

**SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF UKRAINIAN SSR POSTWAR WORKING CLASS
(1946–1965) AS VIEWED BY SOVIET SCIENTISTS
OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 1960s – EARLY 1980s**

The purpose of the scientific research is to investigate the Soviet historiography of the second half of the 1960s – early 1980s on the study of the social structure of the Ukrainian SSR postwar working class (1946–1965), its number, quantitative and qualitative changes in its composition.

We established that, according to the interpretation of Soviet historical science of the second half of the 1960s – early 1980s, the quantitative and qualitative changes in the postwar working class composition, progressive changes in its professional and sectoral and also territorial structure became an important factor in the maturation of the social structure of the Soviet society. Soviet historians interpreted these changes as an essential factor in the convergence of classes and social strata, mental and physical labor. Many authors suppressed a real intensification of internal social development disagreement, including the huge disparity in quality growth, particularly in terms of life of working class of various groups. In the works on the social structure of the working class practically nobody put the issue of new forms of social differentiation. The heterogeneity of workers, related to the nature of work, was poorly studied. Many weaknesses of the problem study are connected with the lack of statistical and sociological source information, which was then available to scientists, intractability difficulties and poor grasp of mass sources analysis method (census, one time counts, and media materials).

Key words: *Ukrainian SSR, working class, postwar reconstruction, social structure, historiography, methodology.*

The merger of the party and the government, represented by L. Brezhnev, and his rise in the early 1970s led to a clear promotion of the posture on the need of restoration of Stalin's discipline, at least in the interpretation of the historical past, including recent one. Another ideological debacle of the historical science of the first half of the 1970s finally conquered its representatives which were set the task by the regime to legitimize the «final solution» of the national problem in the Ukrainian SSR and scientifically justify the entry of the Soviet society into the period of «developed socialism». The approach to historical science by those in power during this period was identical to the one during the Stalin era, which gives grounds to speak about systemic availability of neo-Stalinism historiographical metamorphoses.

The purpose of the scientific research is to investigate the Soviet historiography of the second half of the 1960s – early 1980s on the study of the social structure of the Ukrainian SSR postwar working class (1946–1964), its number, quantitative and qualitative changes in its composition.

Various aspects, indirectly identical to the subject of our study, can be found in theses of Yu. Nikolaiets [8], Yu. Laievska [7], the works of O. Dodonov [4], V. Yaremchuk [22], Ya. Grytsak [3].

One of the most pressing thematic areas of the working class issues in the second half of the 1960s – early 1980s was the study of the social structure, the number, quantitative and qualitative changes in the working class composition. According to the Soviet ideological matrix, the Soviet working class is a class of socialist society, which, unlike the proletariat at the times of capitalism, owns the instruments and the means of production, works at enterprises that are the higher nationwide form of the socialist property, is steadily growing in number and increases its financial welfare and cultural level, shows high awareness through creativity in the political, economic and cultural life of the state, has a leading role in the society up to building of communism [2, P. 45]. S. Seniavskiy divided the working class into industrial, construction, transport, services and agriculture workers [17, P. 427]. Characterizing the working class by unified common ground concerning the means of production, leading role

in the social organization of labor and the only major source of livelihood, Soviet researchers at the same time pointed to the multilateral social differentiation of workers [21, P. 4]. The fact that during the investigated period a rapid quantitative growth of the working class and at the same time radical qualitative changes in it took place is emphasized [19, P. 4].

Estimating the growth rate of the working class during the postwar twenty years, the scientist V. Romantsov came to the conclusion that they are significantly higher than the growth rate of the entire population. Thus, if the population of the Ukrainian SSR from 36.6 mln in 1950 increased to 45.1 mln in 1965, i.e. by 23.2%, then the number of industrial workers from 1862000 people in 1950 increased to 3953000 people in 1964, i. e. by 112.3%. This led to the increase of the industrial workers ratio among all workers and employees engaged in the Ukrainian SSR economy from 27.8% in 1950 to 31.3% in 1964 [13, P. 44]. As the researcher noted, generally from 1950 to the mid of the 1960s the number of workers in the Ukrainian SSR industry, construction and transport increased from 3.7 mln to 8 mln people, i.e. more than doubled, and the population of the republic increased only by 25%. As a result, the ratio of these units of the working class increased from 10% to almost 17% [14, P. 34]. Thus, Soviet historians found that the number of workers, employed in leading industries, increased most rapidly. Their ratio in the total number of the working class increased as well.

As the researcher S. Seniavsky objectively stated, the quantitative growth of the working class itself affected the changes in the social structure of the Soviet society, increasing the share of workers of industrial sectors, and within the industrial sectors it increased the ratio of wealth-creators namely workers and engineers [17, P. 210]. The core of the working class, consolidating its internal structure, was still represented by industrial workers. Together with construction, transport and communications workers, which were similar with them as for the nature of work and the degree of concentration in the production teams, they accounted for about 2/3 of the Soviet working class. The agricultural unit took bigger ratio in the working class [16, P. 6]. According to Soviet researchers, the interdependence of the quantitative growth of the working class and progressive changes in the social structure was clearly demonstrated. It is emphasized that the significant ratio increase of the working class among the population of the country by a corresponding number decrease of collective farmers and cooperative artisans and employees within the industry, is a progressive phenomenon, reinforcing the economic and political influence of the working class [10, P. 48].

A number of publications of V. Romantsov are devoted to the changes in qualitative composition of the Ukrainian SSR postwar working class [14–16]. The scientist found that the consequences of the war affected the age structure of the republic industrial workers. In 1947 there was the following distribution by age: workers under 19 constituted 17.7% of their number, from 20 to 25 – 19.7%, from 26 to 49 – 52.5%, from 50 to 59 – 8, 3%, 60 and over – 1.8%. This numerical value enabled the scientist to state the fact that workers under 19 and persons of retirement age constituted 19.5% of the total number of industrial workers at the beginning of the first postwar five-year plan. This was due to the acute shortage of labor force. V. Romantsov explained employment of pensioners at enterprises by the fact that most of them had great production experience and high qualifications, and exactly those workers were urgently needed. Older workers showed true patriotism; recognizing the disastrous state of the postwar industry, they voluntarily went to work at enterprises [12, P. 15]. At the same time V. Romantsov emphasized that during the postwar period the structure of working class according to the age changed significantly. In 1963 the ratio of workers under 19 among them was 5.8%, aged 20–25 – 23.7%, 26–49 – 61.8%, 50–59 – 7.9%, 60 – 0.8% [12, P. 15]. So, during 1947–1963 the share of young people employed in production fell by three times. This is certainly a positive development, indicating that young people of school age had conditions for studying at schools and other educational institutions. At the same time, the researcher points out that during 1947–1963 the significant changes in the composition of the working-

class according to the continuous service took place. The prevailing category was represented by the workers with experience of five or more years (almost 53%). At the same time the ratio of workers experienced up to one year decreased by almost three times, and from one to two years – by two times [12, P. 17].

More details on this aspect are analyzed in the dissertation of the historian Ja. Podpryhorschuk [9]. The scientist emphasized that the change in the qualitative composition of the working class resulted in the increase of ratio of persons with a longer continuous experience among them. The industry experienced a decline of the workers ratio with continuous experience of up to three years and a dramatic increase of the workers ratio with experience from five to ten years. Heavy industries experienced this process even more intensively. The author stresses that during the fifth five-year plan the category of workers with continuous service of five years and more became the dominant one in industry [9, P. 12].

Ja. Podpryhorschuk also considered the qualitative changes in the structure of professional composition of workers. The historian convincingly proved that under the influence of technological progress during the postwar twenty years the professions with prevalence of manual physical labor died out, new professions emerged and many of the old ones changed. Thus, the number of professions in the coal industry decreased from more than 100 at the beginning of the fifth five-year plan to 20 in 1959. Among workers of coal production from 1950 to 1954 the ratio of longwall miners increased from 18.7% to 22.6%, and the ratio of miners engaged mainly in physical work decreased by 7.4%. Such professions as driver and assistant driver of self-propelled combines appeared. In fact such professions as waler, horse driver, horse fettler were eliminated [9, P. 12].

An important discussion in the Soviet historiography of the 1970s took place on the issue of the limits of the working class composition and their possible expansion. The authors of the monograph «Ukrainian SSR working class and its leading role in the building of communism» [11] believe that, under the influence of the scientific and technological revolution and the consequent changes in labor conditions and content, the expanding of the working class boundaries, known within certain limits, occurred. The introduction of new equipment at enterprises led to intellectualization of work in the field of direct production and emerging of new professional groups of workers. Thus, according to the historians, the mental effort share of the work of steelmakers operating electric furnaces is 70%, the one of the automatic lines equipment adjusters is 95% [11, P. 187]. This means that the number of professional workers in the working class increased, the nature of their work required specialized secondary and even higher education. The scientists focused on the fact that it is quite clear that the composition of the working class cannot be restricted by workers who are engaged only in manual labor. Intellectualization of work leads to the progressive blurring of social distinctions between the working and the professional classes, especially between groups engaged in material production. At the same time, the researchers believe that it is wrong to include the professional class engaged in material production into the working-class. In fact, there are real and very significant differences between the majority of workers and the majority of the professional class representatives according to their place in the system of social production, to the content and nature of work [11, P. 188].

According to the researcher V. Kiseliiov, the workers, connected with highly mechanized and automated production, rise to such cultural and technical, production and qualification and educational level at which further development of production inevitably leads to the blurring of differences between them and the engineering staff. As a result of this judgment, the historian tries to prove that the more intensively the nature of work changes and the number of highly skilled workers grows, the more successful the process of blurring of the significant differences between the professional and working classes in general is. According to V. Kiseliiov, a homogeneous nature of work within the working class provides a more

successful process of all distinctions blurring between the working and professional class in terms of the nature of work and the cultural and technical level [6, P. 102].

At the same time, the historians S. Seniavskiyi and V. Telpukhovskiyi oppose the expanding of the working class boundaries due to the inclusion of certain groups of professional class in it. They believe that, along with relation to ownership, one of the criteria of belonging to the working class is the nature and content of the work, which precisely differentiate professional class from workers and employees. In the studied period the content of work retains its socio-economic orientation. The authors indicated that only categories of scientific and technical personnel who perform the functions of skilled workers can be included to the working class [18, P. 375].

According to the researcher L. Kemen, the decisive condition for the study of trends of changes in the working class social structure is the identification of the seamless interrelation of social and professional structural changes. The historian convincingly proves that exactly this ratio expresses the concept of socio-professional structure of the working class. It is this concept that embodies the problem of connection of social and functional and production characteristics of different groups. The thesis of L. Kemen analyzes the problem of synthesis of professional (qualification) and social characteristics of the working class groups. The author assumes that professional characteristics directly and indirectly don't coincide with social features. As a result, the scientist has come to the conclusion that groups of workers who differ in a professional basis, may belong to one social group and vice versa [5, P. 18].

The work of L. Kemen defends the position that this synthesis is expressed by the concept of «social and professional structure». This concept cannot be equated with the concept of professional structure of the working class and take away or rigidly oppose the social and professional structures. Its content is exactly the relationship of social and professional structures. The researcher specifies the concept of «social structure» meaning by it a set of different social strata of the working class, whose existence is due to the socio-economic heterogeneity of labor, reflecting the general features of the socio-economic system, in which the work occurs, and expresses the relationship between the work of this group and the work of the society. The professional structure of the working class is determined by technical and organizational division of labor and expresses differences between groups of workers in terms of technical aspects on connection methods of personal and material elements of production. In the center of the author's study is the socio-professional structure, by which he means the distribution of workers into groups due to social and economic as well as organizational and technical division of labor. This structure is a reflection of the professional structure of the working class in its social structure and expresses the connection of functional and production and socio-economic differences within the working class. Summarizing his analysis, L. Kemen concludes that in the conditions of the variety of social structure changes, the leading element, organizing the whole system of the working class, is presented by the socio-professional structure, which is a concrete expression of the interrelation of the growth process of the working class social homogeneity together with the growing differentiation and integration of professions and specialties during the development of the scientific and technological revolution [5, P. 19].

According to the researcher L. Bliakhman, the social structure of the working class includes interconnected and interacting intraclass groups and relations among them. The social and professional strata, which emerged within the class basing on the social division of labor, are the leading ones. The historian paid special attention to fact that the foundations of working class social structure are based on production, at the same time stressing that the connection between changes in the production structure and changes in the working class social structure is not direct. It is mediated through the changes in professional qualifications structure [1, P. 188].

L. Bliakhman notes that the socio-economic heterogeneity of labor generates the connection with a certain range of professions with certain social strata in the working class. A profession or a group of professions acts as a characteristic of a social group. At the same time, the researcher also demonstrates an inverse relationship: the changes in the occupational structure, including the changes in the content of occupations, according to L. Bliakhman, affect the socio-economic structure of the production workers. The workers with qualitatively different skill levels demonstrate socio-economic heterogeneity of labor [1, P. 189].

One of the most important works on the subject of the working class social structure is the monograph of O. Shkaratan. He defines a social structure as a set of functionally related social strata, historically formed groups of people (classes, nations, and production collectives), connections and relations between them which emerged on the basis of a certain economic structure. According to the author, this definition allows to distinguish a social structure among various structures of the society [21, P. 29].

O. Shkaratan recommends to identify the belonging of specific social groups to the working class according to three interrelated criteria that reflect its position, functions and characteristics in three main areas: a) in the production sphere – belonging to a collective laborer; b) in the socio-economic sphere – belonging to the employees of state enterprises and institutions which get their wages as their share in the distribution of material values according to the quantity and quality of work; c) in the socio-political, ideological and psychological spheres – belonging to people who realized their class unity, their class interests and goals and participate in activities of society and production management [21, P. 100].

O. Shkaratan defines the working class social structure as a set of functionally related social strata and groups which are united by common class features and are different in non-core economic (primary and basic) and socio-psychological (secondary and minor) characteristics. The socio-economic aspect of the differentiation of labor is demonstrated in the division of labor into organizing and executive, and the latter in its turn is divided into mental and physical, skilled and unskilled. Treating the problem of identification of specific criteria of working class social differentiation, O. Shkaratan names the division into groups engaged in mental and physical labor as the first criterion. At the same time, according to the researcher, in the postwar twenty years such division was not a clear boundary but existed as a gradual transition through a series of intermediate types – from the employees of creative, intellectual work to the employees of intellectual physical labor and then to the workers of heavy, monotonous physical labor.

O. Shkaratan considers the division of the organizers and executors of the production process, with a gradual transition from professional managers through the mixed types of members of public authorities to performers, to be the second criterion. This criterion, according to O. Shkaratan, concerning workers of mostly physical labor is belonging to professions groups of different skill level, and in relation to nonmanual workers it is the functional and efficient division into workers who perform the functions of social management (heads of labor collectives), functions of management and the production process control (engineers and similar specialists), executive functions of scientific and technical work (researchers, designers, etc.) [21, P. 156]. All empirical criteria of social strata differentiation enumerated by O. Shkaratan involve such parameters as type of employment, position, profession, qualification, participation in public administration.

We have to pay special attention to exceptionally broad division classification of the Soviet working class presented by O. Shkaratan up to including the representatives of senior management and heads of organizations into the ranks of workers. This social differentiation of O. Shkaratan depends on the judgment about the workers' leadership in the Soviet society, and training of management exclusively from the working class, which is an extremely controversial position. Moreover, even central statistical office of the Ukrainian SSR provides less detailed qualification in which industrial workers only according to the degree of work

mechanization are divided into: a) those who are engaged in operation and control of the machines; b) those who perform work by means of machines and mechanisms; c) those who perform work both manually and by means of machines and mechanisms; d) those who perform work without machines and mechanisms; e) those who perform manual work adjusting and repairing machines and mechanisms [21, P. 330].

According to the researcher O. Shatalova, the social structure of the working class is objectively presented in a number of specific structures. First of all the Soviet historical science stated that the working class included sectoral structure due to the division of social production into large areas. It includes the industrial unit (workers of industry, transport, construction); the agricultural unit (workers of agriculture, forestry and fisheries); service workers (trade, catering); workers of science and scientific services (pilot production) [20, P. 25]. O. Shatalova also found that the social division of labor into different types and the corresponding differentiation within them determine distinguishing of working class professional structure. The professional division means grouping of workers according to specific types of activity, identity of knowledge and skills in a particular area. The professional structure is closely related to qualification structure, suggesting the existence of blue-collar occupations of high, medium and low qualifications. According to Soviet historians, in the conditions of scientific and technical revolution, the vocational qualification structure of the working class was largely dependent on workers' cultural and educational level. Therefore, the Soviet historiography also suggests to distinguish the cultural and educational structure of the working class, which consists of groups which differ according to the degree of intellectual culture development and general and special training duration (primary, basic secondary, complete secondary, vocational and higher education) [20, P. 26].

Thus, according to the interpretation of the Soviet historical science of the second half of the 1960s – early 1980s, the quantitative and qualitative changes in the postwar working class composition, the progressive changes in its professional and sectoral and also territorial structure became an important factor in the maturation of the social structure of the Soviet society. Soviet historians interpreted these changes as an essential factor in the convergence of classes and social strata, mental and physical labor.

One of the most important areas of the research is presented by the study of the internal development of the working class, the dynamics of its social character, the quantitative and qualitative changes. The main internal processes of social development of the working class included its quantitative (absolute and relative) growth (in the conditions of the population decline), growth of the career workers ratio, intensification of reproduction tendency, concentration mainly in industrial areas and large industrial collectives.

Many authors suppressed a real intensification of internal social development disagreement, including the huge disparity in quality growth, in life conditions of various working class groups. The historians focused mainly on industry workers. The development of transport, agriculture, research and production, service workers was studied less. In the works on the working class social structure they practically did not pay attention to the new forms of social differentiation. The researchers seemed not to notice those groups which, due to various factors and reasons, got a privileged position in the society or the most backward one. They didn't analyze the issue of new forms of social inequality. The heterogeneity of workers, related to the nature of work, was poorly studied. It should be noted that in some works they exaggerated the degree of social homogeneity of society, convergence of the workers with other social groups, peasants, and intellectuals. It was assumed that an intense blurring of interclass differences took place.

Many weaknesses of the problem study are connected with the lack of statistical and sociological source information, which was then available to scientists, intractability difficulties and poor grasp of mass sources analysis method (census, one time counts, and media materials).

ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Бляхман Л. С., Шкаратан О. И. НТР, рабочий класс, интеллигенция. Москва: Политиздат, 1973. 320 с.
2. Вопросы историографии рабочего класса СССР : сб. ст. / Ред. кол.: М. П. Ким (гл. ред.) и др. Москва: Мысль, 1970. 327 с.
3. Грицак Я. Українська історіографія. 1991–2001: Десятиліття змін // Україна модерна. Київ; Львів, 2005. Ч. 9. С. 43–68.
4. Додонов О. Ф. Нове бачення періодизації історії радянського робітничого класу і його історіографії // Культурологічний вісник: Науково-теоретичний щорічник Нижньої Наддніпрянщини. Вип. 8. Запоріжжя: Просвіта, 2002. С. 67–74.
5. Кемень Ласло. Научно-техническая революция и изменение социально-профессиональной структуры рабочего класса в социалистическом обществе : автореф. дис. на соискание уч. степени канд. философ. наук : спец. 09.00.02 «Теория научного коммунизма». Москва, 1978. 26 с.
6. Киселёв В. Н. Рабочий класс СССР – руководящая сила строительства коммунизма. – Казань: Изд-во Казан. ун-та, 1969. 223 с.
7. Лаєвська Ю. В. Перетворення в економіці України в 1953–1964 рр.: історіографія проблеми : дис. ... кандидата іст. наук : 07.00.06. – Донецьк, 2008. 218 с.
8. Ніколаєць Ю. О. Суспільно-політичні процеси в УРСР другої половини 1940-х – першої половини 1960-х років: українська історіографія : дис. ... доктора іст. наук : 07.00.06. Київ, 2008. 481 с.
9. Подпригорщук Я. В. Рабочий класс Украины в период пятой пятилетки (1951–1955 гг.) : автореф. дис. на соискание уч. степени канд. ист. наук : спец. 07.00.02 «История СССР». Киев, 1969. 23 с.
10. Рабочий класс развитого социалистического общества / [Л. С. Гапоненко, И. Е. Ворожейкин, С. Л. Сенявский и др.]. Москва: Мысль, 1974. 276 с.
11. Рабочий класс СССР и его ведущая роль в строительстве коммунизма / [Ц. А. Степанян, А. И. Арнольдов, Б. С. Маньковский и др.]. Москва: Наука, 1975. 568 с.
12. Романцов В. О. Зміни в якісному складі робітничого класу промисловості Української РСР у післявоєнний період // Український історичний журнал. 1966. № 12. С. 13–21.
13. Романцов В. О. Кількісні зміни робітничого класу промисловості Української РСР (1946–1964 рр.) // Український історичний журнал. 1966. № 2. С. 38–44.
14. Романцов В. О. Про зміни структури робітничого класу УРСР за статтю та віком у післявоєнний період // Український історичний журнал. 1971. № 4. С. 27–34.
15. Романцов В. О. Робітничий клас Української РСР (1946–1970 рр.). Київ: Вид-во Київ. ун-ту, 1972. 219 с.
16. Романцов В. О. Робітничий клас Української РСР в період розвинутого соціалізму // Український історичний журнал. 1975. № 6. С. 3–14.
17. Сенявский С. Л. Изменения в социальной структуре советского общества 1938–1970. Москва: Мысль, 1973. 447 с.
18. Сенявский С. Л., Тельпуховский В. Б. Рабочий класс СССР (1938–1965 гг.). Москва: Мысль, 1971. 536 с.
19. Цветков П. М. Изменение структуры рабочего класса в период построения социализма в СССР. Москва: Высшая школа, 1975. 153 с.
20. Шаталова О. А. Социально-политические аспекты воспроизводства рабочего класса в условиях зрелого социализма : дис. ... кандидата философ. наук : 09.00.02. Москва, 1984. 188 с.
21. Шкаратан О. И. Проблемы социальной структуры рабочего класса СССР (Историко-социологическое исследование). Москва: Мысль, 1970. 472 с.
22. Яремчук В. Минуле України в історичній науці УРСР післясталінської доби. Острог: Вид-во Нац. ун-ту «Острозька академія», 2009. 526 с.

REFERENCES

1. Blyakhman L. S., Shkaratan O. I. NTR, rabochiy klass, intelligentsiya. Moskva: Politizdat, 1973. 320 s.
2. Voprosy istoriografii rabocheho klassa SSSR : sb. st. / Red. kol.: M. P. Kim (gl. red.) i dr. Moskva: Mysl, 1970. 327 s.

3. Hrytsak Ya. Ukrayinska istoriografiya. 1991–2001: Desyatylittya zmin // Ukrayina moderna. Kyiv; Lviv, 2005. Ch. 9. S. 43–68.
4. Dodonov O. F. Nove bachennya periodyzatsiyi istoriyi radyanskoho robitnychoho klasu i yoho istoriografiyi // Kulturolohichnyy visnyk: Naukovo-teoretychnyy shchorichnyk Nyzhnoyi Naddnipryanshchyny. Vyp. 8. Zaporizhzhya: Prosvita, 2002. S. 67–74.
5. Kemen Laslo. Nauchno-tehnicheskaya revolyutsiya i izmenenie sotsialno-professionalnoy struktury rabocheho klasa v sotsialisticheskoy obshchestve : avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uch. stepeni kand. filosof. nauk : spets. 09.00.02 «Teoriya nauchnogo kommunizma». Moskva, 1978. 26 s.
6. Kiselev V. N. Rabochiy klass SSSR – rukovodyashchaya sila stroitelstva kommunizma. – Kazan: Izd-vo Kazan. un-ta, 1969. 223 s.
7. Layevska Yu. V. Peretvorenniya v ekonomitsi Ukrainy v 1953–1964 rr.: istoriografiya problemy : dys. ... kandydata ist. nauk : 07.00.06. – Donetsk, 2008. 218 s.
8. Nikolayets Yu. O. Suspilno-politychni protsesy v URSR druhoi polovyny 1940-kh – pershoi polovyny 1960-kh rokiv: ukrayinska istoriografiya : dys. ... doktora ist. nauk : 07.00.06. Kyiv, 2008. 481 s.
9. Podprigorshchuk Ya. V. Rabochiy klass Ukrainy v period pyatoy pyatiletki (1951–1955 gg.) : avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uch. stepeni kand. ist. nauk : spets. 07.00.02 «Istoriya SSSR». Kiev, 1969. 23 s.
10. Rabochiy klass razvitogo sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva / [L. S. Gaponenko, I. E. Vorozheykin, S. L. Senyavskiy i dr.]. Moskva: Mysl, 1974. 276 s.
11. Rabochiy klass SSSR i ego vedushchaya rol v stroitelstve kommunizma / [Ts. A. Stepanyan, A. I. Arnoldov, B. S. Mankovskiy i dr.]. Moskva: Nauka, 1975. 568 s.
12. Romantsov V. O. Zminy v yakisnomu skladi robitnychoho klasu promyslovosti Ukrayinskoyi RSR u pislyavoyennyi period // Ukrayinskyy istorychnyy zhurnal. 1966. № 2. S. 13–21.
13. Romantsov V. O. Kilkisni zminy robitnychoho klasu promyslovosti Ukrayinskoyi RSR (1946–1964 rr.) // Ukrayinskyy istorychnyy zhurnal. 1966. № 2. S. 38–44.
14. Romantsov V. O. Pro zminy struktury robitnychoho klasu URSR za statyuu ta vikom u pislyavoyennyi period // Ukrayinskyy istorychnyy zhurnal. 1971. № 4. S. 27–34.
15. Romantsov V. O. Robitnychyy klas Ukrayinskoyi RSR (1946–1970 rr.). Kyiv: Vyd-vo Kyiv. un-tu, 1972. 219 s.
16. Romantsov V. O. Robitnychyy klas Ukrayinskoyi RSR v period rozvynutoho sotsializmu // Ukrayinskyy istorychnyy zhurnal. 1975. № 6. S. 3–14.
17. Senyavskiy S. L. Izmeneniya v sotsialnoy strukture sovetskogo obshchestva 1938–1970. Moskva: Mysl, 1973. 447 s.
18. Senyavskiy S. L., Telpukhovskiy V. B. Rabochiy klass SSSR (1938–1965 gg.). Moskva: Mysl, 1971. 536 s.
19. Tsvetkov P. M. Izmenenie struktury rabocheho klasa v period postroeniya sotsializma v SSSR. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1975. 153 s.
20. Shatalova O. A. Sotsialno-politicheskie aspekty vosproizvodstva rabocheho klasa v usloviyakh zrelogo sotsializma : dis. ... kandidata filosof. Nauk : 09.00.02. Moskva, 1984. 188 s.
21. Shkaratan O. I. Problemy sotsialnoy struktury rabocheho klasa SSSR (Istoriko-sotsiologicheskoe issledovanie). Moskva: Mysl, 1970. 472 s.
22. Yaremchuk V. Mynule Ukrainy v istorychniy nautsi URSR pislyastalinskoyi doby. Ostroh: Vyd-vo Nats. un-tu «Ostrozka akademiya», 2009. 526 s.

Нефьодов Д. Соціальна структура повоєнного робітництва УРСР (1946–1965 рр.) очима радянських науковців другої половини 1960-х – першої половини 1980-х рр.

Метою наукової розвідки є дослідження радянської історіографії другої половини 1960-х – першої половини 1980-х рр. щодо вивчення соціальної структури робітництва УРСР повоєнного періоду (1946–1965 рр.), чисельності, кількісних і якісних змін його складу.

Встановлено, що, відповідно до трактування радянської історичної науки другої половини 60-х – першої половини 80-х рр., кількісні та якісні зміни в складі повоєнного робітничого класу, прогресивні зрушення в його професійно-галузевій і територіальній структурі стали важливим фактором визрівання соціальної структури радянського суспільства. Радянські історики трактували дані зміни в якості найважливішого чинника зближення класів і соціальних верств, розумової та фізичної праці. Багато авторів замовчували реальне посилення протиріч внутрішнього соціального розвитку, зокрема, величезні диспропорції в якісному зростанні, в умовах життя різних загонів робітничого класу. У роботах

про соціальну структуру робітничого класу практично не ставили питання про нові види соціальної диференціації. Слабо розкривалася неоднорідність робітників, пов'язана з характером праці. Багато слабкостей вивчення проблеми пов'язані з недостатністю джерельної інформації статистичного і соціологічного характеру, яка перебувала тоді в розпорядженні вчених, трудноцями обробки і слабким володінням методикою аналізу масових джерел (перепису, одноразових обліків, матеріалів засобів масової інформації).

Ключові слова: УРСР, робітничий клас, повоєнна відбудова, соціальна структура, історіографія, методологія.

Одержано 31.08.2017.

УДК 355.1(47+57):581) «1979/1989»

Дмитро Островик
(Переяслав-Хмельницький)

ОРГАНІЗАЦІЯ ПОБУТУ РАДЯНСЬКИХ ВІЙСЬК ПІД ЧАС ВОЄННО-ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ СПЕЦОПЕРАЦІЇ СРСР В АФГАНІСТАНІ 1979–1989 рр. (ЗА МАТЕРІАЛАМИ «ВОЄННО-МЕДИЦИНСКОГО ЖУРНАЛА»)

У статті здійснено аналіз публікацій «Военно-медицинского журнала» 1990-х рр., у яких піднімалися питання санітарно-гігієнічного та протиепідемічного забезпечення радянських військ під час воєнно-політичної спецоперації СРСР в Афганістані 1979–1989 рр. Окреслено основні тематичні напрямки досліджень фахівців. Встановлено, що зазначені питання розкривалися у публікаціях працівників медичної служби А. Карцева, В. Королькова, В. Колкова, В. Крайнього, В. Мандрика, С. Нікіфорова, В. Перепьолкіна, Л. Яньшина та ін.

Розгляд публікацій засвідчив низку проблем в організації побутових умов радянських військ в Афганістані, що мали місце в силу неготовності медичної служби до проведення відповідних профілактичних заходів серед військових на перших етапах війни, недоліків матеріально-технічного забезпечення медиків, не своєчасного їх допуску при «розбудовах» гарнізонів радянських військ. Чільне місце серед них займали проблеми неналежного санітарного нагляду за військовими «містечками», проблеми індивідуальних та колективних засобів очистки та знезараження води для питних і господарських потреб військових тощо.

Ключові слова: Афганістан, війна, 40-ва Армія, побут, «Военно-медицинский журнал», медичне забезпечення, санітарія.

Історіографія афганських подій 1979–1989 рр., учасниками яких виступав, з одного боку, офіційний кабульський режим, з іншого, – Радянський Союз та незаконні збройні формування, виокремилась в окремий розділ історичної науки. Тематика, піднята дослідниками, досить багатопланова: це й дискусії щодо причин та передумов збройного конфлікту в умовах геополітичного розвитку регіону, воєнного параметру, оцінок кампанії у цілому. Меншою мірою розвинена тема житлово-побутових умов військових Обмеженого контингенту радянських військ в Афганістані (далі – ОКРВ).

Проте й даний аспект проблеми частково представлений у науковому дискурсі. Мова йде, поряд з іншим, про публікації фахівців медичної служби 40-ї Армії та дослідників медичного забезпечення радянських військ у ході війни. Результати їхніх досліджень оприлюднені на сторінках «Военно-медицинского журнала» (далі – ВМЖ). Оскільки, як зауважував Л. Яньшин, одним із комплексних завдань медичної служби 40-ї Армії в Афганістані було «здійснення попереднього та поточного санітарного нагляду за облаштуванням військових містечок, умовами життєзабезпечення особового складу в пунктах постійної дислокації та вирішення гігієнічних проблем, пов'язаних із особливостями регіону перебування військ» [13, с. 41]. Тому у статті об'єктом