

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ДРОГОБИЦЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
DROHOBYCH IVAN FRANKO STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY

ISSN 2519-058X (Print)

СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК

EAST EUROPEAN HISTORICAL BULLETIN

**ВИПУСК 7
ISSUE 7**

**Дрогобич, 2018
Drohobych, 2018**

*Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(протокол від 29 травня 2018 року № 8)*

Наказом МОН України збірник включено до Переліку наукових видань, в яких можуть публікуватися результати дисертаційних робіт на здобуття наукових ступенів доктора і кандидата наук з історичних наук (Наказ МОН України від 13.03.2017 р. № 374).

Східноєвропейський історичний вісник / [головний редактор В. Ільницький]. – Дрогобич: Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2018. – Вип. 7. – 212 с.

Збірник розрахований на науковців, викладачів історії, аспірантів, докторантів, студентів й усіх, хто цікавиться історичним минулим.

Редакційна колегія не обов'язково поділяє позицію, висловлену авторами у статтях, та не несе відповідальності за достовірність наведених даних і посилань.

Головний редактор: Ільницький В. І. – д.іст.н., доц.

Відповідальний редактор: Галів М. Д. – к.пед.н., доц.

Редакційна колегія:

Борщевич В. Т. – д.і.н.; **Вагнер Марек** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Вегеш М. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Вацлав Вєжбєнєц** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Гліва Анджей** – доктор історії (Польща); **Дегтярьов С. І.**; **Корсак Р. В.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Литвин М. Р.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Морозов А. Г.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Новацький Роман** – д. габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Падалка С. С.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Патриляк І. К.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Петречко О. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Сергійчук В. І.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Ситник О. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Стародубець Г. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Стемпнік Анджей** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Тельвак В. В.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Футала В. П.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Чопек Сильвестер** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща).

Рецензенти:

Білий Дмитро Дмитрович – д.і.н., проф., професор кафедри хореографії та мистецтвознавства Львівського державного університету фізичної культури імені Івана Боберського;

Гуцуляк Віктор Володимирович – д.і.н., проф., професор кафедри археології та спеціальних галузей історичної науки Черкаського державного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького;

Деревінський Василь Федорович – д.і.н., проф., професор Київського національного університету будівництва і архітектури.

Збірник індексується в міжнародних базах даних: Cite Factor, Google Scholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing, Journal Index, Polish Scholarly Bibliography, Research Bible, Scientific Indexing Services, Index Copernicus International

Статті збірника прирівнюються до публікацій у виданнях України, які включені до міжнародних науково-метричних баз відповідно до вимог наказу МОН України від 17 жовтня 2012 р. № 1112 (зі змінами, внесеними наказом МОН України від 03.12.2012 р. № 1380).

*Свідцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
«Східноєвропейський історичний вісник» Серія КВ № 22449-12349Р від 28.12.2016 р.*

Усі електронні версії статей збірника оприлюднюються на офіційній сторінці видання

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://echb.ddpu.drohobych.net/>

Засновник і видавець – Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка.

Адреса редакції: Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, обл. Львівська, 82100.
тел.: (0324) 41-04-74, факс: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: vilnickiy@gmail.com

© Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, 2018
© Автори статей 2018

Recommended for publication
by Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University Academic Council
(protocol dd. 29.05.2018 No. 8)

By a Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine this collection of articles is entered into the List of scientific editions in which results of dissertational researches in competition for scientific degrees of doctor and candidate of science in historical disciplines may be published.
(Decree of MES of Ukraine dd. 13.03.2017 No 374).

East European Historical Bulletin / [chief editor Vasyl Ilnytskyi]. – Drohobych: Publishing House “Helvetica”, 2018. – Issue 7. – 212 p.

This collection is meant for scholars, history lecturers, aspirants, doctorants, students and all the readership interested in historical past.

Editorial board do not necessarily reflect the position expressed by the authors of articles, and are not responsible for the accuracy of the data and references.

Chief editor: Vasyl Ilnytskyi – PhD hab. (History), Assist. Professor

Executive editor: Mykola Haliv – PhD (Education), Assist. Professor

Editorial Board:

Volodymyr Borshcheych – PhD hab. (History); **Marek Wagner** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Mykola Vehesh** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Wacław Wierzbieniec** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Andrzej Gliva** – PhD (History) (Poland); **Sergeyi Degtyarev**; **Roman Korsak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Mykola Lytvyn** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Anatoliy Morozow** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Roman Nowacki** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Serhiy Padalka** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Ivan Patryliak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Oleh Petrechko** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Volodymyr Serhiychuk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Oleksander Sytnyk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Galyna Starodubets** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Andrzej Stępnik** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Vitaliy Tel'vak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Vasyl Futala** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Sylwester Czopek** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland).

Reviewers:

Dmytro Bilyi – PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Chair of Choreography and Art Studies, Lviv State Ivan Boberskyi Physical Culture University;

Victor Hutsuliak – PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Chair of Archeology and Special Branches of Historical Science, Cherkassy State Bohdan Khmelnytskyi University;

Vasyl Derevinskyi – PhD hab. (History), Professor of Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture.

The edition has been entered into international scientometric databases: Cite Factor, Google Scholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing, Journal Index, Polish Scholarly Bibliography, Research Bible, Scientific Indexing Services, Index Copernicus International

The articles are equaled to publications in Ukrainian journals entered in international scientometric databases in accordance with the MES of Ukraine order dd. 17 november 2012 p. No. 1112 (amended by the MES of Ukraine order dd. 03.12.2012 No. 1380).

Print media registration certificate «East European Historical Bulletin» series KV No. 22449-12349P dd. 28.12.2016

All electronic versions of articles in the collection are available on the official website edition

<http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://eehb.ddpu.drohobych.net/>

Founder and Publisher: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University.

Office address: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Str., 24, Drohobych, Lviv Region, 82100. tel.: (0324) 41-04-74, fax: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: vilnickiy@gmail.com

© Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 2018

© Copyright by the contributors, 2018

ЗМІСТ

Іван КУЦІЙ РЕЦЕПЦІЯ ЄВРОПИ/ЗАХОДУ У НАУКОВІЙ СПАДЩИНІ МИХАЙЛА МАКСИМОВИЧА	8
Василь МЕНЬКО ГЕНЕЗА ТА ПОХОДЖЕННЯ ПРАВОСЛАВНИХ ЦЕРКОВНИХ БРАТСТВ УКРАЇНИ І БІЛОРУСІЇ У ПРАЦЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІСТОРИЧНОЇ НАУКИ (50-ті рр. ХІХ – поч. ХХ ст.).....	16
Лідія ЛАЗУРКО ЛЬВІВСЬКИЙ ЧАСОПИС «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» ТА УКРАЇНСЬКА ТЕМАТИКА.....	22
Ольга ВЛАДИГА БІЛЯ ВИТОКІВ АРХЕОГРАФІЧНОЇ КОМІСІЇ НТШ: ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В 1894 – 1895 рр.....	31
Тарас БАТЮК СПІВПРАЦЯ МИРОНА КОРДУБИ ІЗ ГАЗЕТОЮ «ДІЛО»	40
Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК, Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК УКРАЇНСЬКА ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ У ДЗЕРКАЛІ ПОЛЬСЬКОЇ ПУБЛІЦИСТИКИ (МИХАЙЛО ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ CONTRA ФРАНЦІШЕК РАВІТА-ГАВРОНСЬКИЙ).....	46
Віталій МАСНЕНКО ЮРІЙ НЕМИРИЧ ЯК ІДЕАЛЬНИЙ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАНТ ШЛЯХЕТСЬКОГО СТАНУ У ВІЗІЇ В'ЯЧЕСЛАВА ЛИПІНСЬКОГО	54
Микола ГАЛІВ НАЦІОНАЛЬНА ПОЛІТИКА РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ТА АВСТРО-УГОРСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЙ НА ВОЛИНІ І В ГАЛИЧИНІ (ПОЧАТОК ХХ ст.): ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ.....	65
Лариса СИНЯВСЬКА РАДЯНСЬКА ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ВАЖКОЇ ПРОМИСЛОВІСТІ СХІДНОГО РЕГІОНУ УКРАЇНИ В УМОВАХ ПЕРШОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ВІЙНИ	75
Вадим МАШТАЛП ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ШЛЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО ВІЙСЬКОВОГО МУЗЕЮ (1917 – 1920 рр.)	88
Олександр КОЗІЙ, Оксана ГОРБАЧИК ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ М. СТАХІВА У ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗАРУБІЖЖЯ ТА СУЧАСНИХ ВІТЧИЗНЯНИХ ІСТОРИКІВ.....	97
Сергій КОРНОВЕНКО СЕЛЯНСЬКИЙ ФАКТОР ПЕРЕХОДУ ДО НОВОЇ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ (1921 р.).....	104

Діана ЯБЛОНСЬКА ФАКУЛЬТЕТИ ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ ОСВІТИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ВИХОВАННЯ КАМ'ЯНЕЦЬ-ПОДІЛЬСЬКОГО ІНСТИТУТУ НАРОДНОЇ ОСВІТИ (1921 – 1930)	111
Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ ВИЯВЛЕННЯ ТА ЛІКВІДАЦІЯ РАДЯНСЬКИМИ РЕПРЕСИВНО-КАРАЛЬНИМИ ОРГАНАМИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ, ПОЛЬСЬКИХ ТА ЄВРЕЙСЬКИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ У м. ДРОГОБИЧ (1940 р.).....	120
Олександра СТАСЮК ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ ПРЕДСТАВНИЦЬКОЇ ГІЛКИ ВЛАДИ У ЗАХІДНОУКРАЇНСЬКИХ ОБЛАСТЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ РСР ПОВОЄННОГО ПЕРІОДУ	151
Дмитро НЕФЬОДОВ ПОВОЄННЕ РОБІТНИЦТВО УРСР (1946 – 1965 рр.) В ОЦІНЦІ ЗАХІДНОЇ РАДЯНОЛОГІЇ	160
Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ, Наталія КАНТОР РЕПРЕСІЇ РАДЯНСЬКОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ПРОТИ РОДИН ПОВСТАНЦІВ У КАРПАТСЬКОМУ КРАЇ ОУН (1945 – 1954).....	173
Яніна ФЕДОРЕНКО РОЗВИТОК АГРОХОЛДИНГОВИХ СТРУКТУР У СІЛЬСЬКІЙ МІСЦЕВОСТІ УКРАЇНИ (ТЕХНОЛОГІЧНІ ПЕРЕВАГИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНІ ЗАГРОЗИ).....	181
Юрій СЛЮСАРЕНКО ПРАВОВЕ РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ЕКОЛОГІЧНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ ПІД ЧАС ВИДОБУТКУ НАФТИ ТА ГАЗУ В УКРАЇНІ.....	189
Ігор ГИРИЧ ЛЬВІВСЬКА ІСТОРИЧНА ШКОЛА МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО: НОВИЙ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНИЙ СИНТЕЗ. Рецензія на: Віталій Тельвак, Василь Педич. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського. Львів: Світ, 2016. 440 с.	199
Микола ЛИТВИН ЛІТОПИС УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ВИЗВОЛЬНОГО РУХУ СЕРЕДИНИ XX СТОЛІТТЯ НА УКРАЇНСЬКО-ПОЛЬСЬКОМУ ПОГРАНИЧЧІ. Рецензія на: В. І. Ільницький. Карпатський край ОУН в українському визвольному русі (1945–1954): монографія / Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України; Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка. Дрогобич: Посвіт, 2016. 696 с.	209

CONTENTS

Ivan KUTSYI THE RECEPTION OF EUROPE/WEST IN THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF THE MYKHAILO MAKSYMOVYCH	8
Vasyl MEN'KO THE ORIGIN AND ONTOGENESIS OF ORTHODOX CHURCH BROTHERHOODS IN UKRAINE AND BELORUSSIA IN THE WORKS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF RUSSIAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE (the 1850s – beginning of the XX century)	16
Lidiya LAZURKO LVIV CHRONICLE «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» AND THE UKRAINIAN ISSUE	22
Olha VLADYHA BY THE ESTUARY OF THE ARCHEOGRAFIC COMMISSION OF THE NTSH (TARAS SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY): MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI'S ACTIVITY IN 1894 – 1895	31
Taras BATIUK MYRON KORDUBA'S COOPERATION WITH THE NEWSPAPER «DILO».....	40
Vitalii TELVAK, Viktoria TELVAK UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE MIRROR OF POLISH JOURNALISM (MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI CONTRA FRANCISHEK RAVITA-GAVRONSKY).....	46
Vitaliy MASNENKO YURIY NEMYRYCH AS AN IDEAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SZLACHTA LAYER IN VYACHESLAV LYPYNSKY'S VISION	54
Mykola HALIV THE NATIONAL POLICIES OF THE RUSSIAN AND AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRES' IN VOLHYNIA AND GALICIA (at the beginning of the XX century): A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	65
Larisa SINYAVSKA SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RESEARCHES OF THE HEAVY INDUSTRY OF EASTERN UKRAINE UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR	75
Vadym MASHTALIR A HISTORICAL WAY OF THE UKRAINIAN STATE MILITARY MUSEUM (1917 – 1920).....	88
Olexandr KOZIY, Oxana HORBACHYK M. STAKHIV'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY IN RESEARCHES BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF UKRAINIANS ABROAD AND CONTEMPORARY DOMESTIC HISTORIANS	97
Sergey KORNOVENKO A PEASANT COMPONENT IN THE TRANSITION TO THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY (1921).....	104

Diana YABLONSKA DEPARTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRAINING OF KAMYANETS-PODILSKYI INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION (1921 – 1930).....	111
Vasyl ILNYTSKYI SPOTTING AND LIQUIDATION OF UKRAINIAN, POLISH AND JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN DROHOBYCH BY SOVIET REPRESSIVE UNITS (1940).....	120
Olexandra STASIUK THE PECULIARITIES OF FORMATION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE BRANCH OF POWER IN THE WEST UKRAINIAN REGIONS OF THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD	151
Dmytro NEFYODOV THE UKRAINIAN SSR POSTWAR WORKING CLASS (1946 – 1965) IN THE EVALUATION OF THE SOVIETOLOGY IN THE WEST.....	160
Vasyl ILNYTSKYI, Natalia KANTOR REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET ADMINISTRATION AGAINST FAMILIES OF INSURGENTS IN KARPATSKYI KRAI OF THE OUN (1945 – 1954)	173
Yanina FEDORENKO DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDING STRUCTURES IN UKRAINE’S COUNTRYSIDE (TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND SOCIAL THREATS).....	181
Yuriy SLUSARENKO LEGAL REGULATION OF ECOLOGICAL SAFETY DURING THE OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION IN UKRAINE.....	189
Ihor HYRYCH MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI LVIV HISTORICAL SCHOOL: A NEW HISTORIOGRAPHIC SYNTHESIS. Review of: Vitalii Telvak, Vasyl Pedych. Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho. Lviv: Svit, 2016. 440 s.....	199
Mykola LYTVYN THE CHRONICLE OF THE UKRAINIAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE MIDDLE OF THE XX CENTURY ON THE UKRAINIAN-POLISH BORDER. Review of: V. I. Ilnytsky. The OUN Carpathian region in Ukrainian liberation movement (1945 – 1954): monograph / Ivan Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine; Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University. Drohobych: Posvit, 2016. 696 p.....	209

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

Dmytro NEFYODOV,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1992-7271

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Дмитро НЕФЬОДОВ,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ключові слова: УРСР, робітництво, історіографія, радянологія.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The work of the American economist J. Berliner «Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev» (Berliner, 1988), an appropriate paragraph of the monograph by British researcher A. Nove (Nove, 1970: 322–368), a collective monograph «Khrushchev and Khrushchevism», published in 1987 under the general editorship of M. McCauley (Khrushchev and Khrushchevism, 1987) and an analytical article by D. Filtzer, devoted to the study of the tariff reform of 1956 (Filtzer, 1989), are of great significance for all further development of Western historiography on the problem of M. Khrushchov's economic policy and the situation of workers in the second postwar decade. The most important conclusion obtained in the process of studying the economic causes of M. Khrushchov's reforms was the one about the need to meet the basic material needs of the population. The research confirms the fact that by the middle of the 1850s the limit in «tightening belts» had been reached and a further development of the Soviet state became impossible without reforms aimed at the material interests of workers. Also, in connection with the expansion of labor freedom in the choice of jobs, the problem of more effective use of the limited resources emerged, that led to the crisis of the planned economy and attempts to find a way out of it (Nove, 1970: 357).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES

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

- Giddens, 1973 – Giddens A. The Glass Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson univ. library, 1973. 336 p. [in English]
- Gleaso, 1984 – Gleaso A. «Totalitarianism» in 1984 // Russian Review. 1984. № 43, P. 145–159. [in English]
- Gripp, 1973 – Gripp R. C. The Political System of Communism, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973. 209 p. [in English]
- Gwertzman, 1982 – Gwertzman B. U.S. Survey Shows a Steady Growth in Soviets G.N.P. // The New York Times. December 26. 1982. P. A6. [in English]
- Harrington, 1972 – Harrington M. Socialism: Past and Future. New York: Bantam, 1972. 336 p. [in English]
- Hollander, 1978 – Hollander P. Soviet and American Society. A Comparison. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 496 p. [in English]
- Inkeles, 1968 – Inkeles A. Social Change in Soviet Russia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. 475 p. [in English]
- Kaser, 1970 – Kaser M. Soviet economics. London: Routledge, 1970. 311 p. [in English]
- Katsenelinboigen, 1978 – Katsenelinboigen A. Studies in Soviet Economic Planning. New York: White Plains, 1978. 229 p. [in English]
- Khrushchev and khrushchevism, 1987 – Khrushchev and khrushchevism / Ed. by M. McCauley. Houndmills et al., 1987. 391 p. [in English]
- Knight, 1978 – Knight R. Why Workers Want to flee USSR // US News and World Report. 1978. Vol. 84. № 21. Pp. 51–60. [in English]
- Krylov, 1979 – Krylov C. A. The Soviet Economy: How It Really Works. Lexington (Massach.): Lexington Books; Heath and Company, 1979. 257 p. [in English]
- Manning, 1953 – Manning C. Ukraine under the Soviets. New York: Bookman associates, 1953. 223 p. [in English]
- Markovic, 1974 – Markovic M. The Contemporary Marx. Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974. 217 p. [in English]
- Matthews, 1972 – Matthews M. Class and society in Soviet Russia. London: Penguin, 1972. 366 p. [in English]
- Millar, 1981 – Millar J. R. The ABC's of Soviet Socialism. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois press, 1981. 215 p. [in English]
- McAuley, 1979 – McAuley A. Economic Welfare in the Soviet Union. Madison, 1979. 269 p. [in English]
- Neuberger, Duffy, 1976 – Neuberger E., Duffy W. Comparative Economic Systems: A Decision – making Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. 354 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1970 – Nove A. An Economic History of the U.S.S.R. London: Penguin, 1970. 448 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1978 – Nove A. The Soviet Economic System. London: Allen and Unwin, 1978. 318 p. [in English]
- Pallet, Shaw, 1981 – Pallet J., Shaw D. Planning in the Soviet Union. London: George Allen a. Unwin, 1981. 250 p. [in English]
- Parkin, 1968 – Parkin F. Middle Class Radicalism. The Social Basis of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Manchester: University Press, 1968. 207 p. [in English]
- Pethybridge, 1974 – Pethybridge R. The Social Prelude to Stalinism London: Macmillan, 1974. 343 p. [in English]
- Schapiro, 1970 – Schapiro L. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. London: University Paperbacks, 1970. 631 p. [in English]
- Society and Politics, 1976 – Society and Politics. Ed. by R. G. Braungert. New Jersey: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1976. 368 p. [in English]
- Teckenberg, 1981–1982 – Teckenberg W. The Social Structure of the Soviet Working Class. Toward an Estatist Society? // International Journal of Sociology. 1981 – 1982. Vol. XI. № 4. P. 1–163. [in English]
- Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.04.2018 р.*

НАУКОВЕ ВИДАННЯ

**СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ
ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК**

**EAST EUROPEAN
HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

ВИПУСК 7

ISSUE 7

Головний редактор
Василь Ільницький

Відповідальний редактор
Микола Галів

Літературне редагування
Ірина Невмержицька

Редагування англomовних текстів
Олег Шалата

Технічний редактор
Лілія Гриник

Макетування та верстка
Наталія Кузнєцова

Дизайн обкладинки
Олег Лазебний

Здано до набору 21.05.2018 р. Підписано до друку 04.06.2018 р.
Гарнітура Times. Формат 70x100 1/16.
Друк офсетний. Папір офсетний.
Ум. друк. арк. 24,65. Зам. № 0618/54
Наклад 300 примірників

Друкарня – Видавничий дім «Гельветика»
73034, м. Херсон, вул. Паровозна, 46-а, офіс 105.
Телефон +38 (0552) 39-95-80
E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.com.ua
Свідectво суб'єкта видавничої справи
ДК № 4392 від 20.08.2012 р.