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Abstract

AARON TODD HALE-DORRELL: For Peace and Friendship of All Countries: Soviet Citizens' Opinions of Peace During the Cold War, May 1960
(Under the Direction of Dr. Donald J. Raleigh)

This thesis analyzes a public opinion survey that sociologist Boris Grushin conducted in the Soviet Union in May 1960. His survey asked average Soviet citizens about war and peace immediately following a Cold War incident in which the Soviet military destroyed an American U-2 spy plane that had violated Soviet airspace. This thesis questions why, despite resulting heightened tensions between the superpowers, 96.8 percent of survey respondents expressed confidence that humanity could prevent war. I argue that, while propaganda promoting Khrushchev's “peaceful coexistence” policy influenced every respondent, some respondents emphasized different official policies and explanations for events, demonstrating a degree of independence from propaganda. Furthermore, respondents justified belief in peace and integrated themselves into a collective war narrative by describing experiences of World War II. Finally, I show that official interest in public opinion reflects Khrushchev-era political and cultural reforms, especially in Soviet journalism and sociology.
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For Peace and Friendship of All Countries: Soviet Citizens' Opinions of Peace during the Cold War, May 1960

Although public opinion surveys crucially contribute to political life in modern democracies, they predictably did not exist in the Soviet Union during the reign of Josef Stalin (1928-53). After Stalin's death, political changes under his successor, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev (1953-64), allowed polling of Soviet citizens. In this thesis, I examine the results of and contextualize the first Soviet opinion survey, which sociologist Boris A. Grushin conducted between May 10 and May 14, 1960, with the support of Komsomol'skaia pravda, the daily newspaper of the Young Communist League. In the survey, a remarkable 96.8 percent of one thousand respondents answered “Yes” to the question “Can humanity prevent war?”1 In addition to quantifying respondents' faith in peace despite the Cold War, Grushin's groundbreaking survey exemplified a dialogue, inconceivable during the Stalin era, between Soviet citizens and the Party-state. Not surprisingly, the results show that respondents' answers fell within the boundaries of what was ideologically acceptable, signaling this communication's limits. Ultimately, this new relationship between state and society could not have developed without post-Stalin reforms in journalism and the rebirth of sociology that Grushin's survey embodies.

Grushin conducted his survey against the backdrop of the highly publicized “U-2 Incident,” which began on May 1, 1960, and heightened the survey results' importance.2


2 For a detailed account of the U-2 incident, see Michael Beschloss, Mayday: Eisenhower, Khrushchev, and the U-2 Affair (New York: Harper & Row, 1986). Beschloss, writing before the opening of Soviet archives, uses American documents and offers an American perspective. William Taubman, in his biography of Khrushchev, covers these events from a Soviet angle. See “From the U-2 to the UN Shoe: April-September
that day, the Soviet military destroyed an American U-2 spy plane conducting a photoreconnaissance mission over the USSR and captured its pilot, Francis Gary Powers. An international incident resulted that ruined the Paris Summit involving the leaders of Great Britain, France, the United States, and the Soviet Union, scheduled to begin on May 16. In the intervening two weeks, Soviet propaganda characterized the United States and its allies as aggressive militarists who endangered the stability that “peaceful coexistence” offered.

Peaceful coexistence had dominated Soviet Cold War discourse after Stalin's death. It partially explains respondents' confidence that peace would prevail, despite the furor over the U-2 incident. During Stalin's final years, Kremlin doctrine regarding the Soviet Union's capitalist adversaries had presumed an antagonistic relationship, which might include war with the West. After 1953, Khrushchev advanced peaceful coexistence, seeking to curtail the threat of war between the nuclear-armed superpowers. Relations between the two governments intermittently improved. The resulting alleviation of tensions offered the Soviet Union opportunities to grow its economy and gain influence among the newly independent states of the Third World. Under Khrushchev, Soviet media and propaganda organs promoted peaceful coexistence, promising citizens that the socialist system would prove its superiority to capitalism not in war, but in economic, material, and technological progress. Proclaiming outrage at the U-2 incident, Soviet newspapers stressed the idea of the Western powers' aggression. Although this indictment of the United States' actions might have weakened Soviet citizens' belief in peaceful coexistence's potential—but not the Soviet commitment to it—the


4 Ibid., 138.
results of the survey show that it, in large part, did not. So

Viet propaganda had profound, but not absolute, influence on Grushin's respondents' opinions. Soviet rhetoric about the U-2 incident and the looming summit placed issues of war and peace at the forefront of public consciousness. In May 1960, Komsomol'skaia pravda focused its propaganda on the conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States surrounding the U-2 incident. The newspaper denounced the espionage as a violation of international law and Soviet airspace. It protested the United States government's initial attempts to conceal the flight's true mission. The quarrel escalated when Khrushchev played his trump cards, producing Powers' documents, equipment, and finally, the pilot himself. Komsomol'skaia pravda hailed Soviet missiles' superiority, evidenced by the destruction of the plane “with the first shot.” It published pictures of the U-2's wreckage and of Powers, cartoons satirizing Western attempts to “invade” the Soviet Union, and Khrushchev's denunciation of the “provocation.” One characteristic cartoon depicts a sinister figure using a slingshot to launch a plane, labeled “provocations,” toward the Soviet Union. Despite this intensity, the U-2 incident remained a solely diplomatic


5 Contemporary American surveys revealed an opposing trend in public opinion. In October 1959, following Khrushchev's visit to the United States, 40 percent of Americans surveyed believed that war with “the Russians” was possible, while only 46 percent held the view that peace could endure. In June 1960, following the U-2 incident and the failure of the summit in Paris, a second survey found that 50 percent of Americans thought war possible and only 30 percent believed in peace. Hazel G. Erzkine, “The Polls: Defense, Peace, and Space,” The Public Opinion Quarterly 25, 3 (Autumn 1961): 488.

6 “Raketoi, s pervogo vystrela” (By a Rocket, With the First Shot), Komsomol'skaia pravda, May 7, 1960. Soviet readers knew little of previous flights, which had begun on July 4, 1956. This was simply the first time that a U-2 strayed too close to new, more effective anti-aircraft defenses. Taubman, Khrushchev, 443.
and public relations battle.

The Paris Summit, scheduled to begin on May 16, formed another part of the survey’s context that *Komsomol’skaia pravda* developed. Khrushchev’s peaceful coexistence policy had been less prominently featured in the press during the preceding two weeks, but *Komsomol’skaia pravda* diverted attention from the U-2 incident to emphasize the meeting’s potential to promote peace. Grushin’s survey questionnaire reminded respondents that “on May 16 a meeting of the heads of government of the USSR, USA, England, and France, dedicated to problems of peace, will open in Paris.”

Positive portrayals of the summit, such as the cartoon entitled “The Peoples’ Will,” appeared even on the day the summit failed. The cartoonist portrayed the Cold War as a serpent, succumbing to the world's collective desire for peace and agreements among the four powers, represented by the negotiating table.

*Komsomol’skaia pravda* used the survey’s results to demonstrate Soviet citizens’ belief in peaceful coexistence and their commitment to peace, regardless of the United States’ “provocations” and the failure of the summit. The summit's collapse signaled tensions that had been mounting over time, but peaceful coexistence persisted on *Komsomol’skaia pravda’s*

---

7 A blank questionnaire with this prompt and the survey's questions is located in Appendix I.
pages after the failure in Paris. On May 19, the newspaper published the survey, revealing respondents' overwhelming assurance that peace would succeed. That issue's banner headline declared “Our Path is Truly Lain, the USSR Stands Firmly in Favor of Peaceful Coexistence.”

What explains the fact that peaceful coexistence elicited a response among Soviet citizens and that 96.8 percent of respondents answered “Yes” to Grushin's first survey question? Sociologist Vladimir Shlapentokh describes a contradiction, which he observed in his sociological studies, between Soviet citizens' acceptance of official principles in regard to what they said and to what they did in daily life. He identifies two “levels of public opinion” to facilitate understanding of this inconsistency. On one level, which Shlapentokh names “the mythological level,” citizens expressed support for Soviet leaders, policies, and values relating to issues far removed from their personal experiences. Shlapentokh states that this level “is also characterized by various concrete beliefs which are a part of the official dominant ideology. These beliefs constitute the core of the individual's perception of the world beyond his or her immediate experience.” As Grushin's survey shows, citizens' opinions particularly conformed to Soviet discourse on matters about the outside world, official policies, and leaders. Citizens believed in the superiority of the Soviet Union's social structure, economy, and foreign relations, even if their everyday experiences fell short of expectations created by official policies. On the level of daily life, Shlapentokh’s “pragmatic level,” individuals violated

---


9 Ibid., 450.

10 The Harvard Interview Project documented former Soviet citizens' views in the early 1950s in a survey of refugees who found themselves outside the Soviet Union at the end of World War II and whose last period of non-wartime life in the Soviet Union had been prior to 1941. The interviewers found that citizens believed in the superiority of the Soviet Union's social structure, economy, and foreign relations, even as they acknowledged that daily life fell short of official goals. Raymond Bauer and Alex Inkeles, *The Soviet Citizen: Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 371.
Soviet norms intended to govern behavior. Shlapentokh's example contrasts these two levels in regard to citizens' attitudes toward work. They agreed with the abstract statement, “Labor is one of the most important human needs and is a basis for self-esteem,” while they concurrently pursued individualistic, self-serving ends such as the attainment of money, power, sex, or material goods.

Shlapentokh’s “mythological” level of public opinion helps to explain the nearly unanimous result of the survey's first question, but respondents demonstrated more complex attitudes toward official ideas in their replies to two secondary questions. Grushin's survey asked, “On what do you base your confidence (in your first answer)?” and “What should be done above all to strengthen peace?” Responses to these questions reveal that some respondents merely parroted propaganda while others' opinions demonstrated a complex interaction between propaganda and personal experiences. Individuals' experiences were especially important in responses to the survey's final two questions, which inquired about participation and losses in World War II, demonstrated those events' influence on their worldviews, and provoked the survey's most emotionally moving responses.

Instead of focusing on the survey's statistical results, I examine the twenty-five unabridged responses that Komsomol'skaia pravda published in conjunction with Grushin's analysis on May 19, 1960. I contextualize the survey, relating it to the newspaper's concurrent portrayals of world events, peaceful coexistence, and the Soviet Union's adversaries. I privilege statements that connect official interpretations, respondents' past personal experiences, and their opinions about contemporaneous news stories because they facilitate answering the following questions: Why, despite the Soviet media's denunciation of the U-2 incident, did Soviet citizens express nearly unanimous confidence in the prospect of maintaining peace?
What does the survey reveal about the relationship between the Party-state, citizens' views, and events at home and abroad?

I use two published sources to answer these questions: The first is a book that Grushin published in 2001, *Chetyre zhizni Rossii v zerkale oprosov obschestvennogo mneniia* (Four Periods of Russia in the Mirror of Public Opinions Surveys). In the first of four volumes, *Zhizn' pervaia: Epokha Khrushcheva* (The First Period: The Epoch of Khrushchev), Grushin makes retrospective commentary on individual surveys, his methodology, and public opinion in the Khrushchev era that political constraints of the 1960s had prevented. I refer on several occasions in this thesis to this recent analysis, made with the benefit of experience accumulated over the intervening decades' of work on Soviet and post-Soviet Russian public opinion. The second source is *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, which published the twenty-five responses that I analyze and Grushin's assessment of the entire sample on May 19, 1960. The responses that Grushin included in his book are identical to the corresponding texts in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, indicating that the newspaper had not edited or censored them.

Since the Khrushchev era, fresh conceptual models and the availability of new sources have modified scholars' perceptions of Soviet society, including the role of public opinion in it. Most Western scholars in Khrushchev's time accepted the totalitarian model, which privileged study of the highest political leadership and presumed state dominance of an “atomized” population of individuals, isolated and fearful of exchanging opinions. The post-Stalin era

---

11 The full title is *Chetyre zhizni Rossii v zerkale oprosov obschestvennogo mneniia: Ocherki massovogo soznaniia rossian vremen Khrushcheva, Brezhneva, Gorbacheva, i El'tsina v 4-kh knigakh* [Essays on Mass Consciousness of Russians in the Times of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Gorbachev, and Yeltsin, in Four Volumes] (Moscow: Progress-Traditsia, 2001). The Hoover Institution for War, Peace, and Defense at Stanford University holds some of Grushin's papers. Documents relevant to the survey form part of a collection of Grushin's work in “Institut obschestvennogo mneniia, uchezdennyi gazetoi Komsomol'skaia pravda, 1960-67,” Box 1, Folders 8-13. While Grushin reproduced much of this material in his book, these files include distinct documents such as an unused survey questionnaire, instructions to those who conducted the survey, and Grushin's manual statistical tallies of the results.

12 The totalitarian model influenced the researchers of the Harvard Interview Project. However, in an early
moderated the extremes that had inspired the totalitarian model, encouraging a generation of revisionist scholars to reexamine the Khrushchev period during the 1960s and 1970s. While the totalitarian school had seen continuities with Stalin and downplayed Khrushchev's reforms, revisionist scholars looked for ways to understand two opposing trends in Soviet politics, society, and ideology. In place of prejudicial or technical terminology, the terms “reformer” and “conservative,” as they are understood in other contexts, fit the Soviet case. Each represented a diversity of viewpoints, from moderate to extreme. The “friends and foes of change” were in competition throughout the post-Stalin period. The obstruction of Khrushchev's reforms and his removal reflected inertia, or insufficient “enlightenment” among the bureaucracy, and his overthrow resulted from a coalition of moderates from both sides. Other scholars of the 1970s envisioned Khrushchev as a “populist leader,” who built his authority by appealing to broad segments of society and who believed in the people's inclination to behave as responsible citizens. Recent scholarship suggests that Khrushchev's belief in the people enabled his political and economic reforms aimed at “constructing Communism by 1980.”

13 Stephen F. Cohen, “The Friends and Foes of Change: Reformism and Conservatism in the Soviet Union,” *Slavic Review* 38, 2 (June 1979): 187-202. Cohen described diverse reform and conservative coalitions that shifted with time and changing conditions, rather than remaining rigid and monolithic blocs. This understanding clarified how Khrushchev was able to gain support for his reforms and the Brezhnev “reaction” quietly left in place many of Khrushchev's programs.

14 George Breslauer, *Khrushchev and Brezhnev as Leaders: Building Authority in Soviet Politics* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1982), 52. Breslauer positions Khrushchev's populist appeal in a framework of “building authority,” the ability to marshal support for policies and programs. This contrasted with prior conceptions that undervalued policymaking and focused on Soviet leaders' personal control over the system.

15 Iurii Aksiutin and Aleksandr Pyzhikov interpret Khrushchev's actions as part of plans for a “government of all the people” (*obshchenarodnoe gosudarstvo*), incorporating mass participation and oversight of the Party-state. However, entrenched elites opposed the plan and realities of the one-party state blunted the reforms.
The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the “archival revolution” have provided scholars access to governmental and Party records, encouraging reexamination of the relationship between state and society. In archived letters to Soviet media and officials—as well as svodki, reports on popular opinion that the security services gathered—scholars have found that in the Khrushchev era Soviet citizens could express personal worldviews.\footnote{16} Citizens entered an embryonic public sphere to discuss events, issues, and ideas in dialogue with official positions, a development that could have occurred only in the comparatively permissive period that followed Stalin's death.\footnote{17} Other scholars have investigated citizens' heightened belief in the government's promises and programs, finding that local officials' failure to meet citizens' expectations could lead to expressions of discontent and civic disturbances.\footnote{18} This scholarship

---


\footnote{18} Vladimir A. Kozlov, \textit{Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the Post-Stalin Years}, trans. Elaine M. MacKinnon (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), 313. Using material from central archives to study such events, Kozlov finds that citizens might protest failures to meet their expectations for Soviet society while expressing faith in the overarching goals and highest leadership. Kozlov equates this to the
indicates that, while Soviet propaganda influenced views and encouraged belief in Soviet principles, citizens did not uncritically accept official pronouncements. I situate my work on Grushin's pioneering survey into this small but growing understanding of Soviet public opinion in the Khrushchev era.

Changes after Stalin: Society, Culture, Sociology, and Journalism

By relaxing controls on cultural life and allowing public discussion of issues formerly prohibited, the “Thaw” altered many aspects of the Stalinist system after 1953, influencing Soviet citizens' views and creating the conditions necessary for Grushin's survey. The state attempted to satisfy demands for consumer goods, housing, and an improved diet. It released prisoners from Stalin's labor camps, a development that put pressure on the leadership to face the question of Stalin's crimes. As a result, Khrushchev made his “Secret Speech” to the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, denouncing these negative aspects of Stalin's legacy. Yet, later that year, Khrushchev quelled Hungary's reform efforts and attempt to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, proving that de-Stalinization had its limits. Events such as the Moscow World Youth Festival in 1957 allowed increased contact with foreign visitors and ideas. Amid this

---

19 Relaxed controls on cultural matters allowed publication of Il'ia Ehrenburg's The Thaw (1954), which gave the period its name. The novel stimulated real debate about Soviet society in public forums, which had never occurred under Stalin. On the relative openness of the time and the effects of the end of mass terror, see Zubkova, Russia after the War, 201.


21 Rósa Magnúsdóttir describes the results of the festival, which allowed unprecedented exchange of ideas and culture among youth. Instead of its intended effect—showcasing Soviet successes—the festival boosted Soviet youths' interest in Western music, fashion, and culture. Magnúsdóttir, “Keeping Up Appearances:
ferment, citizens had to find reforms’ limits on their own and this is what Grushin's respondents had done, as they expressed their views without ever crossing the boundary into “anti-Soviet” statements.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda} shaped readers' opinions as it adapted to Khrushchev-era reforms in journalism, thereby enabling Grushin's survey. Qualitatively different from Western media, Soviet newspapers functioned as instruments for propaganda, social engineering, and guiding citizens' worldviews and opinions.\textsuperscript{23} Newspapers had served as propaganda organs since 1917, but they became reinvigorated in the 1950s and reformed their unimaginative style, leftover from the Stalin era. \textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda} combined photojournalism, human interest stories, cartoons, letters, and news reported from the far corners of the Soviet Union and from around the world to describe Soviet progress, triumphs, and creation of the “New Soviet Man,” who would build and thrive in the future communist society.\textsuperscript{24} To further this task, \textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda} depicted the individual as a unique and productive member of a society making political, cultural, and economic progress toward the goal of “building Communism.”\textsuperscript{25} Even today, its pages communicate the optimism, confidence, and pride in the

---

\textsuperscript{22} Grushin, \textit{Chetyre zhizni}, 109.

\textsuperscript{23} In this role, journalists were a crucial component of “governmentality,” the methods by which a state organizes and sustains power and influence over its citizens, or “the conduct of conduct.” Thomas C. Wolfe, \textit{Governing Soviet Journalism: The Press and the Soviet Person after Stalin} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 4 and Ibid., 11-23. Michel Foucault devised the term “governmentality,” but Wolfe employs it to frame interactions between the Party-state and Soviet journalists, especially their mission to shape society and guide citizens to think and act in ways appropriate to Soviet ideals. Ibid., 16.

\textsuperscript{24} Alexei Adzhubei, chief among the reformers in journalism, worked at \textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda} until 1959. Many felt that Adzhubei rose only because he was Khrushchev's son-in-law, but he proved to be a talented editor in his own right. Among the changes he made was to hire Grushin as an editor. A.I. Volkov, M.G. Pugacheva, and S.F. Iarmoliuk, \textit{Pressa v obshchestve (1959-2000): Otmenki zhurnalistov i sotsiologov: Dokumenty} [Press and Society (1959-2000): Evaluations of Journalists and Sociologists: Documents] (Moscow: Moskovskaia shkola politicheskikh issledovanii, 2000), 59.

\textsuperscript{25} Contributing to recent scholarship on Soviet subjectivity, Oleg Kharhordin argues that Soviet society
creation of a fundamentally different society that characterized Khrushchev's years in office. *Komsomol'skaia pravda* reported current affairs and guided readers toward desired conclusions by placing those events within an ideological framework. “The news” combined fact with opinion-editorial, at its best seamlessly integrating these events into the official worldview. In this way, the press shaped popular opinion on a massive scale. Individuals read, interpreted, and incorporated information from the newspaper into their own experiences, creating a community of Soviet citizens with common, but not uniform, positions.  

In pursuit of this goal, newspapers publicized Soviet successes, but also foreign labor strikes, South African Apartheid, the American Civil Rights Movement, and anticolonial movements. These stories fit preconceived notions that the capitalist adversaries were “decadent,” “enfeebled,” and rife with internal “contradictions.” In the Soviet representation, the everyday reality for African-Americans, the poor, the urban working class, and the oppressed called into question these countries' ideals of equality and freedom. Grushin's survey, on its surface about foreign relations, illustrated the contrast between a just Soviet Union, whose people desired peace, and the capitalist “other.”

emerged from a peculiar relationship between individuals and social collectives, both of which differed from their Western counterparts. He traces the conception of the individual as a component of the collective in Soviet society to the work of Anton Makarenko, an influential pedagogue and philosopher of education in the early years of the Soviet Union. Makarenko's ideal socialist individual would be naturally at home in the workplace or other collectives, as well as cultured, productive, and loyal to the cause of socialism. Kharkhordin, *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 201.


27 “Rasisty brosaiut vyzov” (Racists Make a challenge), *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, March 10, 1960 and “Narody klemiat rasistov: Naglaia vykhodka predstavitelia IuAS” (The People Denounce the Racists: The Insolent Trick of the Representative of the Union of South Africa), April 1, 1960. Other stories and photos emphasized foreign support for Soviet-backed causes such as peace and disarmament protests. “Golos trudovoi Ameriki” (The Voice of Working America), May 4, 1960 and “Premiia millionam stoikikh bortsov” (A Prize to Millions of Steadfast Activists), May 5, 1960.
The hierarchical structure of the Soviet media ensured that Grushin's respondents had read a homogeneous, officially sanctioned message, even if its form varied with location and publication. *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, *Izvestiia* (*News*), and *Pravda* (*Truth*) set the tone for the rest of the media hierarchy, from regional daily newspapers to weekly factory bulletins. These newspapers backed peaceful coexistence because Khrushchev's leadership wanted the policy to succeed. The leadership saw peace and the accompanying potential for reducing defense spending as integral to the broader project of building communism and creating material abundance. The survey's results measured Soviet citizens' reception of the message of peaceful coexistence at a moment when the U-2 incident focused their attention on dangers from beyond Soviet borders.

Grushin's survey also became possible after 1956 because Soviet sociology reemerged from Stalin-era suppression to become a tool for understanding a society undergoing reform. Stalin's regime had prohibited sociology, branded it a “bourgeois social science,” and replaced it with the framework of “historical materialism,” which assumed that individuals' worldviews resulted from their class's relationship to the means of production. Responding to the Twentieth Party Congress, sociologists began “concrete social research” into the society around

---


29 Polish, Czechoslovakian, and Hungarian research predated Grushin's survey. These countries had a history of opinion polling in the immediate postwar years, before the Communist seizure of power. These traditions resurfaced during the de-Stalinization period and spread knowledge and techniques to the Soviet Union. Matt Henn, “Opinion Polling in Central and Eastern Europe under Communism,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 33, 2 (April 1998): 229-40. Vladimir Shlapentokh explains that East European, especially Polish, sociology was important to Soviet development. Shlapentokh, *The Politics of Sociology in the Soviet Union* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1987), 21. In this book, Shlapentokh named this the “embryonic period” of initial development (1958-65). In turn, it was followed by sociology's “golden age” of official recognition and support (1965-72) and the Brezhnev regime's limitation of the field for political reasons (1973-75).

them to supplement theoretical conceptions of society, challenging the Stalin-era prohibition on empirical surveys. Introducing *Komsomol'skaia pravda*'s publication of the survey results, Grushin described his understanding of public opinion. First, the survey's large sample guaranteed that his survey measured the multiplicity of individuals' opinions. Second, he wrote, “It is necessary to learn the thoughts of people living not in one place, but in different geographic regions of (our) immense country. The respondents should represent every stratum (*sloi*) of our society in both city and village.”31 With this goal, Grushin aided the development of sociological, empirical knowledge of Soviet society. This was the first time officials conducted this type of survey.

In 1960, these developments in sociology and journalism enabled the formation of the *Institut obshchestvennogo mneniia* (Institute of Public Opinion) of *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, which sponsored Grushin's research. The newspaper's editors intended for the Institute's work to aid the publication's propaganda mission by quantifying readers' reception of official messages.32 The editors did not interfere with the survey, but they ensured that it was within the proper ideological parameters. Taking advantage of this fortuitous situation, Grushin promoted the development of sociology by conducting the first surveys of their kind in the Soviet Union.


The Survey's Context and Sample

An examination of Grushin's methods reveals his sample's characteristics and biases, which influence my decision to privilege respondents' texts over the survey's statistical results. From May 10 to May 14, 1960, newspaper personnel traveled to ten locales found on one line of longitude in the European part of the Soviet Union. These locations included towns, cities, and farms in the Russian SFSR, Karelian ASSR, Belorussian SSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Moldovan SSR, giving the sample geographic diversity. However, the sample was not statistically representative of the whole Soviet population. Drawn from the western, majority Slavic areas of the Soviet Union, Grushin's sample included only Russian speakers. A representative sample would have included individuals from more regions and each of the USSR's constituent republics.

The responses indicate that respondents did not feel pressure to answer the survey's questions in a predetermined fashion. At each of the ten locations, sociologists relied on local managers or Party officials to direct them to institutions where they could contact average citizens. Because authorities helped to select them, respondents might have feared negative consequences from “wrong” answers. However, they included their surname only if they wished, offering a measure of anonymity. The majority signed their responses, indicating a sense of security. Furthermore, if respondents anticipated repercussions, they could avoid

33 Hoover Institution, Papers of Boris Grushin, Box 1, Folders 8-13.

34 The Soviet Union's Slavic populations were in the majority, but Grushin's sample seems to exclude any significant representation of non-Slavic peoples. The sample's Slavic majority may have been intentional, or it could have resulted from the selection of this line of longitude. Among the twenty-five responses in Komsomoľ'skaia pravda, all but one respondent of who did so provided a surname indicating Slavic origins. The exception is Analia Baier, whose surname could be of German origin. The sample could have Jewish representatives, but the survey provides no means for discerning this. Even in Moldova—where the language is related to Romanian—those surveyed were members of a Soviet Army unit, the language of which was Russian. The survey's lack of interest in “nationality,” as the Soviet Union conceived it, is more instructive because it demonstrates the idealized Soviet self-image of a society of equal national groups.
answering clearly. The insignificant number who did not answer the survey's questions testifies to the majority's comfort in doing so. This contrasts with surveys conducted in Poland after martial law was introduced in 1982, in which a high percentage of respondents refused to reply to sociologists' questions.35

Grushin's statistical findings were not representative of the population of the USSR. On the whole, respondents typified their peers in the factories, mines, mills, schools, and military units from which Grushin's team selected them. However, men constituted about 60 percent of the sample, even though they were less than half of the population due to the demographic impact of World War II.36 Furthermore, the survey drew respondents from only one or two institutions in a given city. In Leningrad, for example, only employees of the Stalin metalworks participated in the survey. Without a heterogeneous sample of individuals from the city, the survey cannot disaggregate the attitudes characteristic of foundry workers, residents of large cities, or some other potential classification. Moreover, the percentage of “Yes” answers to the survey's first question did not vary by more than 4 percent from the total figure of 96.8 percent, regardless of classifications by age, sex, location, or employment.37 Such small deviations from the total preclude drawing any meaningful conclusions from them. In contrast, Grushin's ensuing survey, though on an unrelated question, found greater disagreement with the official view.38 This suggests that the figure of 96.8 percent was neither artificial nor inflated.

Be that as it may, by concentrating on the twenty-five responses that Komsomol'skaia

35 Only eleven out of one thousand failed to clearly answer “Yes” or “No,” a figure that contrasts with Polish cases, in which 40 or 50 percent refused to answer sociologists' questions. Henn, “Opinion Polling,” 238.

36 Grushin, Chetyre zhizni, 72.

37 Ibid., 84-93.

38 Ibid., 125. In this survey, about 25 percent of respondents indicated that their living standards had fallen or remained static. Khrushchev's programs and Soviet propaganda encouraged them to report that standards were rising.
published, I avoid becoming entangled in questions of the survey's statistical reliability. One problem with this strategy is that Grushin did not explain the process for selecting the twenty-five responses. He did not describe his criteria, publish the remainder at a later date, or make clear their representativeness. He might have chosen this small group at random; as examples of extreme views; or because they articulated generally held positions, similar to the sample of letters on an American newspaper's opinion page. In any case, these responses provide insight into the worldviews of individual Soviet citizens and exemplify the opinions of socioeconomic groups often missing from historical records. The sample extends beyond the educated and urban working classes, on whom the regime relied for support, to include collective farmers, who benefited less from Soviet modernization efforts.

While the survey gathered only limited details about individual respondents, the Soviet population shared some common experiences and characteristics that influenced their worldviews. First, the literacy they demonstrated represented a success that the Soviet system had achieved since the Revolution. Second, successive generations had experienced a number of defining events and changes. The oldest respondent, at eighty-seven years old, had lived in Imperial Russia and through the Revolution and Civil War. Younger generations had endured collectivization of agriculture, upward social mobility, urbanization, and political repression in the 1930s. In the 1940s, the war against Nazi Germany defined those old enough to work or fight. Thirty-nine Twenty years old in 1960, the youngest respondent lived through the war as a child, experiencing the scarcity, trauma, and loss of family members that characterized it. In the post-Stalin era, everyone shared in the launch of Sputnik, the world's first artificial satellite;

---

Khrushchev's social, cultural, and economic reforms; and changes in the wake of his Secret Speech. These developments represented common influences on Soviet citizens' worldviews.\(^{40}\)

The Responses

Respondents' answers fell within the framework of Soviet discourse, but not all of them simply restated official conceptions about the world in the language of propaganda. To help analyze the responses, I turn to a framework that Grushin articulated in his 2001 book. Grushin asserted that while opinions were “to a huge degree unfree,” their dependence on propaganda was far from absolute, pointing to the spirit of criticism and freedom to speak out that the 20th Party Congress fostered among the population.\(^{41}\) He defined three “zones” of consciousness (soznanie) that characterized Soviet public opinion in the 1960s. The first is independent consciousness—he uses the term “self-generating”—which was rare at the time and, like Shlapentokh's pragmatic level of public opinion, related to judgments of issues pertaining to individuals' everyday experiences.\(^{42}\) Because this survey questions respondents about issues remote from daily life, independent consciousness is essentially absent from this survey's responses.

At the opposite extreme, Grushin described “dependent” consciousness as reliant on ideas developed by others, in this case Soviet propaganda organs. The resulting opinions were "appropriated by the masses from the bottomless arsenal of contemporary Soviet

\(^{40}\) The long-term effects of these post-Stalin changes are difficult to measure. However, the generation of leaders that Mikhail S. Gorbachev led in a renewed reform effort in the 1980s drew their inspiration from this time. Having come of age during the 1950s and 1960s, they labeled themselves “the children of the Twentieth Party Congress.” David J. Nordlander, “Khrushchev's Image in the Light of Glasnost' and Perestroika,” Russian Review 52,2 (April 1993): 248-64.

\(^{41}\) Grushin, Chetyre zhizni, 525.

\(^{42}\) Grushin, Chetyre zhizni, 523.
propaganda." He attributes the prominence of these types of opinions not to the "mental laziness" of citizens, but rather to the effectiveness of the Soviet Party-state's propaganda apparatus. Ideas in this category most often related to issues that were part of official mythology rather than everyday experiences of the workplace, family, and community. Respondents demonstrated dependent consciousness by repeating official phrases and understandings in the same terms found in any Soviet newspaper or radio broadcast, as the case of a tractor driver on a collective farm (kolchoz) in the Gaivoron district of Ukraine demonstrates. The entire text of his response to Grushin's three questions reads, “Yes. I think so because the whole world does not want war and our Soviet Union is strong and powerful. It is necessary to work even harder so that the Motherland is strong.”

Grushin defined an intermediate category, “semi-independent” consciousness, existing between the “dependent” and “independent” categories. It consists of perceptions of the world that, while borrowed from elsewhere, are reliant on “internalization of knowledge, which is qualitatively different from simple, unthinking repetition of formulas borrowed from others.” Semi-independent views are harder to define because they are based on ideas from propaganda that respondents have somehow “made their own.” Nearly all respondents assimilated the idea that the Soviet Union was committed to peace, but in cases in which a respondent explicitly rejected one justification for peace in favor of another, the individual's role in forming opinion becomes clearer. Even though he thought humanity could prevent war, Smirnov, a thirty year-old engineer from Leningrad, questioned the idea that peace could be achieved through negotiation. He stated, “I don't believe in negotiations' positive results, especially if (American

43 Ibid., 524.
44 Ibid., 523.
Vice-President Richard M. Nixon, or someone like him, represents the USA. (The Western powers) are frightened and deterred by our achievements, especially in the area of rocket technology.” Smirnov had appropriated ideas about Soviet technological superiority from propaganda, but by choosing that justification over the negotiations on which peaceful coexistence relied, he demonstrated semi-independent consciousness. While Grushin's categories offer a useful framework for thinking about the responses' relationship to propaganda, only a few responses fit a single category, as most connect ideas representing different levels of independence.

In the following section, I organize the survey responses according to several recurrent issues that respondents emphasized, while I also repeatedly refer to Grushin's three categories. Respondents drew on three common themes to support their belief in peace: the importance of Soviet technological and social progress, peace proposals, and superpower status. Some respondents had misgivings about these themes, citing Western threats, rejection of Soviet proposals, and refusal to accept the USSR's powerful position in the postwar world. Regardless, only a tiny minority of respondents who had reservations doubted that humanity could prevent war.

A large number of respondents believed in the Soviet Union's development and progress. For example, propaganda cultivated belief in Soviet technological superiority, which encouraged respondents' confidence in the USSR's security and prosperity. Peaceful uses for technology such as the world's first nuclear-powered icebreaker and the launch of Sputnik

45 Nixon represented a bête noire of Soviet peace and economic policies. Many recalled President Dwight D. Eisenhower positively as a result of his role as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II. Therefore, Nixon became the face of “anti-Soviet” and “reactionary” American political and economic interests in the Soviet view. Finally, Nixon and Khrushchev had disputed the merits of their respective social and economic arrangements during the “Kitchen Debate,” which occurred during a visit to a model kitchen at the American National Exhibition in Moscow in the summer of 1959.
encouraged their optimism. Valentina Veselova, a twenty-four year old Komsomol secretary, employed a metaphor of the Cold War as ice, which Soviet policies would melt or break, that commonly appeared in propaganda. She wrote, “The first atomic icebreaker in the world, the Lenin, has gone into construction. (Its) atomic propulsion will help N. S. Khrushchev break the ice of the Cold War.” Her response is an example of semi-independent consciousness because, while she borrows official imagery and language, she combined the icebreaker with the recurring metaphor of the Cold War as ice in a way that was unique to her. Previously, this metaphor had been used in response to Khrushchev's visit to the United States in 1959, when, for instance, a citizen had written that “the ice of the 'Cold War' has begun to melt.” A more contemporary utilization of the metaphor appeared in Komsomol'skaia pravda on May 1, 1960. The cartoon “On the Iceberg of the Cold War” depicts an iceberg, representing the Cold War, melting under a bright sun symbolizing Soviet peace proposals. The ice's melting threatens to drown a number of distressed caricatures, including capitalists, an anthropomorphic moneybag, spies, soldiers, and weapons. The cartoon encouraged readers' optimism toward peaceful coexistence on the same day that Soviet forces shot down Powers's plane.

46 In Nikita S. Khrushchev, Litsov k litsu s Amerikoi, 15-27 sentiabria 1959 goda (Face to Face with America, September 15-27, 1959) (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1960), 565. The letter is among a collection of letters written before, during, and after Khrushchev's tour.
Official claims about Soviet superiority in missile and nuclear weapons technology, especially the antiaircraft missiles that had destroyed the U-2, assured respondents of the Soviet Union's strength and ability to defend against foreign threats. Depending on newspaper accounts of the U-2's destruction, a worker wrote, “My confidence (in peace) results from our scientists’ creation of the powerful rocket that quickly destroyed the American plane.” Repeating a phrase from reports of the incident, Andreeva—a worker—wrote, “Our military taught them a good lesson, destroying the American bandits with the first shot.”47 Gorodetskii, a young engineer from Leningrad, affirmed that war would not occur, but not because of peaceful coexistence. Choosing an alternative justification, he wrote, “The capitalists of America will not begin a war because we are stronger in military hardware, especially in rocket and atomic weapons, the fundamental weapons of modern war.”

47 See for example, “Raketoi, s pervogo vystrela” (By a Rocket, With the First Shot), Komsomol'skaia pravda, May 7, 1960. See also footnote 6.
Economic and development plans reassured many respondents of the Soviet Union's strength and ability to secure peace. For instance, a forty-six year-old veteran and collective farmer, Mel'nichuk, convinced that the Soviet Union would achieve Khrushchev's goals, wrote, “My confidence (in peace) is based on the strength of our socialist society, which continuously moves forward and in the near future will have built Communism.” Several respondents pledged personal efforts toward this goal, for example the same collective farmer wrote, “I believe in the leadership and in our Communist Party. I will muster all my strength so that my district will complete the Seven-year Plan not in seven years, but in three.” In these phrases, Mel'nichuk demonstrated mastery of the Khrushchev era's key concepts, but his pledge also alludes to the Stalin era's calls to complete the first Five-year Plan in less time.

A number of respondents believed that Soviet military, economic, and technological development threatened the position of the capitalists, who would not allow the Soviet Union to surpass them unchallenged. The Western adversaries might attack and, to ensure the continuation of peace, Soviet citizens had to remain prepared. Ekaterina Kolosova, seventy-three years old, described how she did so. Mixing a “semi-independent” image in her largely dependent response, she wrote, “The people do not want war and whatever the people want, they achieve. But it is always necessary to have means of defense against enemies. I am an old woman living alone, but I keep an axe under my bed for those who would invade us. The government must continue to be able to defend the people.” Soviet propaganda encouraged preparedness and individual contributions of vigilance and strength, which other respondents repeated by saying, for example, “Most of all it is necessary for each to be vigilant himself.” However, Kolosova expressed this idea in terms of an axe, which she did not borrow from propaganda and this is what makes her response semi-independent. Moreover, her response
was exceptional because she was a nun. The sample's inclusion not just of a believer, but of clergy and church personnel, as well as *Komsomol'skaia pravda*'s publication of Kolosova's response, despite antireligious attitudes reemerging after 1957, further indicate the remarkable openness of Grushin's survey.48

Analiiia Baier, an eighty-seven year old pensioner in Ukraine displayed a similar mixture of Grushin's “dependent” and “semi-independent” consciousness. Offering her contribution to the cause of peace, she wrote, “I am prepared to eat potato skins, dry bread, and salt with water, if only war would not occur.” While subsistence on a starvation diet had no place in propaganda about a citizen's duty, her response conveys the common conviction that peace was possible if individuals struggled for it. However, her suggestion for how to ensure peace consisted of a simple repetition of the tenets of peaceful coexistence: “Our Soviet power, the best in the world, does and will do everything so that there is peace.” Having internalized ideas from propaganda and put them in her own terms in the first, semi-independent part of the response, Baier then simply repeated Soviet propaganda in the second, dependent part of the response. Nonetheless, in both, she supported to Soviet commitment to peace and affirmed her own.

Some respondents believed that disarmament was the best answer to the survey's third question, “What should be done above all to strengthen peace?” They favored the policies of the Communist Party, which *Komsomol'skaia pravda* had propagandized consistently. Articles trumpeting Soviet proposals carried headlines such as “Reason Dictates: Disarmament!

---

48 After persecution following the Revolution, the Orthodox Church revived with Stalin's blessing under state control during World War II, part of an effort to bolster support for the war effort among believers. However, in the late 1950s, Khrushchev included combating religion in his drive to “construct Communism.” The resulting radicalization of policy toward the Church became more open and public after 1960, leading to the closure of many churches and monasteries in the period of 1960-64. Tatiana Chumachenko, *Church and State in Soviet Russia: Russian Orthodoxy from World War II to the Khrushchev Years*, trans. Edward E. Roslof (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2002).
Peace!” and “A World without Weapons—A World without War.” For Bondarenko, a thirty-six year-old from the northern town of Nikel', the masses' support for Soviet proposals encouraged his confidence in peace. He wrote, “It is necessary for the great powers' leaders to heed the peoples' wishes and for every country to give up atomic and hydrogen weapons.” Il'eva, a twenty-one year-old student in the Belorussian city of Vitebsk, utilized a rhetorical strategy based upon fear of war and the loss that her family had experienced in World War II. She believed that “the very foundation (of peace) is an agreement on the destruction of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, the most terrifying weapons of mass destruction.” Others invoked fear of war, such as the twenty-one year-old collective farm worker who emotionally proclaimed that she “simply could not imagine war breaking out. It would be a terrible catastrophe. People are prepared to live together happily. Each believes in his own radiant future. . . . I believe in the humanity of the world's people, before whom those who begin wars are powerless.” Each of these responses demonstrate a significant degree of dependence on propaganda, represented by terms such as “radiant future” (that is, Communism) and “the peoples' wishes” or “will” for peace.

Sometimes even those who supported disarmament doubted its success because of the intransigence of the Soviet Union's adversaries. In his unsigned response, a young student in Vitebsk answered the first question, not simply “Yes,” but emphatically, writing that “Humanity must do this!” In a dependent opinion that fully supported the official stance on negotiation, he thought that both sides should “outlaw atomic and thermonuclear weapons, limit military forces, (and) create a united and democratic Germany.” Turning to a more pessimistic tone, he declared unfeasible further military reductions—which the Soviet Union

49 “Razum diktuet: Razoruzhienie! Mir!,” Komsomol'skaja pravda, January 12, 1960 and “Mir bez oruzhiia—mir bez voin,” Komsomol'skaja pravda, April 13, 1960. Other stories focused attention on Western peace protesters and interviews with peace and disarmament advocates, such as those mentioned in footnote 27.
had announced in January 1960—and insisted on the necessity of preparedness and weaponry: “These are necessary measures, but they are not enough. It is impossible to disarm and cut back military forces further (because) a wounded animal may attack and the imperialists might do just that. Therefore we must still make weapons and be prepared militarily.” This appraisal suggests an internal struggle between dependence on peaceful coexistence and a semi-independent appraisal of danger posed by the Western powers, which he derived from official, negative portrayals of the Soviet Union's Cold War adversaries, a dilemma that he, like nearly every other respondent, resolved in favor of peace.

Negotiations such as those at the Paris Summit were a prominent part of *Komsomol'skaia pravda's* propaganda, but not all respondents anticipated a positive outcome from the meeting. Shabel'skii, a fifty-seven year-old department manager from Nikel', wrote of his anticipation of the approaching Paris Summit, but few others did. Respondents voiced doubt about negotiation with the West on disarmament and related issues. Several respondents expressed outright pessimism, finding alternative justifications for their belief in peace. Smirnov, the engineer whose response was cited above as an example of semi-independent consciousness, analyzed the situation in this manner. Soviet media had promoted the Paris Summit, part of Khrushchev's program to negotiate with the West, but few respondents followed the prompt on the survey questionnaire that stressed the importance of the negotiations in Paris. Instead, a few respondents who believed in the possibility of peace also stressed preparedness and vigilance. They had found other assurances, which compensated for the uncertainty aroused by reactions to the U-2 incident.

By printing responses doubting the value of negotiations, *Komsomol'skaia pravda* demonstrated that it permitted not only those that supported this major tenet of peaceful
coexistence, but some that did not. Bondarenko, a miner, believed that war would occur. His response is difficult to classify in Grushin's scheme: While he doubts the success of peaceful coexistence, suggesting an independent appraisal of the situation, his rhetoric incorporates ideas from propaganda, such as “peaceful construction” and the caricature of the capitalist West that propaganda emphasized after the U-2 incident. He blamed the Soviet Union's adversaries for the threats to peace:

The problem is that these aggressors are trying to disturb peaceful construction. They send spies and planes against us. They do not want to cut back their military and weaponry. Although there are few capitalists, they are a bunch of crooks who want to drink others' blood before they die. To that end, the leaders of the USA, England, and France work to disagree with us.

Rather than backing negotiation, Bondarenko called upon Khrushchev to take a tough stance, writing, “I personally ask that you, Comrade Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, give (the Western leaders) a good one over the head, so they know who they're dealing with.” In his folksy manner, he depicted Khrushchev as a hard-nosed realist and defender of the Soviet people in a dangerous world. This contrasted with the image, which formed an integral part of peaceful coexistence in domestic propaganda, of Khrushchev as peacemaker and advocate for friendship and coexistence. While Bondarenko was one of the few who felt that war would occur, his other suggestions for disarmament or, failing that, vigilance and military preparedness, fall firmly within the larger body of dependent and semi-independent responses.

Finally, respondents invoked the post-World War II balance of power and improving relations between the Soviet Union and friendly governments. Many expressed confidence in peace and friendship among the Soviet Union, its East European allies, and African or Asian states emerging from colonial domination. Using language shared with propaganda, many responses drew attention to this aspect of the Soviet peace mission. For example, Shabel'skii
confidently declared, “The number of our friends constantly grows, mostly because we are for peace and peaceful, productive labor.” After invoking the image of the icebreaker Lenin and Khrushchev breaking the ice, Veselova turned to this theme while continuing to use the metaphor and official perceptions of the world. She wrote, “As a result of N.S. Khrushchev's visits to various countries around the world, a thaw has occurred in the world arena. We have more and more friends every day.” Khrushchev ceaselessly traveled to socialist and capitalist nations, promoting this approach to peace. In the six months prior, Komsomol'skaia pravda had trumpeted the success of Khrushchev's travels in Southeast Asia, to Paris for meetings with French President Charles de Gaulle, and to the United States. These travels received glowing coverage in the Soviet media, which promoted them as both necessary to, and a validation of, peaceful coexistence. Support for reducing conflict and fostering peace could come from surprising sources in Grushin's survey. Using fire as a metaphor for the destructive potential of war, a young soldier in the Soviet army wrote that, to ensure peace, “it is necessary for every worker to struggle against every smoldering flame, so that none grows into a fire. We are for peace! For friendship with all countries!”

50 “Vizit, otkrivaiushchii vesnu” (A Visit to Begin Spring), Komsomol'skaia pravda, March 23, 1960 and “Sili mira berut verkh nad silami voiny” (The Forces of Peace Will Take the High Ground over the Forces of War), April 1, 1960.

Some respondents, taking into account the impact of the U-2 incident, drew on images and news that broadcast ominous interpretations of Western governments' actions. Even though the Soviet Union and its allies had grown strong, their adversaries remained a threat. Gorodetskii warned that the rearmament of the Federal Republic of Germany—the western, capitalist zone of the defeated Nazi enemy—could cause a new war. Some expressed more extreme alarm in reaction to contemporary propaganda portrayals, which recalled the Nazi enemies and the invasion of 1941. Andreeva, a worker, called for the working classes of capitalist countries to stage a revolution. She vowed that “in their place, I long ago would have settled accounts with the bourgeoisie and the militarists. I would have strangled with my own hands that Hitler-like degenerate (giterovskii vyrodok), (postwar West German Chancellor Konrad) Adenauer.” Others referred to capitalists as “wild beasts,” “thugs,” “fascists” and the like. These labels illustrate the dichotomy that Soviet propaganda created between the Soviet Union and its socialist allies on the one hand, and the anti-socialist, aggressive “other.” Such imagery appeared frequently in Komsomol'skaia pravda's cartoons. In May 1960, they caricatured the Western powers failed espionage and aggressiveness. A cartoon published on May 7, 1960, portrays the government of West Germany in Bonn as aggressive and militaristic successors to the defeated Nazi regime. In it, Adolf Hitler's ghost advises Adenauer to invade the USSR. A second cartoon, from May 31, 1960, depicts either Allen or John Foster Dulles and Secretary of State
Christian Herter as serpents, clutching a threatening representation of atomic weapons and the Cold War.\textsuperscript{52}

Although they believed that the balance of power was in the Soviet Union's favor, respondents also stressed the need for the Soviet Union to be well-armed and Soviet citizens to be watchful. Despite expressing belief in peace, Kramarenko, a thirty-nine year-old worker, stated, “It is necessary to increase the military strength of the USSR and of the countries of the socialist camp, to carry out a firm policy of peace, and to foster vigilance among free people. Most of all, it is necessary for each person to be vigilant.” Responding in a similar way, Shabel'skii described the necessity to be watchful for those who, like him, lived near the Soviet Union's borders. Kolosova, the elderly woman with an axe under her bed, was another respondent who articulated this obligation. Furthermore, letters appeared in \textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda} on this subject. Ovsepian, an engineer in Yerevan, Armenia, reminded readers of the need to monitor Soviet borders. Published on May 14, his letter recalled events that had occurred in 1949.\textsuperscript{53} He wrote, “Residents of our border villages often have helped to discover and subdue spies and saboteurs sent from Turkey. Our city hasn't forgotten that a few years ago

\textsuperscript{52} Allen Dulles was Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, but the cartoon might refer to his brother, Eisenhower's recently deceased Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. In the Soviet conception, either brother represented virulently anti-Soviet forces in the American government.

\textsuperscript{53} “K otvetu!” (To Account!), \textit{Komsomol'skaia pravda}, May 14, 1960.
American spies climbed Mt. Ararat, as if searching for Noah's Ark, and took pictures of our territory from there.”\(^{54}\) At least four out of the twenty-five responses in *Komsomol'skaia pravda* refer to vigilance, a proportion much higher than in the survey as a whole.\(^{55}\) Moreover, the newspaper published a military order calling for vigilance on May 1, the very day that Soviet defenses shot down Powers's U-2.\(^{56}\) Taken together, the order, responses, and letter accentuate the importance of this call for vigilance. In the absence of the selection criteria for the twenty-five responses in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, it is possible to infer that Grushin or the newspaper's editors selected these responses to emphasize the idea of a more defensive, alert posture while maintaining optimism for peaceful coexistence. Such a shift makes the sample's overwhelming endorsement of peace even more striking.

Respondents supplemented their views and justifications for their belief in peace in the replies they gave to the two questions about World War II. The first asked, “What was your participation in the war?” and the second inquired, “What losses did you and your family suffer in the war?” Some respondents had written about their war experiences already in their answers to the survey's initial questions and wartime memories evoked some of the most moving stories and pleas for peace among the responses published in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*. Having experienced World War II, they believed it impossible that someone could consciously launch a new war between the nuclear-armed superpowers that would cause even greater destruction and loss.

Respondents described their experiences and losses in the context of a broader narrative

---


55 Grushin, *Chetyre zhizni*, 88. The total figure is just 4.4 percent.

56 The Minister of Defense, Marshal Rodion Malinovskii, issued the order, which called on the Soviet military to “diligently heighten vigilance and military preparedness...” “Prikaz minstra oborony SSSR” (Order of the Minster of Defense of the USSR), *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, May 1, 1960.
of collective wartime struggle. The survey responses, highlighting World War II's centrality in postwar Soviet society, illustrate the evolution of popular views between 1945 and 1960. In the days that accompanied victory in 1945, frontline soldiers may have expected improved opportunities and living conditions in return for their sacrifices.\textsuperscript{57} In his famous toast to the Soviet victory at a banquet on May 24, 1945, Stalin drank to “the health of the Russian people,” who were the “leading force” of the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{58} But the victory soon came to belong to Stalin. A month after the toast, he indicated a rift between the little people, the “screws in the great machine of state,” who supported the leaders' achievements, and himself—the \textit{vozhd’}—the leader responsible for the strategies and decisions that enabled the Soviet triumph.

In the early postwar years, the war's impact was important to the millions who had survived its travails, but the state quickly deemphasized celebration of the victory.\textsuperscript{59} Stalin rejected the publication of individuals' memoirs and, in 1947, the anniversary of the victory over Germany was demoted from an official holiday to a workday.\textsuperscript{60} Responding to the emerging Cold War, propaganda recast the wartime allies, Great Britain and the United States, in an antagonistic light.\textsuperscript{61}

Khrushchev reinterpreted the war in his Secret Speech, blaming Stalin for military

\textsuperscript{57} Zubkova, \textit{Russia after the War}, 25.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 29.


\textsuperscript{60} Nina Tumarkin, \textit{The Living and the Dead: The Rise and Fall of the Cult of World War II in Russia} (New York: Basic, 1994), 104. It became an official holiday again in 1965. Tumarkin reports that during the late 1940s and early 1950s, the day was celebrated “informally” with meetings, visits to cemeteries, and fireworks.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 105. For example, the Nazi enemy was recharacterized not as “fascist,” but “imperialist,” which indicated commonality with the Soviet Union's Cold War adversaries. Soviet propaganda questioned why the Western Allies had opened a “second front” by invading France only in June 1944, suggesting that out of self-interest they had waited while the Soviet Union had taken the brunt of the Nazi war machine.
failures and attacking his privileged position in the war narrative. Khrushchev praised the “magnificent and heroic deeds of hundreds of millions of people,” declaring that it was “not Stalin, but the Party as a whole, the Soviet government, our heroic army, its talented leaders, brave soldiers, and the whole Soviet nation—these are the ones who assured the victory in the Great Patriotic War.” As a result, the Soviet Union began to publicly celebrate the victory with mass involvement in celebrations. For instance, the Soviet Union's commemoration of the victory's fifteenth anniversary on May 9, 1960, emphasized a collective narrative and individual experiences of the war, struggle, and triumph just days before Grushin conducted his survey. This celebration and the war's growing importance in collective memory also indicate Grushin's reason for asking about the war. Respondents shared individual stories of sacrifice and loss within this broader collective narrative, aligning themselves with Soviet attempts to create a “useable past” from the war.

Each respondent wrote about the war in one of three styles. Some discussed World War II on the most general level, perhaps because they had been too young to contribute to the war effort, but the war's legacy supported their belief that new wars would not occur. Two responses in particular, from the pens of students at a college in Vitebsk, refer to universally

62 Quoted in Ibid., 107.

63 Articles, such as “Mai sorok piatogo” (May of ‘45) and “My vstrechalis' na Elbe” (We Met on the Elbe) on May 8, 1960, published individual soldiers' recollections of the victory and of a meeting with American troops on the banks of the Elbe River in Germany, respectively.

64 James V. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 31. Wertsch describes collective memory as a search for a "useable past," using Soviet memory of World War II as a case study. Theoretically sophisticated, his book describes a "sociocultural" model of collective memory. The basic building blocks in his understanding are "cultural tools," such as language or narrative texts. Actors and cultural tools are both "mediators," which act in a "sociocultural context" to create a common narrative of the past. Collective memory is a "textually mediated" version of events that balances "accuracy criteria" with the need to create a common version of events that helps to affirm identities. In the Soviet case the most common agent is the Party-state, which used control of the media and information to create a narrative of the war—and of history in general—with which it is comfortable. Perhaps most importantly in the Soviet context, this official narrative was dynamic, malleable, and constantly changing.
known tragedies. Peace would prevail, in the view of one, because:

people saw the kinds of horrors war brings. It was necessary to send children to the front, for them to fight. And atomic weapons! The tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki must not occur again. Witnesses of these tragedies still live. And the Nazi death camps: Auschwitz, Dachau, and Buchenwald! Thousands, tens of thousands of people burned alive. People remember. Therefore they will not allow war.

The other student similarly wrote, “Millions of people, having experienced the 'value' of war, would not tolerate a recurrence of the gas chambers of Auschwitz, children losing their fathers, or the tragedy of Hiroshima.” Everyone knew of these events and would do anything to prevent a new war that could only be worse.

Other young respondents supported pleas for peace with personal stories of interrupted childhoods and lost family members. Veselova, the young Komsomol secretary, wrote:

In 1943, fascists killed the person closes to me: my father. I barely remember him. I do not even remember saying the word “Papa.” How you envy those who have fathers! The fascists stole the happiness of our childhood. We did not even smile or laugh. We were serious. We did not even seem like children. We did not have toys. We played with empty bullet cartridges and pottery shards taken from the ashes. We do not want to repeat that; for them to take our childhood. The youth of the whole world wants to live in peace and friendship.

Veselova's losses in World War II supported her abhorrence of war in general and resulting confidence that it would not occur again. In a letter published in Komsomol'skaia pravda on May 22, a group of Moscow high school students echoed this attitude. Born at the end of the war, many had never known their fathers, a tragedy that supported their conviction that war would be averted:

Let all sixteen year-olds, those whose fathers and older brothers did not return home, and all honest people raise their voices in protest against aggressive policies. We pledge all of our wishes and deeds to strengthening peace. We call on our peers, young men and women of the five continents, to sign on to our protest. Long live peace around the world!65

Left orphaned by the war, Filippova, a young textile worker, based her belief in peace on wartime experiences: “I was six years old when the war began. I remember well all of its horrors and I do not want war.” She described how the Party and the state became surrogates for her lost family. The Germans had killed her parents, so she spent her childhood in a Soviet orphanage. She wrote, “The orphanage raised me and I will be in debt to the Motherland my whole life. . . . I thank the Party and the leadership for guiding me onto the Soviet path, leading to the beautiful future—Communism.” Showing dependence on the judgments of Soviet propaganda, she emotionally invoked the official image of the Soviet state as guardian of its people. She also created an identity for herself as a good citizen, a product of the state's upbringing. For all of these young people, the experience of maturing quickly and losing family members at an early age shaped the worldviews and experiences of their generation of Soviet citizens.

A small number of respondents who experienced the war as adults recounted personal involvement in the war in detail. Andreeva, fifty-four years old, described being left with her children behind the advancing German lines. She outlined her harrowing experiences, by giving a few particulars: “I took part in the fight with the Hitlerites among the partisans near Cebezh. In the beginning, my children were with me, but later they were evacuated by plane to the rear. I lost everything. Of what I began the war with, I was left with only my two children. The Hitlerites burned down my house.” These tribulations gave her the moral

66 Wertsch, *Voices*, 121. Wertsch describes how narratives of collective memory help individuals create identities and make themselves part of a community. In the case of Grushin's respondents' narratives of the war, some showed mastery in their ability to repeat the general narrative. For example, the students from Vitebsk or the writers of the letter described the war in abstract terms because they had not witnessed it. Others appropriated the narrative and put their own experiences within the framework it provided. In the case of Filippova, the narrative had a “personal sense” rather than simply an “abstract meaning.” By placing her individual narrative in the shared one, she helped identify herself as part of the collective.

67 Zubkova, *Russia after the War*, 22.

68 A town in western Russia, near the city of Pskov.
authority to advise the “simple people of capitalist countries . . . to more bravely struggle for peace.”

Each of these individuals included greater detail about World War II than the average respondent, using their stories to emphasize their support for, and belief in, the Soviet system and peaceful coexistence. The publication of these responses, in combination with that of the students' letter, indicates that individual stories represented a vital element in Komsomol'skaia pravda's narrative of the war. Like the rest of respondents' answers to other questions, these responses betray the influence of official ideas, categories, and language on citizens' thinking. Although their experiences are personal, their descriptions of wartime experience contain elements drawn from state sources, making them “dependent” or “semi-independent.”

Andreeva told her own story, but combined it with official terminology and conceptions of the world borrowed from propaganda. For example, she labels the enemy not as “German,” “fascist,” or even “Nazi,” but “Hitlerite”—a favored term in Soviet propaganda. Likewise, as Filippova detailed the individual experience of losing her mother and father, she incorporates official worldviews by invoking “the beautiful future—Communism.”

Arsen'eva, a collective farmer, contrasted the destruction caused by the war with the improving conditions of the Khrushchev era. A brigade leader at the Krasnoe znamia (Red Banner) collective farm, she narrated, “We have rebuilt the farm, which the Germans destroyed. Now we have begun to live well. My old mother says that no one ever lived as we do now.” Her experience of kolkhoz life supplemented standard praise for the Soviet system and official policies. Moreover, the survey's inclusion of collective farmers, such as Arsen'eva, demonstrates the inclusiveness of Grushin's sample. During the 1930s, when only the poorest peasants were portrayed as part of the Soviet collective, social origin was a central component
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of one's biography. Being a rich peasant—a “kulak,” an indeterminate and damning label that invited widespread abuse—or the child of a kulak could place one's educational, professional, or legal prospects in jeopardy. However, millions of soldiers and workers of peasant origin made sacrifices and demonstrated heroism during the war. Wartime service largely replaced social origin as a defining characteristic of a member of the Soviet collective.\(^{69}\) The war narrative and the Soviet foundational myth that grew out of it came to include peasants' experiences, which had previously been minimized in official narratives.

In contrast to the detailed responses above, the remaining examples are terse, as if memories of wartime losses and experiences remained painful enough that respondents found it better to discuss them with minimal detail. They used short, declarative sentences. “My father died in the war,” a soldier wrote. A sergeant reported, “My father died for his home city of Stalingrad, in the fight with the German occupiers.” A collective farmer stated, “I didn't participate in the war, but two (of my) brothers died. The fascists burned down all of the buildings (on the collective farm).” A disabled veteran recalled, “I was in the active army from 1941 to 1945. I was wounded in 1945 in Berlin. Two of my brothers died in the war. All of my possessions were destroyed.” A female student remembered, “Three of my uncles were killed in the war. Grandfather died of hunger. My father was wounded three times.” Young, old, men, women, soldiers, and workers wrote in this manner, a diversity that illustrates the widespread impact of the war and its resulting losses.\(^{70}\) Nearly every respondent described losses and traumatic experiences, but no response could affect the reader more than that of the twenty-one

---


\(^{70}\) According to Grushin's analysis, 72 percent of the survey sample lost close relatives and another 17.4 percent lost possessions. Only 10.4 percent listed no loss. Grushin, *Chetyre zhizni*, 72. These percentages may exceed the norm for the whole Soviet Union because all of the places selected for the survey were under enemy occupation or attack during the war. However, these figures offer an understanding of how widespread the war's impact was.
year-old student in Vitebsk, who concluded simply, “No measure for my loss could be found.”

The collective and individual wartime experiences that respondents shared supported their belief that war would be averted. Wartime losses encouraged respondents to believe that the world and the USSR could not sustain such strain a second time. Because of the effects of the war, no one—not even the capitalist enemies—could contemplate a more destructive, nuclear-armed war. Even a respondent who was exceptional because he did not claim any wartime losses betrays the influence of such thinking. Kramarenko, a veteran and worker, wrote, ”I didn't lose anything and I don't want to. But if it is necessary, I will make any sacrifice.” At the same time, the war shaped his response to the survey's first question. He answered, “I base my confidence on the fact that war is no longer a means for solving international disagreements, as the history of the past two world wars has shown.” Using such statements, Kramarenko and others created personal narratives of the war, which supported their belief in peace and in the Soviet Union.

Conclusion

Grushin's survey results convey that respondents believed in peaceful coexistence's success because of their experiences and losses in World War II. Respondents' answers reflected changed Soviet narratives of the war. Replacing the postwar emphasis on Stalin's role in the Soviet Union's victory, Khrushchev's Secret Speech enabled citizens' and soldiers' claims to a place in the story of the war effort. Responses to Grushin's survey illustrate that acknowledging the people's contributions had supplemented previous Stalinist emphasis on the leader's role. In time, official veneration of the victory would develop from Khrushchev-era antecedents into a “cult of the war,” which reached its apogee under Leonid Brezhnev,
complete with public celebrations, published reminiscences, medals for veterans, and immense monuments glorifying the “Great Patriotic War.” However, this veneration came at a price. Stalin was returned to his place as the great wartime leader after 1964. Censors allowed individuals to publish memoirs, but barred mention of military failures or uncomfortable truths.\textsuperscript{71} In the course of the postwar era, the war became increasingly emphasized as the Party-state's legitimizing myth, supplanting the Soviet Union's original revolutionary foundations, which seemed already distant.\textsuperscript{72}

The responses to Grushin's survey convey the war's impact on citizens' worldviews. Some respondents believed without reservation that war would be averted. Others, noting real Cold War dangers embodied by the U-2 incident, expressed doubts. Even the majority of skeptical respondents, however, voiced confidence in the continuation of peace. Ultimately, recollections of wartime heroism, labor, sacrifice, and tragedy reinforced belief in peace among respondents of every age, sex, educational level, and occupation. Simply put, Grushin's survey respondents concluded that a nuclear conflagration could not occur because they had experienced the destruction visited on the Soviet Union during World War II and that a just and strong Soviet Union would prevent such a disaster.

In addition to the results themselves, the fact the Grushin was able to conduct the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Tumarkin, \textit{The Living and the Dead}, 134.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Two competing explanations exist for the emergence of the war as a legitimizing myth. Tumarkin argues that the Brezhnev regime created it as a response to the population's—especially youths'--lack of devotion to the Soviet order. To promote it, the Party leadership orchestrated celebrations of the war in the hope that outward displays would engender “real popular sentiments.” The “cult of the war” was in essence about raising new loyal generations of Soviet citizens. Tumarkin, \textit{The Living and the Dead}, 130-2. In his contrasting interpretation, Amir Weiner argues that, even in its immediate aftermath, the war “served to validate the original revolutionary prophecy while at the same time almost entirely overshadowing it.” Weiner, \textit{Making Sense of War}, 8. Among the many meanings and results of the war's legacy, Weiner argues that the war was fundamental part of the Soviet project, a step on the path toward communism. Ibid., 364. Both of these interpretations are valid, representing two stages of commemoration. I believe that Weiner is correct that Soviet citizens ascribed great meaning to the war, which Grushin's survey confirms. On the other hand, Tumarkin's descriptions of the “cult” that grew during the Brezhnev era indicate a degree of official veneration, ceremony, and prominence (such as in war memorials) that was still in its formative stages in 1960 under Khrushchev.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
survey illustrates important developments in Soviet journalism and sociology. During the Khrushchev era, journalism developed greater dynamism and focus on the individual, complementing its continuing propaganda mission to shape citizens' opinions and worldviews. Not all respondents to Grushin's survey simply repeated what they had read and learned from propaganda. Even though propaganda ideas and language heavily influenced them, respondents demonstrated some individual judgments between interpretations of events. Respondents justified their optimism that war would be avoided with personal understandings of conflicts, domestic policies, and foreign relations that they had adapted from propaganda. Grushin identified three levels of propaganda's influence on Soviet citizens' worldviews, calling them “dependent,” “semi-independent,” and “independent.” Dependent consciousness, in which respondents expressed official ideas in official language, was very common. Semi-independent consciousness betrayed the influence of propaganda but also showed that citizens were mediating, interpreting, and internalizing the ideas that they borrowed from propaganda. According to Grushin, independent consciousness was very rare in Soviet public opinion at this time, an assertion borne out by this survey's results.

In their dependent and semi-independent consciousness, respondents demonstrated reception of the Party-state's teachings in regard to Shlapentokh's “mythological” category of issues far removed from everyday reality. It demonstrates Soviet newspapers' success during the Thaw at encouraging citizens to accept the Soviet Union's social, foreign policy, and economic goals. In its May 19, 1960, issue the newspaper published the results of Grushin's survey, portraying Soviet society as optimistic and supportive of the Party and government. In this way, *Komsomol'skaia pravda* used respondents' opinions to prove popular support for official Cold War policy. The survey, showing that Soviet citizens incorporated what they had
read and experienced into individual worldviews, confirms the existence of public opinion—however dependent—while publication of the results demonstrated official strategies for influencing that opinion.

Finally, Grushin's pioneering survey embodied the emerging field of sociology and reflected the changing relationship between the Party-state and society. The first of its kind, the survey signaled the rebirth of Soviet sociology after its Stalin-era dormancy. During the 1960s, sociologists effectively studied Soviet society, but the Brezhnev regime limited their work in the 1970s for political reasons. The very existence of Grushin's survey shows that the Khrushchev leadership cared about its citizens' views, even if it still sought to mold and set boundaries for them. A meaningful departure from the Stalinist past, this official interest in public opinion and authorization of limited expression reveals the results, but also the limitations, of Khrushchev-era reforms in the relationship between state and society.
Appendix 1: The Survey Questionnaire
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