department who loved the novel, this article was a shock. They decided to discuss the book and this negative letter together and send their response to the same paper with their rejection of "the freshmen's letter," which they considered a fake.⁷⁵

On May 20, two sophomore students from the History Department, Yurii Mytsyk and Viktor Lavrishchev, without any consultation with the department's administration, announced a debate about *Sobor* to be held on May 22. After reading this announcement, Professor F. Pavlov, the chair of the History Department, visited the classroom where classmates of Mytsyk and Lavrishchev loudly discussed the situation. They were indignant because the local periodicals had published only negative reviews of *Sobor*. Most frustrating for the student-historians was that the "Open Letter" came from their department. They told Pavlov that "the whole letter was falsified; it was a fraud, prepared under pressure from the university administration because some freshmen, whose names were included in this letter, confessed they had never read this novel." Pavlov, wishing to calm them down, gave the students his personal permission to hold a debate. A secretary of the departmental party committee met Mytsyk and Lavrishchev on May 21 and supported their idea as well. Under pressure from the KGB, however, the DGU administration and the party committee interfered and cancelled the event. Meanwhile the KGB established secret surveillance over Mytsyk, Lavrishchev, and other students who were Honchar's most active fans. Lavrishchev and Mytsyk had unpleasant and long conversations with the chair of their department. Eventually, on May 22, the university threatened to expel them, and both men ceased any discussion of Honchar's novel with their classmates. These threats and subsequent pressure from the KGB traumatized the students. Yurii Mytsyk, who in the 1970s entered graduate school in the same department and later became a teacher of Slavic history there, never mentioned this story to his colleagues or students. Moreover, he became carefully guarded and avoided any conversation about politics or Ukrainian patriotism in his department.

Meanwhile, Vatchenko asked the KGB for help in his ideological witch-hunt. He was enraged when some Dnepropetrovsk writers (such as S. Zavgorodnii, V. Korzh, and V. Chemeris) prepared a very friendly letter congratulating Honchar on his fiftieth birthday and praising *Sobor* as "a cleanser of our souls." Vatchenko insisted on the removal of this phrase from the official letter. Moreover, under pressure from the DGU party committee, which responded to Vatchenko's orders, the chair of Ukrainian literature, Professor V. Vlasenko, had to refuse to take a letter of congratulations to Honchar in Kyiv. As KGB officers complained in their report, many writers turned

down a request from the party's daily newspapers, *Dneprovskaya pravda* and *Zoria*, to join the "anti-Honchar" campaign.⁷⁶ KGB informers noted that some students at DGU thought that "keeping silent" about Honchar's birthday at the university was an official party reaction to the news that Pope Paul VI had nominated Honchar for the Nobel Prize in 1968. The KGB even collected information about Honchar's personal life, hoping to find some scandalous and discrediting facts, and sent this information to Vatchenko for his ideological campaign.⁷⁷

In May–June 1968, Vatchenko invited I. Grushetsky, head of the Party Commission of CPU's Central Committee, to Dniepropetrovsk and arranged special meetings with representatives of different party organizations. Vatchenko and other officials of the regional administration orchestrated public meetings where local leaders presented vituperative criticism of Honchar. They submitted various reports and complaints about the "nationalistic" and "anti-Soviet deviations" of the author and his novel. Grushetsky collected all these documents and took them to Kyiv to make a case against Honchar. Vatchenko thus tried to justify his ideological policy and demonstrate the people's support for the anti-*Sobor* campaign as a struggle against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in the strategically important closed city of Dniepropetrovsk. Eventually, Honchar resigned from his position as head of the Writers' Union, but the KGB did not take official action against him.⁷⁸

The KGB and party ideologists used this campaign as a pretext for suppressing any sign of a Ukrainian nationalist movement and punishing those who had displayed enthusiasm and persistence in defending Ukrainian language and culture. In June 1968, Ivan Sokul'sky, Mykhailo Skorik, and Volodymyr Zarembo wrote "A Letter from the Creative Youth of Dniepropetrovsk" in which they documented the KGB's suppression of Ukrainian patriots. During September–December 1968, this letter was sent to various offices of party, Komsomol, and Soviet organizations in Kyiv and Dniepropetrovsk. With the assistance of Dniepropetrovsk intellectuals such as Mykola Kul'chytsky, Viktor Savchenko (a graduate student from Dniepropetrovsk Metallurgical Institute), and Oleksandr Kuz'menko, it reached not only the political leaders of Ukraine, but also Ukrainian émigré centers abroad. The following spring, the foreign radio stations included a text of this letter in their broadcasts.⁷⁹ In June 1969 the KGB arrested Sokul'sky, Kul'chytsky, and Savchenko for writing and disseminating this letter. In February 1970, the Dniepropetrovsk court, using KGB information about their anti-Soviet actions, indicted them as political criminals.⁸⁰

The text of "A Letter from the Creative Youth of Dniepropetrovsk" is a good demonstration of the loyal, pro-Soviet intentions of its authors. They called themselves "young progressive Ukrainians, who were brought up in Soviet schools and colleges, educated with works by Marx and Lenin, Shevchenko, and Dobroliubov."

They criticized the “anti-Ukrainian” campaign in Dnepropetrovsk, which was started by the local administration in reaction to the publication of *Sobor*. The authors called this campaign “a wild and stupid persecution of honest Ukrainian citizens, who are the devoted builders of communism,” a persecution which could be compared only to the actions of Maoists in China. The letter opened with a list of Communists and Komsomol members who were punished for supporting Honchar’s novel and for their “concern over the fate of the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture in the Russified city of Dnepropetrovsk.” It named Sokul’sky and other talented young Ukrainians who had been accused by the KGB of a “fantastic conspiracy of ‘Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism,’ invented in the KGB headquarters on Korolenko Street.” At the same time, the authors demonstrated that the police did not punish those apparatchiks who committed the real crimes of murder or rape because of their ideological loyalty. They appealed to Marxism-Leninism and accused their opponents of betraying Lenin’s ideas. They invoked Karl Marx’s characterization of the Cossack Zaporizhian Sich as “a democratic republic.” They reminded readers of the Marxist approach to history and the need to appreciate everything progressive in the past—including the famous Cossack church in Novomoskovsk, featured in *Sobor*. The authors noted that “for a contemporary Ukrainian, Soviet patriotism includes respect for the national dignity and national pride of the great and talented Ukrainian people.” “If we are Marxists,” they wrote, “we need to change this [Dnipropetrovsk] reality to make it fit Leninist norms and Soviet laws rather than to persecute all progressively thinking Ukrainian citizens who are loyal to Marxism-Leninism.” They finished their letter with an appeal to the leaders of the Ukrainian government to protect Ukrainian culture from Russification. They also requested punishment for those who started the anti-Ukrainian ideological campaign in Dnepropetrovsk. “Such campaigns,” they said, “sow the seeds of animosity and hatred in the relationship of two brotherly, socialist nations, Russians and Ukrainians.”⁸¹

The authors of this letter shared with their opponents certain basic ideas that belonged to the dominant Soviet ideological discourse. The case of the Sokul’sky group was related to the debate over national cultural consumption in Ukraine during Khrushchev’s de-Stalinization campaign. The official interpretation of this case dismissed the pro-Soviet and anti-Stalinist spirit of “A Letter from the Creative Youth.” Dnepropetrovsk party newspapers tried to present it as “an expression of militant nationalism, which is the most dangerous form of ideological struggle, which the intelligence and propagandist centers of international imperialism used in their confrontation with socialism.” Yet Dnepropetrovsk journalists had problems with this description and could not find among Sokul’sky’s arguments a serious foundation for the legal interpretation of his actions as “criminal activities.” According to Dnepropetrovsk periodicals, Sokul’sky’s main crime was his concern for Ukrainian

language and culture in the “Russified city of Dniepropetrovsk.” KGB officials and Communist ideologists also had problems with the claim that he had committed an “anti-Soviet crime” because they shared with Sokul’sky and his friends the same ideological language of Marxism-Leninism, the same arguments of the “progressive development of mature socialism.” Both sides of the conflict had to portray their opponents’ behavior as a “deviation” from Soviet cultural production and consumption (i.e., reading and writing in Ukrainian). Each side blamed the other of “a betrayal of Leninist nationality policy” or “anti-Soviet provocations.”⁸² Even the Soviet police and the court found it hard to justify their decisions and accusations. As it turned out, one of the men arrested, Victor Savchenko, did not participate in the circulation of Sokul’sky’s letter at all. Two people (one of them a KGB informer) saw this document among other “anti-Soviet documents” in Savchenko’s apartment. As a result, on November 17, 1969, he was arrested and included in the “anti-Soviet nationalist group of Sokul’sky.” According to the KGB, reading and keeping “suspicious literature” at home was a crime. Savchenko, who was very interested in Ukrainian history, borrowed from Sokul’sky photocopies of two books about Ukrainian history by M. Braichevs’ky and Mykhailo Hrushevsky; reading these “nationalist” books was considered a crime by KGB officials. Despite KGB pressure the court did not send Savchenko to prison, but after the trial, he was fired from the metallurgical institute and had to abandon his career in Soviet academia.⁸³

On August 26, 1971, the Dniepropetrovsk regional committee of the CPSU passed a special resolution about preventing the spread of anti-Soviet and politically harmful documents. This resolution was a response to a similar Central Committee resolution issued on June 28, 1971. Local leaders used this resolution to suppress any “ideological deviation” in the region. They noted that the police had discovered fifty titles of anti-Soviet “samizdat materials” in the region of Dniepropetrovsk. According to this party document, the most “dangerous” among these was “A Letter from the Creative Youth” because it was sent abroad and published by centers of anti-Soviet propaganda. Using the phraseology supplied from Moscow, local leaders justified their persecution of young Ukrainian patriots as a struggle with the “anti-Soviet nationalistic conspiracy of Sokul’sky’s group.”⁸⁴

The ideological campaign of 1968–69 in Dniepropetrovsk created a model for the suppression of any “ideological deviation” in the region. Using the CPSU document of 1971 and resolutions issued in 1973, KGB officials and party ideologists punished any expression of Ukrainian patriotism.⁸⁵ Thus, Ivan Sokul’sky, who was released from prison in December 1973, was arrested again in 1980 for writing Ukrainian nationalistic poetry, that is, for his “cultural production.” In January 1981, he was sentenced to ten years in prison for “Ukrainian nationalism.” His interest in the cultural production

and consumption of Ukrainian poetry had cost him almost thirteen years of life spent in prison and labor camps. Sokul'sky was released from prison in August 1988 and died in April 1992.⁸⁶ Thus the post-Stalinist cultural revival in Ukraine confused and disoriented young Ukrainian intellectuals. Some of them paid with their own lives for what communist ideology considered Leninist nationality policy, “a creation of culture, socialist in its essence, but national in its form.”

After 1970 and until perestroika, any Ukrainian “deviation” in “cultural production and consumption” was destroyed immediately by the KGB. In 1973–74 it suppressed the slightest sign of “Ukrainian nationalism” among local intellectuals. Mykola M. Tretiakov, a thirty-three-year old engineer at the Dniepropetrovsk agricultural machine building corporation was arrested for “the dissemination of anti-Soviet rumors.” As it turned out, Tretiakov sent more than forty-five letters to various newspapers and local Soviet administrators in the region with complaints about “Russification of the Ukrainian national culture” and “the need to develop the national culture of the socialist Ukraine.” In the spring of 1974, he was indicted according to Article 187 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code “for spreading false ideas that discredited the Soviet state and social order.”⁸⁷

KGB officers discovered that the most popular books from Tretiakov's personal collection included historical novels by Soviet Ukrainian writers—novels by Semen Skliarenko, for example, about the princes of Kievan Russia such as Sviatoslav and Volodymyr. All the arrested members of Sokul'sky's poetic group also owned these books. One volume from Tretiakov's collection attracted especial attention. It was a historical novel by Ivan Bilyk, another famous Soviet Ukrainian writer, about Attila, leader of the legendary Huns, who defeated the Roman Empire in the fourth century A.D. According to Bilyk's interpretation, Attila was the first successful Ukrainian leader, and his real name was Hatylo, a purely Ukrainian name. This novel was criticized for its “distortion of historical truth” and for Ukrainian nationalism as well. After 1974, the KGB ordered that all copies of this novel be withdrawn from public libraries as “anti-Soviet material.” During 1975–78 the police found that some college students had an “unhealthy interest” in Ukrainian historical novels. A few “forbidden” books, including Bilyk's, were confiscated from Dniepropetrovsk students by 1980. But these transgressions were considered minor and nobody was arrested.⁸⁸

No significant case of “nationalist dissent” was recorded by the KGB in Dniepropetrovsk after 1974. The participation of a few intellectuals, including Sokul'sky, in the Ukrainian Helsinki group after 1975 was an exception to the rule. Overall, after the “anti-Ukrainian” campaign of 1968–69, the region of Dniepropetrovsk no longer had scandalous cases of Ukrainian nationalism.⁸⁹ Many Ukrainian patriots, such as

the young writer Savchenko, or the young historian Mytsyk, had to keep silent and hide their interest in the revival of Ukrainian culture until the era of perestroika.

Youth, Identity, and Mass Consumption of Popular Music

During the 1960s and 1970s both Communist ideologists and KGB officers complained about another form of cultural consumption. Their target this time was Western mass culture, particularly rock music. By the mid-seventies local police were encountering very unusual forms of this rock music consumption, which, surprisingly, became connected again to Ukrainian history and culture. According to KGB data, the first Western rock'n'roll records came to Dnepropetrovsk from the Western Ukrainian city of L'viv. Beatlemania, the mass adulation of the British band, began in the closed city in the late fall of 1964 when local engineers from the secret rocket factory brought in the first Beatles records, which they had bought on the black market in L'viv.⁹⁰ The popularity of the Beatles triggered interest in other types of rock music.⁹¹ As a result, by 1968 Anglo-American rock had become the favored form of cultural consumption for the majority of young Dnepropetrovsk residents. According to popular demand in the city's "music studios," where customers could order the recordings on flex-discs during 1968–70, the uncontested leaders were mainly European rock musicians—the Beatles, The Animals, the Rolling Stones, Shocking Blue, Cream with Eric Clapton, Procol Harum, Jimi Hendrix, the Yardbirds with Jeff Beck, Elton John, and The Who. Only a few American rock musicians reached Dnepropetrovsk's "music market" at the end of the 1960s. They included the Doors, Creedence Clearwater Revival, Simon and Garfunkel, and Santana.⁹²

In 1970, Dnepropetrovsk rock bands (officially known as vocal-instrumental ensembles) incorporated major, international rock music hits in their repertoire for dance parties. These hits included "Girl" by the Beatles, "As Tears Go By" by the Rolling Stones, "Suzie Q" by Creedence Clearwater Revival, and "Venus" by Shocking Blue. Musicians covered these songs with their own lyrics in Ukrainian. While Ukrainian versions of "Girl," "As Tears Go By," and "Suzie Q" represented romantic poetry about love, a traditional topic for Soviet bands, their cover of "Venus" in Ukrainian was very different.⁹³

Originally the Dutch band Shocking Blue composed "Venus" in 1969 as a single. They included it in their 1970 album *At Home*, which became very popular not only in Great Britain, but also in other European countries. As a Dutch sociologist wrote, "Shocking Blue played brilliant, concise, almost classical American rock'n'roll, and its song 'Venus' with the alien, mechanical vocal sound of Mariska Veres became a

major hit in Holland and the rest of Europe in the second part of 1969 and number 1 in America in early 1970.”⁹⁴ The song was aired on BBC radio programs throughout 1970. Even Aleksandr Tatarskii, a Soviet radio journalist, included it in his popular show on the Moscow radio station Maiak (A Beacon) in December 1970. At the beginning of the 1970s, this song became a symbol of beat music all over the Soviet Union.⁹⁵

Music studios all over Ukraine put this hit in their material for “greeting-card recordings,” together with popular Soviet songs by Muslim Magomaeu, Eduard Khil, and Edita Piekha. The average Dniepropetrovsk consumer of popular music ordered more “greeting cards” with recordings of “Venus” than with popular Gypsy songs or folk songs by Zykina or Vysotsky. Before 1970 only the young asked for musical greeting cards with foreign music (predominantly by the Beatles and Rolling Stones). After 1970, customers in their thirties and forties ordered the Shocking Blue song.⁹⁶

To some extent, the immense popularity of this song was connected to the new Ukrainian version of the lyrics for this song. Many local Ukrainian rock bands covered “Venus” with very unusual lyrics, quite unlike the traditional poetry of Soviet pop songs. It became a song about the Ukrainian Zaporizhian Cossacks who fought with foreign enemies to defend their native land and religion. The new lyrics were simple but catchy: “Dnipro flows into the Black Sea, and there will be a disaster for Turks, when the Cossacks will arrive and kill all the Turks. Hey Cossacks, Zaporizhian Cossacks . . .”⁹⁷

This song about Zaporizhian Cossacks set to the melody from “Venus” had five or six versions in different parts of Ukraine. It became very popular not only among young fans of rock music, but also among those who visited dance parties and loved to dance. Even the Russian-speaking audience in Dniepropetrovsk danced when “The Cossacks” came out. It was the beginning of a new phenomenon—the “Ukrainization” of English rock songs. A similar indigenization of rock music in English took place among Russian rock musicians as well.⁹⁸ The Russian band Singing Guitars from Leningrad covered “Yellow River,” a popular song by the New Christy Minstrels, with Russian lyrics about Karlsson, a funny character from a fairy tale by the Swedish writer Astrid Lindgren. The Moscow rock band (VIA) Happy Guys covered the Beatles’ song “Drive my Car” from *Rubber Soul* with Russian lyrics about “Small old car” and released it on the Melodia label.⁹⁹

The tremendous popularity of the Ukrainian version of “Venus” was an interesting example of new cultural consumption among young Ukrainian rock music fans. Even Russian-speaking dance hall visitors in Dniepropetrovsk did not feel offended by a song that idealized the Ukrainian Cossacks; they preferred the Ukrainian version to the English original. To some extent, the popularity of this patriotic theme paralleled the growing interest in Ukrainian historical novels during the 1970s. According to librarians’ statistics, besides the traditionally popular adventure stories by

Alexander Dumas or Arthur Conan Doyle, the most popular novels among young readers in Dnepropetrovsk were those about ancient Ukrainian heroes written by Semen Skliarenko, Ivan Bilyk, and Pavlo Zagrebel'nyi.¹⁰⁰

Significantly, neither Communist ideologists nor KGB operatives objected to the Ukrainian version of the song on Dnepropetrovsk dance floors. In the 1970s the DGU rock band from the Physical Technical Department still sang "The Cossacks" to the melody of "Venus." As one police officer noted, "It is better to have Soviet young people dance to their national song 'Cossacks' than to American rock and roll."¹⁰¹ Ideological priorities to limit "dangerous" Western influences on the Soviet youth thus led to approving an idealization of the Ukrainian national past as an alternative to an idealization of the capitalist present. Such permission for pop music consumption is remarkable because it follows so closely the 1968 KGB campaign of persecution against local poets for the very same activity: the idealization of Ukrainian national history.

According to Harris M. Berger, a sociologist of music, much of human "identity in everyday life is achieved through linguistic behavior, and, capitalizing on this fact, singers and songwriters use forms of talk from the social world around them to publicly think about, enact, or perform their identities. Construed broadly to include the use of multiple dialects and registers, the issue of language choice in music is central to these processes."¹⁰² The choice of the Ukrainian language for a cover of the popular Shocking Blue song signified a very important cultural construction of meaning through association in expression of the local Ukrainian identity in the Russian-speaking city of Dnepropetrovsk. As Maria Paula Survilla noted, such a language choice plays the role of "an aural trigger that connects the idea of cultural rebellion with music rebellion" in rock music.¹⁰³

The popularity of "The Cossacks" song contrasted with the story of Smerichka, a Ukrainian rock band (a vocal-instrumental ensemble) from the region of Chernivtsi in Western Ukraine. (The word means a small spruce in Ukrainian.) Their first original songs, written by a talented medical student, Volodymyr Ivasiuk, reached the local audience in Eastern Ukraine by 1970. At this time a majority of Dnepropetrovsk consumers of pop music fell in love with Smerichka's music, which was broadcast on radio and TV almost every night. Ukrainian Komsomol leaders supported this band, and the Ukrainian Republic's festival of popular music awarded Smerichka a gold medal. In 1971 the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture praised the band as "the best Komsomol music ensemble in the country" and called it "the best model for the contemporary Soviet Estrada [i.e., popular music] that responded to the requirements of the life today."¹⁰⁴

Moreover, Komsomol ideologists used the band's music as an antidote against Western rock music. Komsomol leaders in Dnepropetrovsk recommended that local rock bands play the music of Smerichka instead of Western rock'n'roll. This produced

an unexpected result. Many musicians who had played Smerichka's songs in 1970–71 now avoided them because they had become "the official Soviet" music. To follow the official recommendations to include Soviet Ukrainian songs in their repertoire, they continued to perform their favorite, "The Cossacks."¹⁰⁵ When Smerichka's songs became part of the official Soviet Estrada, local rock fans lost interest. According to the sale of greeting-card recordings, "Chervona ruta" and other songs by Ivasiuk were top hits in 1970–71 among Dnepropetrovsk pop music consumers, mostly middle-aged people and recent migrants from the countryside. After 1971, the young generation of rock fans ignored Smerichka. Even Ukrainian-speaking fans of rock music preferred the "real rock" they associated with Western musicians like Shocking Blue.¹⁰⁶ The melodious and catchy Ukrainian pop songs lost the competition with American and European hits of rock music. Ukrainians wanted to identify themselves with the "authentic" West to look "cool" and "trendy" (*firmennyi* and *classnyi*). Once Smerichka became integrated into Soviet music propaganda it lost its rock music status. As one fourteen-year-old Ukrainian rock fan wrote in his diary during August 1972, "When I heard those songs 'Chervona Ruta,' 'Vodograi' [songs by Ivasiuk] the first time in my life, I loved them. I thought these guys would be our Ukrainian Creedence [Clearwater Revival] or the Beatles. Now it sounds like old folk music or Soviet Estrada. I hate these peasants' songs. The only real 'cool' song in Ukrainian that I am aware of is still 'The Cossacks.'"¹⁰⁷

Overall, during the 1960s and early 1970s, young local consumers preferred cultural products they associated with the emotional world they imagined. They identified with the world they called "Western rock." This music framed their sense of identity through the direct experiences it offered, enabling them to place themselves in imaginative cultural narratives. According to Simon Frith, "the experience of pop music is an experience of identity: in responding to a song, people are drawn, haphazardly, into emotional alliances with performers and with the performers' other fans. [Therefore] music symbolizes and offers the immediate experience of collective identity."¹⁰⁸ The imaginary West played a central part in this cultural narrative. To some extent, listening to rock music became a way to cultivate "the hopes and ideals of an imaginary West." Dnepropetrovsk rock music consumers sought to recover cultural meaning that had deliberately been removed from their daily life in the closed city and relocated in a distant cultural domain they called "Western rock."¹⁰⁹

Rock music consumption in Soviet Ukraine depended on changes in supply and demand and reflected the general trends of cultural consumption in the Soviet Union in the late 1960s and early 1970s. For the new generation of rock music consumers, the first and most popular source of rock and roll was not foreign radio stations such as the Voice of America or the BBC. Most developed their first taste of, and enthusiasm for, new music on the dance floor in their schools, offices, or at private parties where

they had their first exposure to the new rhythms and melodies. Through their friends in school they began to listen seriously to rock music recordings. They began creating their own audiotapes, which they then exchanged with their friends. Some of them went to a black market (called the “music market” in Dnepropetrovsk) while others went to the city music studios to ask about new tape recordings. In contrast to other big Soviet cities open to foreigners, Dnepropetrovsk lacked the foreign tourists who usually brought “fresh music information from the West.” During the 1970s in Kyiv’s black market, 25 percent to 50 percent of all new Western music records came directly from foreign visitors. In port cities like Odesa, almost 50 percent of all new pop music records came from foreigners, and the other 50 percent were brought by Soviet sailors and fishermen who visited foreign countries on a regular basis.¹¹⁰

The closed city had no such sources. Dnepropetrovsk music enthusiasts who were interested in fresh Western recordings had to go to the black markets of the open cities—Moscow, Odesa, Zaporizhie, or L’viv. By 1970 the black market in downtown L’viv had become the major source of new Western music in Dnepropetrovsk. KGB officers worried about the “growing new Western influences and boogie-woogie” from L’viv.¹¹¹ According to KGB informers, the most influential black marketeer of foreign music records in Dnepropetrovsk was Aron (Arnold) Gurevich, a DGU student whose major was English language and literature. During 1965 Arnold, as he preferred to call himself, discovered a new source of Western records. In 1965–66, he established friendly relations with Polish tourists who sold various Western goods, including music records, in L’viv. For many years these tourists provided Arnold with the most popular Western music. According to KGB data, by 1970 Arnold’s Polish “connections” in L’viv had resulted in a mass influx of “bourgeois” music records in Dnepropetrovsk.¹¹²

The period of popularity of Anglo-American rock music (or beat music) from 1964 to 1969 in the big cities of Soviet Ukraine, such as Dnepropetrovsk, was a time of elitist cultural consumption. It was the Soviet elite—party members and police officials, engineers, lawyers, and college professors, the “upper middle class”—who could afford foreign recordings of rock music.¹¹³ The fans of Jimi Hendrix and a few hippies who appeared on Dnepropetrovsk’s main thoroughfare in 1968 and 1969 and flaunted their long hair and new American jeans, and who demonstratively rejected cultural consumption on the black market and any relations with the material world, represented the wealthy families of Dnepropetrovsk’s ruling elite. The local police arrested at least forty people who called themselves “hippies” and who tried to imitate that American lifestyle. According to contemporaries and participants, they were inspired by Western rock music and information about the American and European hippie movement that was published in the Soviet Komsomol magazine *Rovesnik* in December 1967.¹¹⁴

Some of these local hippies were children of KGB officers, one was a son of a secretary of the regional committee of the CPSU, two were children of a famous lawyer, and some were children of respectable physicians and professors from the local university. After long conversations between their parents and KGB operatives, in the spring of 1972 Karl Marx Avenue, the main thoroughfare of Dnepropetrovsk, called “Broad,” was cleared of both hippies and black marketeers.¹¹⁵ Yet hippie fashions survived all persecutions. During the 1970s, a majority of young rock fans tried to imitate “hippie style,” which included obligatory long hair, a pair of bell-bottom American jeans, a Western T-shirt, leather jacket, and platform shoes. At the beginning of the seventies this look it was so closely associated with the hippie image that the combination of American jeans and long hair was called “hippism” (*hipiza* in Russian). By the end of the seventies, after this fashion had spread among millions of Soviet consumers, people gradually forgot about its hippie origins. Jeans became a part of everyday life not only for young enthusiasts of rock music, but also for the middle-aged, including members of the ruling Communist elite.¹¹⁶

Communist ideologists tried to stop any new forms of rock music consumption among young dwellers of the city and region of Dnepropetrovsk. Yet the black market in music survived and was revived in late 1972, this time not on “the Broad,” but in different locations of the city.¹¹⁷ In 1971–74 music tastes changed and the consumers changed as well, representing not only the upper middle class, but also lower middle and lower classes of society. Representatives of working-class families, students of vocational schools, joined college students in favoring the new, loud, and aggressive music, which was called hard rock in the 1970s and heavy metal in the 1980s.¹¹⁸

Hard Rock, Jesus Mania, and the Democratization of Pop Music Consumption

Thousands of boys and girls from vocational schools bought audiotapes of hard rock music because they loved to dance to it in the city dance halls where they socialized. They found the dance floor to be the most convenient place for communication with people of the same age, and music provided the necessary emotional background. Dance music thus initiated the democratization of rock music consumption in Soviet cities.¹¹⁹ By the middle 1970s the major centers of this democratization had moved from traditionally elitist and selective forms of trade in the downtown black markets to the locations where the overwhelming majority of the new music consumers lived—the hostels and dormitories of college students, students of *tekhnikums* (technical schools which gave a basic education in engineering, etc.), and students of various vocational

schools (*PTU*). The audiotapes spread among dormitory residents faster than among individuals who lived in city apartments.¹²⁰

Democratization of rock music consumption started with the “hard rock mania.” Sometimes the contemporaries called it “Deep Purple mania” because the British rock band Deep Purple became the most desirable object of cultural consumption at Soviet dance halls. By 1973, “Deep Purple mania” especially affected high school and vocational school students.¹²¹ Anything related to this British band immediately attracted the attention of thousands of Dniepropetrovsk rock music fans. When on Sundays in 1973 the Soviet radio station Maiak from Moscow broadcast twenty-five minutes of Aleksandr Tatarskii’s radio show about this band, soccer and volleyball fields in Dniepropetrovsk stood empty because boys stopped playing in order to tape-record their favorite songs.¹²²

Deep Purple’s immense popularity shaped the music preferences of Soviet youth in the early seventies. Dniepropetrovsk enthusiasts of rock music idealized and venerated everything related to their favorite band. Therefore, when rumors that musicians from Deep Purple would perform in a rock opera about the last days of Jesus Christ reached Leningrad and Moscow in 1972, many hard rock fans tried to get tapes of this opera. During 1973 the music black markets of major industrial Soviet cities, including Dniepropetrovsk, had not only tapes but also the original vinyl recordings of Andrew Lloyd Webber’s rock opera, *Jesus Christ Superstar*. The British two-record album of this opera, which was released in 1970 (before it became a Broadway sensation in 1971), became the most popular object of cultural consumption among Soviet hard rock fans because Ian Gillan, a leading singer of Deep Purple, sang the part of Jesus Christ. Thus, in the imagination of young rock music consumers, Webber’s opera was connected directly to the legendary British band.¹²³

Because of this opera thousands of rock fans became curious about the history of Christianity. They went to local libraries for information about the Gospels and Jesus Christ. Since the Bible was officially banned from Soviet libraries, the only available books about the Gospels were dusty and boring pieces of atheistic propaganda. This literature was suddenly in great demand in local bookstores and appeared on the waiting list in libraries. Dniepropetrovsk librarians complained during 1973 and 1974 about this sudden interest in atheistic literature, especially books about Jesus Christ and origins of Christianity.¹²⁴ Even notorious classics of antireligious propaganda, such as *The Bible Stories* and *Stories about the Gospels* by Zenon Kosidowski, and Leo Taxil’s *Funny Gospels*, became objects of cultural consumption among local rock fans.¹²⁵ The piles of old issues of *Nauka i religia* (Science and Religion), a Soviet atheistic periodical, suddenly became very popular among young readers, who spent hours in the reading rooms of local libraries looking for information about the

Gospels, Jesus, the crucifixion, Judas, and Mary Magdalene.¹²⁶ This Jesus hysteria also resulted in a new fashion: besides long hair, jeans, and T-shirts, a big cross worn around the neck became an important element of the new image of the young rocker in Dnepropetrovsk.¹²⁷

To some extent the new religious interest of rock fans resulted in visits to Orthodox churches and sectarian meetings for worship, especially during big Christian holidays such as Easter. Young people liked to watch the Easter religious services “just for fun.” Moreover, due to police persecution, some of them loved the excitement of attending such forbidden events as Easter mass at the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in downtown Dnepropetrovsk. They enjoyed a feeling of danger when they ran away from the police who chased them.¹²⁸ During 1972 and 1973 rock fans also joined these young adventurers because of the new musical influences.

As Mikhail Suvorov recalled, on Easter eve, April 28, 1973, he and some of his friends, who had just taped *Jesus Christ Superstar* and were fascinated with this music, came to the cathedral to watch the religious ceremony. They met hundreds of other kids, rock fans with long hair, dressed in jeans and with metal crosses. They whistled tunes from Webber’s opera and showed each other their crosses. These “Jesus Christ” fans tried to go through a thick crowd of police and *druzhinniki* (groups of voluntary supporters of police) to enter the cathedral. The police prevented them, and they arrested some of the drunken fans. According to one police officer, “this crowd of young men shouted disapprovingly” and then all the rock fans left the premises of the cathedral. Soviet officials controlled access to the cathedral and stopped young people from approaching. As these officials later reported, their efforts led to a decrease in the number of Komsomol members who visited the cathedral during the Easter holidays. The police recorded 11,400 young people who visited the church in 1972; the following year only 8,500 could get in the church through the police lines.¹²⁹

Many young people whose interest in the Gospels was ignited by Andrew Lloyd Webber’s opera later became Christian believers. Some of them joined local Orthodox communities; others began visiting Baptist or Pentecostal meetings for worship. As Mikhail Suvorov and Eduard Svichar noted, those who were involved in the Jesus hysteria eventually discovered the real text of the Holy Scriptures through either their Christian relatives or friends. Young rock fans tried to compare the real story with the version in the opera. They made handwritten copies of the libretto and read the Gospel of St. John word by word. Many students of English from Dnepropetrovsk University spent hours of their free time after classes translating the lyrics and checking this translation against the biblical text in Russian.¹³⁰ Some of these students later entered religious schools and became either Orthodox priests or Baptist ministers. One of them, Valerii Likhachev, who graduated with honors from the Department of History in 1978

and worked in the university's archeological expedition, applied and was admitted to the Orthodox seminary in Leningrad in 1983.¹³¹ Alexandr Gusar remembers how his classmates from the local high school in Pavlograd (a town near Dniepropetrovsk) met at his house to compare their copy of the Gospels, which belonged to Alexandr's grandmother, with two Russian versions of the lyrics from the original British sleeve of the *Jesus Christ Superstar* album. They would listen to these records every evening during the entire year of 1974. It is noteworthy that their interest in biblical stories led some of Alexandr's friends further than the rules of the Soviet school permitted. Two joined the local Baptist community, two others became active participants in the local Pentecostal church, and one of them later became a prominent preacher among the local Adventists.¹³² A similar story happened in Sinel'nikovo (also near Dniepropetrovsk), when close friends of Vladimir Solodovnik's began their biblical studies by listening to Webber's opera and checking the Russian translation of its lyrics. Five of these friends converted to the Baptist faith by the end of the 1970s. It is interesting to note that all of them began as ordinary participants in Jesus hysteria, with all usual elements of fashionable youth culture, such as long hair, crosses, jeans, and an idealization of hippies. Eventually they replaced images of Ian Gillan and other elements of Western popular culture with purely Christian symbols. New elements of religious piety and Christian ethics rather than rock and roll music shaped their identity after they joined the local Christian communities.¹³³

Between 1972 and 1976 two other music manias influenced rock music consumption in the city and region of Dniepropetrovsk.¹³⁴ One was triggered by the British hardrock band Slade; the second was related to a star of British glitter rock, Marc Bolan and his band T.Rex.¹³⁵ Many contemporaries of these events noted a significant social factor that contributed to this development: the influx of young migrants from local villages to the city. A majority of all students at the vocational schools (*PTU*) came from Ukrainian peasant families. During the three years of their studies they were adjusting to the new urban conditions of life, and they began consuming the popular music of the city en masse.¹³⁶ As Yurii Mytsyk, a historian who lived in Dniepropetrovsk at that time, explained, these young Ukrainian peasants experienced the shock of encountering a new lifestyle. They were losing their old peasant identity, cultural preferences, and stereotypes. In a Russified Ukrainian city like Dniepropetrovsk many of these migrants adopted the new style of behavior that prevailed in vocational school dormitories. To some extent, they replaced elements of their Ukrainian peasant identities with new elements of popular youth culture, including not only the "obligatory" American jeans and long hair, but also dancing to new music, especially hard rock and disco. Many police officers and Communist ideologists expressed their concerns about this transformation.¹³⁷ During police interrogations, *PTU* students who were arrested for different

crimes during the late sixties and seventies blatantly denied their Ukrainian identity. They “were not bumpkins [*byki*, or *baklany*] from the village,” they explained. They wore Western dress and listened to Western rock music because they wanted to look “cool” (*firменно*) and “stylish” (*modno*).¹³⁸

As Yurii Mytsyk noted, “*PTU* students, former Ukrainian peasant children, became victims of Soviet cultural unification during mature socialism.” This cultural unification or homogenization, according to some scholars, affected Ukrainian children in big industrial cities like Dnepropetrovsk. When these children left their villages for Dnepropetrovsk and tried to adjust to urban lifestyle, they became completely immersed in the cultural homogenization of the big industrial Soviet city.¹³⁹ Many of them lost the major features of their Ukrainian identity. They tried to speak Russian instead of Ukrainian; they wore new, fashionable Western dress; they listened and danced to the new, fashionable music; and they stopped reading Ukrainian literature. Urban Soviet mass culture—influenced by Western pop culture—filled a vacuum in the development of Ukrainian peasants who moved to the cities. Soviet cultural homogenization that involved millions of young migrants from villages to the cities laid the foundation for the consumption of Western mass culture during late socialism. Paradoxically this process included mass consumption of the cultural products that had previously been rejected as dangerous tools of imperialist propaganda, such as American rock and roll or disco clubs. As a result, by the end of the 1970s Ukrainian popular music had disappeared from local music markets and dance halls in Dnepropetrovsk. The typical mass consumer of popular music on Dnepropetrovsk dance floors had heard mainly non-Ukrainian, in many cases Anglo-American or Russian, Soviet music.¹⁴⁰

Cultural Consumption and Identity on the Dance Floor

Because of the All-Union Komsomol discotheque campaign, which reached Dnepropetrovsk in 1976, both Komsomol leaders and Komsomol activists became involved in the organization and supervision of various forms of popular music consumption. After 1976 the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol required Komsomol leaders in Dnepropetrovsk to participate actively in the new discotheque movement triggered by the Komsomol of the Baltic republics in 1974–75.¹⁴¹ The main goal was to keep ideological control over dance halls where a majority of Soviet youths spent their free time. Therefore, local Komsomol leaders who were responsible for the organization of leisure time became coordinators of a new network of connections and personal relations, which by 1986 was called the “discotheque mafia” in Dnepropetrovsk. Loyal young Komsomol functionaries suddenly found themselves

in a very ambiguous situation. They had to communicate with those who provided the most popular music for the dance parties but whose ideological preferences were questionable. These people were connected to the black market for rock music, which had flourished in downtown Dnepropetrovsk since the early 1960s. Because ideologically reliable music was required for disco clubs, the coordinators now had to depend on material from nontraditional sources. At the same time, rock music enthusiasts, who were also the organizers of the first Komsomol discotheques, were able to get the necessary material through the black market. Indirectly, the Komsomol ideologists became involved with new connections and sometimes even with the very murky and illegal activities of rock music providers from the music market. The primary sources for this music were two black market areas that still existed in downtown Dnepropetrovsk, despite repeated efforts of the authorities to arrest dealers in Western recordings.¹⁴²

At the end of 1976, the first disco club in Dnepropetrovsk was organized by young rock music fans who worked at Yuzhmash, the secret rocket factory. They used Komsomol facilities and funds as well as its trade-union organizations. In 1977 this discotheque became the model for various Komsomol clubs in the city. Eventually, on May 15, 1977, the city Komsomol committee sponsored the opening of the central city discotheque Melodia, and hired as its main disc jockey Valerii Miakotenko, the former manager of a local rock band and organizer of the Yuzhmash disco club. Club Melodia combined sound equipment, a dance hall, and a local cafeteria into one successful business. It became a center not only for all discotheque development in the region but also for various business activities related to music. Some of these activities involved the illegal trade of Western records, audiotapes, and musical equipment. By July 1978, Melodia controlled eleven new disco clubs in Dnepropetrovsk.¹⁴³

Officially, Komsomol and trade-union apparatchiks worked together with the “discotheque activists” from the early stages of the discotheque movement in 1976. Moreover, the rapid spread of this movement made this region exemplary for many Soviet ideologists, who, in their propaganda for new forms of socialist leisure for Soviet youth, used the success of the Dnepropetrovsk central discotheque as proof of ideological efficiency. The region of Dnepropetrovsk was praised by Komsomol ideologists in Kyiv for “the efficient organization of the disco club movement.” In 1979, the city of Dnepropetrovsk became a location for the “first All-Ukrainian final festival contest of the discotheque programs.”¹⁴⁴ The city Komsomol organization of Dnepropetrovsk had prepared a special report about the achievements of Melodia which summarized the major forms and methods of “music entertainment” in the city. In October 1979 this published report was widely circulated among the participants at the All-Union competition. It praised local disco clubs for promoting “Ukrainian national music forms and Ukraine’s glorious history.” The guests of the All-Union

festival used this publication as a guide for their disco club activities.¹⁴⁵ During the first year of its existence, Melodia organized 175 thematic dance parties with special music lectures attended by more than sixty thousand young people.¹⁴⁶ In 1979 many apparatchiks who were involved in this movement were promoted and rewarded for “excellent ideological and educational activities among the regional youth.” By the beginning of 1982, more than five hundred sixty youth clubs with eighty-three officially registered discotheques existed in the region of Dnipropetrovsk.¹⁴⁷

Komsomol ideologists and their KGB supervisors faced a very serious problem. Young pop music consumers apparently preferred Western music hits to Soviet ones. A majority of rock music enthusiasts rejected completely what they called Soviet *estrada* (pop music). Therefore Komsomol ideologists began to encourage discos that played mainly Soviet music, including songs from the national republics. Apparatchiks responsible for the discotheque movement supported the Ukrainian band Vodograi or the Byelorussian band Pesniary because they represented Soviet tradition in contrast to the alien forms of Western pop culture. To show their ideological loyalty and local patriotism many disk jockeys in Dnipropetrovsk included comments about “glorious Ukrainian history” and criticized “capitalist exploitation in the Western countries.”¹⁴⁸ Even in their comments about Ukrainian history they (as loyal Soviet citizens) always emphasized the class struggle. Still, their stories were about the Ukrainian Cossacks or melodious Ukrainian poetry which were not very popular subjects among the local KGB operatives. Eventually, the KGB supervisors had to accept these stories and national Ukrainian music on the local dance floors. For them it was less evil than capitalist music from the West.¹⁴⁹ It is noteworthy that both KGB and Komsomol apparatchiks praised the patriotic approach of Dnipropetrovsk’s discotheques in contrast to the famous L’viv disco clubs from Western Ukraine. One KGB officer who visited both L’viv and Dnipropetrovsk during April and May 1979 criticized “a lack of patriotic themes in L’viv disco programs and bad pop music on L’viv dance floors.” “Only Western rock and disco music dominated in L’viv,” he noted.

L’viv disco clubs did not include Ukrainian popular songs in their programs. L’viv disc jockeys did not cover problems of Soviet or Ukrainian history and culture. Their comments were only about the Western style of life. It is a paradox, but our Dnipropetrovsk discos (in a mainly Russian-speaking city!) had more Ukrainian music and presented more information about our Soviet Ukrainian culture in one week than all L’viv discos did in the entire month. I was pleasantly surprised when I heard at the Dnipropetrovsk disco club a good story about our Ukrainian Cossacks’ struggle with Turkish invaders for the freedom of our Ukrainian nation. You would never hear such stories in L’viv disco clubs. Their disc jockeys talk only about the most fashionable trends in American pop culture. L’viv disk jockeys ignored completely the Western Ukrainian popular music of the band Smerichka.

We should praise our Dnepropetrovsk entertainers for promoting the good Soviet Ukrainian music of Smerichka and other Ukrainian Soviet musicians. We need to support our Dnepropetrovsk initiatives in the disco movement in a contrast to the Americanized disco clubs in L'viv. Patriotic material about our Ukrainian history and culture on the Dnepropetrovsk dance floor will educate young people, while an idealization of American pop culture and ignoring Ukrainian history and culture in L'viv disco clubs will confuse and disorient our Soviet citizens and transform them into apolitical cosmopolitans.¹⁵⁰

During 1978–1982, according to official documents and to Mikhail Suvorov, a sound engineer from Melodia, the Dnepropetrovsk Komsomol committee discussed the disco club repertoire almost every month. The main focus of these discussions was the patriotic theme of music education on the dance floor. Komsomol leaders complained about the bad Western influences from L'viv discotheques; local ideologists tried to protect the patriotic character of youth entertainment from the Westernized trends emanating from L'viv. The major concern of Komsomol apparatchiks was “the total domination of American music hits” in L'viv disco programs. The main advice for disc jockeys in Dnepropetrovsk was to avoid this “bad and ideologically harmful L'viv disco experience.”¹⁵¹

As we see again, the themes of good and bad cultural consumption became involved in the evaluation of the disco club movement in Soviet Ukraine. But this time it also included the problems of national history and culture. The paradox was that to prove their ideological reliability, the Dnepropetrovsk ideologists invoked elements of Ukrainian culture in opposition to the dangerous Westernization of youth culture. This time Westernization was associated not only with the “capitalist West,” but also with L'viv, the most Westernized city of Western Ukraine. This was part of the ambiguity in the Soviet ideology of mature socialism in addressing the problems of leisure and entertainment among the youth of national republics such as Ukraine. On the one hand, Communist ideologists had to resist Western cultural influences on the dance floor, using any available Soviet music genres, including the Ukrainian ones. On the other, they confused the young consumers of mass culture by officially supporting and elevating cultural forms which usually were associated in Soviet ideological discourse with so-called bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism.

Anti-Punk and Anti-Fascist Hysteria in 1982–84

Discotheques became a new responsibility for the Dnepropetrovsk Komsomol's Department of Agitation and Propaganda when, after the death of Brezhnev, Yuri Andropov, the new Soviet leader, began his campaign against corruption in the Communist

party and Komsomol.¹⁵² Andropov emphasized the need for discipline and ideological purity. In his speech at the July 1983 plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, he declared war on Western pop music: “It is intolerable to see the occasional emergence on a wave of popularity of musical bands with repertoires of a dubious nature.” He pointed out the danger of ideological confusion created by Western popular music, which had become the main object of consumption for millions of Soviet young people, and he reminded the Komsomol that leisure-time activities were “the battleground for fierce conflict between Communist and bourgeois ideologies.” Andropov suggested special counterpropagandist efforts that would protect the mentality of the “young builders of the initial stage of developed socialism” from “distortions, confusion, and antisocial patterns of behavior” associated with degenerate Western music.¹⁵³ In response to these suggestions, the Komsomol introduced in 1983–84 special counterpropagandist measures that affected the discotheque movement.

In 1984, after Andropov’s death, the new Soviet leader, Konstantin Chernenko, began a fresh round of criticism of the Komsomol’s ideological work among Soviet youth. According to Communist ideologists, the Komsomol failed to combat new temptations, the blind imitation of Western fashions, and the lack of interest in politics. The leadership accepted this criticism and called “for a mobilization of Komsomol forces to patrol the performances” of local rock bands and check “the repertoires of Soviet discotheques.”¹⁵⁴ During the same year, the USSR Ministry of Culture, and later, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Education, issued special orders about “the regulation of activities of vocal-instrumental groups and improvement of the ideological-artistic standard of their repertoires.” These orders were used for strengthening ideological control of local rock bands and discotheques all over the Soviet Union.¹⁵⁵ New Soviet legislation now threatened to punish people who provided the thriving Komsomol discotheque movement with musical material.¹⁵⁶

On October 1, 1984, the USSR Ministry of Culture issued a list of sixty-eight Western rock bands and thirty-eight “unofficial” Soviet rock bands whose music was not recommended for playing in public places within the city limits of Moscow. The list of “forbidden Western bands” included favorites such as Kiss, AC/DC, Black Sabbath, Alice Cooper, and Pink Floyd. All these bands were now officially prohibited for cultural consumption by all Soviet youth. By the end of 1984 many regional Komsomol committees in Ukraine, including the one in Dnepropetrovsk, were using these lists in their campaign to purify the pop music consumption of Komsomol members. They wanted to replace “bad” bourgeois music with “good,” ideologically reliable, socialist music.¹⁵⁷

In Ukraine, Andropov’s campaign on behalf of Communist cultural consumption converged with another ideological campaign that targeted so-called fascist punks. It

began in 1980–81, as a result of confusing information in Soviet periodicals where British punks were presented by Soviet ideologists as skinheads, as neofascists. Therefore, all Western music which was associated with the punk movement and used fascist symbols had to be prohibited for mass consumption in the Soviet Union. As Artemy Troitsky explained, the periodicals' description of punks as fascists confused and disoriented thousands of Communist ideologists in provincial cities such as Dnepropetrovsk. "The only thing anyone knew about punks," Troitsky noted,

was that they were "fascists," because that's how our British-based *correspondents* [*sic*] had described them for us. Several angry feature articles appeared in the summer and fall of 1977 with lurid descriptions of their unsavoury appearance and disgraceful manners, including one that quoted sympathetically a diatribe from the *Daily Telegraph*. To illustrate all this, a few photos of "monsters" with swastikas were printed. . . . The image of punks as Nazis was established very effectively, and in our country, as you should understand, the swastika will never receive a positive reaction, even purely for shock value.¹⁵⁸

For many discotheque activists the new antipunk campaign was a shock. In Dnepropetrovsk the local disc jockeys played the music of British bands like the Sex Pistols and the Clash as an obligatory, ideological part of their dance programs during 1979 and 1980. This was in accord with a critique of the "political agenda" of progressive rock and punk musicians offered by *Rovesnik's*, a central Komsomol magazine. It praised the anticapitalist spirit of "young English rock musicians" who followed the traditions of legendary, intellectual rock bands like Pink Floyd. Komsomol journalists from Moscow wrote about the collaboration between the Clash with British communists in their struggle against racism and neofascism, and about the criticism of capitalist reality in Pink Floyd's album *The Wall*.¹⁵⁹ KGB officials and Communist ideologists in Dnepropetrovsk followed conflicting ideological recommendations from their Kyiv supervisors: they interfered in local youth clubs and banned the music of any musician who was associated with the word "punk." According to the KGB's taxonomy from Kyiv, the "punk movement" was considered to be a part of international neofascism.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, music by the Clash or the Sex Pistols was forbidden in the region of Dnepropetrovsk as early as 1980.

The first public scandal of the new antipunk campaign took place at Club Melodia at a dance party on the eve of 1981. As one organizer of this party recalled, the program was officially approved by the city Komsomol committee. The ideological part of the program was devoted to the theme "The World Celebrates the New Year." A disc jockey began with a summary of the major political and musical events of the last year. He told the audience that three of the most popular musicians among Soviet youth died in 1980: the Russian bard and guitar poet Vladimir Vysotsky; a popular French singer, Joe Dassin; and ex-Beatle John Lennon. After playing their songs a disc jockey mentioned a *Rove-*

snik publication about the Clash, and then noted the strange behavior of the Komsomol apparatchik who was in charge of the party. In the middle of “London Calling” by the Clash, this apparatchik and two KGB officers approached the disc jockeys and ordered them to stop playing “fascist music.” Then one of the leaders of Melodia tried to explain that *Rovesnik* had praised the Clash as an anticapitalist, “leftist” British band.

The KGB people did not listen to us. They interrupted our party for one hour. They checked all our tapes of the dance program. Eventually they confiscated all our music records and tapes with recordings of the Sex Pistols, the Clash, AC/DC, Kiss, and 10cc. KGB officers punished our Komsomol supervisors for giving us permission to play the music of “fascist punks.” One of these Komsomol supervisors tried again to refer to *Rovesnik* publications in his defense. A KGB officer dismissed this as misinformation. “We know better,” he told us. “All this music crap you are playing is a part of the fascist, anti-Soviet conspiracy. You call this music punk rock, we call this stuff neofascism.” When one of our discotheque enthusiasts interfered and told the KGB people that AC/DC and Kiss were not punk rock bands, he was arrested by the police and removed from the dance floor.¹⁶¹

This was the beginning of a long ideological campaign waged by both Communist party ideologists and KGB officers. After 1980, nobody tried to use punk rock for dance parties any more.

According to Professor Vladimir Demchenko, who worked in the 1980s as a public lecturer in the regional lecture society Znanie in Dniepropetrovsk, local ideologists used a “description of a British punk” from the atlas of TASS (Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union), the secret digest of foreign press for Communist propagandists: the main identifying sign of a fascist punk was his shaven head. Apparently, it was a misunderstanding because the author of the original article dealt with British skinheads, and he compared punks and skinheads as the most fashionable trends in Western popular culture. In a confusing translation from English into Russian, a typical punk had shaved temples or, to put it correctly, according to this description, a punk’s hair had to be removed over his ears. When this interpretation was included in the portrait of a “fascist punk,” Komsomol ideologists were ready to identify as a punk any young man with long hair and a pony tail. As a result, many heavy metal fans from the Dniepropetrovsk region were arrested during 1983–84 because the ignorant policemen were not able to tell one fashionable hairstyle from another or distinguish between “hard rock” and “punk rock.”¹⁶² Police and Komsomol activists thought punk and fascist were the same. All Komsomol propagandists and people in charge of discotheques in the Dniepropetrovsk region received special notices about punk ideology with Russian translations of British punks’ phrases. This information was reprinted in many publications by the Dniepropetrovsk journalists who covered the antipunk campaign. Even during perestroika local journalists and KGB officials still used these materials.¹⁶³

Antipunk hysteria resulted in the prohibition of bands that were tremendously popular among Soviet high school and vocational school students. AC/DC and Kiss had nothing to do with the punk movement at all, yet after 1980, the local Komsomol apparatchiks officially considered them “fascist, anti-Soviet bands.” Komsomol ideologists in Kyiv “discovered” elements of insignia from Nazi Germany in the names of these bands. The combination “SS” presented as a symbol of lightning in their logos was interpreted as an expression of the musicians’ fascist ideology. Komsomol leaders in Dnepropetrovsk followed the recommendations of the Kyiv “experts” and tried to ban the music of “fascist rock’n’rollers.”¹⁶⁴

By the end of 1982 two British bands had been added to the list of “profascist, anti-Soviet bands”: heavy-metal Iron Maiden and the “art pop” rock group 10cc, which was famous for its ironic, intellectual lyrics and interesting melodic arrangements. Komsomol ideologists explained to KGB officers that these bands were especially dangerous because of their “hellish, antihuman imagery, fascist symbols, and anti-Soviet lyrics.” They cited the name “Iron Maiden,” derived from the name of a medieval torture device; the group’s artistic symbol, or mascot, a ten-foot rotting corpse named Eddie; and their 1982 album *The Number of the Beast*, that contained images of “the fascist, satanic cult.” The name of the second group was mistakenly reinterpreted as “Ten SS,” referring to Hitler’s secret police, the SS (*Schutzstaffel*). Given the fact that the English letter C is the equivalent of the letter S in Russian and Ukrainian, the cc (cubic centimeters) was pronounced “ess-ess,” and local Komsomol ideologists immediately characterized 10cc as a “fascist name.” Moreover, in 1978 the band released its album *Bloody Tourists* with a song—a musical parody of the anti-Soviet hysteria of the Cold War—entitled “Reds in My Bed.” The refrain of this song shocked the Soviet censors: “I’ve got Reds in my bed, I’m not easily led to the slaughter, and while the Cold War exists, I’ll stay warm with the Commissar’s daughter. . . . Let me go home. You’re a land full of misery. I don’t like your philosophy. You’re a cruel and a faceless race.” Of course, nobody on a Soviet dance floor cared about these lyrics and nobody understood a word of this song; they just loved the melody. The major songs from *Bloody Tourists*, including “Reds in My Bed,” “Dreadlock Holiday,” “For You and I,” “Life Line,” and “Tokyo,” became hits in discos during 1979–83. Appalled by this “musical propaganda” of “anti-Soviet, fascist ideas,” Komsomol ideologists asked the police and KGB for help to remove “dangerous” music from the cultural consumption of Soviet youth. In 1981–84 hundreds of the forbidden records were confiscated from young rock fans in the region. An overwhelming majority of these records were albums by AC/DC, Kiss, Iron Maiden, and 10cc.¹⁶⁵

This antipunk and antifascist hysteria affected even the music of Pink Floyd. This band traditionally was considered by Soviet ideologists as an anticapitalist “progres-

sive” band, and Soviet television and radio occasionally broadcast its music. “One of These Days” from the 1971 album *Meddle* was constantly used by the political TV show *International Panorama* as theme song in the 1970s. Some popular songs by Pink Floyd were included in musical compilations of the music journal *Krugozor*. “Money” from *Dark Side of the Moon* was praised as “an anti-imperialist anthem” of Western, progressive youth culture. The idealization of Pink Floyd by Soviet youth media reached a peak with the release of the band’s album *The Wall* in 1979,¹⁶⁶ but the official attitude changed in 1983. Its new album, *The Final Cut*, written by Roger Waters, criticized imperialistic aggression all over the world and concentrated mainly on the Falkland War between Argentina and Great Britain. According to Waters’s lyrics, three major imperialist powers threatened to destroy the world: the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. Two tracks, “Get Your Filthy Hands Off My Desert” and “The Fletcher Memorial Home,” openly criticized the expansionism of “Mr. Brezhnev and Party,” including the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. According to KGB officers, the Komsomol experts recognized Brezhnev’s name in *The Final Cut* lyrics, and they included Pink Floyd in the list of “forbidden musicians” for discotheques because of their “distortion of Soviet foreign policy.” By the end of 1983, all ideological departments of the regional Komsomol organizations in Ukraine had received a complete list of “forbidden music groups” with Pink Floyd at the top.¹⁶⁷

Soviet cultural consumption of Western products was always very limited and censored. On the one hand, forms of this consumption were regulated by various ideological requirements, and on the other hand, they were influenced by consumers’ demands. The more the ideological experts tried to ban a product, the more desirable it became. This happened with music by Kiss and AC/DC, which became the most profitable items sold on the music market in Dnepropetrovsk. Both central Komsomol and local periodicals disoriented and confused their readers when they directly connected criminal anti-Soviet and neofascist behavior with “forbidden music.”¹⁶⁸

In 1983, when Dnepropetrovsk police arrested ten students of a local vocational school for “acts of hooliganism,” they discovered that the students had adopted various Nazi and American KKK symbols. Sergei Onushev, Aleksandr Rvachenko, and their friends made white robes, put the letters KKK on them, and tried to “imitate acts of this American fascist organization.” Sergei Onushev, the leader of this “fascist” group, “used to play at home the music tapes of bands which belong to the profascist movement—Kiss, Nazareth, AC/DC, Black Sabbath.” Dnepropetrovsk ideologists established direct connections between this music and the fascism of Onushev’s group. According to them, Kiss provoked the Soviet students to commit inhuman, fascist acts.¹⁶⁹

Another case that attracted the attention of local journalists concerned Dmitrii Frolin, a student from the Department of Philology at Dnepropetrovsk University. As a

result of the antipunk and antifascist campaign Frolin was arrested by the police in 1983 and expelled from both the Komsomol and the university in 1985 for “propaganda of fascism.” According to the local ideologists, Frolin’s activities were the direct result of “intensive listening” to music by “fascists bands” such as Kiss and AC/DC.¹⁷⁰ Similar themes appeared in all central and local Komsomol periodicals during 1983–84. In the closed city of Dnepropetrovsk, the KGB monitored this campaign and criticized local ideologists for losing control of cultural consumption among the local youth. Each week a KGB supervisor recommended that Komsomol apparatchiks read and analyze material from local periodicals about the threat of punk fascist culture.

According to the KGB officers, “the youth culture of fascist music” was also connected to the idealization of Hitler and the Ukrainian nationalist leaders during the World War II, such as Stephen Bandera. In 1983 and 1984 the police arrested members of “a fascist group” who were students at the Dnepropetrovsk agricultural school. These students—Konstantin Shipunov and his followers (all together six members)—organized their own “party” and popularized the ideas of Nazi leaders and Ukrainian nationalists. They criticized the Russification of cultural life in Dnepropetrovsk and emphasized the necessity of Ukrainian independence from the Soviet Union. According to KGB informers, fascism, “heavy metal,” punk rock, and Ukrainian nationalism were presented as the crucial elements of the same “punk fascist movement.”¹⁷¹

In 1983–85, Dnepropetrovsk police discovered other groups of so-called fascist punks. Only a few of them had anything to do with Nazi ideology or fascism. All ten groups, arrested by the police, used various fascist symbols and paraphernalia, painted their faces “in punk fashion” and had shaven temples without hair. Because the Komsomol said repeatedly that the main sign of punk behavior was “shaven temples of the head,” this was enough to be arrested on the streets of Dnepropetrovsk during 1983–85. Hundreds of rock music fans were detained and their records and audiotapes were confiscated in the region of Dnepropetrovsk as a result of the antipunk and antifascist campaign.¹⁷² A famous discotheque at the cultural center of Dnepropetrovsk University was transformed into a music lecture club named Dialogue: Music in Ideological Struggle. Instead of dancing, students now listened to boring lectures about modern music and important issues of international politics. The local ideologists preferred this kind of cultural consumption to the spontaneous dance parties of bourgeois music, which were difficult to control. Many talented disc jockeys and music engineers, such as Mikhail Suvorov, left Komsomol discotheques in 1985–86 and moved to the safer ground working as a technician, far away from the dangerous restrictions surrounding rock music.¹⁷³

In 1983–84 the police organized special raids on music markets in downtown Dnepropetrovsk. They were not looking for black marketeers, but for anti-Soviet

music products, including records and audiotapes of Kiss and AC/DC. Thousands of original Western records were confiscated and hundreds of people were arrested during those two years.¹⁷⁴ By the beginning of 1985 the police had destroyed a thriving rock music market in the city, but they were not able to halt this consumption. Disco clubs, restaurants, and bars still existed because “fresh” Western popular music had become part of a very lucrative business. The “disco club enterprise” became the first stable source of significant material profit for the local administration, including Komsomol apparatchiks. In 1981–83, according to official records, Club Melodia produced a monthly profit of more than fifty thousand rubles; the organizers of this business earned an additional “non-registered” twenty thousand rubles per month.¹⁷⁵

As a result of the campaign against rock music, those in charge of music entertainment had to find nontraditional—and unofficial—sources for products to satisfy the growing demands of Dniepropetrovsk consumers. Two neighboring cities, Kryvyi Rig and Zaporizhie, which were open to foreigners, became important locations for obtaining “fresh” recordings, supplied primarily by international tourism during 1983–85. In 1972 only 30 percent of all records and tapes of Western music came directly through the channels of international tourism to the Dniepropetrovsk music market. By the end of 1984 more than 90 percent came from local tourists who traveled abroad, including those who used the services of the Sputnik, the Komsomol travel agency.¹⁷⁶

Much of the banned pop music was brought to Dniepropetrovsk by representatives of the ruling Soviet elite who visited foreign countries as members of local tourist groups. According to discotheque activists, in 1979 KGB officers who supervised local tourism brought to Dniepropetrovsk the original rock albums later banned by Communist ideologists. One tourist returning from a trip to Hungary, and another from Poland, brought *Highway to Hell* by AC/DC and *Dynasty* by Kiss for their own children, who were active participants of the music market in the city. Through these children, tapes of AC/DC and Kiss became available for thousands of rock consumers in the region many months before foreign students brought these albums to Kryvyi Rig, a city open to foreign tourists.¹⁷⁷ Even during the antirock campaign, Komsomol apparatchiks who had an opportunity to go abroad brought back new records, audiotapes, cassettes, and audio and video equipment. According to Mikhail Suvorov, during the crisis of 1983–84 when the music market was closed by the police, the same Komsomol apparatchik who had once asked him about rare songs by John Lennon for his antiwar event in 1980 brought recordings of the forbidden Blondie and Iron Maiden to the central city discotheque. He had bought them in Hungary when he was the leader of a local tourist group. According to active participants in the Dniepropetrovsk music market, approximately nine out of ten songs at a Melodia dance party usually came from such tourists. From February to December 1984 more

than 1,500 young tourists from Dniepropetrovsk went abroad. Each member of this group brought to the city at least one Western music record or other kinds of music information, according to the *Sputnik* annual report.¹⁷⁸

An irony of the situation was that given the ideological requirements, these apparatchiks had to demonstrate how effectively they performed their duties in organizing youth entertainment. Due to narrowing channels of music information during the antirock campaign, they had to depend more and more on the networks of the old discotheque movement, which necessarily involved enthusiasts of rock music who were connected to the black market. In addition, they also relied on domestic and mainly international tourism, especially Sputnik. This involvement in popular music consumption produced a very important network of connections for the new Komsomol elite in the region. After the beginning of the discotheque movement in 1976–77, they became active organizers, supervisors, and participants in this system of rock music consumption. By 1985, they had access to all the major forms of profit and money-making which this consumption involved. Moreover, as young ideologists of the Soviet state, they had a legitimate right to participate in all these ventures. Through their discotheque connections, Komsomol leaders started a new type of entertainment—video salons. The first video recording equipment appeared in Dniepropetrovsk radio shops in 1983. Any attempt to use VCR to show foreign films to make money in private homes was considered a crime, and people who tried to profit were punished.¹⁷⁹ Yet by the end of 1984, Komsomol activists together with their discotheque friends had started an initiative to organize an official Komsomol video business. Only in 1986, during Gorbachev’s perestroika did the city administration permit the opening of so-called video salons in Dniepropetrovsk.¹⁸⁰ Like the discotheque movement, video salons became relatively lucrative, and young Komsomol leaders used both their legal connections to tourist organizations and the regional Soviet administration and their informal connections with rock music enthusiasts to succeed in this business. After 1976, these new forms of cultural consumption, especially popular music and video, led to the creation of new managerial and business connections that would contribute to the post-Soviet political and business activities of former Komsomol elites.¹⁸¹

Conclusion

Communist ideologists and KGB officers who controlled cultural consumption in Dniepropetrovsk created a confusing and disorienting ideological situation for the local youth. They promoted Western forms of entertainment such as the discotheque, and at the same time, they tried to limit the influence of capitalist culture by popularizing expressions of Soviet nationalism, including Ukrainian music and history. They

feared the rise of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and tried to suppress any extreme enthusiasm for Ukrainian poetry and history, yet the entire system of Soviet education was designed to promote the progressive cultural models of socialist nations in contrast to the “degenerate capitalist culture” of imperialist nations. As a result, young members of mature socialist society in Dniepropetrovsk adopted elements of Western mass culture as well as the controversial ideas of Shevchenko and images of Zaporizhian Cossacks as part of their cultural identification.

Cultural consumption depended also on a changing demographic situation in the sixties and seventies. The constant migration of non-Ukrainian ethnic groups, combined with ideological pressures led to Russification as the main trend in the cultural development of the region, and especially in the city of Dniepropetrovsk. Employment at Yuzhmash, a high priority for KGB officials, also contributed to the growing Russification of this city.¹⁸² Moreover, the Ukrainian language was steadily losing ground to Russian during the seventies and eighties. An overwhelming majority of the non-Ukrainian ethnic groups preferred Russian to Ukrainian, and more Ukrainians chose Russian as their native language. In 1979, 12.6 percent of all Ukrainians in the region claimed that Russian was their native language. By 1989 this number grew to 15.2 percent, and in the cities it increased from 16.4 percent to 18.9 percent.¹⁸³

Reading books and popular magazines, listening and dancing to popular music (including Western rock and roll and disco), became the major elements of intensive cultural consumption among Soviet youth. Young people in Dniepropetrovsk not only consumed, but also produced new cultural forms that challenged the traditional notions and ideological discourse of local apparatchiks. Moreover, local ideologists tried to use different types of entertainment, such as discotheque, for communist propaganda. The use of Western music as propaganda made it legitimate for everyday ideological activities and justified its immense popularity. KGB and party ideologists tried to neutralize this popularity by promoting Soviet and Ukrainian cultural models. Young people who lived in Dniepropetrovsk were thus confused and disoriented. The prevailing ideological discourse, and the changing demographic situation, emphasized the cultural role of only one language, Russian. At the same time, the young generation was urged to respect certain heroes of Ukrainian history, such as the Cossack rebels, Bohdan Khmel’nytsky, or Taras Shevchenko, and related aspects of Ukrainian culture.¹⁸⁴ After many years of such indoctrination, this generation was ready, in the period of Ukrainian independence, to consume the familiar forms of Ukrainian culture as legitimate symbols that connected their former Soviet ideological discourse to the new, post-Soviet one. Because of the ideological confusion of late Soviet socialism, these symbols became intermixed with various forms of both Soviet and Western popular culture. Such a situation created very peculiar, regional types of identity formation

among the local youth. The Dniepropetrovsk version of cultural identification differed significantly from the version associated with less Russified regions of Ukraine. The last generation of late socialism in Dniepropetrovsk developed their national identity through a dual process, (1) of seeing themselves as the cultural descendants of late Soviet civilization with some elements of Western mass culture and Ukrainian national culture, and (2) of opposing the extreme Westernization and Ukrainization associated with the Western Ukrainian cities such as L'viv.¹⁸⁵

Cultural consumption in the closed city of Dniepropetrovsk also led to what KGB and Communist party officials considered to be alternative and even deviational behavior. Such activities were not just what James Scott called the “arts of resistance to dominant political culture” and “strategies of the weak.”¹⁸⁶ The new Soviet youth culture which originated in the Brezhnev period was more the result of blending and transforming dominant Soviet cultural practices and new Western cultural influences. According to Michel de Certeau, in social systems such as the Soviet city “the imposed knowledge and symbolisms [by the ideologists] become objects manipulated by practitioners [the Soviet youth] who have not produced them.” Using de Certeau’s ideas, we can say that young people from Dniepropetrovsk “subverted practices, and representations that were imposed on them from within—not by rejecting them or by transforming them (though that occurred as well), but by many different ways.” Young Soviet consumers of popular culture “metaphorized the dominant order: they made it function in another register. They remained other within the system which they assimilated and which assimilated them externally. They diverted it without leaving it.”¹⁸⁷ They used a sphere of leisure as the main arena of their cultural transformation. Simultaneously, books, rock and disco music, and discothèques became their alternatives and transformations of the dominant cultural practices of late socialism. At the same time, new cultural activities and tastes produced new values and demands for cultural consumption, which gradually replaced and transformed traditional Soviet values and Communist ideological practices even among the young Komsomol elite of the late 1970s and 1980s.

Notes

1. The city's name combines two words—Dnipro (Dniepr) River and Grigory Petrovsky, a famous Bolshevik and the first president of the Soviet Ukraine. After 1991, the new official spelling is Dnipropetrovs'k. I will retain the common Soviet spelling. For personal names (especially among my interviewees) I use the Russian spelling for Russian speakers and the Ukrainian spelling for Ukrainian speakers.

2. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Dnipropetrovs'koi oblasti (DADO), f. 22, op. 15, d. 252, l. 62.

3. DADO, f. 416, op. 2, d. 1565, ll. 306–307.

4. *Naselenie Dnepropetrovskoi oblasti po dannym Vsesoiuznoi perepisi naselenia 1989 g.* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1991), 4.

5. Yuzhmash is the abbreviated Russian for “southern machine-building factory.” From the middle of the 1950s this plant became the site of a secret construction center that developed new military devices—rockets, missiles, and special engines for the Soviet aviation and space programs. By the 1980s, it produced sixty-seven different types of space ships, twelve space research complexes, and four defense space rocket systems. These systems were used not only for purely military purposes by the Ministry of Defense, but also for astronomic research, for the global radio and television network, and for ecological monitoring. Yuzhmash initiated and sponsored the international space program of the socialist countries, called Interkosmos. Twenty-two of the twenty-five automatic space Sputniks of this program were designed, manufactured, and launched by engineers and workers from Dnepropetrovsk. The Soviet Ministry of Defense included Yuzhmash in its strategic plans. The military rocket systems manufactured in Dnepropetrovsk created a material base for the newly born Soviet Missile Forces of Strategic Purpose. On the eve of the collapse of the Soviet Union, Yuzhmash had 9 regular and corresponding members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, 33 full professors and 290 scientists holding a Ph.D. They could grant scientific degrees and had a prestigious graduate school which attracted talented students of physics from all over the USSR. *Dnepropetrovskii raketno-kosmicheskii tsentr: Kratkii ocherk stanovleniia i razvitiia*. DAZ-YuMZ-KBŪ: *Khronika dat i sobytii* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1994); *Dnipropetrovs'k: Vikhy istorii*, ed. A. G. Bolebrukh et al. (Dnipropetrovs'k: Grani, 2001), 209–211, 229. See also: Yurii Lukanov, *Tretii presydent: Politychnyi portret Leonida Kuchmy* (Kyiv, 1996), 13. Many specialists consider the unique rocket complex SS-18, manufactured by Yuzhmash as an important material factor that pushed Soviet and American leaders toward *détente*. *Zemni shliakhy i zoriani orbity: Shtrykhy do portreta Leonida Kuchmy*, ed. V. P. Gorbulin et al. (Kyiv, 1998), 6, 24–31.

6. Brezhnev himself began his career in the region of Dnepropetrovsk and he brought his former comrades to the Kremlin as well. Even after the “downfall of the Brezhnev clan” in Moscow in 1983, when Yurii Andropov began his struggle “with corruption and nepotism” among the Soviet *nomenklatura*, members of this clan played a prominent role in the political life of Soviet Ukraine. In 1990 Mikhail Gorbachev sent a special committee to check a political situation in Ukraine. This committee represented the department of Ukrainian party organizations at the organizational sector of the CPSU Central Committee. The report of the committee proved that 53 percent of Ukrainian executive officials came from Dnepropetrovsk. *Dnipropetrovsk vs. Security Service*, ed. Vyacheslav Pikhovshek et al. (Kyiv, 1996), 8; *Ukrains'kyi Nezaleznyi Tsentri Politychnykh*

Doslidzhen', "Dnipropetrovs'ka sim'ia": *Informatsia stanom na 25 lystopada 1996 roku*, ed. V. Pikhovshek et al. (Kyiv, 1996), 15.

7. From 1990 to 2007, I interviewed over two hundred people. The majority were college-educated, electrical engineers, police and state officials, and political leaders between the ages of 30 and 60. All were residents of either the Dnipropetrovs'k region or Kyiv. I made transcripts of all my interviews (the most recent ones are on audiotapes). I also took notes and Xeroxed pages from diaries made available to me. All interview transcripts and diary notes are in my possession.

8. The pioneering studies in English on Soviet cultural consumption concentrate mainly on Leningrad and Moscow. See Svetlana Boym, *Common Places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994) and Hilary Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture: A Nation's Constructors and Constructed* (London: Routledge, 1994). Sociology of rock music consumption in Leningrad is covered in Thomas Cushman, *Notes from Underground: Rock Music Counterculture in Russia* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1995). Alexei Yurchak wrote an excellent anthropological study of late socialism which focuses mainly on Leningrad. See *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005). Another good study about Soviet hippies concentrates on Lviv: William Jay Risch, "Soviet 'Flower Children': Hippies and the Youth Counter-Culture in 1970s Lviv," *Journal of Contemporary History* 40, no. 3 (July 2005): 565–584. For a more balanced approach see: Catherine Wanner, *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998). See also a good collection of essays about the Brezhnev era in *Brezhnev Reconsidered*, ed. Edwin Bacon and Mark Sandle (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

9. S. Frederick Starr, *Red and Hot: The Fate of Jazz in the Soviet Union, 1917–1980* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1985); Artemy Troitsky, *Back in the USSR: The True Story of Rock in Russia* (London: Omnibus Press, 1987); Timothy W. Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc: A History of Rock Music in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Richard Stites, *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society Since 1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); *Rocking the State: Rock Music and Politics in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. Sabrina Petra Ramet (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1994). The last collection has two articles devoted to Belarus and Ukraine: Maria Paula Survilla, "Rock Music in Belarus," 219–242, and Romana Bahry, "Rock Culture and Rock Music in Ukraine," 243–296. Unfortunately, a major part of this material covers the period after 1985. See also studies based on Moscow and Leningrad sources: Cushman, *Notes from Underground*; Yngvar Bordewich Steinholt, *Songs from the Leningrad Rock Club, 1981–86* (New York: Mass Media Music Scholars' Press, 2004); Michael Urban with Andrei Evdokimov, *Russia Gets the Blues: Music, Culture, and Community in Unsettled Times* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004). Polly McMichael, "'After all, you're a rock and roll star (at least, that's what they say)': Roksi and the Creation of the Soviet Rock Musician," *Slavonic and East European Review* 83 (2005): 664–684; and Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*. See also: Eric Shiraev and Vladislav Zubok, *Anti-Americanism in Russia: From Stalin to Putin* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 19–21, and Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 11–13, 205–209. See also a collection of essays about Soviet youth: *Soviet Youth Culture* ed. Jim Riordan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), and a good study of the youth

entertainment in the Soviet Palaces of Culture: Anne White, *De-Stalinization and the House of Culture: Declining State Control over Leisure in the USSR, Poland, and Hungary, 1953–89* (London: Routledge, 1990). Compare with David MacFadyen, *Red Stars: Personality and the Soviet Popular Song, 1955–1991* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001).

10. Two post-Soviet studies have added the provincial Russian towns of Samara and Ulianovsk to the traditional focus on Moscow: Hilary Pilkington et al., *Looking West? Cultural Globalization and Russian Youth Cultures* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), and Elena Omel’chenko, *Molodiozh: Otkryti vopros* (Ulianovsk: Simbirskaiia kniga, 2004).

11. See especially Igor Sklovs’kyi, *Robitnycha molod’ v etnosotsial’nykh zryshenniakh Ukrain’skogo suspil’stva: 70-ti—pochatok 90-kh rokiv XX stolittia* (Kirovograd, 2001), and books in English: Serhy Yekelchyyk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); idem and Oliver Schmidtke, eds. *Europe’s Last Frontier?: Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine between Russia and the European Union* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Blair Ruble, *Creating Diversity Capital: Transnational Migrants in Montreal, Washington, and Kyiv* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005); Hiroaki Kuromiya, *Freedom and Terror in the Donbas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Wanner, *Burden of Dreams*; Andrew Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002); Taras Kuzio, *Ukraine: State and Nation Building* (London: Routledge, 1998); Bohdan Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); Marta Dyczok, *Ukraine: Movement without Change, Change without Movement* (London: Routledge, 2000). See also good studies of cultural production in Soviet Ukraine under Stalin: George O. Liber, *Soviet Nationality Policy, Urban Growth, and Identity Change in the Ukrainian SSR, 1923–1934* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); idem, *Alexander Dovzhenko: A Life in Soviet Film* (London: British Film Institute, 2002); Yekelchyyk, *Stalin’s Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2004).

12. See as an example of the focus on Lviv and Donetsk: Claudia Sabcic and Kerstin Zimmer, “Ukraine: The Genesis of a Captured State,” in *The Making of Regions in Post-Socialist Europe: The Impact of Culture, Economic Structure, and Institutions. Case Studies from Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine*, ed. Melanie Tatur (Wiesbaden, 2004), 2: 107–354. Another good sociological survey of 1991 completely ignored Dnepropetrovsk as well: *Natsional’na samosvidomist’ studets’koi molodi (Sotsiologichnyi analiz)*, ed. N. I. Chernysh et al. (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1993). Even a good study of the Ukrainian evangelicals concentrates mainly on the Kharkiv region. See Catherine Wanner, *Communities of the Converted: Ukrainians and Global Evangelism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2007).

13. John Storey, *Cultural Consumption and Everyday Life* (London: Arnold, 1998), 135, 136.

14. Madan Sarup, *Identity, Culture, and the Postmodern World* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 105, 125.

15. See in detail: John B. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), 207, 210; Storey, *Cultural Consumption*, 135, 136, 147.

16. Simon Frith, "Music and Identity," in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. S. Hall and P. du Gay (London: Sage, 1996), 122, 124.

17. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity*, 210.

18. According to William Taubman, Khrushchev's dream that Communist society was within reach resulted in new ideological priorities, on the one hand, and in new practical policies for the Soviet state, on the other hand. During the Twenty-first Party Congress in 1959 a Soviet leader announced that the Soviet Union had completed the "full and final construction of socialism." The Soviet people now had to demonstrate a higher level of production because after two decades they would have a higher level of consumption than any country in the world. See William Taubman, *Khrushchev: The Man and His Era* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), 509 ff.

19. See, on the origins of Soviet consumption: Elena Osokina, *Za fasadom "stalinskogo izobilija": Raspredelenie i rynek v snabzhenii naselenia v gody industrializatsii, 1927–1941* (Moscow, 1998); Catriona Kelly and Vadim Volkov, "Directed Desires: *Kul'turnost'* and Consumption," in *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881–1940*, ed. C. Kelly and D. Shepherd (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 291–313; Natalia Leбина, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' sovet'skogo goroda: Normy i anomalii, 1920–1930 gody* (St. Petersburg, 1999); Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Jukka Gronow, *Caviar with Champagne: Common Luxury and the Ideals of the Good Life in Stalin's Russia* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), esp. 69–86. On Soviet tourism and consumption during late Stalinism, see: Anne E. Gorsuch, "'There's No Place Like Home': Soviet Tourism in Late Socialism," *Slavic Review* 62, no. 4 (Winter 2003): 760–785. See also a good collection of articles about tourism and consumption in: *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism*, ed. Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006).

20. See Leonid I. Brezhnev, *Report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU 1971* (Moscow: Progress, 1971), 12–53; idem, *Report to the 25th Congress of the CPSU 1976* (Moscow: Progress, 1976), 99; idem, *Leninskim kursom* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1972), 3: 24, 124, 235. See also, about consumption and developed socialism: A. Butenko, "O razvitom sotsialisticheskom obshchestve," *Kommunist*, no. 62 (1972): 6, 48–58, and J. R. Millar, "The Little Deal: Brezhnev's Contribution to Acquisitive Socialism," *Slavic Review* 44, no. 4 (Winter 1985): 694–706. See also a new "revisionist" approach to this problem in three articles in *Brezhnev Reconsidered* ed. Edwin Bacon and Mark Sandle (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002): Mark Harrison, "Economic Growth and Slowdown," 38–67; Mark Sandle, "A Triumph of Ideological Hairdressing? Intellectual Life in the Brezhnev Era Reconsidered," 135–164, and Mark Sandle, "Brezhnev and Developed Socialism: The Ideology of *Zastoi*?" 165–187. Compare with Cold War studies of the Brezhnev era: *Developed Socialism in the Soviet Bloc* ed. J. Seroka and S. Simon. (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1982); D. Kelley, *The Politics of Developed Socialism* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986); *Soviet Society and Culture* ed. T. L. Thompson and R. Sheldon. (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1988).

21. See Gorsuch, "'There's No Place Like Home'," 781, and Kelly and Volkov, "Directed Desires," 293. See also, Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*.

22. DADO, f. 9870, op. 1, d. 48, ll. 3–4.

23. DADO, f. 9870, op. 1, d. 48, l. 14.
24. DADO, f. 9854, op. 1, d. 42, l. 60; f. 22, op. 15, d. 39, ll. 59–61, 120. During the 1960s the words “beat music” (*beat muzyka*) were used in the USSR for Western rock music. See also how the Dutch used the same words for rock music during the 1960s, in Mel van Elteren, *Imagining America: Dutch Youth and Its Sense of Place* (Tilburg, Tilburg University Press, 1994), 118, 130–138.
25. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 25.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.* ll. 25–26. “19th Nervous Breakdown” was in fact a Rolling Stones’ hit in 1966.
28. S. Budrevich, “O tekh, kto zasoriaet efir,” *Dneprovskaia Pravda*, June 4, 1969.
29. DADO, f. 19, op. 60, d. 92, ll. 3, 4, 8–9, 14–15.
30. DADO, f. 19, op. 60, d. 85, ll. 7, 17. See complaints of the party leaders in DADO, f. 22, op. 19, d. 2, ll. 142–143. Author interview of Igor T., KGB officer, Dniepropetrovsk, May 15, 1991. On Soviet illegal black marketeers of Western goods, see Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 138, 142, 201–202. On anti-hippie campaigns in L’viv, see Risch, “Soviet ‘Flower Children’.”
31. See the obvious similarities to German ideologists’ reaction toward American rock and roll in Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), esp. 184–197.
32. DADO, f. 22, op. 19, d. 2, ll. 142–143. Author interview of Igor T., May 15, 1991.
33. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 2. Mazhara noted that a significant part of religious and “revisionist” literature came through L’viv from socialist countries, such as Poland and Romania, and some of nationalistic literature came from Czechoslovakia.
34. *Ibid.*, l. 3.
35. The historical-philological department later was divided in two different departments: history and philology.
36. What follows is based on documents from DADO, f. 9870, op. 1, d. 48, ll. 9–11.
37. Taras Shevchenko, “Velykyi liokh,” in Taras Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh* (Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1989), 1: 221–233; see also comments about the poem, 494–497.
38. For the Stalinist interpretation of these events, see Yekelchuk, *Stalin’s Empire of Memory*, 96–107.
39. DADO, f. 9870, op. 1, d. 48, l. 9.
40. *Ibid.*, ll. 10–11.
41. See Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannia*, 1: 494–497; and Dina Zisserman-Brodsky, *Constructing*

Ethnopolitics in the Soviet Union: Samizdat, Deprivation, and the Rise of Ethnic Nationalism (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 26.

42. See the official interpretation given in documents of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture devoted to preparations for the celebration of Shevchenko's one-hundred-fiftieth anniversary in Ukraine in 1964: Tsenral'nyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Vyschchykh Organiv Vlady ta Upravlinnia Ukrainy (TsDAVOVU), f. 5116, op. 4, d. 147, ll. 1–105.

43. In April 1960, Natalia Televnaya, head of the literary workshop at the Palace of Students in Dnepropetrovsk, was fired "for anti-Soviet, nationalistic remarks" in public. DADO, f. 9870, op. 1, d. 48, l. 16–18.

44. DADO, f. 19, op. 50, d. 56, ll. 17–19. Citation is from l. 19. According to the new KGB investigation in September 1965, Yuri Zavgorodnii, a poet who was living in Kyiv, brought a photocopy of a West German study by I. Koshelivits, "Modern Literature in the Ukrainian SSR" to his Dnepropetrovsk friends. Through his cousin O. Vodolazhchenko, who was an active member of the group of young poets and a junior student in the evening classes at the historical-philological department of DGU, copies of this book reached other DGU students such as Ivan Sokul'sky. KGB experts regarded Koshelivits's study of Ukrainian literature, which was published in Ukrainian, to be a book with dangerous nationalistic content. By the end of November 1965, the KGB had reports about O. Vodolazhchenko's "nationalistic inclinations." Once he said in class that "the old generation was outdated, it does not know and does not understand a modern youth," *ibid.*

45. DADO, f. 19, op. 50, d. 56, l. 20.

46. *Ibid.* There were similar events in Kyiv. See Kenneth C. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era: Myth, Symbols and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (The Hague, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1980), 119–120.

47. DADO, f. 19, op. 50, d. 56, l. 20.

48. *Ibid.*, ll. 20–21.

49. V. Zarichny, "Students'ka shchedrivka," *Prapor iunosti*, January 7, 1966.

50. *Reabilitovani istorieiu*, ed. V. V. Ivanenko, vol. 2: *Svidchennia z mynuyshyny. Movoiu dokumentiv* (Dnipropetrovs'k: Monolit, 2001), 281. Sokul'sky, who felt offended by these accusations, prepared a special article for a local periodical with a title "Am I Nationalist?" in which he denied all accusations. Sokul'sky even planned to sue I. Iarmash, deputy secretary of the DGU party committee, for calling him "a Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist."

51. DADO, f. 19, op. 50, d. 56, ll. 22–24. Many of these young poets, participants in Gart, did not conceal the calls from KGB officials for interrogations or KGB official warnings, and even boasted to their friends about resisting KGB pressure and persecutions.

52. Sergei Oushakine, "The Terrifying Mimicry of Samizdat," *Public Culture* 13, no. 2 (2001): 191–214.

53. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, ll. 5–6. See also the similar case of Leonid S. Gavro, an engineer

at the Dniepropetrovsk Institute of Metallurgy. On Soviet dissidents in recent anthropological studies, see Oushakine, “The Terrifying Mimicry,” and Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 102–108, 130–131, 143–145.

54. Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2001), 13. See also Dina Zisserman-Brodsky, *Constructing Ethnopolitics*, 24–27.

55. This objective resulted in Khrushchev’s and Brezhnev’s national policy of “cultural-linguistic russification and internal migration” that led to “the loss by ethnic groups of their cultural-linguistic identity.” Zisserman-Brodsky, *Constructing Ethnopolitics*, 31, 32.

56. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, ll. 69–73. The classic study of games as a form of performance in human presentation of self is: Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Anchor books, 1959).

57. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 6. His position was typical of many Ukrainian Soviet patriots who were accused of “bourgeois nationalism.” Author’s interview of Professor Yurii Mytsyk, January 15, 1992, Dnipropetrovsk.

58. See Vasyl Markus, “Religion and Nationalism in Ukraine,” in *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*, ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1984), 59–80.

59. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 9.

60. *Ibid.*, l. 8.

61. *Ibid.*, l. 10.

62. See Zaremba’s case in *ibid.*, ll. 100–102. In 1964, after graduating from L’viv University, Zaremba got a job as a full-time journalist for the Komsomol newspaper *Prapor iunosti*. From the first he attracted KGB attention because of his “aggressive pro-Ukrainian position.” In one conversation after his arrival in Dniepropetrovsk, Zaremba complained about “Russification” and how Russians and Jews ousted Ukrainians from positions of power in the city. As one KGB informer noted, he always demonstrated his contempt to colleagues who spoke Russian instead of Ukrainian and called them traitors. Zaremba distributed copies of Ivan Dziuba’s pamphlet *Internationalism or Russification* among his friends and maintained close connections with famous “nationalists” in L’viv like Mikhailo Kosiv and Bohdan Goriv. “I worry about our Ukrainian nation now,” he used to say, “but I believe that our Soviet system of power will fall apart soon.” In November 1965, the KGB called Zaremba to visit their office for a “prophylactic interview” about his “nationalistic declarations.” After this meeting, he still maintained his old contacts in L’viv and established new ones in Dniepropetrovsk—with Ivan Sokul’sky and his group of young poets. In 1966, after two years of struggle against Russification in *Prapor iunosti*, Zaremba accepted a new job in the youth department of Dniepropetrovsk’s regional radio. In 1968 Zaremba again attracted KGB attention: He proposed a public celebration (sending information to all means of mass information) of the anniversary of Taras Shevchenko’s reburial, which took place on May 22, 1868, in Kaniv and had an important symbolic meaning for all Ukrainian patriots. Under

pressure from the KGB, Zaremba was expelled from the Komsomol in June 1968. In July 1968, he was fired from the radio station as well. After this he worked as a free-lance journalist and a poet, but his actions were always under KGB surveillance.

63. *Ibid.*, ll. 11–12. Mykhailo Skorik, who was expelled in 1965, reentered the department of journalism at Kyiv State University later as an external student taking courses by correspondence. His wife, Tatiana Skorik (Chuprina), also had problems with the KGB. At Kyiv State University, her master's thesis, "M. O. Skrypnyk as a Publicist," was criticized by her colleagues for "Ukrainian nationalism." She changed her topic and defended her new thesis in 1967. But the main reason for punishing Skorik and his wife was their support of Matvii Shestopal, their professor from the Department of Journalism at Kyiv State University, who was fired for his "nationalism." On March 12, 1965, sixty-seven students from the department, including Skorik and his wife, signed a letter to the university's administration requesting that Shestopal be reinstated. They vowed to quit their study at the university if it insisted on firing Shestopal. The university retaliated by expelling all sixty-seven students, future journalists. Since the beginning of 1968 Mikhail Skorik had worked as a journalist at the department of culture, science, and schools of the editorial board of *Zoria*, and his wife as a proofreader at *Prapor iunosti*. After their arrival in Dnipropetrovsk the Skoriks joined the group of Sokul'sky and Zavgorodnii. See *Vinok pam'iaty Olesia Honchara. Spogady. Khronika*, ed. V. D. Honchar and V. Ia. P'ianov (Kyiv, 1997), 255. DADO, f. 19, op. 51, d. 74, ll. 78–79.

64. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, ll. 89–90. The same informer told the police that Uniat read anti-Soviet documents and urged others to discuss them during the meeting on the banks of Dnieper.

65. *Ibid.*, l. 78.

66. *Ibid.*, l. 90–91, 99.

67. I used a post-Soviet edition of the novel: Oles' Honchar, *Vybrani tvory u 2-kh tomakh* (Dnipropetrovs'k, 2001), 2: 5–272.

68. About this church, see N. F. Karpenko, S. G. Koldunenko, D. S. Shelest, "Novomoskovsk," *Istoria gorodov i siol Ukrainskoi SSR 26-ti tomakh: Dnepropetrovskaia oblast'*, ed. I. V. Vasiliev et al. (Kiev, 1977), 470.

69. For a discussion of the scandal around Honchar's novel in English, see Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era*, 106–109. See my conversation with Professor Yurii Mytsyk, Dnipropetrovsk University, 1991.

70. See Vitalii Koval, "*Sobor*" i navkolo "*Soboru*" (Kyiv, 1989); *Vinok pam'iaty Olesia Honchara; Ternystym shliakhom do khramu: Oles' Honchar v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Ukrainy*, ed. P. T. Tron'ko, O. G. Bazhan, Yu. Z. Danyliuk (Kyiv, 1999). See also in English: Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence* (Toronto, 1999), 36; Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 106–109.

71. See "Lyst tvorchoi molodi Dnipropetrovs'ka," a manuscript circulating in hand-written (and later typed) form during 1968–69. Later on, it was published in Ukrainian émigré periodicals in Germany and Canada. I use another edition, a verbatim reprint of the original: "Lyst tvorchoi molodi Dnipropetrovs'kogo," in *Molod' Dnipropetrovs'ka v borot'bi proty rusyfikatsii: The Youth of Dnipropetrovsk in Fight Against Russification* (Munich: Suchacnist', 1971), 9–19. See

also recent reprint editions of the document in *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 169–180; and *Tysiacha rokiv Ukrain's'koi suspil'no-politychnoi dumky 9-ty tomakh. Tom 8 (40-v–80-ti roky XX ct.)*, ed. Taras Hunchak (Kyiv, 2001), 230–237. An English translation appears in *The Ukrainian Review* 16, no. 3 (1969): 46–52.

72. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, ll. 47–50; see also Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 158–159.

73. *Ibid.*, l. 49. See also a publication of this document in *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 143–145. The KGB also spied on a communist, a hero of the Great Patriotic War and a teacher of Ukrainian, Gavriilo Propkopenko (b. 1922), who wrote an article “Air, Water, and Bread of the People” defending Honchar’s novel against ideological accusations. See *ibid.*, l. 51. Another poet, Vladimir Sirenko, also supported Honchar and criticized *Zoria* for participating in the anti-Honchar campaign. The KGB confiscated his short poem-epigram and insisted on firing him from his job. In the original Ukrainian the epigram was very nasty and funny; Sirenko called Honchar a great man and the daily periodical “shit.”

“Zoria na sirykh shpal'takh z krykom
Na Honchara pleska bagnom.
Honchar zalyshyt'sia velykym,
Zoria—zalyshyt'sia govnom.”

Ibid., l. 94. Cf. *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 145–147.

74. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 53. See also the memoirs of the famous Ukrainian political dissident: Leonid Plyushch, with a contribution by Tatyana Plyushch, *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography*, ed. and trans. Marco Carynnyk (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), 174–175.

75. The letter can be found in DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, ll. 95–96 and in *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 148–149, 256. The following account is based on these sources and on my personal conversation with Yurii Mytsyk on April 10, 1990. Only during *perestroika* did he tell us, his former students, the details of this story. See Yu. Mytsyk, “‘Sobor’ I navkolo ‘Soboru’,” *Kur'er Kryvbasu*, no. 9 (1998): 102–109.

76. Including N. Mikolaenko, M. Nechai, and literary critic I. Lutsenko. DADO, f. 19, op. 52, d. 72, l. 55.

77. *Ibid.*, l. 58. See ll. 63–68 about the KGB’s collection of biographical data and personal information on Honchar.

78. *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 156–163.

79. *Ibid.*, 261. See an English translation of this letter in *The Ukrainian Review* 16, no. 3 (1969): 46–52. As a result of this international publicity, the first scholarly analysis of the case appeared in English: Farmer. *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 158–159.

80. DADO, f. 19, op. 54, d. 113, ll. 29–31; *Ternystym shliakhom do khramu*, 260, 261. Ivan Sokul'sky, *Lysty na svitanku* (Dnipropetrovs'k, 2001), 1: 22, 2: 489, 491. Sokul'sky was accused not only of writing the letter, but also of disseminating copies of articles by General P. Grigorenko in defense of Crimean Tartars; “A Current State of the Soviet Economy,” by a Soviet academician,

A. Aganbegian; and a book by the Czechoslovak scholar Molnar, “Slovaks—Ukrainians.” All these documents were considered “anti-Soviet propaganda” by the Dnepropetrovsk KGB. Moreover, the police discovered originals of Sokul’sky’s poems “Freedom,” “Nostalgia,” and “Sviatoslav,” which were also deemed to be “anti-Soviet, nationalistic material.” Later on, the KGB dropped their accusations concerning Aganbegian’s article and Molnar’s book.

81. The full text of the letter, “Lyst tvorchoi molodi,” can be found in *Molod’ Dnipropetrovs’ka v borot’bi proty rusyfikatsii*, 9, 17, 18–19. The complete letter was published in *Molod’ Dnipropetrovs’ka v borot’bi proty rusyfikatsii: The Youth of Dnipropetrovsk in A Fight Against Russification* (Munich: Suchacnist’, 1971), 9–19. The authors reminded their opponents of Lenin’s advice on how to fight nationalism in the former Russian Empire. First of all, Communists had to resist “great Russian chauvinism”; afterward they should fight the nationalism of the oppressed nation, which was always a reaction to Russian chauvinism.

82. See especially F. Tsukanov, “Maska i oblychia naklepykiv,” *Zoria*, February 7, 1970. The author even asked a question: “What is criminal about a concern for the Ukrainian language?” See also L. Vyblaia, “Tak, tse—zrada,” *Prapor iunosti*, February 7, 1970; I. Shylo, “Otravlennye per’ia: Pravda o tak nazyvnom ‘Pis’me tvorcheskoi molodiozhi,’” *Dneprovskaia Pravda*, February 8, 1970.

83. On Savchenko, see Derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy, Fond upravlinnia v Dnipropetrovs’kii oblasti (DASBUDO), sprava 24613, t. 7, ark. 300–317; *Reabilitovani istorieiu*, ed. V. V. Ivanenko, vol. 1; *Vidrodzhena pam’iat’* (Dnipropetrovs’k, 1999), 561–568. Savchenko became a famous Ukrainian writer. See his memoirs in *ibid.*, vol. 2; *Svidchennia z mynuvshyny: Movoiu dokumentiv* (Dnipropetrovs’k, 2001), 278–281.

84. DADO, f. 19, op. 57, d. 25, ll. 9–11.

85. See CPSU resolution of April 23, 1973, in *Reabilitovani istorieiu*, 2: 285–286.

86. See the documents of his criminal case of 1980 in Ivan Sokul’sky, *Lysty na svitanku*, 2: 392–493.

87. G. Nikolenko and A. Pankratov, “Pis’mo, napisannoe zhelchiiu: Istoria moral’nogo padenia odnogo neudavshegosia dissertanta (iz zala suda),” *Dneprovskaia Pravda*, April 2, 1974.

88. The most popular books were Semen Skliarenko, *Sviatoslav* (Kyiv: Radians’kyi pys’mennyk, 1961); idem, *Volodymyr* (Kyiv: Radians’kyi pys’mennyk, 1963); and Ivan Bilyk, *Mech Areia* (Kyiv: Radians’kyi pys’mennyk, 1972). In 1980 another book made a sensation among college students. It was Pavlo Zagrebel’nyi, *Roksolana* (Kyiv: Radians’kyi pys’mennyk, 1980). These were mentioned in my interviews of Igor T., 1991; Yurii Mytsyk, 1992; Vitalii Pidgaetskii at the Department of History, Dnepropetrovsk University, February 10, 1996; and Vladimir Demchenko, a former public lecturer of the Society of Knowledge, Dnipropetrovsk, January 12, 1992. See also my interviews of Evgen D. Prudchenko, the Central Library of Dnepropetrovsk Region, July 18, 2007, and Galina V. Smolenskaia, the Central Library of Dnepropetrovsk Region, July 18, 2007 (Both interviews were conducted in the library). See also Myroslav Shkandrij, “Literary Politics and Literary Debates in Ukraine, 1971–81,” in *Ukraine after Shelest*, ed. Bohdan Krawchenko (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), 55–72. On the popularity of Bilyk’s book, see also Oles Buzyna, *Tainaia istoria Ukrainy-Rusi: Vtoroe izdanie* (Kyiv: “Dovira.” 2007), 32–35.

89. *Reabilitovani istorieiu*, ed. V. V. Ivanenko, vol. 3, *Mynule z girkym prysmakom: Represii v istorychnii retrospektyvi radians'kogo suspil'stva* (Dnipropetrovs'k, 2002), 204–209. Yurii Danyliuk and Oleg Bazhan, *Opozytsia v Ukraini (druga polovyna 50-kh—80-ti rr. XX st.)* (Kyiv: “Ridnyi kraj,” 2000), 204; Borys Zakharov, *Narys istorii dysydents'kogo rukhu v Ukraini (1856–1987)*, Kharkivs'ka pravozakhysna grupa (Kharkiv: Folio, 2003), 123, 124.

90. Author's interview of Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996. On the Beatles and Soviet youth during the sixties and seventies see David Gurevich, *From Lenin to Lennon: A Memoir of Russia in the Sixties* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1991), 128; Yury Pelyushonok, *Strings for a Beatle Bass: The Beatles Generation in the USSR* (Ottawa: PLY, 1999).

91. Some authors who lived in Moscow in those days considered Elvis Presley and Bob Dylan as the most popular American rock musicians among Soviet youth during the 1960s. According to my material, an overwhelming majority of rock music fans in provincial cities like Dniepropetrovsk ignored Presley and Dylan. The tapes with their music reached a mass, local audience only after Beatlemania, and they were few and of bad quality. Many young consumers of popular music could not appreciate Bob Dylan's songs because they did not understand the English lyrics. As one young rock fan wrote in his summer school diary in August 1966, after reading a Soviet magazine with a positive review of Bob Dylan, “What did they find progressive and good in this slow and boring muttering to a guitar? I prefer the catchy melodies of the Beatles or Rolling Stones than this boring Dylan's stuff. It's hard to believe that such bad music as songs by Bob Dylan came from America, the motherland of rock and roll.” Local rock bands in Dniepropetrovsk never performed Dylan's songs in the 1960s. They preferred “more energetic and more rock'n'roll” American music by the Doors and Creedence Clearwater Revival. See: Shiraev and Zubok, *Anti-Americanism in Russia*, 20. The quotation is from the diary of Vladimir Solodovnik, August 16, 1966. See also my interviews of Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996, and Vladimir Demchenko, 1992. Compare with: Pavel Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze: The Memoir of a Soviet Interpreter* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 3; Andrei Makarevich, “*Sam ovtsa*”: *Avtobiograficheskaia proza* (Moscow: Zakharov, 2002), 53, 90–91, 109–110, 116–118; Pelyushonok, *Strings for a Beatle Bass*; Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War, 205–209*; Walter LaFeber, *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945–2006*, 10th ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2007), 337. Even Muscovites considered the Beatles more interesting than Elvis or Dylan. “Elvis was nice,” they used to say, “but the Beatles had melodies. The Beatles were wonderful. The Beatles came knocking at our hearts.” See Reggie Nadelson, *Comrade Rockstar: The Life and Mystery of Dean Reed, the All-American Boy Who Brought Rock 'n' Roll to the Soviet Union* (New York: Walker & Co., 1991), 81.

92. Author's interviews of Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996; Mikhail Suvorov, June 1, 1991; Andrei Vadimov, Dniepropetrovsk, July 20–21, 2003; Eduard Svichar, in Vatutino, Cherkasy region, Ukraine, June 8, 2004. Yulia Tymoshenko, a heroine of the 2004 Orange Revolution, also stressed the strong influences of Western pop music in her youth. In 1975, while in school, she wrote: “I am fond of sports, especially of ping pong, skating, and also of games like volleyball, basketball. I like music by Bach, Mozart, and Strauss. I like also the modern rock bands such as the Beatles, Manfred Mann's Earth Band, Led Zeppelin and others.” Tymoshenko confessed in her high school paper that she was not able to imagine her everyday life without modern rock music. Dmitrii Popov and Ilia Mil'shtein, *Oranzhevaia printsessa: Zagadka Yulii Timoshenko* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Ol'gi Morozovoi, 2006), 55.

93. Author interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Andrei Vadimov, 2003; Eduard Svichar, 2004. The American consumers know the disco version of “Venus” by the band Bananarama.

94. van Elteren, *Imagining America*, 138.

95. Even in 1974 the central Komsomol magazine published an article about Shocking Blue as a response to its immense popularity among Soviet youth. See M. Freed, “Tochnyi pritsel “Shocking Blue”,” *Rovesnik*, no. 10, (1974): 24. See also a recent novel about Soviet youth culture in the 1970s: Sergei Soloukh, *Shizgara* (Moscow: “Vremia,” 2005). This novel demonstrates the popularity of “Venus” among Siberian youth in the 1970s. The very title of the novel is a mispronunciation of the song’s refrain, “She’s got it.” See *Shizgara*, 92–93.

96. Author’s interview of Vladimir Demchenko, 1992. For many Ukrainian rock musicians the work of Shocking Blue became what Thomas Cushman called a cultural fixation. See *Notes from Underground*, 41–45.

97. “Dnipro vpadae v Chorne more, / to turkam bude gore, / koly kozaky pryplyvut’ / i turkiv vsikh ub’iut’ . / Kozaky, zaporiz’ki kozaky . . .” in Ukrainian. The Ukrainian musicians transformed the original “She’s got it, Your baby, she’s got it, I’m your Venus I’m your fire At your desire” into a refrain about Cossacks. Author’s interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Andrei Vadimov, 2003; Eduard Svichar, 2004. Eduard Svichar still remembers all the lyrics of this song in Ukrainian; see my more recent interview in Vatutino, Cherkasy region, Ukraine, July 28–29, 2007.

98. On a Byelorussian rock musician’s linguistic choice, see Maria Paula Survilla, ““Ordinary Words’: Sound, Symbolism, and Meaning in Belarusian-Language Rock Music,” in *Global Pop, Local Language*, ed. Harris M. Berger and Michael Thomas Carroll (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2003), 187–206. See also her essay, “Rock Music in Belarus,” in Ramet, 219–241.

99. Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 106; MacFadyen, *Red Stars*, 312. See also, on the popularity of “Yellow River,” Makarevich, *Sam ovtsa*, 130. Unfortunately, a good essay about rock music in Ukraine focuses mainly on the period after 1985. See Romana Bahry, “Rock Culture and Rock Music in Ukraine,” in Ramet, *Rocking the State*, 243–296.

100. Author’s interviews of Vladimir Demchenko, 1992; Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996; Evgen D. Prudchenko, 2007; Galina V. Smolenskaia, 2007. On the popularity of Bilyk’s book, see Oles Buzyna, *Tainia istoria*, 32–35.

101. Mentioned by Mikhail Suvorov. See interviews of Suvorov, 1991; Andrei Vadimov, 2003; and Igor T., 1991.

102. Harris M. Berger, “Introduction: The Politics and Aesthetics of Language Choice and Dialect in Popular Music,” in *Global Pop, Local Language*, xv.

103. Survilla, ““Ordinary Words’,” 204. On the indigenization of Western pop music in the Russian youth culture, see Pilkington, *Looking West?*, 210. Compare with a good sociological analysis of rock music in Leningrad and the Russification of Western rock in Cushman, *Notes from Underground*, 36–39, 51–54.

104. See Svitlana Frenets', "Chervona ruta (Rozpovid' pro zolotykh laureativ ogliadu khudozhnioi samodial'nosti)" *Ranok*, no. 3 (1971): 17–18.

105. Author's interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Andrei Vadimov, 2003; Eduard Svichar, 2004.

106. Author's interview of Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996. See also a report on the music schools in the Dniepropetrovsk region during 1974–75 in TsDAVOVU, f. 5116, op. 19, d. 308, ll. 1–128. Compare with decisions of the officials in Ukrainian Ministry of Culture in 1974: *ibid.*, d. 25, ll. 1–97, and d. 27, ll. 1–78.

107. School diary of Aleksandr Gusar, August 12, 1972. Ukrainian is his native language.

108. Frith, "Music and Identity," 121, 124.

109. Colin Campbell, *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 89; Grant McCracken, *Culture and Consumption* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 104. On the imaginary West, see Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 34, 35, 161–162, 164ff.

110. According to Eduard Svichar five of every ten records in Kyiv's black market came directly from foreigners. Author's interview, 2004. According to Mikhail Suvorov, in Odesa five out of ten came from foreign tourists and the other five from Soviet sailors. Author's interview, 1991. About Odesa's black market, called *tolkuchka* or *Privoz*, see a letter of Tatiana I. Karetnikova, March 25, 1978, Library of Congress, Rubinov Collection, box 15, folder 28C, letter 21418, p. 2. See also, about the black market called *tolchok* in the city of Zaporizhie, one hour's drive from Dniepropetrovsk, *ibid.*, box 26, folder 60A, letter 39847, p. 1.

111. DADO, f. 22, op. 19, d. 2, ll. 142–143; author's interview of Igor T., 1991.

112. Author's interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; DADO, f. 19, op. 60, d. 85, l. 7, 17; *ibid.*, d. 92, l. 3, 4, 8–9, 14–15. See also two articles by O. Iaseneva: "Krapka nad 'I,'" *Prapor iunosti*, September 16, 1966, and "Sud," *Prapor iunosti*, December 16, 1966.

113. Many of the people I interviewed characterized this social group the "upper middle class" of Soviet society, e.g., Mikhail Suvorov, 1991, and Eduard Svichar, 2004, 2007.

114. DADO, f. 19, op. 60, d. 85, l. 7, 17. Author's interviews of Andrei Vadimov, 2003, and Sergei Pulin, Dniepropetrovsk, April 15, 1990. The article about hippies was by Yu. Ustimenko, "Liudi s tsvetami i bez tsvetov." See also Makarevich, "*Sam ovtsa*," 121–124.

115. Author's interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. Compare with an idealized description of hippies in L'viv: Risch, "Soviet 'Flower Children,'" 565–584. Many people who were interviewed by Risch represented the local elite of L'viv, not a large group. Some of them assumed the hippie role later as a common fashion during the 1970s. I used information from other sources, including my interview of Eduard Svichar, 2004.

116. Author's interview of Vladimir Sadovoi, Dniepropetrovsk, March 10, 1992. See also: Alexei Kozlov, *Dzhaz, rok i mednye truby* (Moscow: EKSMO, 2005), 257–260; Risch, "Soviet 'Flower Children'"; and Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 138, 142, 201–202.

117. Dnepropetrovsk fans had their music market on what they called “Broadway,” a part of Karl Marx Avenue, the main street in downtown Dnepropetrovsk, between Serov Street and Moskovskaya Street. Sometimes people called this place simply “the Broad.”

118. See parallels with U.S. developments in Will Straw, “Characterizing Rock Music Culture: The Case of Heavy Metal,” in *On Record: Rock, Pop, and the Written Word*, ed. Simon Frith and Andrew Goodwin (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990), 97–110. Vocational schools were called *professional’no-tekhnikeskoe uchilishche* in Russian, or *PTU* in abbreviated form. During Brezhnev’s era the Soviet government introduced this form of education for children who did not meet intellectual requirements of Soviet high schools. They provided cadres from the Soviet working class and peasantry for industrial factories and collective farms.

119. Author’s interview of Mikhail Suvorov, Dnepropetrovsk, June 1, 1991; Aleksandr Gusar, Dnepropetrovsk, May 4, 1990; Vladimir Solodovnik, Dnepropetrovsk, June 21, 1991.

120. Author’s interview of Eduard Svichar, 2004. The number of high school students in the region of Dnepropetrovsk who regularly visited local dance halls increased from 42,200 during the 1960–61 academic year, to 125,900 in 1970–71, and to 108,800 in 1983–84. The number of *PTU* students grew from 13,800 in 1960, to 29,500 in 1970, and to 49,600 in 1984. Dancing *tekhnikum* students rose from 20,200 in 1960–61, to 54,400 in 1970–71, and to 56,700 in 1983–84. The figures for college students were 21,700 in 1960–61, 36,800 in 1970–71, and 52,200 in 1983–84. Tsentral’noe statisticheskoe upravlenie (TsSU) USSR. Statisticheskoe upravlenie Dnepropetrovskoi oblasti, *Molodiozh Dnepropetrovskoi oblasti. Statisticheskii sbornik*, ed. L. T. Glushkina and V. F. Iagniuik (Dnepropetrovsk, 1985), 8, 10, 12.

121. In October 1970 local tourists who visited Hungary brought back the original *Deep Purple in Rock* album. By the end of that year, tapes of this album had spread all over the student dorms in the city. In 1972 and 1973 the most popular albums among all college students in Dnepropetrovsk were three by Deep Purple: *Fireball* (1971), *Machine Head* (1972), and *Who Do We Think We Are* (1973). School diary of Vladimir Solodovnik, May 22, 1971, June, 10, 1972, July 15, 1973; School diary of Aleksandr Gusar, June 2, 1972, and August 14, 1973. For the situation in Moscow, see Kozlov, *Dzhaz, rok i mednye trubny*, 261. Compare with Troitsky, *Back in the USSR*, 33; Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 129, 154; and Cushman, *Notes from the Underground*, 43, 84, 125.

122. Author’s interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Aleksandr Gusar, 1990; Vladimir Solodovnik, 1991. See also my interview of Vladimir Sadovoi, 1992.

123. School diaries of Vladimir Solodovnik, May 22, 1971, June, 10, 1972, July 15, 1973; and Aleksandr Gusar, June 2, 1972, August 14, 1973. See also Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 149.

124. Author’s interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. My mother, who was a librarian in Vatutino in the Cherkasy region of Ukraine, had the same complaints about this “Jesus hysteria” in 1974. Others also mention this phenomenon. Author’s interview of Eduard Svichar, 2002.

125. See the Russian editions of the Polish author Zenon Kosidowski: *Bibleiskie skazania* (Moscow, 1966), and *Skazania evangelistov* (Moscow, 1977); and of the French author Leo Taxil, *Zabavnoe evangelie, ili Zhizn’ Iisusa* (Moscow, 1963).

126. Author's interviews of Eduard Svichar, 2002, and Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. My mother also confirmed this growing interest in Christianity among young readers. See also the school diaries of Vladimir Solodovnik, May 22, 1971, June 10, 1972, July 15, 1973; and Aleksandr Gusar, June 2, 1972, August 14, 1973. Also Dnepropetrovsk Central City Library, Yearly Reports, 1972–1977.

127. Leaders of local tourist groups traveling abroad complained about the new obsession with the metal crosses among young tourists. See DADO, f. 22, op. 24, d. 141, l. 11; f. 1860, op. 1, d. 1533, ll. 7, 8–9 (for 1972); f. 1860, op. 1, d. 1993, ll. 59, 70, 90–91, 119 (for 1976).

128. School diary of Aleksandr Gusar, April 29, 1973.

129. Author's interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. Compare with the official description in DADO, f. 6465, op. 2, d. 4, l. 23.

130. Author's interviews of Sergei Pulin, 1990; Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Eduard Svichar, 2004.

131. DADO, f. 6465, op. 2, d. 37, ll. 235–236.

132. Author's interview of Aleksandr Gusar, 1990.

133. Author's interview of Vladimir Solodovnik, 1991. Compare with similar developments in the Cherkasy region of Ukraine in my interview of Eduard Svichar, 2004.

134. Many contemporaries noted that the popularity of Deep Purple raised an interest in other hardrock bands from Great Britain. For young fans in Dnepropetrovsk the number two rock band in 1971–76 was Uriah Heep. See Soloukh, *Shizgara*, 481, 482 ff., and my interview of Natalia Vasilenko, Dnipropetrovs'k, July 19, 2007.

135. On Leningrad's fixation on T. Rex, see Cushman, *Notes from Underground*, 42, 44, 47. For Moscow, see Makarevich, "Sam ovtsa", 126ff., and Kozlov, *Dzhaz, rok i mednye truby*, 261ff. For Lviv, Odesa, and Kyiv, see my interview of Eduard Svichar, 2004 and the school diaries of Vladimir Solodovnik, May 22, 1971, June, 10, 1972, July 15, 1973, and Aleksandr Gusar, June 2, 1972, August 14, 1973. As Vladimir Solodovnik, who was a young enthusiast of hard rock music in 1975, told me in 1991: "In the early 1970s we began listening to Deep Purple, Uriah Heep, Black Sabbath, Manfred Mann's Earth Band, and Led Zeppelin. We loved this music because it was heavier and more aggressive than 'beat music' of the 1960s. Then after 1972 Slade and T.Rex became even more popular among Dnepropetrovsk kids. These mainly working-class children had no idea of the Beatles or Animals. They did not like the sophisticated music of Pink Floyd. They needed the rhythm and aggression of the new hard rock music. They preferred the simplicity and rudeness of Slade to the complex musical ideas of Deep Purple and Led Zeppelin. Slade and T.Rex opened a door to new bands with heavy sound and simple music which was easy to understand and was good dance music. Sweet, Suzi Quatro, Nazareth, ZZ Top followed Slade and T.Rex in popularity. High school students and PTU students were the main consumers of this simple and aggressive music which became a typical emotional background for the collective fistfights on the dance floors in the 1970s. Young men with little education found in this music an expression of their 'manliness,' their masculinity."

136. Bohdan Krawchenko, *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth Century Ukraine* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 171–258; Wsevolod Isajiw, “Urban Migration and Social Change in Contemporary Soviet Ukraine,” *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 22, no. 1 (March 1980): 56–66.

137. Author’s interviews of Yurii Mytsyk, 1992; and Vitalii Pidgaetskii, 1996. See also numerous complaints about the loss of Ukrainian identity on the dance floor in DADO, f. 17, op. 8, d. 44, ll. 1–3, 175–176; f. 416, op. 2, d. 1353, ll. 23–26, 40–49; d. 1991, ll. 4–7, 14–23. Some experts connected a loss of identity to the rise of crime among local youth. See DADO, f. 416, op. 2, d. 1694, ll. 6–14; f. 18, op. 60, d. 28, ll. 74–76, 79.

138. DADO, f. 19, op. 53, d. 109, ll. 28–31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 46. See also statistics for 1980–84 in DADO, f. p-18, op. 60, d. 28, l. 79. Compare with post-Soviet identification of Russian youth in Pilkington, *Looking West?*, 180.

139. Author’s interview of Yuri Mytsyk, 1992. See also, about homogenization as a part of the Soviet cultural project, Stephen Lovell, *The Russian Reading Revolution: Print Culture in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Eras* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2000), 22–23. Compare with the roots of this project in the Stalin era in Jeffrey Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 2000). For the effect of the urban Soviet culture of the big industrial cities on the new workers, migrants from villages and small towns, see M. D. Afanasiev, *Za knigoi: Mesto chtenia v zhizni sovetskogo rabochego* (Moscow: Kniga, 1987), esp. pp. 36–43.

140. According to orders and a special questionnaire from the city committee of the Komsomol, the disc jockeys of the central city discotheque in Dnepropetrovsk organized a sociological survey among regular visitors to their discotheque in November 1979 (200 people), September 1980 (350 people) and December 1981 (400 people). Almost 95 percent of the respondents visited the discotheque at least once a week; 80 percent of them were Komsomol members; 40 percent were female and 60 percent were male; 10 percent were high school students, 15–17 years old (from eighth to tenth grades); 20 percent were from vocational schools, 16–17 years old; 30 percent were young workers, 17–22 years old; 10 percent were *tekhnikum* students; 30 percent were college students or “young specialists” with a college degree, 18–25 years old.

Only one-third of regular participants in these dancing parties were local intellectuals with a college degree; the majority had very different music tastes and preferences from what the Soviet intellectual youth listened to. Only 5 percent (both men and women) preferred “serious music” by King Crimson, Yes, Genesis, and Pink Floyd, and they requested each evening at least one song from Pink Floyd’s albums *Dark Side of the Moon*, *Wish You Were Here*, *Animals*, and *The Wall*. Almost 10 percent of the visitors (all of them male) wanted to dance to heavy music by old hard rock bands such as Deep Purple, Led Zeppelin, Nazareth, Queen, Uriah Heep, and Black Sabbath. Hard rock music fans also included in their list old songs by the Beatles from their last albums; by the end of the dancing program, they always requested “Birthday” and “Helter Skelter” from *The White Album* (1968). Approximately 30 percent of all visitors (an overwhelming majority of them female) also preferred Soviet “Estrada” pop-music, especially songs by Alla Pugacheva and Yurii Antonov, and 10 percent liked nonofficial Soviet rock bands such as Mashina vremeni (Time Machine). But almost 80 percent (both female and male) preferred Western disco music,

especially songs by ABBA, Boney M., Eruption (with the most popular song “One Way Ticket”), songs by the Bee Gees’ from *Saturday Night Fever* and by the American band Blondie (the most popular hit of 1979 and 1980 was “Heart of Glass”).

The most shocking fact for Komsomol ideologists was that 70 percent of the men and 60 percent of the women preferred music by the Australian band AC/DC and the American band Kiss. The ideologists considered these bands “propagandists of fascism and violence.” Men used to request for dancing all songs from AC/DC albums *Highway to Hell* (1979) and *Back to Black* (1980) and a Kiss song, “Rock and Roll All Nite.” Women always asked for the three Kiss hits, “for slow dances when ladies would invite gentlemen to dance”: “Hard Luck Woman,” “I Was Made For Lovin’ You,” and “Beth.” Nobody requested Ukrainian songs. See DADO, f. 17, op. 11, d. 1, ll. 28–29, and a document of the Komsomol city committee, *Zdes’ možno uznat’ mnogo pouchitel’nogo: Iz opyta raboty Dnepropetrovskogo molodezhnogo diskokluba “Melodia.”* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1979), 1–4. Author’s interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. See also a complaint about this music in documents of the Dnepropetrovsk regional committee of the Komsomol: DADO, f. 22, op. 28, d. 1 “Protokol XXIV Dnepropetrovskoi oblastnoi otchetno-vybornoi komsomol’skoi konferentsii,” ll. 1–221, esp. ll. 26–27, 110, 201. About anti-Soviet music and antisocial behavior of young people see also for 1980, DADO, f. 22, op. 28, d. 38, ll. 1–12, and d. 74, ll. 1–21; for 1981, see f. 22, op. 30, d. 35, l. 1–10, and d. 63, ll. 1–46.

141. Yu. Milinteiko, “Pervye shagi diskoteki,” *Dnepr vechernii*, February 26, 1977; B. Ivashura and I. Manevich, “Ruzhane dariat prazdnik,” *Dnepr vechernii*, March 23, 1977.

142. During February–July of 1972 the police organized 100 raids and arrested 200 such dealers, confiscating hundreds of music records and tapes. See DADO, f. 19, op. 60, d. 85, ll. 7, 17.

143. See I. Chenous’ko, “Disko-klubu—zelionuii ulitsu,” *Dnepr vechernii*, July 1, 1978; L. Titarenko, “Tsikavi tsenry vidpochynku,” *Zoria*, August 15, 1978; I. Rodionov, “Vecher v diskoklube,” *Dneprovskaiia pravda*, January 14, 1979; A. Belkina, “Vechir u dyskotetsi,” *Prapor iunosti*, December 11, 1979.

144. A. Belich, “Diskoteka: ot fakta k priznaniu,” *Komsomol’skoe znamia*, October 20, 1979; A. Belich, “Pervye—vse: v Dnepropetrovske podvedeny itogi 1-go respublikanskogo smotrak-konkursa diskoteknykh program,” *Komsomol’skoe znamia*, October 24, 1979. See also the main requirements of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture for youth entertainment in TsDAVOVU, f. 5116, op. 19, d. 890, ll. 1–86 (for 1978), and d. 1362, ll. 1–4 (for 1980).

145. *Zdes’ možno uznat’ mnogo pouchitel’nogo: Iz opyta raboty Dnepropetrovskogo molodezhnogo diskokluba “Melodia.”* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1979), 1–4.

146. DADO, f. 17, op. 11, d. 1, l. 28.

147. DADO, f. 22, op. 32, d. 1, l. 44.

148. DADO, f. 17, op. 10, d. 1, ll. 87, 98; op. 11, d. 25, l. 88; op. 12, d. 18, l. 15; f. 22, op. 36, d. 1, ll. 36–37. See also the articles cited in n. 143 above.

149. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991

150. *Ibid.*, see also my interviews of Askold K., son of the head of the tourist department in the Dnepropetrovsk Trade Unions branch, Dnepropetrovsk University, April 15, 1993; and Serhiy Tihipko, a director of Privatbank in Dnepropetrovsk, October 12, 1993.

151. See the official documents in DADO, f. 17, op. 10, d. 1, ll. 32, 87, 98 (for 1977); d. 46, l. 9 (for 1978); f. 17, op. 11, d. 1, ll. 28, 28 (for 1979). Author's interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; and Andrei Vadimov, 2003.

152. During 1983–84, according to Soviet and Western scholars, the Soviet leadership was concerned “with the social control of young people, mentally through improved ideological training and physically, through the greater regulation of their leisure time and activity.” Hilary Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 79.

153. Paul Easton, “The Rock Music Community,” in *Soviet Youth Culture*, ed. Jim Riordan (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1989), 56. See Yurii Andropov, “Uchenie Karla Marksa i nekotorye aspekty stoitel'stva sotsializma v SSSR,” *Kommunist*, no. 3 (1983): 9–23. See also his speech in *Pravda*, August 16, 1983.

154. On the 1983–84 campaign, see Artemy Troitsky, *Back in the USSR*, 89–93ff.; Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 220–222, and Sabrina Petra Ramet, Sergei Zamascikov, and Robert Bird, “The Soviet Rock Scene,” in Ramet, *Rocking the State*, 190–191.

155. Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 220; Easton, “The Rock Music Community,” 57.

156. The activities of sound engineers and others involved in the mass production of music recordings came under articles in the Soviet Criminal Code regarding entrepreneurial activities (Article 153) or the practicing of an illegal trade (Article 162). *Komsomol'skaya pravda*, April 7, 1984. On September 16, 1984, this newspaper announced that the spread of rock music in the Soviet Union was the result of “Operation Barbarossa Rock and Roll,” a plan by the CIA and NATO military intelligence to undermine the USSR.

157. This list was first published in *Komsomol'skaya pravda*, November 10, 1985. In English, see Ryback, *Rock Around the Bloc*, 221, and Ramet, Zamascikov, and Bird, “The Soviet Rock Scene,” 191. Alexei Yurchak reprinted a similar list used by the Nikolaev regional Komsomol committee (in Ukraine) in January 1985. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, 213–216.

158. Italics added. See Troitsky, *Back in the USSR*, 42–43. Troitsky explained that there were various reasons for rejecting punk in the Soviet Union in those days. “A psychological reason: having always been put down as a poor cousin of ‘real’ (high) culture, our rockers humbly strove for symbols of ‘prestige,’ meaning complex musical arrangements, technical virtuosity, poetic lyrics or even just chic costumery. The anarchic, consciously seedy pathos [of punk music] was alien to our musicians Another reason was that our listeners had an acute case of disco fixation. Teenagers who only recently had idolized Deep Purple, Slade and Sweet now couldn't live without Boney M. and Donna Summer. [Another reason was] in the Russian understanding of music. We have no tradition of playing loud and fast and dirty. Maybe our love for melody and a ‘clean’ sound is embedded in the genes. How else can one explain the boundless love for a miserable group like Smokie or the enormous popularity of The Eagles in the late seventies . . . and

the total disregard for The Sex Pistols, although everyone knew of their odious name.” *Ibid.*

159. About the Clash see *Rovesnik*, no. 6 (1978): 13–15; no. 10 (1980): 26; no. 4 (1982): 22–23. *Rovesnik* reprinted sheet music and lyrics of two Clash songs: “The Guns of Brixton,” in no. 4, 1982, and “Know Your Rights,” in no. 10, 1983. About *the Wall*, see *Rovesnik*, no. 11 (1981): 24–26.

160. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991. See the very conservative recommendations of the central Kyiv authorities in TsDAVOVU, f. 5116, op.19, d. 1362, ll. 1–4 (1980); d. 2064, ll. 1–9, d. 2063, ll. 1–80, d. 2068, ll. 1–24 (1983); d. 2348, ll. 1–126, d. 2349, ll. 1–11 (1984). For the attitude of Ukrainian Communist ideologists toward cultural consumption in a speech by the film director Eldar Ryazanov 1980, see Val S. Golovskoy with John Rimberg, *Behind the Soviet Screen: The Motion-Picture Industry in the USSR, 1972–1982*, trans. Steven Hill (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis, 1986), 118–119.

161. Author’s interviews of Igor T., 1991; Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; and Andrei Vadimov, 2003.

162. Author’s interviews of Vladimir Demchenko, 1992; and Serhiy Tihipko, 1993.

163. For the use of Komsomol ideologists they reprinted some British punks’ declarations such as: “Live by today’s day only! Do not think about tomorrow! Do not give a damn about all these spiritual crutches of religion, utopia and politics! Forget about this. Enjoy your day. You are young and do not hurry to become a new young corpse.” They concluded with a sentence that was used in a propagandist campaign against “fascist punk music”: “These were slogans of punks, who are the preachers of bestial cynicism and meanness, the slogan of the real spiritual mongrels of the twentieth century.” L. Gamol’sky, N. Efremenko, V. Inshakov, *Na barrikadakh sovesti: Ocherki, razmyshlenia, interviu* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1988), 139. Author’s interview of Igor T. and Mikhail Suvorov, 1991.

164. For Dnepropetrovsk, see author’s interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Vladimir Demchenko, 1992; Igor T., 1991; Evgen D. Prudchenko, 2007; and Galina V. Smolenskaia, 2007. For Cherkasy and Kyiv, see my interviews of Eduard, 2004, 2007.

165. Author’s interviews of Igor T., 1991; Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; and Eduard Svichar, 2004, 2007.

166. See especially *Rovesnik*, no. 11 (1981): 24–26.

167. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991. Both Suvorov and Gusar mentioned that KGB officers gave them this explanation during an interrogation following the confiscation of *The Final Cut*. See my interviews, 1991, 1990. See Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 216–217. Yurchak obviously recalls his life in Leningrad during the same period of time.

168. The first public scandal that involved both “fascist music” and “fascist symbols” took place in the closed city in the fall of 1982. The city police arrested two college students, I. Keivan and I. Plastun, who had their own collections of Western records with “fascist symbols” and demonstrated their “neo-Nazi” behavior in downtown Dnepropetrovsk. Their T-shirts, with images of Kiss and AC/DC, attracted the policemen who interpreted such images as “fascist.”

After the arrest and confiscation of all “fascist” records, the police sent information about the students’ anti-Soviet behavior to their colleges. In December 1982 the entire city and region of Dnepropetrovsk experienced the beginning of the real antifascist and antipunk campaign. Under KGB pressure, the local ideologists organized a special public trial of Keivan and Plastun, who were expelled from the Komsomol and their colleges in January 1983. From this time on, all Komsomol organizations in the region began a purge of any member suspected of unusual enthusiasm for the forbidden music. *Dnepr vechernii*, December 24, 1982, about a public trial that took place on December 23, 1982, in Dnepropetrovsk. See also L. Vasil’eva, “Takim ne mesto sredi nas!” *Dnepr vechernii*, January 10, 1983.

169. “What kind of art,” a journalist commented, “did the musicians of Kiss represent? They tear apart live chickens and vomit in public during their performances. This band Kiss is a group of four hooligans, who selected SS Nazi symbol as the symbol of their band. But promoters transform them into the idols of contemporary youth and proclaim them as ‘trendsetters’ in popular culture.” Gamol’sky, Efremenko, and Inshakov, *Na barrikadakh sovesti*, 133, 134.

170. “Our Soviet books paradoxically co-existed with fascist and racist slogans on Frolin’s book shelves,” wrote one local journalist. “These slogans were written in Gothic script in both English and German with phrases such as ‘Only for Whites,’ etc. Over his bed, Frolin put a fascist cross and a poster with distorted, non-human grimaces and ugly, painted faces of members of the band Kiss. Frolin paid forty rubles on the black market for a Kiss poster. Plus, he had a variety of audiotapes with music of Kiss and AC/DC. Just press a button of his tape recorder and you will hear this music.” And then the journalist made his own ideological comments: “Let’s think about all this! They, musicians of AC/DC, call themselves the devil’s children. Their song “Back in Black” became an anthem of the American Nazi party. During a Komsomol meeting Dmitrii justified his behavior: ‘I do not consider my collecting of such things a crime. This is just mere collecting. It does not matter what is a subject of this collection. These items reflect a certain period of history of the people.’ Let’s think again! There is no justification for a collection of Nazi regalia! Many people in the West understand this. And Leon Rappoport, an American professor from the University of Kansas, was absolutely right when he sincerely declared: ‘Collecting Nazi relics is certainly one form of fascist propaganda’.” *Ibid.*, 135–136.

171. *Ibid.*, 137. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991.

172. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991.

173. At Dnepropetrovsk University I became head of Dialogue in September 1986, when I started my teaching career there. See also my interviews of Serhiy Tihipko, 1993, and Mikhail Suvorov, 1991.

174. The police released those black marketeers who had no “fascist or punk music products.” Those who had AC/DC and Kiss records were held in the police stations for fifteen days. Author’s interviews of Igor T., 1991, and Mikhail Suvorov, 1991.

175. I. Rodionov, “Večer v diskoklube,” *Dneprovskaiia Pravda*, January 14, 1979. About guest numbers, admission fees, and alcoholic beverages in 1982 and 1983, see B. Gran’ko, “Karbovanets’ za tansi, try—za kokteil’, abo chomu vprav avtorytet ‘Melodii,’” *Prapor iunosti*, June 24, 1982,

and January 15, 1983. About profits of “Melodia,” see my interview of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991. See also documents in DADO, f. 17, op. 11, d. 1, l. 28; f. 22, op. 36, d. 1, ll. 36, 37, 39, 40.

176. DADO, f. 22, op. 19, d. 2, l. 143; f. 19, op. 60, d. 85, ll. 9–11 See also my interview of Serhiy Tihipko, 1993.

177. Author’s interviews of Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Vladimir Sadovoi, 1992; Aleksandr Gusar, 1990; Vladimir Solodovnik, 1991; Igor T., 1991; Askold K., 1993.

178. DADO, f. 22, op. 36, d. 73, ll. 13–15. See also my interviews of Aleksandr Gusar, 1990; Mikhail Suvorov, 1991; Igor T., 1991; Askold K., 1993; Evgen D. Prudchenko, 2007; and Galina V. Smolenskaia, 2007.

179. Gamol’sky, Efremenko, and Inshakov, *Na barrikadakh sovesti*, 146–147.

180. Author’s interview of Igor T., 1991.

181. Yulia Timoshenko began her entrepreneurial career in such a “video business.” See Popov and Mil’shtein, *Oranzhevaia printsessa*, 52–89.

182. In 1959, 70 percent of the 2,705,000 people who lived in the region of Dnepropetrovsk resided in the cities. In 1970, this figure grew to 76 percent of 3,343,000 people. L. I. Poliakova, “Zminy v etnonatsional’nomu skladi naselennia pivdnia Ukrainy v 60-80-ti roky XX st.,” in *Pivdenna Ukraina XX stolittia: Zapiski naukovo-doslidnoi laboratorii istorii Pivdennoi Ukrainy Zaporiz’kogo Derzhavnogo Universytetu*, ed. A. V. Boiko (Zaporizhzhia, 1998), 227–237.

183. Goskomstat USSR, Dnepropetrovskoe oblatnoe upravlenie statistiki, *Naselenie Dnepropetrovskoi oblasti po dannym Vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1989 goda* (Dnepropetrovsk, 1991), 100, 102, 106, 116, 117.

184. Soviet Ukrainian officials followed the Ukrainian patriots’ efforts to preserve sites of “Cossack glory” in the Dnipro region. See *Zbereshemo tuiu slavu: Gromadskiyi rukh za uvichnennia istorii ukrains’kogo kozatstva v drugii polovyni 50-kh-80-kh rr. XX st.*, ed. Iu. Danyliuk (Kyiv: Ridny kraj, 1997).

185. As an example of such identification, see Popov and Mil’shtein, *Oranzhevaia printsessa*, 52–89; Andrew Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 18–22.

186. I refer to James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985) and idem, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990).

187. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 31.

Center for Russian & East European Studies
University Center for International Studies
University of Pittsburgh
4400 W. W. Posvar Hall
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
(412) 648-8716
www.ucis.pitt.edu/crees/cbpaper.html.

Ronald Linden, Bob Donnorummo, William Chase, Co-Editors
Eileen O'Malley, Managing Editor
Vera Dorosh Sebulsky, Editorial Assistant