

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Valdemaras Klumbys

BEHAVIOURAL MODELS OF SOVIET LITHUANIA'S CULTURAL ELITE

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanitarian Sciences, History (05 H)

Vilnius, 2009

The doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University during 2004–2009

Scientific Supervisor:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Algirdas Jakubčionis (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

The Dissertation is being defended at the Council of Scientific Field of History at Vilnius University:

Chairman:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Saulius Kaubrys (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ramojus Kraujelis (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Dr. Arūnas Bubnys (Genocide and Resistance Research Center of Lithuania, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Algis Povilas Kasperavičius (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Habil. Dr. Jūratė Sprindytė (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanitarian Sciences, Philology – 04 H)

Oponentai:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Dr. Danutė Blažytė – Baužienė (Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of History in the 211 auditorium of the Faculty of History of Vilnius University at 2 p. m. on 28 December 2009.

Address: Universiteto 7, LT–01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

The summary of doctoral dissertation was circulated on November 27, 2009

The doctoral dissertation is available at the Vilnius University Library

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Valdemaras Klumbys

LIETUVOS KULTŪRINIO ELITO ELGSENOS MODELIAI SOVIETMEČIU

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2009

Disertacija rengta 2004–2009 metais Vilniaus universitete

Mokslinis vadovas:

doc. dr. Algirdas Jakubčionis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas

doc. dr. Saulius Kaubrys (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Nariai:

doc. dr. Ramojus Kraujelis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

dr. Arūnas Bubnys (Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centras, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

doc. dr. Algis Povilas Kasperavičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

habil dr. Jūratė Sprindytė (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:

Doc. dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Dr. Danutė Blažytė – Baužienė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2008 m. gruodžio 28 d. 14 val. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto 211 auditorijoje

Adresas: Universiteto 7, LT–01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2009 m. lapkričio 27 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje

Relevance of investigation. Scientific investigations of Soviet Lithuania's society and its inner life are on the beginning of the way only. Various aspects of Soviet regime politics in Lithuania has been investigated much more intensive. But such a political analysis without consideration of the effect of political decisions on society is parochial because the époque is being seen through the glasses of Soviet bureaucracy and therefore only formal and official level of situation is considered mainly.

It is very important to fathom out certain complex deep societal processes. They were not always determined by decisions of governing stratum. Such processes influenced not only behaviour of members of society, their interactions with regime, but character of regime itself and its policy in various ranges too.

Cultural elite was in exclusive position in Soviet Lithuania. Its double influence is obvious: creative works and behaviour of this elite influenced consciousness and attitudes; Lithuanian political elite needs its standing and function of ideology maintenance. Cultural elite not only served ideological machinery, but cherished and nurtured Lithuanian culture and national consciousness. Due this idiosyncratic status members of cultural elite enjoyed major amount of freedom than most members of the Soviet society; but, on the other hand, in some areas they were more constrained than majority of society.

These reasons determine that investigations of behavioural models of cultural elite can reveal tendencies of development of Lithuanian society in Soviet times that are tenacious till now. It can clarify regime's policy peculiarities in Lithuania and shed light on contemporary cultural, social, political processes. Investigation of cultural elite behaviour helps to establish more deep and universal image of sociocultural and political processes that take place in Soviet Lithuania. It enables to correct or replace entrenched stereotypes of Soviet times, erroneous assessments of Soviet society, and its processes.

Analysis of cultural elite behaviour can not only indicate common tendencies in developments of Soviet bloc societies but also determine the differences of Lithuanian society from other Soviet societies. This research enables comparison of Soviet Lithuanian cultural elite and its behaviour with other cultural elites of Soviet and non-Soviet countries; it also allows to correct interpretations of cultural elite behaviour and

its influence on regime and society that are proposed in sovietological and historical researches.

Role of intellectuals in Soviet times has been very often discussed in Lithuanian historiography and in public sphere. Such discussions turned into hot quarrels frequently. This indicates that problems of behaviour of cultural elite in Soviet times are very important for the present society as for assessing Soviet experience, as for creating a construct of Soviet past.

Evaluative interpretation of cultural elite behaviour is often common not only in public discussions, but in scientific works too. This testifies that main intention of such discussions and researches is to find out what behaviour in Soviet times was righteous or at least justifiable and what was wrong, bad and damnable. Such a normative attitude is normal for public discussions, but it narrows scope of sight and depth of investigation. Refusal of normative attitude to the behaviour in the past contributes to depth of investigation of behaviour of cultural elite in Soviet times, new insights of its causes' and outcome. Analysis of processes and discourses in Soviet society's depth allow predicate that such a normative viewpoint is a product of Soviet times. This finding enables reconsider recent critics of Soviet intelligentsia, processes in Soviet society and public discourses of these times. This point of view allows to determine society's influence on behaviour of individuals and on texts of public space as on the particular decisions of regime and on its politics in various spheres. This composes prerequisites that are necessary to a more precise and deep analysis of the Soviet époque.

Cultural elite is the clearest example that testifies the duality between official behaviour in the public and non-official in non-public sphere, which is called doublethink. Researches of the Soviet times pay too much attention to non-official, informal behaviour. Formal and informal components of behaviour were equally important. Therefore research of informal behaviour allows not only see roots of a lot of Soviet processes, but simultaneously to discover processes, which were new and important to the Soviet social life. Fundamental distinction between formal and informal behaviour survives till now and is characteristic to post-Soviet Lithuanian society. A lot of informal behaviour models that formed in Soviet times are common till now. This means that analysis of origins and expressions of such duality can service to the

knowledge not only of period of Soviet occupation but of present Lithuania's society as well.

The subject of the research and most important terms used in the dissertation. Objective of research is the cultural elite and its models of behaviour from the middle of fifties till the end of nineties.

Cultural elite is stratum of highly educated people engaged in genuinely creative activity. It is upper segment of intelligentsia – a social layer that consisted of persons living on intellectual work. Term *cultural elite* is used by descriptive meaning and more or less concurs with Soviet concept of creative intelligentsia that encompassed intelligentsia of science and art. Creative work, membership in creative unions and scientific or academic work distinguish cultural elite from intelligentsia. The research has been orientated towards officially recognized members of cultural elite; therefore the behaviour of those whose attribution satisfied features of cultural elite but they did not belong to that officially has been analysed only scarcely.

Behavioural models are behaviour strategies that determine relation to the regime and they are common or similar to many individuals. Most important are behavioural strategies that were pointed to the regime and to other members of the cultural elite. These trends of behaviour often influenced each other. Dominated tendencies of behaviour and consciousness lineament are described but created behaviour models and discussed attitudes and values weren't common to all cultural elite members.

Terms *conformity* and *conformism* are synonyms. Conformity did not mean resign: conformist can be not resigned with the Soviet system. Conformity described only the outside state of man – individual activity.

The term *collaborationism* is considered as greatly politicized, therefore has not been used in the research. Term of *totalitarianism* has not been used because of the same reason. This term undoubtedly fit to Stalin era's Soviet system, but post-Stalinist regime have missed some fundamental features, such like high repression level. However, the Soviet system retained some features of totalitarian state, such like coalescent party and state apparatuses. Very important to this research is the distinction of the regime policy regarding internecine relations between individuals. Stalinist regime attempted to destroy horizontal relations between persons and intended to leave only vertical ones between

the state and the individual. Later on the regime did not attempt to influence horizontal relations and only prevented settling alternatives to official organizations.

Period from the end of 60-ies (symbolic date – 1968 – when regime significantly changed its attitude to cultural elite) is named the late Soviet era or the *Stagnation* period.

It is worth mentioning that regime was not as solid and purposeful as the popular image of the Soviet times tells. There were plenty of administrative and control apparatuses and influential groups; their objectives, purposes and decisions could vary and even be contradictory. Processes that took place in society, cultural and public practices, and attitudes of cultural elite, nomenclature and political elite influenced the regime. These factors confronted and counterbalanced each other. This combination formed the practices of power owners that frequently were inconsistent and contradictory. Sum of such practices are named as the regime.

The objective and the tasks of the dissertation. The objective of the study is to analyze cultural elite behavior models in soviet Lithuania, reasons that caused them, outcomes to society, regime and cultural elite of establishment of them. remiantis kompleksine šaltinių analize,

In pursuance of this objective the following tasks are set forth in the dissertation:

1. having analyzed sources historiography and theoretical works to form theoretical model of compliance. Analyze influence of regime and groups of friends to cultural elite behavior;
2. structure theoretical models of opposition and resistance that supplement theoretical model of compliance that all three models encompass different soviet behavior models;
3. analyze phenomenons of public and societal in soviet times and special role of cultural elite in formation of societal opinion, examine place where societal opinion were operated;
4. distinguish soviet discourses that discussed cultural elite and its relations with regime, analyze their origin, process of formation and influence on cultural elite;
5. scrutinize situation of cultural elite of tension between basic values and conflicting with them behavior of compliance to regime, and results of such situation;
6. elaborate attitudes of cultural elite that enabled compliance consider as resistance.

Methodology of investigation. With regards to the tasks of the research a variety of methods employed in humanitarian and social sciences were applied in the dissertation. Method of problematic analysis is leading here. It allows analyzing main problems through prisms of historical, social and discursive sections. Also historical descriptive, analysis of discourse and case study methods were employed.

Historiography. Researches of Soviet cultural elite's behaviour are neither numerous nor wide. Most of these consists of the self-expressions of intellectuals in press, not of the researchers. There are two periods of historiography of this theme. Only significantly ideologized works could be published in Soviet Lithuania till 1990; cultural elite was examined only as part of intelligentsia. Shortage of knowledge about real situation of intellectuals in Lithuania and danger to name clearly their anti-Soviet subtexts were main obstacles of free researches of this theme in exile. The works published there began to reflect more elaborate nuances of Soviet cultural elite behaviour, when more information reached the Western states.

More solid researches appeared in 1980'ies when emigrants from USSR represented more exact information and middle generation of historians and sovietologists of emigration appeared. The society of Soviet Lithuania most widely was analysed by A. Štromas (known as A. Shtromas). He constructed concept of political mind and behaviour of a subjugated Lithuanian people in a study *Politinė sąmonė okupuotoje Lietuvoje (Political consciousness in the occupied Lithuania)*. The difference between theleological and pragmatival political consciousness that he introduced characters phenomenon of double thinking. He distinguished three main models of behaviour that were characteristic to people of Soviet-occupied Lithuania: complete conformity, conservatism (partial conformity) and activism (nonconformity of various degrees). T. Remeikis in his *Opposition to the Soviet Rule in Lithuania* attributed institutional opposition to loyal opposition that worked within and not rejected the regime. He attributed some *samizdat* publications (*Chronicle of the Catholic Church of Lithuania*) and ethnographic clubs to loyal opposition too. Main difference between Štromas and Remeikis concepts is that the first attributed legal defence of human rights to the system rejective opposition. Štromas emphasized conformity of conservationists and Remeikis emphasized hostility of institutional nationalism to the regime.

V. S. Vardys names three general attitudes by intercourse with nationalism: an authoristic ideological nationalism, a national communism and a traditional – liberal nationalism. Alas, he did not develop their relations with the behaviour of the cultural elite.

Baltic States history in Soviet time synthesis by R. J. Misiūnas and R. Taagepera, collections of articles about cultural developments in Soviet Lithuania, and other emigrant works on that theme provide a lot of valuable information about society's and cultural situation and regime policies but these are not detailed researches of intellectual behaviour.

A watershed between more rigorous and less rigid assessments of Soviet conformity remained and entrenched in Lithuania's historiography after 1990. Cultural elite members (many of them were the same as in Soviet times) treated conformity rather reasonably. This point of view is called an optimistic opinion to the Soviet times. Authors of that stream, especially historians of cultural history, emphasize non-resignment to regime politics by the society, especially the intellectuals. They esteem cultural work as the resistance. This opinion dominated as in public, as in researches for a long time.

Nomenclaturian stream dominated upon it. This opinion interpreted the actions of the nomenclature, or the highest officials of Soviet administration, as social, ideological or even political resistance to the regime. Its representatives absorbed and adjusted to own needs the concept of institutional nationalism of Remeikis. This opinion have spread by semi-memoir works of former nomenclature members, presented as historical works designed for histories of various industrial and institutional branches. K. Navickas study has been the only attempt to write a synthetic history of Soviet Lithuania from such position, but it resembles to apologia of Soviet Lithuania authorities more than to scientific research.

Such justification of conformity challenged retaliatory responses. Critique of Soviet conformity emerged which was focused of analysis of memory and silence of the Soviet times (works by V. Rubavičius, A. Samalavičius).

Catholic intellectuals that rallied around the magazine *Naujasis židinys* are the most critical to Soviet past and conformity. Their view of people posture during Soviet times is pessimistic: underground and dissent activities were small, society and

especially intelligentsia were conformistic and sovietized. Investigators of this direction judge the institutional opposition very reservedly and emphasize conformist side of such activities. A. Streikus analyses cultural policy of Soviet regime and its influence on Lithuanian nationality. N. Putinaitė criticizes conception of the past of both intelligentsia and nomenclature. Her critique is pointed to the lack reflection of Soviet conformity nowadays; but her critique of Soviet conformity and especially of cultural elite's behaviour is very strong as well. This critical trend of historiography not only evaluates Soviet behaviour, but also proposes new methods of survey and analysis of behaviour that supplement historiography.

K. K. Girnius article "Pasipriešinimas, prisitaikymas, kolaboravimas" grounded triple mode of behaviour (resistance, conformity and collaborationism) and has become very influential in classifying Soviet behaviour. There were some other attempts to explain Soviet behaviour, mostly by interpreting terms that namely discuss behaviour of cultural elite.

All such attempts failed to avoid tension between collaboration and resistance as the main criteria of Soviet behaviour division. But opinion that proposes neglect difference collaboration vs resistance in latter years has been increasing. S. Trilupaitytė states that conformity and nonconformity terms did not fit to the behaviour of Soviet Lithuania's painters because there were neither such types of behaviour and nor circumstances to form it. Quantity of Soviet cultural life researches that apply new methodological approaches and compare circumstances of Lithuania with other Soviet bloc countries have been growing recently. They change research focus from the question of collaborationism or conformity to focusing on interpretation of oeuvre and mechanics of intellectuals' relations with the regime.

Z. Norkus study *Kokia demokratija, koks kapitalizmas* stands out of the crowd of Lithuanian sovietology. Various theoretical frameworks of Soviet society and regime that found on comparative historical sociology are proposed there. This analysis of theoretical trends eased to construct the conceptual basis of the research.

Foreign researches that did not concern Lithuania directly were also important for theoretical framework of the research. Sociological work of A. Etzioni was essential for elaborating the conformity conception. Detailed analysis of various modes and forms of conformity assisted to distance from normative attitude to conformity that predominates

in Lithuanian historiography and to construct an own concept of conformity that corresponds with Soviet Lithuania's situation. Classical study of Cz. Miłosz *Captured mind* that proposes analysis of intellectual's behaviour in totalitarian system serviced for creating the conception. R. Petersen's concepts of behaviour determining circumstances and sustaining – promoting mechanisms were important in constructing scales of conformity, opposition and resistance. K. Wojtyła's work "Individual and action" led to look to resistance and compliance from religious philosophy point of view.

Essential were the studies by V. Shlapentokh, A. Zinoviev, which focus on alternative thinking operations in Soviet society and on Soviet intellectuals. Theoretical works of H. Arendt, J. Habermas have founded the concept of societal sphere. J. Fiske and V. Pruskus studies were essential for analysing the informal communication.

Sources. Historical sources providing primary information on behaviour of cultural elite in Soviet times, i. e. elite of intelligentsia in the cultural sphere, may be grouped by criteria of origin, content, structure and nature of the contained information of the sources. Sources used in this research are categorized into five groups: 1. published archival documents; 2. unpublished archival sources; 3. oeuvre; 4. memoirs, letters and diaries; 5. *Samizdat* publications. They are divided into subgroups by genre and time of creation.

Fair amount of sources providing information about cultural life in Soviet times are published in the publications of documents. Such are publications committed to situation of literature and music of 1940s-1960s, situation of intellectuals in Stalin times, spiritual constraints, and operation of censorship. There are not only archival materials but also memoirs in some of them. Publications of documents *Lithuanian culture in prison of Soviet ideology (Lietuvos kultūra sovietinės ideologijos nelaisvėje)* is dedicated to situation of culture in Soviet times. These sources assisted in formation of detailed view of the official cultural life and its regulation, as well as of picture of party policies directions and its development, and provided a lot of data too. There is one limitation of such publications: they are composed by attitudes of editors therefore they might misrepresent Soviet reality.

Unpublished archival sources enabled more precise knowledge of cultural elite situation in Soviet times. Materials of official institutions that were important in Soviet culture life were significant to this research. The research investigates into the

documents of KGB activity in Lithuania kept in Lithuanian Special Archives (hereinafter – LSA), fund K-1. Documents of KGB internal activities, inquiry, and surveillance allow seeing how Soviet society and cultural elite were seen by Soviet intelligent service. KGB documents were important sounding informal links its character and particular behaviour and offenses to policy of regime of cultural elite. Some funds of documents of Communist party of Lithuania were valuable too. Sniečkus documents (LSA, fund No. 16895, schedule No. 2): correspondence with officials of various ranks, various papers addressed to Sniečkus, his sketchbook and stenographies of his speeches revealed not only official but unofficial activity of Soviet Lithuania administration in cultural field as well. Fund of Central committee of Lithuanian communist party (LSA, fund 1771) contains various documents and data of the meetings. They reveal activities of control of culture from the side of institution which approved repressions and cultural policy. Most valuable were documents which led to see the response of the regime to the pressure of society and to the behaviour of the cultural elite. They helped in explaining how regime formed influence upon cultural elite. Decisions and information documents of Vilnius district of Lithuanian Communist party (LSA, fund 3109) shed the light on cultural life of Vilnius and climate of the society in capital of Lithuania.

Documentation of the Writers union of Lithuania such as documents of congresses', plenums and various routine papers were inspected in Lithuanian Literature and Art Archive, fund No 34. They reflected not only cultural policy of regime but various opinions and behaviours that took place in Soviet society and latter aspect was most important for research.

Most important shortage of official documents is that they reflect surface of official life mostly. They accounts for control of culture and operation of ideological machinery quite well, but they impart processes that took place in Soviet society in lesser degree. Actually image of culture control by regime is incomplete because official documents didn't reflect informal side of decision making process that was so important in Soviet times. This research concentrates on profound processes that took place in Soviet society. They reflect in official documents partially and even awry. Therefore archival documents are only auxiliary material for research. They assisted to verify and correct information from other sources.

Oeuvre of cultural elite are important to reveal attitudes and relationships with regime and to better understanding of social, cultural and political atmosphere of Soviet époque. Some influential and important oeuvre assisted in ascertaining what ideas of cultural elite have spread publicly.

Essential to this research was memoir literature which directly reflects the attitudes of the cultural elite. It has been divided according to genres to diaries, letters and memoirs and according to time of creation – by those created in Soviet times and post-Soviet ones. Latter distribution reflects relations with the Soviet époque: some of works reflects the Soviet époque directly, and some – by prism of post-Soviet epoch with totally different political order. This is main reason why the texts created in Soviet times are more reliable and valuable. But there is one important detail not to be overlooked – personal jottings were often censored by authors themselves because of fear of espionage by KGB. Extensive and detailed diaries were most valuable for the research because of the detailed accounts of cultural and intellectual life, fluctuations of regime politics and relationships of intellectual life with such policies. Some part of such jottings more focuses on commonness, problems of creation, travel accounts; however, such works provide valuable facts on behaviour of cultural elite, cultural and social life in Soviet times.

Special attention in the research is paid to the prisoners' letters to the leading Soviet intellectuals V. Mykolaitis-Putinas and A. Žukauskas-Vienuolis, composed in winter of 1954-1955. It is essential as witness of prisoners' attitude toward cultural elite behaviour. It is one of the first and *ipso facto* most exhaustive and rigorous critiques of cultural elite that were produced in Soviet Lithuania. Various aspects of such critique varied latter in Lithuanian *samizdat* and unofficial discussions. Authors of these letters were intellectuals themselves so they express opinion of stratum of intellectuals therefore these texts represents inner discourse of cultural elite.

Important are the works of those Soviet cultural elite members which emigrated to Western countries and there wrote about their experiences in the Soviet system. These texts are valuable while researching consciousness of Soviet cultural elite and behaviour models of the intellectuals. They are one of the first works where such models were constructed with reference to personal experience. In the public sphere of Lithuania understanding of cultural elite behaviour established by such works is dominating.

Trinomial scale that was elaborated in articles of A. Sluckaitė-Jurašienė, E. Finkelšteinas mainly predominate in Lithuanian historiography till now. This group of sources enables comparison of attitudes that were expressed in emigration with those expressed in diaries, letters and memoirs. But this position reflects only most critical attitude to Soviet regime that were expressed by most radical part of cultural elite, i. e. minority.

Memoirs about Soviet times that were written until the National Awakening period but published after Soviet regime collapse compose separate subgroup of memoirs. They convey an opinion which was not affected by post-Soviet interpretations. They conceal or by official demands interpret some phenomena or facts which were “inappropriate” to the regime, and this is the main imperfection of this subgroup of the sources. But they are more frank than memoirs published in Soviet times. Latter propose ideological and official picture of intellectuals and situation of culture.

Memoirs and collection memoirs of various intellectuals (litterateur, theatrical, music and other areas of intellectual activities) published after Soviet regime collapse are widely exploited in this research as well. Some amount of memoirs is published in an interview form. Some of essays and other form of writings are treated as memoirs and they offer valuable information about Soviet times. Biographies of intellectuals are mainly treated as data sources about activity of intellectuals’.

Memoirs of nomenclature members (especially functionaries of culture) form a distinct subgroup of memoirs. They introduce official and unofficial sides of administration apparatuses’ activity. One of main objectives of such memoirs is justification and revaluation of actions that were held in Soviet times therefore they should be exploited and read very critically.

55 interviews with intellectuals and participants of dissident activities were collected 2001–2008 using social qualitative methods (deep, semi-structured interview) by the author of the dissertation. Main objectives of interviewing were: 1. to record as much as possible unique data known only to the respondents; 2. to collect sufficient amount of data for to generalize.

Respondents were chosen from various spheres of intellectual activities and from various age groups. But predominant are interviews with the elder generation of intellectuals because of aspiration to collect information that tend to cease. Majority of respondents are residents of Vilnius. Main themes of the interviews were such:

connections between intellectuals and underground; relations with regime; groups of intellectuals; character of contacts between cultural elite; values and attitudes of intellectuals; spread of informal information between intellectuals. Interview provided a lot of data about cultural, societal life and, simultaneously, about behaviour of the cultural elite.

Common shortages of memoirs and interviews are several, such like domination of the present attitude towards the past events, events described are actual for the present time and not for the past, and memoirs often are instruments for justification and self-esteem. Therefore spread the risk of overrating the resistance and devaluation of conformity. Most valuable side of memoirs is the emphasis of personal, informal relations. But this feature also causes imperfection of this source, because the ideas that spread only in a group of respondent's or author's friends and primary groups are representing like general to all society. One more weakness is protection or defence of friends and their behaviour. Therefore unofficial ties of respondents or memoir authors must be known very well. This led to the detection of tendentiousness of the memoirs. This can be neutralized by using a big variety of memoirs which authors have belonged to various intellectual groups. Sources of other origin partly counterbalance the drawbacks of the memoirs.

Samizdat material is one more group of sources that were employed in the research. It can be chronologically divided into the press of partisan movement and *samizdat* of dissidents. This group provided authentic uncensored information about judgments on cultural elite's behaviour and relations with Soviet authorities that took place in the society. Debates about conformity of intelligentsia were dominating.

KGB handbook about nationalist activity shed light on security organ's viewpoint of independent society practices and named means and methods of the combat with it.

Factographical basis of the research lies on the sources. It substantially renews and specifies facts that were published on this theme. This basis led to a detailed analysis of cultural elite of Lithuania in Soviet times and to a construct concept of the study. Cumulative material stimulates revision and widening of Soviet cultural elite's behaviour conceptions.

Novelty of the investigation. All trends of Lithuanian historiography that analyse the Soviet times propose unanimously nearly the same view of conformity and models of

cultural elite behaviour. They propose triple model of behaviour and analysis of various behaviours in the framework of these models. There is a lack of researches on the society groups' relationships with the regime. Historiography bypasses informal behaviour and individual level of relations within the cultural elite. Cultural elite is analysed not as a distinctive group but only as a part of society. It can be investigated as a separate individual group with its unique features and particular ties with rest part of the society and with the regime after the separation. A simplex way of understanding regime's and society's relations with overemphasement of regime's influence on society is dominant in Lithuanian historiography. Regime's response to society's pressure frequently is far less observed and underestimated. This research stresses out the cultural elite's response to the pressure of regime and the impact this pressure made to the cultural elite behaviour.

Researches of Soviet communication character and public opinion influence on regime's policy are very limited. Political significance of public opinion even in democratic societies does not known well what to say about undemocratic regimes. Much attention is paid to internecline communication between cultural elite members and to their communication with the regime and with the society to seek the more profound analysis of processes that took place in Soviet society.

The research focuses special attention to the prerequisites and nature of opinions independent from the regime. Systemic viewpoint to its beginnings and characteristics led to expose the societal life independent from regime; this contributes to decreasing of the regime's influence. Societal discourses and their influence to the cultural elite behaviour are investigated in this research. Comparison of the attitudes of underground members with dissidents' and of cultural elite members is rather important as it led to comparison of different strategies of active society members in the occupied state. Thus this research creates prerequisites to leastwise partially filling gaps of Soviet Lithuania society's research.

The main statements of the Study

1. Cultural elite was forced to comply with regime, but compliance of various intellectuals varied.
2. Various degrees of compliance were determined by unequal pressure of regime and by pressure of intellectuals' groups that formed attitudes of their members.

3. Compliance conflicted with significant part of cultural elite values and attitudes therefore oppositional activity of intellectuals arose that was intended to maintain nation. Oppositional activities did not violated prohibitions of regime.
4. Resistance did not involve intellectuals because their behavioural models that valued oppositional activity as noncompliance or even as resistance.
5. Public and societal were separate objects in soviet times and that witness division between society and regime.
6. Actual public opinion which was uncontrolled by regime could operate in official public only partly and mixed with official discourses. It could operate freely only in politicized part of informal sphere that was formed by interpersonal communications and that is named societal sphere.
7. There were two discourses that differently judged nationality and compliance of cultural elite in Lithuania, roots of which can be discovered in interwar period. Distinction of viewpoint to significance of Catholicism to the survival of nation was very important.
8. Compliance to regime was complicated by opposite to it interwar values. These values were not overcome therefore discrepancy between deeds and values, ideologies emerged. It was overcome by psychological mechanism of harmonization of contradiction.
9. Thoughts that were expressed in societal sphere not always coincided with deeds because considerable pressure of primary groups.

The structure and content of dissertation. The dissertation consists of the introduction, four parts, the conclusions, a list of sources and literature.

Chapter 1. Theoretical models of cultural elite behavior in Soviet times

Chapter one in the dissertation is dedicated to the construction of behavioral models of cultural elite in Soviet Lithuania. First section elaborates model of compliance.

Compliance with requirements of Soviet regime was natural because of coercive nature of regime. Binary resistance–collaboration describes precisely intercourses

between Lithuanian society and regime till about 1949. After that involvement to Soviet system began. That means not only contribution to system, but compliance with it too. Triple scale consisting of resistance, opposition and compliance describes thus relations with system.

To cultural elite pressure to comply was the strongest one because intellectuals were forced to publicly demonstrate loyalty to the regime.

Analysis of individual's intercourse with the public and with the society was important in constructing theoretical model of behavior. Groups of friends and the fold were important counterbalance to public sphere. Essential is distinction of inner compliance stimulated by informational influence and outer compliance stimulated by normative influence. The first dominated in informal groups, and the latter – in public.

Strength of behavioral models, political social and economical pressure of regime, examples of other group members' behavior, attractiveness of group, its unanimity and members interdependence, expectations that defects of Soviet system can be corrected – all these factors were important in forming modes of compliance. Deep compliance with regime mechanisms proceeded within an informal group.

Pressure of social environment created barriers that prevented compliance, especially of higher compliance degrees. Justification mechanisms were constructed to overcome moral problems of compliance. The higher was degree of compliance the stronger was justification. Four degrees of compliance are distinguished: social, ideological, activist and political.

Second section describes the models of opposition and resistance. Scale of opposition activities consists of three parts: social, institutional and semi-legal opposition. Activity that did not violate regime's established lines of correct behavior attributes to the opposition activity. Resistance is understood as hostile activities against regime, mainly functioned in political sphere. The latter could be either underground or public one. It was antagonistic to compliance, while opposition supplemented compliance. Threat of repressions were steady to resistants but not to activists of opposition after Stalin's death.

Institutional opposition was typical to cultural elite, and its sphere of expression was public: institutions, press, oeuvres. It encompasses the critique of Soviet maladies, non-ideological oeuvre, some national ideas that were unacceptable to regime, struggle

for preserving of cultural heritage. Such activities mostly were tolerated by the regime. Official institutions, that were only slightly controlled by the regime, and uninstitutionalized nonpolitical movements, such as regional studies and ethnographic movements or discussion clubs, were ground of semi-legal activities. Such practices were criticized by regime officials' more than institutional opposition manifestations; sometimes some its actors were repressed. Repressions against public resistance were inevitable while underground resistance actors could expect to remain unknown to KGB and thus avoid repressions.

Third section discusses intercourses of the behavior scales. Three scales of behavior enable more detailed and thorough analysis of individual's behavior. Separate elements of the same individual behavior could be classed to conformity and to opposition and sometimes even to resistance scales. All modes of behavior were related yet not matted. The more active was the individual in one scale, the bigger probability that individual's behavior in other scales was less active. Regime tolerated opposition activities because it treated them as possibility to withdraw individuals from resistance. Other mechanisms for sustaining from resistance were demonstration of the repressive force of the regime, improvement of economic conditions for the loyal part of the cultural elite, toleration of part of nationalism that were direct to anti-Russian and anti-Western course, emphasisment of Western society's problems, and last but not the least – the control of cultural and administrative elite. Pressure inside intellectuals' informal group limited radical expressions of anti-Soviet attitudes.

Chapter 2. The theoretical model of societal sphere in Soviet Lithuania

Second chapter is dedicated to the found theoretical model of societal sphere. Informal sphere which intermediated between public and private spheres included commonness of independently organized society as *blat* and communication in friend groups on various questions. Regime tolerated nonpolitical (e. c. economical) part of this sphere, but, in turn, antagonistically valuated politicizement of national and – partly – cultural questions. Such informal discourses are named as political ones, and the sphere where they were spread – a societal sphere. This one was independent from the regime sphere; there individuals exchanged personal opinions and information which was unavailable by official channels. There alternatives to regime's opinion were formed; also alternative values, norms and discourses were created, maintained and meditated.

Activities that were controlled by the regime took place in official public. That was part of the public space. Besides official public there was unofficial public in the public space. It consisted of unorganized presence in physical public that were less controlled by regime (theatres, public places). Societal opinion that has formed in societal sphere was alternative to public opinion formed on the basis of Soviet ideology. The part of societal opinion that penetrated into public (especially official) is called unofficial public opinion. Informal societal activities of groups took place both in informal sphere and in unofficial public (there political discourses were created), and partly in official public through which alternative ideas were disseminated more widely.

Interpretation of intellectual's public activities by societal discourses often was one of the main criteria selecting individuals to groups of cultural elite. Strength when conflicting with regime was argument for trustworthiness. Direct relations between members, many-sided relations, reciprocity, rough equality of material conditions, a common set of values, and common experience, associated members of the group. Official organizations (societies of regional studies, backpackers and discussion clubs) were exploited as a scene for dispersion of societal ideas.

Chapter 3. Comparative analysis of combatant and conservative discourses in Soviet Lithuania

This chapter analyses two discourses that have formed main views to Soviet regime and cultural elite behavior settled in society. First section describes their main features. Importance of emphasizing intelligentsia's position and critical attitude toward regime's favor were common to both discourses. These discourses did not coincide with the models of behavior.

Conservative discourse excused compliance in the name of nation but stressed un-absorption of Soviet ideology and values, as well as the necessity to retain Lithuanian culture, Lithunianiness and nationalism as much as possible. It partially coincides with subordinate system of meaning when dominating official values and existing structure is accepted and main aim is to improve situation of some certain group by negotiating. Conservative discourse reflected duplex situation of cultural elite: between violated public behavior and more important internal life. This discourse was created by cultural elite and have reflected its consciousness.

Combatant discourse reflects opinion of radical regime critics, mostly participants of resistance. Difference between *self* and *alien* (assistants of occupants) was very strong. This discourse rejects any surrender to regime (e. c. official culture) as it was considered as justification of occupation and weakening of the nation. Political patriotism with struggle for independence was the main value there. This discourse corresponds with radical system of meaning, when official values are rejected as false ones and alternative versions of meaning are proposed. Combatant discourse exaggerated regime's influence to formation of the nationality.

Second section analyses role of the Catholicism in the discourses. It was interpreted differently by both discourses. Conservative discourse considered religion as not essential to survival of nation therefore atheistic elements in oeuvre were justified. Catholicism was one of the main pillars that provided values and norms, fortitude and examples of non-Soviet behavior for combatant discourse.

Three last sections describe other crucial elements of the discourses: *self-other* difference, critique of materialism and philistinism, and words-and-deeds ratio. Combatant discourse identified compliance with philistinism and emphasized contempt to commonness. Conservative discourse criticized philistinism too but objective of survival was underlying value and thus an individual, especially a member of cultural elite, was considered as a precondition of the survival of the nation and its culture.

Intelligentsia was considered by conservative discourse as a part of regime's mechanism without independent potency, thus without responsibility. Combatant discourse thought that resistance of intelligentsia could weaken the regime and thus emphasized personal responsibility for regime's power. Combatant discourse was a part of the regime because regime's decisions were considered as a frame of reference.

Chapter 4. Cultural elite between public and societal spheres

The last chapter looks into cultural elite's fluctuation between public and societal spheres. Second section examines an attitude that equalized compliance and resistance.

Personal attitudes and publicly declared position and deeds diverged more often than coincided. Even attitudes that were declared in societal sphere differed from personal attitudes frequently concerning pressure of group majority. Individuals sought to excuse difference between words and deeds; therefore double thinking emerged. Societal values were considered as common values; therefore their impact to cultural

elite was considerable. Their spreading to the nation was important objective to the cultural elite. But such implications were only fragmentary because its decoding was complicated.

For the compliance, the difference between generations was important. Importance of homeland's defense was very big to the elder generation and that stimulated major inner tension. Subsequent generations only absorbed mechanisms of compliance without great tensions.

Doubt about significance and meaning of active resistance have become very strong after entrenchment of regime in Lithuania. Cultural elite interpreted such resistance as dangerous to nation's survival and thus as non-resistance. Their compliance was interpreted as protection of culture and nation and thus as non-compliance. Professional activities were considered as resistance, more often by the cultural elite especially. Instead opposition resistance vs compliance began prevail other ones: non-resistance vs non-compliance. Interaction between combatant and conservative discourses and regime's fragmentation created movement of intellectuals that overstepped frame of non-resistance and non-compliance.

Conclusions

One of the main purposes of the Soviet regime was the compliance of the society and especial of the cultural elite that should safeguard loyalty to the regime's policy. This compliance was not voluntary therefore it stimulated alienation with the regime, especially in the cultural elite.

Cultural elite as a remaining part of society was subdued after some struggle; this process was more rapid in cities than in countryside. Cultural elite was forced to involve itself finally into the Soviet system by the end of 40's.

Normative understanding of compliance distorts nature of processes that took place in Soviet times and forbids to reckon their multiplicity. One had to comply not only with the regime but with whole social environment that only partially was formed and controlled by the regime. Individual's relations with primary groups were especially important; they often determined the character of compliance.

Inner compliance determined by informational influence was more typical to cultural elite's relations with primary groups while outer compliance determined by

normative influence was more typical to its relations with the regime. This determined superficial absorption of Soviet norms and thus negative judgment of compliance. But normative influence existed in individual's relations with the group. That led to variances of individual's and groups' norms and values, though it was lesser than in individuals relations with the regime.

Structure of cultural elite's primary groups influenced their members' degree of compliance. Abyssal mechanisms of compliance have formed in the groups. Compliance of influential members of primary groups deepened the compliance.

Behavior that should be attributing to one or another model of behavior changed in time because perception of compliance fluctuated. But membership in Communist party was condemned almost all the time.

Oppositional behavior wasn't addressed against regime directly. Its aim was the welfare of Lithuania and nation but not regime. Oppositional behavior fitted with the compliance that empowered it. Oppositional behavior justified the compliance with the regime.

Resistance was an antipode of the compliance, but opposition or underground activist could be conformistic in various degrees. Sometimes resistance grew up from opposition activities. Reaction of regime distinguished the opposition from the resistance because of the different risks.

Coercion and material promotion stimulated compliance and were the barriers for resistance. Mechanisms that stimulated institutional opposition suppressed resistance at the same time.

Informal relations and groups were essential to maintain independent from the regime action in the society. By those components of the informal life independent information and autonomous attitudes circulated. Connections, where political and societal discourses spread, formed a particular space – a societal space that was relatively independent from regime's will. Especially active actors of this space were cultural elite and intelligentsia members.

There was a space of political underground beside the societal space. Resistance members there developed an alternative political public space with *samizdat*; with rare exceptions, intellectuals participated there only passively.

Societal opinion, that varied from public opinion formed mainly by regime and acted in official public, operated in the societal and political underground spaces. Cultural elite introduced the elements of societal opinion into the public space, however, it was done with the influence of the regime.

Societal activities needed both societal and official public spheres'. The first enabled the birth of the societal opinion, and the second was provided with most wide public that could be influenced. Codes that helped to decode coded societal opinion which operated in public could be elaborated and maintained only in the societal sphere. Action in public helped in overcoming the fragmentation of the societal sphere that was strengthened by dominating interpersonal relations.

Informal sphere's discourses which defined proper individuals' relations with the regime have estimated cultural elite as well. Combatant discourse was more typical to the resistants and have negatively valued the compliance. Conservative discourse emphasized the inevitability of the compliance and its usefulness to the nation. It widespread among cultural elite and in society; however, there was no direct correlation among discourses and behavior models.

These discourses differed at the regard to the Catholicism's significance to the nation. Combatant discourse was more typical to representatives of confessional nationalism, while the conservative one – to representatives of non-confessional nationalism. Accusation of philistinism was important to both discourses, but the addressees were different. Combatant discourse scorned value of survival that was essential to conservative one. Combatant discourse emphasized unity of speech and action; in this case representatives of conservative discourse were limited by the publicity.

Ambivalence of the conservative discourse formed a contravention between cultural elite's values and norms, as well as between speeches and actions not only in public, but in societal space as well. Therefore values of intellectuals did not coincide not only with publically proclaimed ones, but with those declared in the societal sphere.

Among the cultural elite, an adjustment of public actions with values of societal sphere formed a negative estimation of active resistance. Compliance was considered as a guarantee of national survival, therefore it was considered as a resistance.

Disertacijos reziumė

Disertacijoje remiantis kompleksine šaltinių analize, tiriami Lietuvos kultūrinio elito elgsenos modeliai sovietmečio Lietuvoje (5 deš. vid. – 9 deš. pab.). Kultūrinis elitas traktuojamas kaip inteligentijos, iš protinio darbo pragyvenančio socialinio sluoksnio, elitas. Akivaizdus dvilypis ypatingą padėtį Lietuvos visuomenėje užėmusio elito poveikis Lietuvos SSR visuomenei: kūryba ir elgsena jis veikė krašto gyventojų sąmonę, o savo autoritetu ir parama pasitarnavo sovietiniam režimui. Šis sovietmečiu įtakingas socialinis sluoksnis Lietuvoje iki šiol išsamiau netyrinėtas. Disertacijoje apibrėžiami jo bruožai ir santykiai su likusia visuomenės dalimi ir režimu. Siekiama apibrėžti kultūrinio elito elgseną lėmusias priežastis, tipologizuoti jos atmainas, nustatyti jos raiškos būdus ir įsigalėjimo pasekmes. Kaip elgsenos modeliai įvardijamos daugeliui individų būdingos elgesio strategijos, lėmusios santykį su režimu ir aplinkiniais.

Darbe siekta įsigilinti į sovietinio režimo nepageidaujamus, bet silpnai kontroliuojamus, o kartais net nepastebėtus sudėtingus giluminius procesus, paveikusius ir Lietuvos visuomenės santykius su sovietine sistema, ir santvarkos pobūdį bei politiką įvairiose srityse. Jo metu susitelkta tuometinių neoficialiųjų, neformaliųjų elgsenų, elito narių tarpusavio bendravimo ir komunikacijos su režimu bei visuomene nagrinėjimui. Svarbus darbo aspektas buvo kultūrinio elito narių bendravimo draugų ir bendraminčių grupėse tyrimas. Kultūrinis elitas nagrinėtas pirmiausiai per prisitaikymo prizmę, suvokiant šią asmeninę poziciją kaip kompromisą tarp pasipriešinimo režimui ir bendradarbiavimo su juo. Fundamentalus oficialaus ir neoficialaus elgesio dvilypumas išlieka būdingas ir posovietinei Lietuvos visuomenei ir daugelis tuomet susiformavusių neformaliųjų elgsenų yra paplitusios iki šiol, todėl šio dvilypumo kilmės bei raiškos analizė gali pasitarnauti ne tik sovietinės okupacijos laikotarpio, bet ir dabartinės visuomenės pažinimui.

Darbui buvo pasitelkti Lietuvos ypatingajame ir Lietuvos literatūros ir meno archyvuose saugomi ir publikuoti oficialūs dokumentai, memuarinė literatūra (laiškai, asmeniniai užrašai, interviu metodu užfiksuoti ir rašytiniai atsiminimai), publicistika ir grožinė literatūra, pagrindiniai leidiniai ir disidentų rankraščiai. Atlikdamas tyrimą, autorius 2001–2008 m. užfiksavo kultūrinio elito atstovų ir pasipriešinimo judėjimo

dalyvių atsiminimus penkiasdešimt penkiuose pusiau struktūruotuose interviu. Darbas remiasi lietuviškosios posovietinės ir išeivijos istoriografijos, kurioje interpretuojamas sovietinės Lietuvos visuomenės mentalitetas, analize, J. Hougho, G. Ekierto, V. Slapentokho, N. Ries, P. H. Rossi, T. H. Rigby, R. A. Bauer, O. Charchordino, A. Zinovjevo ir B. Firoso atliktais sovietinės visuomenės pasaulėžiūros ir elgsenos tyrimais, teoriniais A. Etzioni, J. Habermaso, M. Walzerio, S. Bojmo, H. C. Kelmano, H. Arendt, J. Fiskes darbais. Pagrindinis darbe yra probleminės analizės metodas, leidžiantis analizuoti svarbiausias problemas per istorinių, socialinių ir diskursyviųjų pūvių prizmę. Taikomi ir istorinis aprašomasis, lyginamasis diskurso analizės, „vieno atvejo analizės“ metodas.

Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, keturi tyrimo eigą perteikiantys skyriai, išvados ir literatūros bei šaltinių sąrašas.

Pirmajame skyriuje analizuojamas kultūrinio elito prisitaikymas sovietmečiu, pateikiami prisitaikymo, opozicijos bei pasipriešinimo teoriniai modeliai bei aptarti jų santykiai. Taip pat išskirti barjerai ir skatinantys mechanizmai, įtakoję elgsenų pasirinkimą. Nustatyta, kad normatyvinis prisitaikymo prie režimo supratimas iškreipia sovietmečiu vykusio proceso esmę. Skyriuje išanalizuota pirminių grupių svarba formuojantis kultūrinio elito elgesio modeliams. Aptarta jų bei režimo poveikio samplaika susidarant konkrečioms elgsenoms. Taip pat ištirti ir elgsenų pokyčiai laikui bėgant.

Antrajame skyriuje pateikiamas visuomeninės erdvės sovietinėje Lietuvoje teorinis modelis. Parodyta neformaliųjų santykių svarba sovietinėje visuomenėje bei išskirta politizuota tokių ryšių dalis – visuomeniniai diskursai. Ši dalis įvardinta visuomenine erdve ir išanalizuota, kaip joje veikė nepriklausomos nuo režimo nuomonės, konstatuota, kad jas formavo kultūrinis elitas. Ištirta šios erdvės ir joje cirkuliuojančių diskursų santykis su oficialiaja viešuma ir oficioziniais diskursais, parodyta, kad visuomeniniams diskursams buvo būtina oficialioji viešuma.

Trečiajame skyriuje lyginami ir tiriama kovinis ir konservacinis diskursai, sklindę visuomeninėje erdvėje sovietmečiu, skirtingai vertinę kultūrinio elito elgesį ir prisitaikėliškumą. Analizuojamos šių diskursų sąsajos su konkrečiais elgsenos modeliais. Tiriama diskursų požiūrių į katalikybės svarbą tautai skirtumai, miesčioniškumo kritikos vieta, žodžio ir veiksmo bei išlikimo ir kovos interpretacijos juose.

Ketvirtajame (paskutiniajame) skyriuje nagrinėjama Lietuvos kultūrinio elito būseną, atsidūrus tarp viešosios ir visuomeninės erdvių. Išanalizuojamas dvilypumas, neatitikimas tarp kultūrinio elito vertybių, kalbų ir veiksmų ne tik viešumoje, bet ir visuomeninėje erdvėje. Išnagrinėtas elgesio viešumoje derinimo su vertybėmis, vyravusiomis visuomeninėje erdvėje, mechanizmas: neigiamas aktyvaus pasipriešinimo vertinimas (ne-pasipriešinimas) bei prisitaikymo, kuris laikytas laiduojančiu tautos išlikimą, laikymas pasipriešinimu (ne-prisitaikymas).

Sovietinis režimas įvairiomis priemonėmis siekė kuo didesnio visuomenės, o ypač svarbios jos dalies – kultūrinio elito – prisitaikymo prie režimo, kuris turėjo užtikrinti lojalumą jo vykdytai politikai. Prisitaikymas nebuvo savanoriškas, todėl skatino dalies kultūrinio elito narių vidinę priešpriešą režimui, susvetimėjimą su juo.

Režimas palaužė visuomenę ne iš karto, o po įvairaus ilgo pasipriešinimo. Kultūrinis elitas, kaip ir likusi visuomenė dalis, galutinai buvo palaužtas, priverstas išitraukti į sovietinę sistemą ir prisitaikyti 5 deš. pabaigoje, mieste šis procesas vyko greičiau, nei kaime.

Normatyvinis prisitaikymo prie režimo supratimas iškreipia sovietmečiu vykusio proceso esmę, neleisdamas pamatyti jo daugialypiškumo, kad prisitaikoma buvo ne tik prie režimo, bet ir prie visos socialinės aplinkos, tik iš dalies suformuotos bei tik dalinai kontroliuotos režimo. Ypač svarbūs buvo individo santykiai su pirminėmis grupėmis, dažnai nulėmę ir prisitaikymo pobūdį.

Vidinis prisitaikymas, nulemtas informacinės įtakos, buvo daugiau būdingas kultūrinio elito narių santykiams su pirminėmis grupėmis, o išorinis prisitaikymas, nulemtas normatyvinės įtakos – santykiams su režimu. Tai lėmė paviršutinišką sovietinių normų perėmimą ir neigiamą prisitaikymo vertinimą. Tačiau normatyvinė įtaka egzistavo ir individo – grupės santykiuose, lemdama ne visišką grupės vertybių perėmimą bei jų ir individo vertybių dalinį nesutapimą, nors ir gerokai mažesnę nei individo – režimo santykių atveju.

Pirminių kultūrinio elito grupių sandara įtakojo jų narių prisitaikymo laipsnį. Būtent grupėse formavosi giluminiai prisitaikymo prie režimo mechanizmai. Prisitaikymą didino įtakingų, turinčių didelį autoritetą kultūrinio elito narių prisitaikėliškumas.

Prisitaikymo suvokimas visuomenėje nuolat kito, todėl vienos ar kitos elgsenos priskyrimas kuriam nors prisitaikymo lygmeniui priklauso nuo laikotarpio. Tuo tarpu stojimas į partiją neigiamai vertintas beveik visą laiką.

Šalia prisitaikymo elgsenų galima išskirti ir opozicinę elgesį. Jis nebuvo tiesiogiai nukreiptas prieš režimą, tiesiog jo tikslas buvo ne režimo, o Lietuvos, lietuvių tautos gerovė. Opozicinis elgesys derėjo su jį įgalinusių prisitaikymu. Kartu opozicinės elgsenos pateisindavo vidinį moralinį spaudimą jautusių kultūrinio elito narių bendradarbiavimą su režimu.

Nors pasipriešinimas buvo prisitaikymo prie režimo antipodas, tačiau opoziciškai besielgusysis ar net pogrindininkas kartu galėjo būti ir įvairaus lygmens prisitaikėlis. Kartais pasipriešinimas išaugdavo iš opozicinės veiklos. Šias dvi veiklas atskyrė režimo reakcija į jas, lėmusi skirtingą tokių veiklų rizikingumo laipsnį.

Prisitaikymą skatinę veiksniai – prievarta bei materialinis skatinimas – buvo pasipriešinimo barjerai. Nemažai mechanizmų, skatinusių institucinę opoziciją, taip pat prisidėjo prie pasipriešinimo slopinimo.

Nepriklausomo visuomenės veikimo išlikimui svarbiausi buvo neformalūs santykiai, jais pagrįstas įvairių neformalių pirminių grupių egzistavimas. Šiais neformalaus gyvenimo mazgais plito nuo režimo nepriklausoma informacija ir savarankiškos nuostatos bei nuomonės.

Ryšiai, kuriais plito politiniai ir visuomeniniai diskursai, suformavo atskirą erdvę – visuomeninę sferą, nepriklausomą nuo režimo valios. Joje aktyviausiai veikė dalis inteligentijos ir kultūrinio elito narių, atstovavę sluoksnį, kuriam tradiciškai rūpi politiniai ir visuomeniniai klausimai.

Greta jos egzistavo ir politinio pogrindžio erdvė, kurioje atsiradus savigalvėms formavosi alternatyvioji politinė viešoji erdvė. Ją kūrė pasipriešinimo dalyviai, o kultūrinio elito nariai dalyvavo tik pasyviai, su retomis išimtimis.

Visuomeninėje bei politinio pogrindžio erdvėse reiškėsi visuomenės nuomonė, besiskyrusi nuo daugiausia režimo formuotos viešosios nuomonės, dominavusios oficialiojoje viešumoje. Kultūrinio elito pastangomis į ją patekdavo ir visuomenės nuomonės dalis, tiesa, įtakota režimo.

Visuomeninei veiklai reikėjo ir visuomeninės erdvės, kur galėjo formotis visuomenės nuomonė, ir oficialiosios viešumos, kur ji galėjo pasiekti plačiausias

gyventojų mases ir taip jas paveikti. Be to, tik visuomeninėje erdvėje galėjo formuotis ir būti palaikomi kodai, padėdavę išskoduoti viešumoje užkoduotai pateikiamą visuomenės nuomonę. Veikimas viešumoje padėdavo bent iš dalies įveikti visuomeninės erdvės fragmentizaciją, stiprinamąjoje vyravusių tarpasmeninių santykių.

Kultūrinio elito vertinimai, sklidę neformaliojoje erdvėje, buvo dalis diskursų, apibrėžusių siektiną žmonių santykį su režimu. Kovinis diskursas, neigiamai vertinęs prisitaikėliškumą, būdingesnis pasipriešinimo dalyviams, o konservacinis, akcentavęs prisitaikymo neišvengiamumą ir jo teikiamą naudą tautai – kultūriniam elitui bei didesnei visuomenės daliai, tačiau tiesioginės sąsajos tarp diskursų ir elgesio modelių nėra.

Skyrėsi šių diskursų atstovų požiūriai į katalikybės svarbą tautai. Kovinis diskursas būdingesnis konfesinio, o konservacinis – nekonesinio tautiškumo atstovams. Abiejuose svarbus buvo kaltinimas miesčioniškumu, skyrėsi tik jo adresatai. Kovinis diskursas antraeile laikė išlikimo vertybę, o konservaciniame ji buvo svarbiausia. Kovinis diskursas akcentavo žodžio ir veiksmo vienybę, o konservaciniam to neleido veikimas viešumoje.

Dėl konservacinio diskurso dvilypumo susiformavo neatitikimas tarp kultūrinio elito vertybių, kalbų ir veiksmų ne tik viešumoje, bet ir visuomeninėje erdvėje. Todėl jo vertybės, veikusios veiksmus, nesutapo ne tik su viešumoje deklaruotomis, bei ir su visuomeninėje erdvėje skelbtomis nuostatomis.

Bandant suderinti elgesį viešumoje su vertybėmis, vyravusiomis visuomeninėje erdvėje, kultūrinio elito tarpe postalininiu laikotarpiu formavosi neigiamas aktyvaus pasipriešinimo vertinimas bei prisitaikymo, kuris laikytas laiduojančiu tautos išlikimą, laikymas pasipriešinimu.

Publications on the dissertation theme:

Paskelbti straipsniai disertacijos tema:

1. *Klumbys V. (Ne)kaltųjų ieškojimas: Kova dėl sovietmečio praeities bei užmaršties // Inter-studia humanitatis. 2007, Nr. 4, p. 148-165.*
2. *Klumbys V. Visuomenės nuomonės veikimo sąlygos sovietinėje Lietuvoje // Lietuvos istorijos studijos. 2007, T. 19, p. 124-137.*
3. *Klumbys V. Tolerancija sovietinėje Lietuvoje: Tarp dviejų aušrų // Tolerancija Lietuvoje: Tarp minties ir veiksmo. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, 2008, p. 61-75.*
4. *Klumbys V. Lietuvos kultūrinis elitas sovietmečiu: Tarp pasipriešinimo ir prisitaikymo // Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos. 2008, Nr. 8(17), p. 139-161.*
5. *Klumbys V. Požiūris į pasipriešinimą, prisitaikymą ir tautos išlikimą sovietmečiu // Colloquia. 2009, Nr. 22, p. 51-65.*

Žinios apie disertacijos autorių:

Valdemaras Klumbys gimė 1979 m. vasario 14 d. Joniškėje. 1998 – 2002 metais bakalauro studijos Vilniaus universitete, Istorijos fakultete, Naujosios istorijos specializacija. Istorijos bakalauro kvalifikacijos laipsnis. 2002 – 2004 metais magistrantūros studijos Vilniaus universitete. Istorijos magistro kvalifikacinis laipsnis.

Pagrindinis mokslinių tyrimų laikotarpis – Lietuvos istorija sovietinės okupacijos laikotarpiu (20-ojo amžiaus antroji pusė). Pagrindinės domėjimosi ir tyrimo kryptys: sovietmečio visuomenė ir kultūra, kultūrinis elitas, pasipriešinimas sovietmečiu, savilaida. Yra Tarptautinės komisijos nacių ir sovietinio okupacinių režimų nusikaltimams Lietuvoje įvertinti tyrėjas. Nuo 2007 metų Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakultete skaitomas paskaitų kursas „Lietuvos inteligentija sovietmečiu: tarp prisitaikymo ir pasipriešinimo“.

El. paštas: klumbys@gmail.com

Information about the author of the dissertation:

Valdemaras Klumbys was born in Joniškis on 14th February in 1979.

1998 – 2002. Undergraduate studies at the Faculty of History of Vilnius University, specialization of New history, graduated with B.A. in history.

2002 – 2004. Graduate studies at the Faculty of History of Vilnius University, graduated with. M.A. in history.

The main period of scientific research covers Lithuanian history of the period of the Soviet occupation (the second half of the 20th century). The utmost attention is paid to Soviet society and culture, Soviet cultural elite, resistance in Soviet Lithuania and *samizdat*. Researcher of The International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania. Since 2007 subject „Lithuanian intelligentsia in Soviet times: between compliance and resistance“ is lectured.

e-mail: klumbys@gmail.com