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Introduction

The title of my Master thesis is “The Intercultural Exchange of Experiences in Identity Construction: how can the experience of creating Soviet identity be useful for the EU?” The idea of investigation of Soviet identity came to me during the Euroculture program. I decided to research the phenomenon of Soviet identity as an example of successful coexistence of the multiplicity of nations in the frame of one union. 28 big nations (“title nations”) and a huge number of smaller ethnic groups were encouraged to keep their national cultures, customs and languages. At the same time they studied Russian as the main language for international communication inside the Soviet Union. Together with its nation-saving policies, the USSR tried to avoid the problems of nationalism, separatism, and priority and predominance of one nation over the other. Several generations which were born in the USSR are distinguished by tolerance, respect and interest to their neighbors. Even after the collapse of the USSR the generation of the 50s – 70s who were born in the Soviet Union reflects mutual spirit and fraternal attitude towards the nations which formerly belonged to the USSR. I would like to emphasize, that in the research I focus on Soviet people who lived their lives relatively undisturbed by the cruelties of the Soviet regime. In this perspective the investigations of Soviet identity show closeness with European identity.

The problem of European identity is one of the most urgent problems of the European Union. The EU was created on an economic basis as a union of independent national states. Several decades after the establishment of the European Union and its Enlargements the authorities started to think about the mutual spirit of Europe. The European project has lacked of a shared public sphere, where a cross-border dialogue can be held outside national prerogatives and in which each European citizen can participate. The progress of the EU is hampered by cultural assumptions and national differences. The European Union must accept the challenge to recognize different prejudices and to leave them behind. To achieve this, one has to show a genuine interest in other Europeans. The European Union needs to obtain an ideology, which will
encourage citizens to integrate culturally within Europe, but at the same time to perverse the national cultures of the Member States.

My hypothesis is that during the 73 years of the USSR, there were fascinating developments in the field of nation-building and identity construction. In my opinion, the Soviet Union offers a good (and early) example of a state which has constructed its identity as a multinational state where each nation has preserved its distinct cultural identity. The government of the USSR built a new identity for a huge amount of people of different nationalities. In the same time, these nationalities kept their cultures and national identities. That is why I regard the experience of the Soviet Union as an historical example which could share its experience on constructions of identities with the European Union.

How can the experience of creating Soviet identity be useful for the EU? In order to answer on this central question, I conducted the following research.

The first part is dedicated to Soviet identity. I reviewed literature which analyzed national and identity questions in the USSR. It became evident that the construction of Soviet identity has never been discussed in comparison with European identity. I investigated the historical background of the question of nations and the creation of Soviet identity in the USSR. After that I discussed the instruments of identity construction in the Soviet Union. The chapter represents detailed investigation of the question of nations in the USSR. In order to describe the Soviet policies on nationhood I focused on the periods between 1917 and 1937, the Great Patriotic War and the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years. I discussed the policies called korenizatsiia, russification and the creation of “Soviet man”. I discussed the instruments of the creation and promotion of Soviet identity, such as: language, symbols, mass culture, history and common heroes, education, gender relations, leisure and others. I included the interviews with people, who were born in the USSR in order to collect their opinions on Soviet identity. I drew the conclusion, that Soviet identity was created from two levels: top-down and bottom-up; where the role of official ideology was significant, but people’s connections and activities also played a significant role in the feeling of “Sovietness” (the term “Soviet” in the context of personal links obtained another sense).
The second chapter is dedicated to European identity. I started the chapter by defining the term “identity” and “national identity”, describing different concepts of the creation of national identity and discussing whether it is possible to conclude that the EU constructs European identity according to patterns of national identity construction. After that I highlighted the historical basis for the idea of Europe and the feeling of “Europeaness” through the ages. I examined treaties and acts on identity construction and examples of their implementation in the case of the European Union. Following that I reviewed the most recent publications on “Europeaness” and EU citizenship. The chapter shows that the EU does attempt to use the methods of national identity construction for the promotion of European identity. However, there is a lack of patriotic feeling towards the EU and knowledge of common European history and European myths among EU citizens.

In the last chapter I compared the instruments of the Soviet and European Unions on identity construction and revealed similarities and differences. I indicated that there are methods used by the Soviet Union which could be adopted by the European Union. However, some of them are not applicable for the EU. The conclusion shows the results of the research and underlines the differences and similarities between European and Soviet identity constructions.
Chapter 1

Soviet identity

The first chapter is dedicated to the experience of the Soviet Union. Here I would like to characterize literature on the question of nations in the USSR, to show the history of national policies in the Soviet state and to analyze the methods used by the Soviet government for constructions of identities.

1.1 Bibliography and literature analysis on the question of nations in the USSR.

Literature on the question of Soviet nationhood is presented in the research of western, soviet, and post-soviet scholars. It is important to notice that the soviet historians were ideologically biased and their investigations do not present the adequate appraisal of the situation of nationhood in the USSR. Western researches became interested in the Soviet Union and nation-building a several years after the end of WWII. Their studies are interesting in terms of deep analysis of the sources, namely the documents of Politburo conferences and the studies of non-Russian nations which had been members of the USSR. I would like to present therein after the ideas of Richard Pipes, Ronald Suni, Alex Inkeles and Raymond Bauer, David Brandenberger, Terri Martin and others.

Post-soviet Russian researchers studied minor nations of the USSR and their positions and relations between each other and Moscow. Also they investigated Lenin’s and Stalin’s ideas on national policies and their changes during the time.

Investigating and retracing history of the USSR, western scientists and specialists were interested in studying the government and society, social classes, relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, time has shown that classes are not a completely stable concept. Nowadays sovietologists had switched their interests towards the key concepts of identity and self-determination in the USSR. The interest in researching social classes of the Soviet Union changed into enthusiasm to study the national question in USSR. A lot of historians started to investigate relations between Russia and other nations - members of the USSR. The Soviet Union was a multiethnic, multinational and multicultural society; understanding this gave western scientists a large scope for new research.

The first studies of the USSR were started in the first days of the Cold war, and until the middle of the 70s sovietologists analyzed soviet politics policies, the economy and the foreign policy of the USSR. The USSR was not the object of national studies. Scientist devoted their research to the Russian part of the Soviet Union, or to other countries which had been members of the USSR or to the Eastern European countries of the communist bloc. Non-Russian nations were regarded as oppressed people and the question of national differences was not touched at all. But there were a few western researches who referred to the question of nations in the USSR. Most of them were busy with definition of the Soviet state which was seen as an empire, where connections between colonial outlying districts were arranged through the center – Russia. The statement, that the USSR was an empire is arguable, and it does not apply to my research question. However, a lot of authors raise the question of the connection between economic and political needs in national identity constructions. National policies reflected the needs of the authorities. Therefore, it is important to bear in mind,

that the definition of the Soviet Union and its political strategy characterizes its nationhood and soviet identity building policies.

The late-40s and early 50s marked the beginning of the school of sovietologists in the West. The school of sovietologists emerged as a separate branch of political studies mainly in the USA. Scholars disposed a developed basis for the research. The first significant works which considered the question of nations in the USSR were the works of Richard Pipes and I. Deutsher7.

*The Formation of the Soviet Union*8 by Pipes was a fundamental research, because the author discovered a big amount of sources and he embraced the situation of all outlying districts of the USSR. Pipes’ work presents the interesting studies of the ethnical structure of the USSR. The book has become a very important source and an authoritative work for the Russian and Western sovietologists. However, the author doubted that the question was resolved in the USSR. The main thesis of the Richard Pipes’ research is that during the revolution in the USSR there was a struggle between communists and nationalists, and the Bolshevik’s victory denoted the triumph of Russians over the separatists and nationalistic desires and attitudes of non-Russians. He regarded non-Russian territories as annexed illegally and by force. According to the author, the USSR government practiced tough centralized policies towards non-Russian nations. Therefore, Pipe’s work does not present a discussion on the methods of national building and the cultural development of the USSR states. Nevertheless, modern researchers argue with this point of view. It is doubtful to regard the bolshevism as an enemy of non-Russian nations. In contrast, modern researches argue that bolshevism granted national independence to small and big nations of the USSR. Pipes and Deutsher drew a similar conclusion on a national question in the USSR. Ethnical policy was not an independent sphere of social life. It was tightly connected with other tasks of the Soviet government. The role of Stalin in the question of nations started to be regarded separately from Lenin’s policies. The scholars have noticed that the heritage of

Lenin’s ideas was changed in accordance with current circumstances in the Soviet Union.

The works of the group of Harvard scholars started to investigate the life of soviet citizens in the 50s. As a result, Alex Inkeles and Raymond Bauer published the books *How the Soviet System Works. Cultural, Psychological and Social Themes* and *The Soviet Citizen. Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society*\(^9\). The studies are based on a modernization theory, which tells that modernization and industrialization were the most powerful engines for the development of every state. The authors believed that class belonging and status were the most important things for a soviet citizen, but the question of nations and national identity did not play a big role in the life of Soviet people. The Harvard Project did not aim at studying ethno-political questions, but the works contained very important information on the self-identification of USSR citizens and relations between Russians and non-Russians. In *The Soviet Citizen* the chapter “The nationality problem” reports the results of a questionnaire which was given to the Ukraine national group. The authors believed that it is hard to understand the soviet society without studying the national question. The questionnaire wanted to retrace the dependences between national or ethnic membership and class, education and self-identification of people. The most important conclusion draw by the authors was that “… Ukrainian’s life chances in the Soviet system and his reactions to it are determined first and foremost by his status a s Soviet citizen of a given occupation or social class, and only very secondarily by his nationality…the Ukrainians will very rarely explain his life conditions on the basis of his nationality”\(^10\). Also, Inkeles concluded, that the opponents would very seldom have needs to complain on the national policies of the Soviet Union.

The concept of modernization was developed in the 60s by Nove A. and Newth J.A. in their work *The Soviet Middle East: A Model for Development*\(^11\) where the


authors consider relations between Russia and the South republics of the USSR as a mutual profitable, but not as colonial. They state that the cooperation did not have the character of exploitation, because industrialization was implemented thanks to the money which was earned in Russia. Also, industrialization helped to the economical development of the Russian South.\textsuperscript{12} However, Moscow had a decision-making privilege. This fact initiated new discussions on the fact of the imperialistic policies of the Soviet state.

Different in the estimations, but unanimous in approaches, works of sovietologists before the 70s of the XX century regarded soviet policies with caution or negatively.

The situation changed in the 70s. The appearance of works by Anderson B.\textsuperscript{13} and Deutsch K.\textsuperscript{14} brought the new ideas on the concept of nation. They believed that nations are the products of modern social and cultural developments, but not the ancient structures of human race. They stressed that the development of nation was encouraged by the functional demands of industrialism or by the influences of social communication. Nations caused nationalism, but not vise verse. Therefore, they brought a new idea, that nation was a product of people’s interventions and activities. This point of view dominated during Brezhnev governance. But in general, sovietologists from the USSR did not appeal to the theoretical works on nation. For instance, the book \textit{The collaboration of nations in the USSR}\textsuperscript{15} by E. A. Dunaeva was written without any appeal to the theories of nation. It mostly glorifies the Soviet Union and exaggerated data and information on the life of soviet people. The author highlights the state of happiness and collaboration among the soviet people, but does not explain the reasons of it. The soviet literature on the question of nations reflects ideological brainwashing.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textsuperscript{14} Deutsch K. \textit{Nationalism and social communication: an inquiry into the foundations of nationality}, London: Chapman & Hall, 1953. \\
\textsuperscript{15} Dunaeva A.E. \textit{The collaboration of nations in the USSR}, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1951.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Later in the 70s sovietologists admitted the definition of nationality as a phenomenon based on the common language, culture, the myths of origin and territory.

After the 70s scholars started to investigate the life of the different nations in the USSR and made the first steps in the creation of a new paradigm. The triumphant viewpoint that the Bolsheviks were a destructive and overwhelming power, which annihilated all the nations except Russians in the USSR, which *russified* them and deprived them of other cultures – has become invalid. In fact, the question of nations was very important for the USSR authorities. It was not always well elaborated and theorized, but the attempts to maintain national cultures, languages and territories and to protect them from Russian influence were quite important. Together with the attention to national cultures communists tried to modernize the republics of the USSR. However, these attempts at modernization and “korenizatsia” (indigenization or nativization) were not sufficiently coordinated. As the result we had the evidences of compromises: communists Jews tried to exterminate the religion inside their communities but were not successful. The communists in the Central Asia tried to ban burka for Muslim women but did not succeed. The compromise with traditional societies and their cultures has become a very significant and deferential merit of the USSR.

The book of R.G. Suni *A State of Nation: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*\(^{16}\) contains works of scholars on the concepts of ‘nation’ and ‘empire’ in the first 35 years of the Soviet state. When the Bolsheviks came to power in 1917, they inherited a multiethnic state with huge national problems. There were national riots on the Southern and Western outskirts of the USSR, while the Eastern part was quite calm, and in the middle – Russia – they had a problem of indistinct national identity. Stalin and Lenin were aware of the presence of Russian nationalism, because Russians were the major nation of the USSR. Therefore, they decided to encourage the national sentiments of other nations (or “defensive nationalism”). The process of

korenizatsiia is elaborated by Terri Martin in the work *The Affirmative Action Empire*. The important research examines Stalin’s policies on the development of national cultures, creation of languages, education and creation of national identities among the smaller nations of the USSR.

D. Senborn indicates in his research “Family, Fraternity, and Nation-Building in Russia, 1905-1925” that in fact, the soviet government needed strong national unity among citizens as a basis for, and support for their power. The ethnic or national communities were not useful in this sense. On the example of army he explored the creation of a common identity through the ideas of fraternity. The officers used the idea of family unity to make the soldiers of different nationalities feel equal and allied.

The book *National Bolshevism. Stalinist Mass Culture and Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931-1956* written by David Brandenberger discusses the phenomenon of *russification* in Stalin’s era. The author considered *russification* to be a very suitable policy for the Soviet Union of the early 30s. *Russification* came to replace proletarian internationalism which was considered to be a utopian theory. The government needed a pragmatic approach with which to mobilize society for industrialization and war and to help in government building. Stalin and his colleagues were searching for a simple and strong inspirational approach. The decision to use Russian culture as a foundation for new ideology was sharply controversial to the previous policies of the equalization of nations. The author criticizes the policy of *russification* as the system of crude application of Russian culture, myths, heroes and values. In the research the author holds the opinion that common soviet mentality reflected Russian culture and customs and did not mirror the cultures of other Soviet Union nations. Russian mentality was adopted by other nations and was regarded as soviet identity. The author emphasizes that soviet identity was formed by the

---

government. Brandenberges also stresses the theory on the formation of identity by Anderson, which says that national identity develops thanks to printing and popular schooling, and it can emerge between individuals who use the same language. The formation of mass culture, according to Anderson, starts top-down: from national elites to simple people. However, Brandenbergs states, that the theory is not completely applicable for the case of the Soviet Union. In comparison with Europe, Russian identity and the identity of non-Russian nations (members of the USSR) emerged very late, in Stalin era. The author points on the lack of research on the formation of identities. He believes that the constructions of identity have to be studied together with the mass comprehension of these policies. In his research *Stalinist Mass Culture and Formation of Modern Russian National Identity* he attentively elaborates the formation of identity by the means of ideology in Stalin era. The author notices, that the formation of national identity was hampered because of low level of literacy in the USSR. In the end the efforts of the creation of the identity showed, that the USSR nations obtained Russian mentality and identity.

The article of George Schopfin, “National Identity in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe”20, discusses the basis and reasons for the increase of national feeling. He stresses, that national identities depend on political desires and policies21. All communities need to have a strong common economic interest, which will entail the development of common traditions and rituals. He also observes the presence of “others” near the borders of a community, which creates a feeling of difference and solidarity inside a group. The author believes that the origin of identity is in the Soviet Union came from a class perspective22. He reminds us that “sovietness” positioned itself as an ideology that promised national equality, modernity, prosperity and justice.

21 Ibidem, p. 5.
The article of George Liber “Korenizatsiiia: Restructing Soviet Nationality Policy In The 1920” reflects dependence of integration on industrialization and national. The building of cities, work on factories and the policy of industrialization helped to integrate people of different nationalities. Liber asserts that the government understood the importance of communication with nations on their national languages. Tovarish Zatons’ky, the leader of the Communist party in Ukraine said: “Can we reach the Ukrainian peasantry with the German language? Try to communicate with the peasants from Tambov or Kaluga in Chinese, even though what you will tell them would be one hundred per cent Marxist, and Leninist in context”[sic]24. The author emphasizes the positive effect of korenizatsiiia. The Soviet government demonstrated respect for the other cultures and languages of the USSR, it created national identities and raised the amount of languages in the USSR and brought local nationalities to the ruling positions in the Communist party.

The collection of studies Gender And National Identity In Twentieth-Century Russian Culture25 edited by Helena Goschilo presents the interesting studies of Soviet identity through the investigation of gender identity. It consists of ideas on the role of women and men in the constructions of Soviet identity. The increase of women’s rights in the Soviet period, the image of women in propaganda, visuals and the usage of Russian feminine words “zemlja” (land, country), “rodina” (motherland) are discussed. The authors highlight the role of family traditions, the Russian language, and the appearance of Soviet heroes. This book will be examined in the third part of the first chapter, where I will outline the methods of Soviet identity building.

Among the research of post-soviet scholars I would like to highlight the works of Galaganov Zakhar Pavlovich “Meginazional’nie otnosheniya v SSSR” (“Interethnic

24 Ibidem, p. 17.
relations in the USSR. From Stalin to Gorbachev")\(^{26}\) and the collected articles “Interethnic relations and national processes in the USSR”\(^{27}\). The authors used new material and archive documents in order to reveal the role of Soviet government in the establishment of interethnic relations in the USSR. They discuss the role of Lenin’s theories, his democratic ideas and policies for the national question, differences in approaches between Lenin and Stalin. The works are interesting in the field of studies of non-Russian nations and their place in the USSR.

Analyzing the literature written on Soviet national policies, it is possible to draw a conclusion. Scholars started to research the national question in the USSR after the beginning of the Cold War. Most of their works were dedicated to the studies of the state, its economy and policies. The researchers had discussions on the themes of the definition of the Soviet state: was it an empire, a totalitarian state, a union or an affirmative action empire? What theory did the Soviet authorities use: Marxism, Leninism, National Bolshevism or can we refer to the Social Constructivism in the sphere of interethnic relations? It is not easy to find an answer to the question, because it is hard to regard the Soviet state unambiguously. On the one hand, one can hardly forget about repressions and bloody terrors. On the other hand, scholars can find positive actions in the USSR policies. Sovietologists emphasized differences between Lenin’s and Stalin’s approaches towards national policies. The creation of Soviet identity seems to have a long and rich experience, which has a lack of strong studies nowadays.

The first sovietologists called the USSR “the prison of nations”. Most of the modern authors do not agree with the definition. Here we have a theoretical question: how can you create a nation and its identity? The authors answer that it has to be top-down government policies. Others think that the role of people is very important. Some of them argue that for the creation of a nationality, there have to be a mutual economic


interest, mutual language, culture, history, territory and the presence of “others”, who are different.

In the following subchapter I would like to trace the history of the Soviet policies on the question of nations. This will show the development of the process of creation of Soviet identity from the Bolshevik revolution till the time of Brezhnev.

1.2 The historical background of the question of nations in the USSR.

This subchapter is dedicated to the history of the Soviet policies on the question of nations. I will try to retrace the most important ethnic policies of the Soviet government in order to create a complete picture of the elaboration and development of the question in the USSR.

I will focus on the periods between 1917 and 1937, the Great Patriotic War and the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years. After the first days of establishment of the Bolsheviks power, Lenin started to implement his theoretical (Marx-Leninist) ideas into being. The first period, from 1917 to 1937, is the most interesting with regards to the national building of the non-Russian states and the implementation of korenizatsia. The time after 1937 was dramatic for soviet citizens because of bloody terror addressed to all soviet people, regardless of nationality. The years from 1939 to 1954 were very significant for the construction of soviet identity. The difficult time of WWII united people and brought a new sense of closeness and solidarity. The last period which I will focus on is the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years, when the government promoted the idea of a “Soviet man” and of “drawing together” the soviet nations (sliianie).

The Soviet state inherited a big multinational state from the Tsarist Empire, which was also religiously heterogeneous. The Soviet Union was created as a multinational and multicultural state. If we retrace the history of the question of nations in the territory of Russia, we can see that it was a problem for governments of all times: the Russian Empire, RSFSR or the USSR. For instance, according to the general census of the population, in 1897, 43 per cent of the population identified themselves as Russian. The other 57 per cent were non-Russians.
Studies on the Russian society of the XIX and early XX century showed that people identified themselves with their region and a “small homeland”. Russian proverbs of that time contain evidence of their great affection for the “small homeland”, the place where they were born and spent their lives: "here the birds sing in a different way, and the flowers bloom brighter". The famous dictionary compiled by Vladimir Dal gives two definitions for the Russian word “homeland”: the first definition is political and means “state”; the second one refers to colloquial speech where it indicated how an inhabitant describes his native house, area or village/city. Researchers conclude that a peasant did not understand what it meant to be Russian; and he did not feel Russian, but he felt he was from Vyatka or from Tula. Therefore, the Russian people lacked a sense of Russian identity, but they had developed regional identities. The same situation was common in many of the USSR nations.

The new Soviet state included East Slavic nations: Russia, Ukraine and Belorussia; Caucasian republics: Georgia, Armenia with their ancient pre-Christian history and Azerbaijan. Five Asian republics became the part of the USSR: Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Moldavia and the Baltic states also were included in the Soviet state later in the 40s. Each of these states were populated by a big number of different ethnic groups. The territory of Russia had hundreds of smaller ethnicities. The religious question sharply reflected the cultural peculiarities of the different nations. There were Russians, who accounted for more than half of the Soviet population and who subscribed to the Christian Orthodox faith. The USSR also presented a big amount of Muslims, Catholics, Jews and a few Protestants. The three major Slavic groups: Russians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians had very close languages and similar cultures. The cultural and political traditions of Armenians, Georgians, Letts, and Lithuanians were very different from those of the Russians. The level of development and cultural advancement of the Soviet nations was incompatible

---

as well. Some nationalities had a very long history and rich culture; some ethnicities did not even have a written language.30

According to Lenin, The Great October Revolution was the start of a great experiment in democracy and social justice. The government had to resolve the national question and to establish good peaceful relations between the nations. However, when Lenin came to power, he did not have a consistent policy on the question of nations. The only slogan he declared was the right of nations to self-determination. The events of the Revolutions of 1917 showed the rise of nationalism which was a strong mobilizing and heartening power for Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Tartars, Caucasus region and others. Lenin expected the rise of national powers in the Baltic countries and Poland, but did not privies it in Ukraine and other outskirts of the former Russian Empire. Therefore he started to investigate the national question and decided to protect and encourage the national self-determination of people.

I would also like to trace the theoretical part of Lenin’s policy towards the Soviet state, the members of the republic, the question of nations and the creation of a common Soviet society.

Marxism-Leninism is a concept which was taught in the USSR as the interpretation of the Marxist theory by Lenin. Lenin’s theory, in turn, was adapted selectively by the leaders of the USSR.31 The Marxist-Leninist theory is a materialistic, deterministic and atheistic theory. According to the theory, material production is the fundamental basis of society. It is the source of all the processes in society, and it determines social consciousness. However, Marxism-Leninism required people to avoid their personal enrichment.

The Soviet Constitution says that the USSR is “a federal state formed on the basis of voluntary union on equal… Republics…” Marx touched the question of nationalities relatively little. He defined class as the most important form of self-definition. He regarded nationalism and patriotism as the features of a capitalist society.

The aim of the Marxist system was class, and proletarians should unite and replace national consciousness by class consciousness. He argued that internationalism is the highest goal of a socialistic society. Marx offered democratic centralism as an instrument of governance. However, Lenin understood, that the huge amount of nationalities will demand their freedoms and acknowledgment. Therefore, at the Congress in 1903 he insisted on the adoption of the slogan of national self-determination. He was criticized by Polish and Russian Marxists, such as Rosa Luxemburg, who argued that the growth of national independence will split the proletariat of different nations. Lenin had arguments against the Marxist theory of federalism. He believed that a party, organized along federal lines will bring national estrangement. Lenin argued that a centralized proletarian party will promote unity, good organization and education in accordance with internationalist values. He also stated that a centralized party will be able to transform the state into a federation of Soviet states and will help to avoid national conflicts. Therefore, Lenin modified the Marxist theory, because he thought that federalism could not work in the situation with various nationalities in the case of the USSR. In November 1917 the Soviet government issued a “Declaration of the Rights of the People of Russia”. The declaration guaranteed equality and sovereignty of the people of Russia; the abolition of all national and religious privileges and restrictions; the free development of all national minorities and ethnic groups; and the right of the various people to full self-determination and the formation of independent states.

In 1918 the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) emerged. The new state was announced as a “federation of Soviet republics founded on the principle of a free union of the peoples of Russia”. By 1921 the Bolshevik party was established in Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. The communist government was established there with the help of the Communist Party and native communist cadres. The territories took the name of Soviet Socialist Republic (S.S.R.).

33 “Declarations of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia”, Izvestia, Nov. 16, 1917.
Communist Party was formed in all republics and cities; and it was ruled by native cadres. Therefore, each republic had its own government; their authority was decentralized and nominally independent. The 5th All-Russian Congress of Soviets adopted the RSFSR constitution, which announced democratic centralism, proletarian dictatorship, political equality of citizens (irrespective of their racial, ethnic or religious affiliation). In this regard, according to Lenin, all workers got an opportunity to participate in the management of the state. Lenin insisted on the involvement of native nationalities to the Communist Party and governmental organizations in the autonomous republics and areas. During the New Economic Policy, the government had a goal to build national Soviets in the republics and to attract national cadres there. The amount of native workers in the governmental positions increased steadily; in Tatarian Soviet, for instance, there were 25% of Tatars in 1920-21, and 48% in 1923. In Dagestan the amount of native people was 50% by 1923.

The official date of the formation of the USSR is 30th December 1922. The first Congress of Soviets signed the establishment of the Soviet Union and the Union Treaty. The members of the Union became the RSFSR, the Ukrainian and Belorussian republics and the Transcaucasian Federation. The Declaration designed the principles of governance and the participation of the republics in the common policies. The Union authorities were entrusted with foreign policy and trade, railways, communications, and the organization and control of finance and defense. The All-Union Congress of Soviets was announced as the supreme authority of the State. In the pauses between the Congresses the primary role was assigned to the CEC of the USSR. The CEC was organized on the principle of two houses – the Union Council and the Council of Nationalities. Everything else belonged to the management of the republics.

In 1925 The Turkmen and Uzbek SSRs joined the USSR, in 1929 the Tadjik Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR); later, in 1936 the Transcaucasian SFSR was divided into Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijan SSR. The same year the Kazakh and the Kirgiz SSR became members of the USSR as well. The Karelian and the

Moldavian ASSR followed in 1940. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania joined the Union in 1940.

Lenin worked on the question of nations together with Stalin in the period of 1919-1923. They were concerned about the appearance of “Great Russian chauvinism”35, which meant that Russians take the main positions in all Soviet republics and impose their language and culture. Russians relied on their compatriots in the non-Russian territories and tried to promote their interests and to bring them to the ruling positions in the Communist party. The second reason of the containment policy toward Russians was their amount. Russians accounted for the biggest part of the Soviet population. Stalin was in charge of the national policies and supported this principle against Russian influence in other republics. However, he argued that “Great Russian chauvinism” is not the only problem of the Soviet republics. Quoting the example of Georgia he observed the powerful influence of the Georgian people (who were the biggest ethnic group in the republic) over the Ossetians and Abkhazians.36 Stalin believed that the government had to pay attention to the situation in the non-Russian republics, where local bigger nations can “oppress and exploit” smaller nations.

Lenin and Stalin agreed on the national policies and issued three main arguments. Nationalism is an ideology which will help them to build the Socialistic society. The nationalistic approach will help them to hand down ideological ideas to the proletariat. They supposed that national identity is a step to international society. After a while people will overcome their identities and will feel equal and international. The two Soviet leaders also aimed to attract the international society to the ideas of the Soviet state through the promotion of their national policies.37

Resolutions and Stalin’s speeches have become the normative documents on the national policies of the USSR. They were adopted in 1923 during the XII Party

37 Ibidem, p. 21.
According to the documents, national territories were shaped and approved of; and each nationality obtained its national council. The Congress approved the creation and promotion of national languages and the formation and establishment of national elites. The policies were called “nationalization” or “ukrainization”, “uzbekization” etc. The term “korenizatsii” which means “indigenization” appeared later. Korenizatsii was the Soviet approach to the non-Russian nations. The authorities supposed that their policies would be more effective when delivered in national languages; and the Soviet government is not regarded as the Russian invasion into national republics. Korenizatsii was the government’s instrument of soft power. Korenizatsii was a question of minor importance for Stalin and it promoted the good and kind intensions of Soviets in order to promote their authority. Soft power included social work and direct contacts with citizens: people could write letters of complaint to restore their rights, to get government awards etc. Korenizatsii was implemented under the control of the Council of nationalities, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR and the National Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR. The main tasks of Korenizatsii were the constant maintenance of nations (their territories, languages, cultures and elites) and the training of national communist cadres.

The government defined 38 bigger or “title” nations by 1924. Here they faced a number of problems. First of all, there were a lot of smaller nations and ethnicities in each SSR. But Stalin and Lenin were against assimilation, even if assimilation was voluntary. They regarded it as a return to Tsarist Russia. Especially they tried to prevent the assimilation of nations with Russians. Secondly, Stalin stated that a person has to identify his nationality even if he lives abroad. An Uzbek man, who lives in his native land, has cultural and political support there. An Uzbek who lives in a foreign territory has to enjoy the same right. Lenin and Stalin supported the strategy of ethno territorial divergence, which meant the development of a net of National Councils, which were presented even in small villages. For instance in 1927, in the Ukraine territories of the
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National Councils there were 91.2% Bulgarians, 85.8% Greeks, 68.7% Germans. But the strategy of ethno territorial divergence brought the problem of a small ethnicity surrounded by big nations. Sometimes Ukrainians regarded the small National Council of an ethnicity as strangers in their Ukrainian land. There were the occurrences of expulsion of smaller ethnicities from the country. Therefore, the creation of National Councils connected national identities with the territory and the land ownership. This step also helped to create national politicians, who were interested in national territories and rights.

Alongside the process of korenizatsiia authorities faced a problem of a very low national self-consciousness. The Mordvins were the third-largest ethnic minority in the USSR, but they were scattered over a large area and had a very weak ethnic identity, and were almost completely assimilated. The Soviet government attracted the Mordvin people to the National Council and revealed their identity by offering them economic benefits and perspectives.

One of the biggest concerns was the Russian question in Ukraine (and also in other republics). According to the official policy, Russians were regarded as a dangerous group, because they were a big part of the Ukrainian population and promoted Russian culture and language. But later in 1927 the government acknowledged Russians as a smaller nation in Ukraine and let the Russian National Councils appear. The process of korenizatsiia met resistance in Slavic countries. Ukrainians and Byelorussians, who mostly spoke Russian and used it at schools, universities and work, did not want to change their lifestyle and to use native languages instead of Russian. For example, Ukrainian and Belorussian were announced the main languages in the countries; the equality between Russian and another Slavic language was rejected. People, especially city dwellers, were forced to learn and speak their native languages, they were obliged to subscribe to the native language newspapers and to study in the native language. People of title nationalities had privileges when they
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applied for a job, particularly to work in administration and in the Communist Party. The Soviet Party members were encouraged to learn native traditions and culture, the language and history of the nation, the economy of the republic, the history of national Diaspora and geography. In case of failure on the following theoretical examination people could lose their jobs.

On the side, the example of Ukraine shows the success of korenizatsiia in the cultural sphere. Perhaps this is largely the merit of Kaganovich, who was responsible for this process in Ukraine. Also, the Ukrainians were a sufficiently educated nation, so they could adapt to new circumstances. Large investments were spent on the development of Ukrainian opera, theater and literature. The statistics showed that from January 1925 to January 1926 the amount of Ukrainians increased: in the Party from 37 to 43%; the bureaucratic elite in the Center Committee from 15.4 to 34.4%. The Ukranieization of published media was significant, from 1923 to 1928 the amount of newspapers in Ukrainian increased from 37.7 to 63.5%; magazines from 32.4 to 66.4% and books from 31 to 54%. Signboards and official announcements and letters were also issued in Ukrainian. The cultural policies of korenizatsiia had the goal to make the Ukrainian people feel Ukrainian and to be proud of their nation. Ukrainian workers had access to free Ukrainian newspapers and books; they attended excursions and educational lectures on their native languages. They organized soirees on Ukrainian culture. At their working places in the factories they were surrounded by posters with slogans in Ukrainian. One of the most significant events was a three-month festival of Ukrainian culture in 1929, which aimed to introduce Ukrainian culture to the masses. Visiting of theaters, museums, cinemas; meetings with writers and artists, scientists; evenings on Ukrainian culture - these were the main events of the festival. The cultural strategy had a positive influence. Workers started to go to Ukrainian theaters more often, also because there they only required to have a passive knowledge of Ukrainian. However, according to the research of 1929, most of the Ukrainians preferred to use
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Russian in everyday conversations. Ukrainian adults argued that they have national identities, they have Ukrainian territory and their national government, but they will speak Russian because they are used to doing it. They stated that their children have to learn Ukrainian because it is easier for the young generation. The Ukranization of education was almost ubiquitous in the sphere of pre-school and school education. But by the 1930s most university students also had to speak Ukrainian in order to attend university lectures.

According to Terry Martin, the project of ukrainization failed in government institutions and factories, where Ukrainians still used Russian in everyday conversations. However, the sphere of education was completely ukrainianised.

Very similar processes took place in all the USSR republics in the 1920s and 1930s. Korenizatsiia was logically divided into three categories: Ukraine, Belorussia and Tatarstan, where the process was similar to that described above; in Georgia and Armenia korenzsatsiia was adopted with some enthusiasm from the native inhabitants. The third branch was the culturally backward (in the Bolshevik’s opinion) East. In the frame of policy many smaller ethnicities obtained their written languages and used them in the press, radio and at schools, but not in universities and industry.

The example of Uzbekistan provides a different example of korenizatsiia. Uzbekistan is a Muslim country, with completely different gender customs and cultural traditions. The Soviet government found itself in a quandary when it tried to reveal Uzbek identity. On the one hand, they used gender traditions and women’s seclusion as an instrument for the construction of their identity and distinctions. On the other hand the Bolsheviks regarded Uzbek traditions as backward and non modern.43

To Russian eyes, the image of Central Asia was associated with women’s national clothing, the yashmak, with a strict adherence to religion and a lack of education. Yashmak and habit of covering the entire female body conveyed the idea of women’s humiliation and their impossibility to take pleasure in life. When the Bolsheviks came to Central Asia, they were not Muslims and could barely talk their

languages. During *korenizatsiia* they created Uzbek culture in accordance with their views and stereotypes.\(^{44}\) The Soviet literature of the 20s-30s describes Muslim women’s life as a life of powerless beings who were deprived of rights according to the Shariath and the Adat traditions. They became brides at eight or nine years of age and became part of a harem. They did not have a right to go to school and spent their lives sitting at home and taking care of their husbands.\(^{45}\)

The Soviet Turkistan was divided into several republics in 1920. The Soviet scientists tried to reveal who Uzbek people were and their diversity. Women became one of the main distinctive features in the creation of identity for Central Asian inhabitants. The Turkmen face-veil was different from the Uzbek yashmak and it was called parandja. The Soviet scientists created different writing languages and alphabets in order to give Uzbek and Tadjik citizens distinctive self-identities.

After 1927 the Soviet government started to conduct sanitary and health policies in the Uzbek republic. They aimed to stop venereal and skin diseases among the population and to teach people how to take a bath. Also they wanted to emancipate women, because they stated that yashmak was a symbol of women’s backwardness. However, time has shown that even Stalin with his methods could not force the Uzbek people to reject their traditions: even in the 60s you could meet a woman in yashmak in the Uzbek republic.

Terry Martin is positive about the activities of the Bolsheviks in the frame of *korenizatsiia*. He calls the Bolsheviks “international nationalists” or “nationalists of affirmative action” because they tried to support the national interests of people in the multinational state; and they implemented state interests of united economy and policies in the USSR. Martin compares Soviet policies with the theory of Miroslav Hroch who studied the formations of smaller nations in Eastern Europe. He stated that the first step characterizes the interest to the folklore and culture of a national group; the second is the appearance of a national elite which aims to create a mono-ethnic state; and the third

\(^{44}\) Ibidem, p. 231.

step is the emergence of national movement supported by most of the people. Hroch believed that the government of a multiethnic state always suppresses the rise of national groups. Martin argues that the USSR supported each of these steps and he defines the Soviet policies as “international nationalism”.  

Despite the fact that korenizatsiia did not have a violent character, we need to bear in mind that it was not completely liberal and disinterested. The Soviet authorities had a purpose to build a totalitarian society, where all people’s activities would be under control.

After the implementation of korenizatsiia in 1936 Stalin switched his policies to the promotion of a unique identity for all Soviet nations. He also stressed that the nationalities and ethnicities are sufficiently developed culturally and the new step is integration. Stalin and his comrades decided to invent a new cultural policy which would be more populist and pragmatic; which would give its citizens the feeling of a big Soviet community. The resolution of 1938 included the Russian language and literature in the official school program. Students studied their native language from the first year and the foreign language from the third. Russian became the second language in the majority of schools. But the students of smaller ethnicities studied the language of the national majority of the region. For instance, the Chuvash studied Tartar as their second language.

Blitstein analyzed the statute of 1938 according to which non-Russian nations had to study Russian in schools. According to Blitstein’s research, the statute did not produce russification or the intrusion of Russian culture. Simply, Stalin wanted to establish Russian as an international language, which would help people obtain Soviet identity. Before 1938 Russian was not taught at many schools. However, Stalin did not have a clear understanding of language policies. Schools had a lack of well-trained teachers of Russian language, Russian textbooks for students, or special methodological literature. The level of the Russian language among non-Russian students who applied

to universities was not sufficient to study in it. Moreover, there was a law, which existed until Stalin’s death, according to which students only had to attend lessons at their national schools. After 1958, parents were allowed to sign their children up to any school they chose including Russian ones. They could choose whether their children studied in Russian or in any of the other national languages.

Khrychev came to power after Stalin’s death. In the field of the national question he decided to prolong Stalin’s policies. However, he understood that the creation of a common Soviet society had to go through *russification*. Comrade Syslov, who was in charge of ideology in Khrychev’s years, elaborated the concept of denationalization of the non-Russian nations in order to prepare their *sliianie* (‘drawing together’) with Russians. The main idea of the program was to establish the Russian language as the native language of all non-Russian peoples - as a precondition for the creation of a unified Communist nation. In order to reach the goal the government decided to bring Russian words into the vocabularies of other languages, even if they already contained the equivalents of these terms. Secondly, Khrychev’s comrades elaborated the programs for the mass colonization of Turkestan and the Caucasus by the Slavic population. They started to build new factories and farms in the non-Russian republics where people from different nations were called for work. Khrychev planed that the mixed international workers would speak Russian to each other. The Soviet authority tried to avoid national military units in the Army. Soldiers from different republics were mixed in the Army with the purpose to use Russian as the main language of communication.

According to the general census of the population in 1926 there were 6.6 million non-Russian people in the USSR who indicated Russian as their native language. In 1959 they became 10.2 million. The linguistic assimilation mostly touched smaller ethnicities and nations without their own territory. However, the policy of denationalization did not succeed in the big republics. In 1959 only 10-15% of the citizens in the big multinational cities of the Slavic republics regarded Russian as their native language. The Baltic and Moldovan Russian native speakers did not reach 5%. In the Turkistan republics, Georgia and Azerbaijan only 2% of the people indicated
Russian as their native language. The biggest per cent of assimilation was among the Russian Germans (25 percent), Poles (45 percent) and the Jews (78 percent).  

Researchers have different opinions on Khrushchev’s policies. Some of them are very negative, because he destroyed *korenizatsiiia* work, when Lenin and Stalin created languages and cultures for smaller ethnicities. Researches dispute if Khrychev’s policies finished the time of the Affirmative Action Empire. Some of the modern Russian historians state that it is hard to judge *russification* as a negative phenomenon. *Russification* can be regarded as an enriching and educative process, which familiarized nations with the values of Russian culture. At the same time, Soviet Russia was a promoter of small nations to the world. The works of non-Russian authors were translated into Russian and spread all over the world. For instance, Chinghiz Aitmatov and Rasul Gamzatov were promoted by Russia. Georgian and Lithuanian cinema was introduced to a broad audience through Russia’s activities.

Drawing a conclusion to the subchapter on historical background we can observe that the Soviet Union tried to build nations, to shape their territories and to develop their self-consciousness. As the results of *korenizatsiiias* show, most of the small nations which did not have written languages, obtained their own alphabets, literature and books. National elites were promoted to senior positions and leader roles in the Communist Party and national governments, public education and industry. In each territory the national language was adopted as the official language of the authorities. These measures helped the USSR resist the rising nationalism.

However, we have evidence that the official aims and desires did not reach their goals in full measure. It was too idealistic and demagogic to think that people would adopt new languages and cultures in one generation. When the Soviet authorities decided to implement *russification*, they chose the policy which was suitable for the government, but it was a disastrous policy for smaller nations. On the other hand, we notice that *korenizatsiiia* was very effective in Central Asia and the Caucasus. The
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Soviet policies helped the process of identification of the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Tadjik and Uzbek people. Even during *russification* these nationalities did not forget their cultures and their national identities remained unchanged.

Despite the cruelty of the Soviet regime, the authorities succeeded to create a soviet social life, which was characterized by mutual assistance, kindness and the mutual sympathies of soviet people to each other. If disaster happened in one of the USSR republics, all the country-members felt compassion for that republic. The difficult situation was overcome with the support of the other republics.\(^{50}\) The atmosphere which was present in the Soviet Union still exists among the people who were born and grown up in the USSR. What made people feel “soviet” and did they have a common Soviet identity? If yes, what helped it to appear? I will discuss these questions in the following subchapter.

### 1.3 Soviet identity.

I would like to discuss the formation of Soviet identity from different perspectives: government efforts, official ideology, people links, and personal connections. I will bring different points of view on the creation of Soviet identity: pessimistic, which criticized Soviet policies and found that they failed.\(^{51}\) Some authors tend to count the policies as quite successful. Some researches regarded Soviet identity as a spontaneous phenomenon, which happened thanks to a set of conditions. The most interesting point of view is that Soviet identity created itself “in contrast” to the Soviet policies and government.

Modern historians and sociologists started to research Soviet identity in the 1990s. They argued that Soviet identity appeared through regulations. The book “Being Soviet”\(^{52}\) by Timothy Johnson highlights that the identity of the Soviet people emerged
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in contrast to the Soviet ideology. The book by Helena Goscilo examines the construction of Soviet identity through gender relations. When the Bolsheviks came to power they revised and changed the ideology and policy of the states, which had a great impact on the relations between men and women\(^53\). The recognition of women’s rights and emancipation played a great role on the future position of woman in the Soviet state. “It established gender equality under the law, legalized divorce, granted all children equal rights, and guaranteed women full control over their property and income after marriage.”\(^54\) Women received their places in the Communist Party, a special Women’s Section (Zhenotdel), which brought women into the social life of the state, was created.

The Soviet thought created images of a strong man – a hero of the Revolution, and a revolutionary woman. The construction of a collective Soviet identity involved thousands of individual life stories of the heroes of the Revolution. They were always brave and purposeful, dedicated to the idea of the Soviet state.\(^55\) The central feminine heroes were Inessa Armand (who was born in a privileged upper class family, but she rejected her biological family and became the first head of the Women’s Section of the Communist Party\(^56\)), and Lidia Antonovna Basova, who organized Party study circles at a school in Tula and taught peasants to read. The lifestyle of these women was an example to the Soviet ladies.

*Family and brotherhood*

The building and maintaining of a poly-ethnic state can be managed on the assumption, that nations were constructed on the metamorphic basis, but not because they feel blood connections or speak the same language. Nations can be built on the
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basis of historical or political belonging to a territory which unites them. The most important and authoritative institution which built a big nation on the theory of metamorphic kinship was the army. Solidarity, equality and faithfulness were the main principles of fraternity. The idea of fraternity was chosen in the years of the Civil war and in 1918 the soldiers had a slogan: “Long live the world revolution! Long live the brotherhood of nations!” Soldiers understood the relations between nations as a brotherhood. The multinational army could not use class or ethnic identity as the uniting mechanisms, but they relied on the image of family, which was understandable for everyone. The army and war touched every family of the USSR. Most of the men were members of the army fraternity. They adopted the idea of equality of nations and brought it to their families.

Elizabeth Hemenway expressed a similar point of view. She argued that Lenin tried to bring the concept of family ties into people’s consciousness. He talked about small family, where a person was born, and a big family which was represented by the Soviet state. The image of Lenin as the head of a big family was elaborated by Stalin after his death. The Soviet ideology offered people a new slogan, which aimed to underline the citizen’s friendship and sameness: “One person to another is a friend, comrade, and brother” (“Chelovek cheloveky – drug, tovarish i brat”).

The role of language

I would like to discuss language not as a means of communication between people, but as the transporter of information and the instrument of individual influence on citizens. Valentina Zaitseva explored Russian language as an instrument of identity construction. As far as the Russian language was apprehensible to most of the USSR
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people, the Soviet authorities used special words to give people a common sense of patriotism. In the article “National, Cultural and Gender Identities the The Russian Language” she examines the words *rodina* (motherland), *strana* (country) and *zemlia* (land, country). All these nouns have a feminine gender.

(…) *Rodina* (motherland) has the root “rod-” (birth), while two nouns for “fatherland” – *otechestvo* and *otchizna* are related to the root “ots-” – father. Interestingly, neither of the words “fatherland” belongs to the masculine gender. The “birth” root of *rodina* (motherland) is related to the adjective *rodnoi* which means “native”, “blood relation”, “dear” and “beloved”.

The government often used the word *rodnoi* in the phrases “*rodnaia partia*” (our dear Communist Party), “*rodnoi kolkhoz*” (our dear collective farm). Usage of these words gave people “a sense of unity and personal identification with ideological concepts”. Also, the word *rodnoi* was associated with maternity. *Rodina* is a word which expresses the sense of a birthplace but also a state in which a person was born. Therefore, when the Soviet propaganda used the image of a motherland on the War-calling posters, there was written: “*Rodina-mat’ zovet!*” (“The Motherland Calls!”). This phrase applied to all citizens, people felt that they defended something “native” and “blood related”. The image of mother (*mat’*) was associated with beauty, compassion and protection.

The Bolshevik’s authority changed the way people addressed each other. Before the Revolution people in Russia used “*Sudar*” and “*Sudarynia*” (Sir/Madam), where the gender was defined. After the Revolution, people started to use “*Tovarishch*”
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(“Comrade”) when they addressed each other. “Tovarishch” is the type of address without grammatical change or both man and woman. It was implemented in all republics of the USSR. The less formal address in the USSR was “grazhdanin” and “grazhdanka” (“Citizen”); that emphasized the people’s equality and social activity.

The War Songs

With the start of the Second World War, collective and gender identities shifted to the construction of traditional community and traditional notions of gender. Songs played a very significant role during the war period, because they helped reveal people’s self-conciseness and patriotism. The Researcher Suzanne Ament analyzed the war songs. Women and men had different roles on the front. Men were warriors, and women served in the armed forces as nurses or took care of the house and children. “Collective identity changed into individual-national rather than collective-state character” Each person had a goal to protect his own family and homeland. Many researchers emphasize that WWII created a special relations between people: they helped one another and had a sense of unity in an unprecedented way. Each member of the Union understood his particular role in the defense of his homeland. The songs written during this time underlined special merit of each person in the victory and gave people a feeling of their importance for the motherland. “The Sacred War” (“Sviashchennaia voina”) is the striking example of the Soviet war songs:

Arise, huge country! Arise to the fatal battle/with the fascist dark forces,/with the accursed horde./Let noble rage build like a wave./The people’s war, a sacred war, is being waged./… We fight for light and
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peace,/and they for the kingdom of darkness.../Let us to break them with
our strength,/our hearts and our souls,/for our dear land, for our great
union.68

The song constructed Soviet identity through the image of the enemy. Fascist
troops were represented as the dark forces and invaders; and Soviet people are the light
forces, who lead the sacred war to defend their dear land and great union. The war helped Soviet citizens to identify themselves as the members of a big union, because they had a common enemy. Also, the song encouraged all people to invest their energy into the common and just war. The song appeals to “people” without making a distinction on the basis of their gender, nationality and age.69

The composition of the songs was an important contribution to the war. Songs united people through their patriotic meaning. During the war, artists, choirs and orchestras formed bands and traveled to visit the front with concerts. The most famous singers were Klavdia Shul’zhenko and Lidia Ruslanova. The presence of women singers in the war and their feminine voices symbolized maternity and homeland (rodina).

The lyrics of the songs were not only in Russian, but also in other USSR languages. The songs of the Great Patriotic War years contained the theme of a homeland landscape. Ament highlights the importance of the image of nature in songs. The lyrics reminded soldiers about birch trees, forests, and the steppe. Songs emphasized the soldiers’ temporary environment, and sadness when it was time to say goodbye to the

the rocky cliffs” of the northern peninsula, the Dnieper River, the
cities of Kiev and Leningrad, “cities and homes” and “native villages70
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Soviet soldiers explored the huge territory of the USSR; they realized that they are part of a huge state, which reflected on their self-consciousness.

*History and common heroes*

The CEC followed the Socialist theory and aimed at giving people a feeling that the USSR is a young new state of equal people without the Tsarist past. Therefore, they wanted to build a new Soviet culture. Obviously, we can charge the soviet authority with hypocrisy, because they started to use the historical past of Russia after the 30s, and during WWII they actively addressed Russian history, religion and its heroes.

In 1937 the Communist Party decided to revise the school education system. According to the official ideology, the school program needed to cultivate student’s love toward their state. The most famous figures from history and literature became the symbols of power and cultural riches of the state: Ivan III, Ivan the Terrible, Mikhail Lomonosov, Mikhail Kutuzov, Alexander Suvorov and Alexander Pushkin. These heroes represented the authorities’ potency, the army’s strength, and the scientific and literary development of the USSR.

In 1938 the CEC announced Pushkin as “The great Russian poet, father of Russian literature, and the founder of a new Russian language”71. Modern researches reproach the Soviet culture experts for the promotion of Russian poets and writers at the USSR level. They say that they did not give enough attention to the writers of non-Soviet cultures. The exceptions were Rustaveli, Gogol and Shevchenko.

*Cinema*

Stalin believed in the deductive role of the cinema in the creation of Soviet identity. The 30s gave a start to the establishment of Soviet cinema. Cinema attendance

became one of the most important entertainments of the Soviet years. The central subjects of the movies were historical personalities and significant battles. The movies were dedicated to Peter I, Alexander Nevsky, Minin and Pozharsky, Suvorov and Bogdan Khmelnitsky. The movie directors glorified non-Russian personalities as well, such as revolutionaries Simon Caro, Amangeldy Imanov and others. People showed interest in the history of their country. The cinema showed historical victories and the strength and power of the national heroes. People transferred the images of ancient bogatyri (epical heroes) to the modern military: the army, pilots and commanders. These methods gave people a sense of pride for their country and confidence in the future.

Lilya Kaganovsky examined the movie “Putevka v zhizn” (“The road to life”)\textsuperscript{72}. It was a story about the orphaned boys who converted from criminals into productive citizens of the Soviet nation.\textsuperscript{73} One of the tasks of the movie was to show the protagonists’ international status. The protagonist Mustafa sings Tartar songs and speaks broken Russian. However, the audience regarded this as a poor knowledge of Russian. After this case Russian was regarded as the main language of Soviet cinema.\textsuperscript{74}

Historians in Moscow tried to tie nationalism and internationalism, and their colleagues in Kazakhstan, Ukraine and other republics aimed at pressing non-Russian nationalities with the Russo-centric understanding of patriotism. Non-Russian writers published books about their national heroes, but one book of a non-Russian author was shaded with 10 works on Russian heroes.\textsuperscript{75}

Propaganda during the War showed the construction of Russian identity and the desire to unite people under the motto of Russian culture and history. After the victory of the USSR in WWII, Stalin promoted the Russians as the central nation of the USSR. Russification started to decrease only after Stalin’s death. The exposure of the cult of Stalin’s personality brought developments to the national policies. New slogans agitated
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for the “imaginary all-unit community”. The illustration of the “international friendship” concept can be the song of V. Kharitonov: “My address is not a house number and a street name, but the Soviet Union” (“Moi adres ne dom i ne uliza, moi adres – Sovetski Souz”).

National tolerance and respect were supported by law. The law penalized the disrespectful treatment of people of different nationalities towards each other. For example, jocular proverbs such as “An uninvited guest is worse than a Tatar” (“Nezvani gost’ huzhe tatarina”) could bring problems to a person who pronounced that.

Visuals

Posters and stamps spread over the USSR – it was a very easy and understandable way to remind people that they are the citizens of one big state. The posters and stamps had a didactic role. They represented people of different nationalities and developed tolerance and knowledge of the Soviet nations.

1993. Nations of the USSR.
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750 years since the death of Shota Rustaveli.

1947. Armorial bearings of the USSR and union republics. Kazakh SSR.

1948. “Work hard with the persistence of fighting, and the collective farm will be the best! For an honest work will be awards: wealth, fame and honor!” Artist N. Karpovsky (1907-1978).

1948. “From generation to strengthen the friendship of the peoples of the USSR!” Artist Konovalov.
1957. “The 1st of May is the Workers’ Day around the world!” Artists Kominarets I., E. Pozdnev.


“Little tactics of the habitat”

The book by Timothy Johnston offers the theory which says that the Soviet society was constructed in contrast to the Soviet policies. In the last years of the Soviet Union people had the reasons to feel “soviet” because of the war experience, victory, and nuclear conflict. But the “sovietness” did not destroy other identities in the USSR: people could define themselves as “Soviet, Russian, Jewish, a laborer at the Dinamo Factory, a Kievan, or a member of a global proletariat”. Johnston argues, that a person could “wear” a lot of identities. Ethno-national or class identities were significant in the period, but he examined supranational Soviet identity, which was inherited by the USSR citizens together with other identities.

Official Soviet identity formed on the pages of the newspapers Pravda, Krasnaia Zvezda and the journals Ogonek and Krokodil (a satirical magazine). It was promoted through plays, films and speeches of the Agitprop section of the Central Committee. The official Soviet identity was expressed in the diplomatic relations between the USSR and Germany, and in the relations between the soviet and non-soviet civilization.

The USSR aimed at people being proud of the national advance in science and technology. In 1935 the Moscow Daily News announced that “Foreign was always a synonym for the best in Russia, the situation has changed radically now. The Soviet Union has a powerful industry which is able to produce any machine, any metal or any chemical”. People celebrated domestic achievements in aeronautics and Arctic exploration. Johnston noticed that the USSR became its own “West”, it could produce everything and had achievements in many industrial and scientific fields.
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Johnston explains the life of ordinary Soviet people as “little tactics of the habitat” such as “reappropriation”, “avoidance” and “bricolage.” In other words, Soviet people survived in the Soviet state by adapting to the reality. Soviet citizens reappropriated Soviet customs and tried to find new meanings in them: they regarded ideological meetings, marches and campaigns (in which they must take part) as “an opportunity to socialize, drink or to settle scores with enemies.” Bricolage means the skills of Soviet citizens in getting information, knowledge or limited products in the frame of the USSR. When the official information was not enough, Soviet citizens started to gather rumors from unofficial sources and create their own independent impression on the situation in the state. In the frame of the Harvard Project the researchers asked respondents about the sources of information in the USSR. “85% answered ‘newspapers’, ‘radio’ and 47% mentioned ‘word-of-mouth’. To the question: which source is the most important for you?, 36% said “newspapers”, 28% ‘word-of-mouth’ and 10% ‘radio’. When asked which source they consider as the most reliable, 61% preferred ‘oral information’ and 13% ‘newspapers’. Bricolage worked when people needed to get a limited or exclusive product. They used underground sources to obtain food or clothing. Anekdot – was a peculiar way to laugh about reality. A short story, which spread from mouth to mouth, noticed the absurdities of Soviet life and official ideology. People constructed their vision of the world through unofficial information and “innovatively negotiated” in the Soviet society. Johns made an example of an anekdot, which contains ironic humor on the Soviet policies and ideology: “‘extending the hand of friendship’ to the Finns, and they were ‘extending their feet’ (dying).”

The soldiers of the Soviet Army, who attended the army’s activities in the Baltic countries, Bessarabia and Finland, came back with the experience of foreign life. They told stories about “the diversity of goods in the shops”, “low prices on shoes, suits and
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so on”, “mountains of eggs, tubes of butter, clothes, wristwatches, and good woolen material in Tallinn”\(^{88}\), these goods began to spread among the relatives and friends of soldiers. People highly appreciated the items and gave a special status to its owner.

Soviet identity was constructed as a collective phenomenon; its members shared rumors, music tastes, and dances of these years. Each rumor and symbol was collectively understood and familiar throughout the USSR; people had a collective frame of thinking.\(^{89}\)

\textit{What did Soviet identity mean for the Soviet people?}

Igor’ Sibiriakov, an expert of the international IA REX\(^{90}\) interviewed people who were born in the USSR. His question was: Does Soviet identity still exist among the ex-Soviet people after the collapse of the USSR?

Vladimir Belyaminov - political scientist and expert on financial and economic Marketing (Kharkov, Ukraine):

(…) Soviet identity is going away. We watched the same telecasts, listened to the same music, had equal textbooks at schools, solved the same sums about “tubes and swimming pools”, and had the same heroes. It was much easier to be the united nation. Now everyone has his heroes and new generation grows up with the local subcultural values, which the former Soviet neighborhood is not familiar with.

The Soviet people were united in its diversity. During the summer children from one region went to visit their relatives to the other side of the country and brought with them their local games, language, slang, and subculture. They made the youth environment uniform. The Army also helped to integration, sending people to serve the Soviet Union in all regions of the country. Universities mixed people when sent its graduators to work in different directions of the USSR. Organizations worked in the Union scale.
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\(^{88}\) Ibidem, p. 35.
\(^{89}\) Ibid, p. xliiv.
Peter Getsko - Prime Minister of the unrecognized Republic of Subcarpathian Rus (Uzhgorod, Ukraine):

(…) The generation of 35-year-olds and older people still have the feeling of sovietness. The external conditions request Soviet identity. Soon the word "sovok" (from “Soviet”) will get a respectful meaning instead of abusive one.

Michael Dorfman - writer, editor, publisher (NY, USA):

(…) The Soviet national identity existed because there was a common school system, military service, higher education and the other instruments of national construction.

Alexander Kulik - political scientist, Candidate of Historical Sciences (Kiev, Ukraine):

(…) This identity is not political, but cultural - the former Soviet people are united by common traditions, movies, jokes, customs, and a common past. A few more generations will feel the echo of the Soviet past.91

According to the answers, people know what it means to be Soviet. They argue that the feeling of Sovietness still exists, but it will not survive in the modern world, because there are no conditions to maintain it. They characterized this feeling as the sameness and identity in the whole USSR. People were brought up in the same way, they had the same traditions, humor and lifestyle. Their answers corroborate the theory of brotherhood in the Army and the theory of Johnston on tactics of the habitat.

Big cities as the accelerators of Soviet identity

Big cities played a significant role in the construction of Soviet identity. Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, Tashkent, Alma Alta and other megalopolises, where Russians,  

Ukrainians, Jewish, Uzbek or German people lived all in one house or in a shared apartment ("kommunal’naia kvartira"). They shared their cultures, languages; their children grew up playing and studying together. The life in big cities mixed people and helped them to integrate into the Soviet life and between each other. One of the examples of the coexistence is depicted in a recent novel On the Sunny Side of the Street ("Na Solnechnoi Storone Ulizi")\textsuperscript{92} by the Russian writer of Jewish origin Dina Rubina. The novel narrates about the post-war life in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan. According to the official census of the population, 98 different ethnicities and nationalities lived in Tashkent. Rubina compares the city with Babylon or Noah's Ark: “It was impossible to surprise someone with the fact that you are Armenian Aysor, Jewish, Greek, Tatar, Uighur or Korean”.\textsuperscript{93} Children grew up in multicultural society, surrounded by different languages. When parents went to work, they asked their foreign neighbors to look after their children. Common games and entertainments taught children to speak and understand many languages, such as one protagonist argued, that he spoke Farsi, Yiddish, Ukrainian, Greek, Russian and Uzbek. Life in the multicultural society cultivated hospitality and openness in people. Rubina says, that “the true friendship of nations - it was the golden balance, which was presented in old Tashkent, the great Noah's ark, in which people argued, loved, fought, stole from each other, and celebrated – their own holidays and along with them – the holidays of other nationalities.”\textsuperscript{94} The author expressed the point of view, that people created “the friendship of nations” without the government’s involvement. The government established solutions according to which people found themselves in Tashkent, and people solved this problem and survived in the hard solutions of the post-War city.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibidem, part 16.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibidem.
Schools and summer camps

School education played an important role in the cultivation of tolerance. I conducted an interview with seven Russian people, who studied at soviet schools in the 60s. They told me that there were lessons at schools which were dedicated to the cultures and traditions of the nations-members of the USSR. The Soviet schools organized festivals, where students were divided into groups and prepared the presentations of the Soviet republics. They started to prepare long time before the performance and learnt how to dance the national dances, made national costumes, recited poems by heart. One of the respondents said: “We did not think that people of other nationalities were different from us. We had a great interest in their traditions and respected it. When we went to summer camps we often became friends with students of other nationalities and exchanged letters with them after the summer. For example, I met a Georgian girl in the summer camp in Crimea, and we were pen-friends for a long time and visited each other.”

Young pioneer camp was the name for the summer camps in the territory of the USSR. In the camps children could spend two-three weeks of the summer (some of camps hosted children all year round). The most famous international camps were the All-Union pioneer camp Artek (near Gurzuf, Ukraine, on the Black sea), Orelno (Krasnodar krai, on the Black sea) and Ocean (Primorsky krai). Children across the Soviet Union were gathered there, had different activities, games, festivities. Through these activities the camps provided intercultural exchange.

Humor

When we talk about the creation of identity, we need to admit the important role of TV. Television had the same programs all over the USSR. I would like to discuss the humorous KVN show, a unique program which still exists. KVN is an interesting
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phenomenon, because it appeared as an official order of the central TV, but it spread across the Soviet Union and turned into the people’s game. With the help of this game Soviet citizens expressed themselves, their identities and nationalities. The humorous TV show KVN ("Klub Veselikh i Nakhodchivikh" - "Club of the Funny and Inventive") was first aired on November 8, 1961. It was a competition between teams (usually university students). They had to give funny (unprepared) answers to the questions from the audience, improvise on given topics and perform humorous sketches. The most favorite themes of KVNshik (a person, who plays KVN) were every-day situations, social life, politics, and stereotypes. KVNshiki had very intelligent and sharp sense of humor. However, for the reason of ideology KVN was closed in 1971 and revived in 1986.

The game received a great popularity. Across the USSR a KVN-movement appeared and KVN games were held in schools, pioneer camps, and universities. The qualifying rounds were held at universities across the country; there were several KVN Leagues with the Major League on the top. Only the funniest teams got the Major League, and it aired on TV.

The participants of the game were from different republics. They represented universities in Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Latvia, Lithuania, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Tatarstan and Abkhazia.96 Charismatic and artistic teams fascinated the audience with their humor. They emphasized their cultural and national peculiarities and parodied the stereotypes in a kind way. The KVNshiki called the big audience of the Soviet republics for tolerance and peaceful coexistence. They proudly performed their national dances and songs and combined them with humor. The participants expressed (in the name of their republics) that they all are very open and friendly people and they invited everyone to visit their homelands. KVNshiki used the language of everyday life and made fun of the ideological and political circumstances, which was clear for the audience and gave a feeling of solidarity, equality and togetherness.

1.4 Conclusion

The central question was the question of Soviet identity. In order to understand how it was constructed, I had to examine the Soviet policies on nationhood. When Lenin came to power, he inherited a big state with an unsolved national question. In order to avoid the riots (and for ideological reasons), he decided to shape national territories, to support national cultures and to create languages where it was applicable. At the same time, he disparaged Russians in order to decrease their present influence in other republics. The results of *korenizatsiia* were arguable, but strong: people did not forget their cultures and languages and the territories of their countries (for instance, the territories of Central Asia countries) keep their borders till today. Stalin changed policies and started to promote Russian culture as the headmost in the USSR. However, some researchers argue, that the Russian language was international and understandable by everyone in the USSR. That is why the government used it as the Soviet language. In the time of Khrychev people lived in the time of thaw. The War was finished and the well-being of the citizens had become better. The cultural level of the Soviet people increased. They survived the War, and probably troubles made them closer. In this background Soviet citizens integrated with their neighbors, traveled around the USSR, participated in international constructions: built new cities, factories and hydroelectric power stations.

The Soviet identity came from two sources: government policies and links among people. The Soviet government created identity through language, education, a common lifestyle in all the republics, and a common address to all people (“*tovarishch*”); they tried to give people the sense of family and fraternity. They gathered people from different republics in the Army and Summer Camps. The authority created the image of “stranger” and “enemy”: Soviet against Germans or Soviet-non Soviet. The Soviet government underlined the unity of the USSR through visuals: the cinema, posters and stamps. They understood the didactic function of popular culture: songs, cinema, and festivals – all these instruments were used to give people a feeling of sameness and togetherness.
However, Soviet identity was a phenomenon, which also increased among the citizens. Many of them were not satisfied with the government, with the life conditions and a lack of information. They had their “little tactics of the habitat” which helped them to enjoy their life and to survive in the Soviet system. People could identify Soviet in each other; they had skills to adjust into the everyday life of the USSR. They had a common sense of humor and common lifestyles. Some citizens were Soviet in ideology, while others were simply part of the Soviet system.

We observed the question of nations and identity in multicultural Soviet Union. In the next chapter I would like to examine the European Union and its policies on the construction of European identity.
Chapter 2

European Identity

The second chapter is dedicated to the phenomenon of European identity. The chapter aims to understand theories, policies and instruments according to which European identity is being constructed.

In the first part I will investigate the theoretical background on identity and the constructions of national identities. I will discuss the concept of identity in the literature of the 80s-90s and I will try to answer the question: what is the background for the construction of European identity? Was it built according to the framework adopted for the construction of national identities?

In the second subchapter I will observe the historical basis of the idea of Europe. How did Europeans see themselves through the ages?

In the third part of the chapter I will examine government instruments and measures for the creation of European identity and the processes of identity building inside the European Union. The subchapter will investigate treaties and acts on identity construction and examples of its implementation in the case of the European Union. The last subchapter will show the attitudes of the Europeans towards European identity. What does it mean to be European to them and do they feel European?

2.1 Definitions of terms: identity, national identity, European identity.

The term “identity” is used in many disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and international relations. The Oxford English dictionary defines “identity” as “the fact of being who or what a person or thing is”. The word “identity” comes from the Latin “identitas” (“sameness”). The question of sameness was already present in antiquity. Aristotle and Plato studied the universality of being; the Renaissance brought the interest for self-knowledge. The Humanists observed sameness with regard to social relations and reflection. However, the term “identity” appeared in
the XX century, when Karl Jaspers in his work "General Psychopathology" examined identity. He stated that “identity” is one of the fourth definitions of “I”. Identity meant the difference between “Me” and the rest of the World. Claude Lévi-Strauss elaborated the concept of identity in the frame of family ties. He tried to find the sources of identity in the structure of kinship. Identity is the self-image, something that does not exist but appears only in comparison, identity is part of an interaction with others. There were many researchers from different areas of studies who defined this concept.

Individuals and communities have their identities, which also can be multiple. Identity can be expressed through gender, territory, nationality, religion, occupation, or class. For instance, Oedipus Tyrannos from Sophocles’ play had many identities: “father, husband, king, even hero.”  

Each person and community may have several expressions; in this case he or she has a multiple identity. Breakwell argues that identity can be personal, social and political. Personal identity indicates family and personal characteristics, social means belonging to race, nationality and gender, and political means belonging to a political unity. National identity is a part of political identities. The concept of identity in international relation appeared during the Cold War era, when identities were created on the basis of ethnic and national identities. National identity provides social ties between people. As Smith argues, the symbols are a very important means of connection: “flags, coinage, anthems, uniforms, monuments and ceremonies”.

In the 40s, 50s and 60s the European historians started to investigate the concept of Europe, the history of discourse on Europe and the basis for unified Europe. They brought the concept of European identity.

The studies on identity which I observe in my research appeared in the 1980s and 1990s. Identity was defined by Perry Anderson as “basic and essential for the group or
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individual in question”, “fundamentally relational, implying some element of alterity for its definition”\textsuperscript{101}. Researches borrowed the concept of identity from psychology and anthropology in order to answer the question “What is Europe?”

Discussing European identity, we need to bear in mind, that there are many debates and uncertain definitions on the question of identity in Europe. First of all, there is European identity: what does it mean? Second, there are European and European Union identities. What is the difference between them and can we argue that the second exists? Third, when we speak about European identity, it always refers to the shared culture and history of Europeans and its connection with the concept of national identity. Nation is the basis for collective identity. And most of the time it is the main definition of collective identity. Harris explains this: “We are in the realm of collective identities and particularly cultural identity which brings discussion about new forms of identity in contemporary Europe into the area of studies on nationalism”\textsuperscript{102}.

I would like to observe the national identity formation theories and to understand if they are applicable to the formation of European identity and if they can provide explanations for European identity.

National identity, according to Anthony Smith\textsuperscript{103}, is: (i) a historic territory, or a homeland; (ii) a common myth and historical memories; (iii) a common, mass public and culture; (iv) common legal rights and duties for all members; (v) a common economy with territorial mobility for the members. This explanation means that national identity can be formed from two directions – people’s activities and the policy of authorities.

\textsuperscript{102} Harris E. “New Forms of Identity in Contemporary Europe”, \textit{Perspectives on European Politics and Society}, 4/1, pp. 13-33.
Frykman describes identity as the feeling of “belonging”; he argues that this is the folk concept. People want to know their origin and belonging to a territory, to understand themselves genealogically.104

There are two approaches on the creation of national identity: Essentialism and Constructivism. Essentialists state that national identity is something that belongs to a person forever, and thus, it is divine, inherited and natural. In the case of Europe, the unity could grow only on the old roots: the Christian faith, the European languages and humanist values.105 The constructivist approach on national identity says that it is a permanent phenomenon, which can change in accordance with policies, and can be combined with other identities. Delanty wrote: “No coherent idea runs through European history from the earliest time to the present and the historical frontiers of Europe have themselves shifted several times”106. These two concepts can be regarded as the two views on European identity before and after WWII: before people believed in the divine origin of their nations and the essential heritage of their cultures. After World War II the feeling of national identities decreased.107

The concept of European Imaginary Community elaborated by Benedict Anderson says that nation is an “imagined” concept, because “the members of even the smallest nation will never know the most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion”.108

The concept of “imaginary communities” reconciled Marxist theory with the theory of nationalism. Where Marx proved nationalism as a “uncomfortable anomaly” and it was “elided, rather than confronted”109. Anderson argues, that the nation is
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“imagined as limited”\textsuperscript{110}, because even the biggest nations have boundaries, on the other side of which there are other nations. Anderson indicates that nation is a sovereign concept, because the concept was developed in the late eighteenth century, when the “divinely-ordained hierarchical dynastic realm”\textsuperscript{111} was destroyed. The author states, that nation is imaged, as a community, because regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation… the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal commandership. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much as to kill, as willing to die for such limited imaginings\textsuperscript{112}.

Members of “imaginary community” share the same beliefs, have a similar mindset and patriotism. The communities are ruled by institutions, the links between authorities and people are established through legislation, administration and education. Anderson assigns an important role to the print and media communication for the creation of an “imaginary community”.

Does European identity exist? Different researchers have opposite points of view. For example, Kumar argues that at best Europe is seen as “a ‘family of cultures’ made up of a syndrome of partially shared historical traditions and cultural heritages”\textsuperscript{113}, at worst people see Europe as “a myth or ideology… elaborated in different ways and… times by Western elites in the consolidation of their power”\textsuperscript{114}. There are authors who express the opinion that European identity exists. In his book \textit{A Union of Diversity} Kraus argues that the notion of identity is applicable to the European Union case as a cultural identity, because it represents politically institutionalized cultural practices\textsuperscript{115}. However, he stresses that the most popular components of European culture are arguable. The
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Judeo-Christian tradition encountered Islam; when we underline Hellenism, we ignore the “Barbarians”; and when we speak about the role of the Enlightenment we forget about Romanticism, which also influenced the development of European consciousness.\textsuperscript{116}

Munich identified the sources of European identity: economic exchange: homogenization of the standards of living; political centralization: homogenization of the law; border-transcending associations: homogenization of solidarity, border-transcending communications: homogenization of culture; individualization: homogenization of identity\textsuperscript{117}. But he did not mention history, myths and shared stories as the instruments of identity creation. This represents a difference between the creation of national identities and the construction of European identity. Anthony Smith also expressed his doubts that European identity can be designed according to the patterns of national identity construction. He argued that people lack common experience and shared myths and symbols. He stressed that European countries are too nationalistic; they do not have a common education system and media system. Smith doubts that someone “will die for Europe”.

On the contrary, Michael Wintle believes, that there is a space for European identity which is based on common history and common cultural heritage, which has become a universal high culture. European identity and the feeling of “Europeanness” can coexist with national identities. National identities matter for the state’s stability and strength. The identity of the European Union should be regarded as a kind of national identity, which is “transferred from the nation-state model to the European level”\textsuperscript{118}. Wintle describes national identity, which is applicable to the European Union as the identity with patriotism, duty to the state, and jingoism\textsuperscript{119}.

However, in my research I hold the opinion that European identity is the historical basis for the identity of the European Union. The idea of Europe is the
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essential part of the modern view on identity. Europe keeps the history, culture, philosophy, consciousness, myths and territory, which belonged to Europe since ancient times.

The creation of identity depends on the state policies and the development and level of nationalism inside the nation. In order to construct identity, there have to be shared myths, holidays, traditions, symbols and so on. In the case of the EU European traditions were invented, the European community was imagined and European myths and symbols were created or discovered. I will discuss these in the third subchapter. The second subchapter is dedicated to the idea of Europe: the historical notion, which Munich did not include in the sources of European Union identity. We will try to understand if Europeans inherited the consciousness of Europe and what it means.

2.2 The idea of Europe.

Europe as a territorial concept existed in different times. European territories were united politically, intellectually or culturally. There were periods, when the bigger part of Europe was united by one hegemonic ruler; but European power also spread beyond the continent, when European states had shared influences in the world. The Roman Empire united Europe through different degree of influence: in the second century AD the Romans controlled the biggest part of what we call Europe today. The Roman Empire adopted Christianity in AD 324. The Christian faith became a very significant force for uniting Europe. By the eleventh century Christianity was adopted in Western and Eastern Europe and in Scandinavia. After the great schism in 1054, when Christianity split into the Latin and Constantinople Churches, most of the modern territory of the EU remained with the Latin Christianity. The role of the papacy and its influence on the Catholic European territories remained strong until the seventeen century. The Frankish kingdom (V-IX centuries) was the first evidence of the use of
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religion as a uniting instrument. It covered the modern territories of France, Germany, the Low Countries, the Alpine states and a big part of Italy. Christendom was also the measure of defense and distinctive feature for Europeans in the face of Islam. During the Renaissance Europeans started to observe other continents: Africa, Asia, and America. This helped them to draw more distinctions between their cultures and the cultures of the rest of the World. During the Enlightenment self-awareness emerged amongst scholars and artists: they believed in a European world domination and the highest level of development in Europe. Cultural ties between different cities and states were established: they shared political ideas, religion and law. Fine arts and music, together with the Latin language made the European continent recognizable.

From the 1500s Europeans started to think about Europe as a wise, courageous and dominant power which they shared with others and which could shape the world. They had a right to and duty towards the world.

The development of economy has also become a distinctive feature of Europe. Capitalism emerged in Europe already in the Renaissance with the first banks and the policies of the Medici. The Protestant ethic (or more specifically, the Calvinist ethic), according to Max Weber’s theory, generated capitalism. It motivated the believers to work hard, to be successful entrepreneurs and to invest their profits in further development rather than pleasures. In the 19th century Europe showed its greatness through wars, trade and the creation of Empires; Europeans were confident that their economy was the most powerful.

The borders of Europe were not only geographically defined, but also had cultural and political definitions, and they did not coincide. Wintle states that the water boarders of Europe (in the West, North and South) helped Europeans to shape their “alterity”. Through trade, navigation, and colonialism Europeans recognized themselves and their distinction from the other world.

Ibidem, p. 32.

The European border on the East is the subject of many studies and discussions. In the town of Nizhny Tagil in the Ural Mountains there is a monument which bears the dual inscription: “Asia” on one side and “Europe” on the other. This monument is a symbol of the Ural Mountains as a geographical border between two continents. However, from the 1800s until the 20th century, when the Soviet dictatorship shaped other ideological borders with the “West”, Russia was politically regarded as a part of Europe (despite that in social and cultural spheres it seemed far and strange for Western Europe). In the 20th century Europe became part of the Western countries, such as the USA, Australia, and New Zealand.

The most significant period of Europe in the world was in the 19th and early 20th century, because the power of Eurocentrism spread over the world with its norms and values. Europe generated most of the concepts for the modern world, such as: nation-state, western democracy, human rights, class ideology, gender ideas, religion, quality of life (consumerism, the value of education), and the idea of development (every day we need to grow and to become better than we were yesterday). All these ideas shape Europe and Europeans, they link the past and the present and help to shape European identity. Through the consciousness of Europe and ideas, which were produced by European people and which were implemented in Europe, Europeans can define themselves and feel their difference from the rest of the world.

2.3 The Construction of the European Union in the 20th and 21st century: history and instruments.

Very shortly after the Second World War six European states established the European Steel and Coal Community (ECSC). They made it in order to guarantee peace and to control relations between ex-Nazi Western Germany and France; to strengthen Europe in the political and economic spheres (especially because there was a threat from
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the Soviet state); and to control the steal and coal resources through a supranational authority.

European integration became the accompanying factor for the creation of the single market, the development of a common European law, the adoption of the Euro, the establishment of the free movement of people in the EU, enlargement, and policy cooperation on a great number of issues. Back in the 50s, European authorities sponsored historical investigations on the roots of Europeaness in history, on the frontiers of Europe, shared culture and values.

In 1973 at the EC summit held in Copenhagen the Declaration on European identity was adopted. The declaration included the main principles which would help to reveal and to maintain European identity: representative democracy, social justice, the role of law, and respect for human rights. The member states (9 at the time) agreed to protect their rich national diversity. But at the same time they saw European identity as the product of a common policy of all member-states. The official concept of European identity expressed the desire of authorities to build it on the basis of diversity, but drawing on the common set of political values. The idea of European identity was based on the concept of responsibility towards the rest of the world. Nine countries were tied by mutual responsibility and friendly peaceful relations among each other; they had responsibility towards the Mediterranean countries, Africa and the Middle East; they worked in friendship and equality with the USA.\textsuperscript{125}

The concept of European identity remained until December 1999, when the Millennium Declaration was adopted in Helsinki. It established the same formulating on European identity:

\begin{quote}
The European Union is based on democracy and the rule of law. The Union’s citizens are bound together by common values such as freedom, tolerance, equality, solidarity and cultural diversity.
\end{quote}

The European Union is a unique venture, with no model in history. Only together, through the Union, can we and our countries meet tomorrow’s challenges.\textsuperscript{126}

We can see that the basis of the concept of European identity kept its general line; however, it was elaborated and discussed in other significant European documents. The Maastricht Treaty underlined the deepening of “solidarity between people while respecting their history, their culture and their traditions”\textsuperscript{127} and respect to the national identities of the Member States.\textsuperscript{128}

The Treaties of Maastricht (1992) and Amsterdam (1997) included the paragraphs from the treaty established in Rome in 1957, which stated that:

1. The Union shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while representing their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.
   2. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas:
      a. improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples;
      b. conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance;
      c. non-commercial cultural exchanges;
      d. artistic and literary creation, including in the audiovisual sector.

The EU established the diversity of cultures, and the principles of freedom, equality and solidarity. In the 90s more and more citizens started to recognize their involvement in the common European life. The EC was officially called ‘European

Union’ in 1993. European citizens faced the same dimensions and processes in employment structures, education, welfare systems; they obtained the common currency and cultural policies.

The cultural administration of the EU led to the creation of the European cultural heritage. They aimed “to emphasize the intellectual traditions and events that unite the continent”. They started to produce publications about the Roman and Greek empires, the Middle Ages, the Carolingian Empire, the Habsburgs and the modern European Union\(^\text{129}\).

On the following pages I would like to observe the instruments which the European government used in order to build European identity.

An article by Peter Oderman\(^\text{130}\) discusses the symbols of European integration. He argues that firstly European authorities were concerned with internal market and monetary systems, which did not arouse the enthusiasm for integration. The author highlights that in the 90s Europe switched from the structuralist-functionalist model of society to the cultural model. Culture was defined as knowledge inside the community, people’s self-consciousness\(^\text{131}\). People see the cultural differences between communities through stereotypes.

In 1984 the European Community discussed the symbols of the EU. The countries voted to accept or to reject the following suggestions: the implementation of the European passport, European currency; extradition of wanted persons, free movement of labor, European social security, and free movement of goods. The European countries decided to make these symbols common. But they rejected the idea of European representation at the Olympic Games and European diplomatic representation in Washington and Moscow.

In 1985 European citizens were questioned on their attitudes toward the common European currency. People had different opinions, but mostly it depended on the


\(\text{131}\) Ibidem, p. 219.
strength of the national currency. André Száz argues that currency is the very important element of a sovereign state. He discussed the role of currency in the construction of identity. The author brings the opinion of Mrs. Thatcher, who believed that one cannot create a common currency with a group of countries and to preserve autonomy in the area of economic and financial policy. However, others regarded the European currency as a symbol of European identity. There was another group of people, such as Harry Johnson who stressed that the common currency as a symbol should symbolize a reality, which has to be constructed. Economic and political integration should be the initial basis for the common currency.

The pool of 1985 showed that people mostly agreed (80%) with the establishment of a common European passport, with the exception of the citizens of Great Britain and Denmark.

Other four symbols of the EU referred to economic and juridical integration, but impacted on socio-cultural integration as well: the removal of physical frontiers, technical borders, and the acceptance of the fiscal union and the homogenization of legislation. The removing of borders between states also contributed to the elimination of frontiers in people’s mind sets.

However, the distance between bureaucracy and people was too big. More efforts to bring people closer had to be made. During the ministerial meeting at Fontainebleau in 1984 it was decided to “reinforce the identity and image of the community”. They decided that the community needs to have a flag and an emblem, (ECCS had a flag since 1958), and the flag of the European Union was adopted by May 29th 1986. Firstly this flag was the emblem of the Council of Europe. The blue background symbolizes Europe. The twelve stars are five-pointed in order have no associations with Jewish stars and crosses were not possible because Turkey is a member of the Council of Europe. There
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are twelve stars, because number twelve is associated with hours in the day, months in the year, Christ’s apostles, the Roman Law tables and many others\textsuperscript{136}. Along with the flag the anthem “Ode to Joy” (which promoted freedom, peace and solidarity) was adopted. The EU issued postage stamps depicting pictures of Europe and the Bull, France issued a picture of the Euro.

The new European Community needed heroes. The Fontainebleau Committee suggested glorifying people, who contributed to the idea and establishment of the European state: Robert Schuman, and Jean Monnet.

Mass media in Europe is one the most important reflectors of cultural, political, economic and social relations between the Member States of the EU. It has become the subject of discussions on the supranational debates in the 1980s, when the European governance decided to use audiovisual communication as the instrument for the creation of European identity\textsuperscript{137}. The EU argued the importance of making interesting, high quality cultural products, which will attract different people. Culture here bears the sense of popular, mass-produced and everyday culture\textsuperscript{138}. The culture industry will bring “economic goods, creating jobs and producing wealth and vehicles for the construction of cultural identities”\textsuperscript{139}. The first initiatives for the creation of a common media were: MEDIA program, European Cinema and Television Year 1998, and the RACE and EUREKA programs. Other cultural initiatives were: Culture 2000 (a project on heritage protection, translation and artistic cooperation. It involved the Kaléidoscope program and the Raphael program). It aimed at the popularization of culture and media. The initiative lasted for six years and promoted mutual exchange of cultures through dance, theatre, cinema, literature, music etc\textsuperscript{140}.

\textsuperscript{140} Ibidem, p. 170.
The program “Integrating and Strengthening the European Research Area” was also elaborated. It aimed at establishing contacts for an emerging knowledge-based society. Other initiatives were the “European City of Culture” (where selected cities received funds to organize cultural events and exhibitions), “Heritage days” (focused on the promotion of digital technologies for cultural education), and the Debora project (digital access to the culture of the Renaissance period). The European government promoted educational and training programs such as Leonardo da Vinci and Socrates which contributed to language and educational exchange (for example, the Socrates program in 1998 allowed 200,000 university students to study in another European country, which is 5% from all European students\textsuperscript{141}). The YOUTH program (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) was created to involve the young European generation in the democratic life and to give them the feeling of belonging to Europe\textsuperscript{142}.

Elisabeth Dumont has studied the phenomenon of cultural tourism in the European Union\textsuperscript{143}. The question of a common culture within the EU was not discussed in the Treaty of Rome, but it pointed to the idea of Europe as bearing a common cultural heritage. The Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 underlined the importance of establishing an identity based on culture. Article 128 of the Treaty of Maastricht says, that “The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing common cultural heritage to the fore”\textsuperscript{144}. In order to understand the role of the European Union in the development of tourism, the author conducted a sociological pool. She questioned people from 250 small and medium-sized towns across Europe and they answered that they waited for governmental support for the “promotion of networks, exchanges, good practices at supranational or superregional level and in funding”\textsuperscript{145}. Also, the European Union signed the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. This means that the European Union is in charge of
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the preservation and maintenance of cultural diversity in Europe and it has to promote and to sponsor the development of cultural connections within the Union.

In his book *The Image of Europe*¹⁴⁶ Wintle observes the architecture of the European Union which emerged in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. The examples of such architecture can be seen in Strasbourg, Luxembourg and Brussels. The European Parliament buildings in Brussels were “designed to impress: it has sweeping lobbies and lofty halls. They are quite enormous, on a huge stunning scale.”¹⁴⁷ It had additional towers which were built for administrative offices, lobbies and they can accommodate a big number of political parties. The European buildings were constructed in accordance with traditions of the nineteenth-century European royal palaces¹⁴⁸.

There are also the pieces of art presented near the European buildings and on the streets of European cities. The sculptures have a shade of European propaganda. For example, the “Figure of Europe” near the European Parliament in Brussels represents a young woman who steps forward with the expression in her eyes turned towards the future (Wintle compared the sculpture with the Soviet agit-prop art). She holds the symbol of the European monetary union in her right hand. The woman embodies the European Union and its power to unify people from different nations. Another example is a sculpture of a woman which is situated in Amsterdam on Muntplein. She has uncovered breasts and wears a long skirt, as she holds a scarf in her hands and is standing on a globe. The woman personifies Europe; her scarf embodies

---
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the fluttering garment of Europa when she was abducted by the bull (as depicted in many paintings). Her position on the globe means European superiority and power in the world\textsuperscript{149}.

European gender policies also have become an instrument for the creation of European identity. The “Women of Europe” award began in 1987. It was implemented by the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Movement. The aim of the award was to honor a woman from each member state who helped to increase European integration and who conducted her activities during the previous two years. First the national jury picks up candidates and awards them with a special ceremony. Afterwards, the international jury decides who will hold the name of “European Woman of the Year”\textsuperscript{150}. For example, in 1996 the European Woman of the Year was Marit Paulsen. As Cris Shore reports\textsuperscript{151}, she was born in Norway in 1939 and in early childhood moved to Sweden. Since her father died when she was still a girl, her mother married with a German man. As a young adult, Marit Paulsen worked in a factory and then became a farmer. She had ten children and wrote seven children books, five works of fiction, and several television and film scripts. She worked on integration and the protection of the environment. The image of Mrs. Paulsen reflected European history, integration and basic values: in her childhood she suffered from the war, then she became a transnational European worker, because she was from Norway but had a permanent residence in Sweden; she occupied herself as a farmer and dealt with fishing, the iron industry and agriculture - all spheres which are among the most important for


European integration. Her family life and the amount of children responded to Christian values. Thus, the European Union promoted the image of a non-selfish, non-individualistic and non-nationalistic woman, who is the symbol of maternity, who is open to new ideas and has an active lifestyle.

The European government creates EU identity through the common national identity-building instruments, i.e., common passports, European driving licenses, a hymn, Europe days, prizes, diplomas, celebrations and sport events. These are top-down policies. In the last subchapter we will observe people’s attitudes towards Europe. To what extent do they feel European?

2.4 Europeans and European identity.

What do citizens of the European Union feel towards EU identity? In his book *The Europeans: Political Identity in an Emerging Polity*¹⁵² David Michael Green carried out research in which he tried to understand to what extent the citizens of Europe are involved in the construction of European identity. The author used a quotation from *The New York Times*, December 24, 1998, where a twenty-six European businessman describes what it means to be European:

Mobile, fluent in several languages and aggressively non-nationalistic... living the kind of borderless, cosmopolitan existence... they do not share their parent’s sense of national identity.¹⁵³

Green analyzed the questionnaires, which were given to European citizens. He scoped that the level of a person’s education defined the extent to which he feels European. Many of the interviewed informants studied abroad on an Erasmus program and they believed that it had changed their lives. As one respondent noticed: “Erasmus is

---
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European integration". People underlined increasing cross-border relations. Some of them were married with citizens from other nations; some were born from parents of different European nationalities. They argued that when you have such a background, “it is quite natural to feel European”. Educational programs like Erasmus and Socrates gave European youngsters the possibility to learn more about other European languages and cultures. The former British foreign minister said: “younger people are warmer toward Europe [than their elders] because it is rare to find one who had not traveled there and does not do so regularly. Europe’s ease of travel regulations is building affinities and changing public opinion about Europe”.

The respondents described the meaning of “Europeaness”. Most of them referred to the notion of peace, shared sense of culture, democracy, human rights and socio-economic solidarity. They also noticed the idea of common culture and heritage, which helps to construct European identity.

The most recent investigation of Eurobarometer on the feeling of “Europeanness” was conducted in 2010. The research aimed at investigating the concept of “New Europeans”: EU citizens who have connections with other countries of the EU, except the country of their residence. There we defined four types of connectedness: family descent, personal relationships, personal experiences and socio-cultural links. The analyzes have shown, that one of fourteen respondents was born in a country another from his country of residence; four of ten Europeans have close friends living in other EU countries; one of twelve Europeans have worked abroad; “more than one-third of Europeans eat food typically of another country, follow news, cultural life, or sports of another country, speak at least one foreign language or regularly spend holidays or weekends abroad”. One in ten respondents plans to move to another EU Member State within ten years. However, more than nine in ten Europeans feel the strongest
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attachment to the country of his residence. National attachment was defined as the strongest. One in two respondents noted his attachment to the EU. The research highlighted, that the last indicator increased in comparison with 2007. The most frequent answers on the reasons of attachment to other EU Member State were: spending holidays there, having close friends or relatives. The respondents indicated common currency and democratic values as the elements which construct European identity, also there were mentioned geography, common culture and shared history. Six in ten Europeans told that it is important to be European for them\textsuperscript{160}.

Another Eurobarometer research\textsuperscript{161} about the public opinion in the EU shows that 62\% of Europeans feel themselves as EU citizens. A feeling of European citizenship is strong in Luxembourg (88\%), Slovakia (79\%), Finland (77\%), Germany (73\%), Malta (73\%), Poland (72\%) and Ireland (71\%). Europeans, who feel their EU citizenship in less extent, are from the United Kingdom (41\%), Greece (44\%), Bulgaria (44\%) and Latvia (48\%)\textsuperscript{162}. The research demonstrated that young people feel European citizenship more than the older generation. 15-24 years made up 69\%, the category older 55 – 56\%. This feeling was also more marked among Europeans with more education, rather than people who left education before the age of 16 (71\% compared to 50\%)\textsuperscript{163}.

According to the public opinion pools we can judge that there are emerging “New Europeans” who have attachment to the European Union, who feel themselves EU citizens and have some closeness with at least one country except the country of their residence. Most of these Europeans represent the younger generation. However, their attachment to national identity remains strong.

\begin{flushright}
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2.5 Conclusion

In the chapter European Union identity I investigated the concept of European identity. The purpose of my research in this part of the thesis was to understand what instruments the European government uses to build the identity of the European Union. However, before I could start to observe the instruments of European identity construction, I had to examine a lot of questions which arouse during my research. First of all, what is identity? What theories on identity exist in the modern world? What is national identity and how can it be constructed? Can we say that European identity can be built according to the national identity patterns? What is the difference between European identity and EU identity? And, finally, do they exist?

There are many books written on European identity. However, when we start to investigate this problem, we face a broad amount of theories, opinions, books and research. I tried to analyze a wide range of theories and points of view and to form my own opinion on the question of European identity.

First question was: what is national identity and can European identity be constructed as a national identity? National identity is defined by the common territory, myths, historical memories, mass culture, common legislation and common economy with territorial mobility for all citizens. Nation needs to have common boundaries and the feeling of patriotism. Nation as a concept of “imagined community” expresses a strong feeling of fraternity and the will to die for the motherland. From this perspective I investigated if European people have these feelings towards the European Union. Many researchers had the same doubts. Some historians stated that European citizens do not have common myths and history and they lack shared symbols. I concluded that skepticism on the comparison between national identity and European identity constructions expresses itself in the lack of patriotic feelings of Europeans towards the European Union. Also, because the EU does not have enough shared myths and histories.

On the other hand, some researchers argued, that history and cultural heritage are the most important basis for European identity construction. In order to investigate this
question, I researched the idea of Europe and concluded that the concept of Europe as the cradle of civilization is a very significant moment for the feeling of Europeaness. I assumed that cultural heritage, territory and history of the European continent are the foundation for European identity and that European identity is the cultural base for European Union identity.

I came to the conclusion that European identity is constructed from two directions: top-down and bottom-up. Top-down initiatives come from the European governance. They have created the concept of the EU passport, EURO currency, an EU flag, anthem, as well as free movement of goods and people, common legislation and EU prizes, awards and sporting competitions. The EU is promoted through symbols: they are depicted on stamps, on money and there are buildings and sculptures that symbolize Europe. Exchange programs such as Erasmus and Socrates play a great role in the connections among EU citizens. People become more mobile and open; they have more possibilities to engage with other European citizens, to study more about their traditions and culture. Marriages and children who were born from EU citizens of different nationalities also have greater chance of feeling European.

However, the problem of patriotism and the will to die for the European Union rests unsolved: probably, because the European Union needs more time for the creation of European identity. National identities were constructed in Europe for two centuries, while the concept of European identity is less than fifty years old.

How can we strengthen the feeling of Europeaness? What similarities does it have with Soviet identity? I would like to discuss this question in the next chapter.
Chapter 3

Soviet and European identities

It may seem unusual to compare and look for similarities in the governmental approaches towards the construction and maintenance of Soviet and European identities. The Soviet Union and the European Union are two completely different formations. The Soviet state was created on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology; it was a military power with the economy directed at heavy industry. In addition, the USSR was a communist totalitarian state with centralized control and a clear image of the leader, and Soviet policies were notorious for mass repressions and genocide. In contrast, the European Union was formed mainly for economic purposes. The EU is a union based on democratic and liberal ideals, which promotes soft power and human rights. The policies of the European Union are relatively transparent and peace-oriented.

Nevertheless, both of the Unions faced the problem of multiple national identities. The question of nationhood, peaceful coexistence of nations within a union, tolerance and mutual interest inside the formation of states was/is a cause of concern for the governance structures of the Unions.

The Soviet Union united twenty two nationalities and a large number of smaller ethnicities. The citizens of the USSR were native speakers of many languages; representing a number of language families: Indo-European, Altaic, Caucasian, Uralic, Afroasiatic, Chukotko-Kamchatkan and others, which in its turn were composed of many linguistic groups. The citizens of the USSR had national, linguistic and cultural diversity. Nonetheless, the Soviet government attempted to build Soviet identity under these conditions. I will discuss below whether this attempt was successful, or not.

The EU nowadays is an ill-defined territory of languages, cultures and identities. There are 27 Member States, more than 70 “European” languages and hundreds of immigrants and refugees. There are people of Catholic, Protestant, Islamic, Orthodox, Jewish and other faiths, who need to show tolerance and respect towards each other. The national question was raised not only at the EU level, but also within the framework of
each state. Great Britain had national divisions between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland; Spain had issues with Basque and Catalan national identity and there are many other examples. Therefore, the European Union has the difficult task of promoting a common identity that will make people feel European and have a sense of belonging to the European Union. At the same time, the EU authorities try to preserve national cultures and diversity. Why does European Union need European identity? In my research I assume that European identity and the feeling of “Europeaness” is desirable (first of all) for the governance of the Union. The citizens of the EU have to support the Union and its economic and political policies. In the context of the economic crisis and the unstable economies of some of EU states, the government needs to be assured of people’s loyalty and support for EU policies. European identity implies the existence of the feeling of togetherness among citizens, which can help to consolidate the EU and enable it to exercise significance in the international arena. On the other hand, European identity binds people, encouraging them to be tolerant towards each other. Interests, together with some feeling of shared identity will help EU citizens to coexist in a multi-national society.

How can the experience of creating Soviet identity be useful for the EU? On initial investigation, it became evident that the construction of Soviet identity was never discussed in such a context. Researchers tended to focus on the national question in the post-Soviet era and on the former Soviet territories. My hypothesis is that during the 73 years of the USSR, there were fascinating developments in the field of nation-building and identity construction. In order to investigate this, the first chapter of the thesis is dedicated to the question of nations in the USSR. The policies of the Soviet Union were quite peaceful in the sphere of national building and identity constructions. The bloody terror conducted by Stalin did not influence the cultural policies of Soviet identity construction. I have, therefore, chosen to look at the day-to-day lifestyle of the average Soviet citizen, who lived his/her life relatively undisturbed by the cruelties of the Soviet regime.

Was the experience of USSR identity building successful? There are different perspectives on this. First of all, the national program of the USSR was not well
elaborated or rooted in theory, and experience in nation and identity construction was gained over time. We could say the same about the EU, whose policies were analyzed only after implementation. The Soviet authorities concentrated on two approaches towards nationhood: first, to shape national borders, languages and cultures of the USSR regions, and second, to promote Soviet identity among USSR citizens. The first was called *korenizatsiia*, when the Soviet authorities tried to preserve the diversity of ethnicities, to keep their languages (or to create written languages) and to shape the borders of national republics. Borders were created between different ethnic groups in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Most of them have become nationalities and their borders still exist today. The Soviet Union helped to maintain the cultures, even though its policies were met with discontent, and sometimes they were contradictory – as I described in the cases of Ukraine and Uzbekistan. After the period of *korenizatsiia*, *russification* was implemented, which was regarded as the homogenization of the USSR nationalities under Russian supervision. It meant that people had to learn Russian; and Russian culture and traditions were dominant. Some researchers argue that Russian was chosen as an additional shared language in the USSR and it did not seek to abolish national languages and cultures. The sixties and seventies saw an attempt to construct the ‘Soviet man’ and to unify Soviet society. However, the nationalities which were maintained thanks to the policies of *korenizatsiia* kept their culture and languages. USSR citizens had a feeling of “Sovietness” as well as their national identities. We can still find evidence of “Sovietness” today. People who were born in the USSR still refer to a feeling of community among people of different nationalities in the former USSR. They also argue that there was tolerance and fraternity between Soviet citizens.

In order to draw conclusions on the policies of identity building, I researched the nationhood question for the Soviet Union and the EU. In the case of the USSR there were policies aimed at shaping and equalizing nations, and after - “sovietization”. The European Union, in contrast, already had well-established nation-states and has had to work to develop a common identity. However, the countries of the Union have faced periods of intensification and also decline of the national assertiveness inside the member states.
The next question was concerning the theories of identity construction and how to build identity in multicultural society. Are the theories of national identity applicable to the cases of the Soviet Union and the EU?

In order to answer this question, I collected different theories on the construction of identities. National identity is primarily built on: historic territory, or a homeland; common myths and historical memories; mass culture; common legal rights and duties for all members; and a shared economy with territorial mobility for the members.

Suni\textsuperscript{164} asserts that multicultural societies can develop a feeling of togetherness through a fraternal attitude towards each other. Nations can share different religions and cultures, speak different languages but they all have a sense of family and family ties. The idea of brotherhood will be understandable to everyone and so it can be a good basis for identity construction in a multicultural society.

The same feeling of fraternity exists in Anderson’s theory of “imaginary communities”\textsuperscript{165}. According to this theory, members of this community share the same beliefs, have a similar mindset and a shared patriotism.

We can assume that the Soviet nation was built according to these nation-construction patterns. But as I concluded in the second chapter, we cannot observe patriotism among Europeans (towards the European Union) and European common myths are too fragile.

Furthermore, I would like to compare the Soviet and European Union policies on the construction of identity. After which, I will try to identify instruments the EU can borrow from the experience of the USSR for identity creation.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Soviet Union</th>
<th>The European Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The symbols of state</td>
<td>The EU flag, the hymn “Ode to Joe”, common EU passports, common driving license.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soviet Emblem (hammer and sickle), the Soviet flag (and similar emblems of the member-states), the Soviet anthem, common Soviet passports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common currency</td>
<td>EUROS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuals</td>
<td>Stamps, posters which gave people knowledge about Soviet republics and promoted tolerance, solidarity and people’s friendship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps which promote the EU and the myth of Europe and posters which promote the union of diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>Heroes from national histories, later the heroes of the USSR: communists, pilots, cosmonauts, sportsmen, explorers, artists and writers. Soviet heroes-revolutionaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European politicians as Robert Shuman and Jean Monet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common holidays</td>
<td>The anniversary of the October Revolution, Victory Day, Labor Day etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The day of Europe, Christmas and Eastern holidays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common myths and stories</td>
<td>In the time of russification and the Great Patriotic War there was address to Russian history, its tsars and success wars. Myth about the “radiant future”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth about the abduction of Europa, Greek myths, the concept of Eurocentrism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp;Youth</td>
<td>The common school system and university education, festivals dedicated to the cultures of the USSR, summer camps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna system, Culture 2000, Youth, Erasmus, Socrates, European City of Culture, Heritage Days etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TV**

*KVN* as the strict example of the cohesion of humor, the promotion of nations and the building of “imaginary community” of people who understand the jokes which can understand only people from the USSR.

**Architecture**

Stalinist architecture or Soviet monumental classicism (1930s-1950s): the Palace of Soviets in Moscow as an example; houses and streets in all Soviet cities were build in the same style.

The 60s-70s: apartments “*khrushevka*” we can meet in all ex-USSR republics.

The architectural ensemble in ENEA in Moscow: each pavilion is dedicated to different national republics. Fountain with the figures in national clothes in ENEA. Famous sculpture *Worker and Collective Farm.*

**Gender examples**

The role of Soviet woman, the qualities which are recommended to have each woman.

The European buildings: Council, Courts, Parliaments, banks, sculptures.

The role of European woman, award *The Woman of the Year.*

The table shows the similarities between the Soviet and European instruments of identity constructions. The table reflects top-down activities. The EU builds European identity by the principles of national identity constructions, as it did the Soviet Union.
However, in comparison with the policies of the USSR some of European instruments do not have a deep imprint of ideology. The EU has a lack of common myths, stories and heroes. From this perspective, the EU could borrow the experience of the Soviet Union, which created heroes from the contemporary citizens: explorers, revolutionaries, writers, sportsmen etc; the USSR used the visual instruments in bigger extent: posters and stamps, which demonstrated the diversity and equality of USSR citizens. The role of mass culture was one of the main instruments in the Soviet state: patriotic Soviet movies and theater promoted Soviet identity; the EU does not use this method in the full measure.

I would like to discuss some instruments which were used by the Soviet authorities, but I could not find the equivalents in the European policies.

The Soviet Union had Russian language as the common language and most Soviet citizens understood it. After the fifties, it became obligatory to study it at school. In the EU, all of the national languages of the Member States have a status of equal languages. But in practice there are English, French and German which are the most frequently used in as working languages. However, in practice English remains de facto ‘international’ language across the continent, and the world. Therefore it is not particularly associated with a sense of ‘Europeanness’ as a language. Also, not all European people speak English. The role of a common language is very important for identity construction, because it is an important part of shaping human experience. People who can speak the same language have the sense of togetherness. Common language would also benefit to the establishment of a common educational policy in the EU.

The concept of the Motherland does not exist for the European Union. EU citizens do not have patriotic feelings towards the EU to the same extent that they do for their native countries. I would argue that the reason why Soviet people had this feeling was due to the Great Patriotic War. People had to defend the state and to survive the horrors of war with its death, destitution, starvation. In sum, it was the common grief that united the people of the USSR.
The citizens of the USSR sang a lot of patriotic songs and watched patriotic movies, which were familiar across the Soviet territory. The products of mass culture were loaded with patriotic meaning and glorified Soviet citizens, the Soviet state and Soviet unity. These are the activities which were implemented from the top down and were used to strengthen patriotic feelings among the Soviet people.

There were also bottom-up activities. As described in the first chapter, not all citizens of the Soviet Union trusted the Soviet authorities. There was a lack of information, a lack of light industry, and a deficit of goods. People had to adapt to the Soviet conditions, which were very much the same across all the territories of the USSR. Johnston described this phenomenon as “tactics of habitat”: people had recognizable symbols, ideals, slang, jokes, and a similar lifestyle, which made them members of the “imaginary Soviet community”. “Soviet” in this context does not necessarily imply communism and the Soviet government; it is the name given to people who were born in the USSR. This is a recognizable identifier for members of this community, who lived in the USSR despite Soviet regulations and policies.

In the first chapter I described life in big multicultural cities of the Soviet period, where children were brought up in multiethnic surroundings and maintained the feeling of tolerance and Soviet community for the rest of their lives. There is one particularly important period in the creation of identities. Young people are more open and ready to absorb ethnic and cultural identity than adults. The Soviet authorities created the system of octobrists – pioneers, which was uniform in all USSR republics. Children felt part of one community and educational programs cultivated tolerance and the feeling of togetherness. Personal connections established in the summer camps allowed children to learn more about the cultures and languages of other USSR nationalities.

EU citizens establish personal contacts through exchange programs, which I described in the second chapter. The educational programs, Erasmus and Socrates, encourage young people to be tolerant and friendly towards other European citizens.

---

According to the recent investigations, New European generations will be more open and integrated; the European Union is in its infancy compared with the Soviet Union, which existed for 73 years.

It is clear from the research that the Soviet and EU governance structures used similar instruments of identity building for the construction of supra identities (Soviet and EU). However, the ideology of the USSR was stronger and it was loaded with patriotism and glorification, which inspired confidence in the strength and power of the Soviet state. Soviet propaganda sought to regulate all spheres of life. Some people desired to escape the ever-present ideology; through personal connections created their own feeling of togetherness. So, Soviet identity was constructed on two levels. Top-down and bottom-up instruments of identity creation must co-exist to be effective. When the Soviet Union collapsed, the top-down ideology vanished completely, and people’s connections became weaker. In the European Union, there are attempts to construct identity from the governance structures, but there is a lack of bottom-up, citizen initiatives to complement this. The institutions encourage EU identity, and perhaps after the several generations, there will be a stronger feeling of unity among EU citizens. If not, the EU may need to revise its approach and look for ways to make EU identity more attractive and relevant for citizens, perhaps by enhancing a shared sense of patriotism and fraternity.
Conclusion

The thesis was dedicated to the question of identity in the Soviet Union and the EU. My task was to find similarities and differences in the creation of Soviet and European identities. At the end of the thesis I have attempted to answer the question of how the experience of creating Soviet identity could be useful for the EU.

In order to find the answers to the question I investigated policies on nationhood and methods of identity creation in the USSR and the EU.

In the first chapter I discussed literature on the national question in the USSR from the beginning of the Cold War till the present day. Most of the works were dedicated to the study of the state, its economy and policies. The researchers discussed the definition of the Soviet state in terms of whether it was an empire, a totalitarian state, a union or an affirmative action empire. The first sovietologists called the USSR “the prison of nations”. Most modern authors disagree with this definition. They argue that top-down government policies are necessary. Others think that the role of the people is very important. Some argue that for the creation of a nationality, there has to be a mutual economic interest, mutual language, culture, history, territory and the presence of “others”, who are different.

In addition I researched the historical background of the question of nationhood in the USSR. The Soviet Union tried to build nations, to shape their territories and to develop their self-image. As the results of korenizatsiias show, most smaller nations which did not have written languages, obtained their own alphabets, literature and books. National elites were promoted to senior positions and leader roles in the Communist Party, national governments, public education and industry. In each territory the national language was adopted as the official language of the authorities. These measures helped the USSR resist rising nationalism.

However, we have evidence that the official aims and desires did not reach their goals in full measure. It was too idealistic and demagogic to think that people would adopt new languages and cultures in one generation. When the Soviet authorities decided to implement russification, they chose a policy that was suitable for the
government, but was disastrous for smaller nations. On the other hand, we notice that korenizatsiia was very effective in Central Asia and the Caucasus. The Soviet policies helped the process of identification for the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Tadjik and Uzbek people. Even during russification, these nationalities did not forget their cultures and their national identities remained unchanged. Despite the cruelty of the Soviet regime, the authorities succeeded in creating a Soviet social life, which was characterized by mutual assistance, kindness and the mutual sympathies of Soviet people towards each other.

What were the instruments of identity creation in the USSR? The Soviet identity came from two sources: government policies and links among people. The Soviet government created identity through language, education, a common lifestyle in all the republics, and a common address to all people (“tovarishch”); they tried to give people a sense of family and fraternity. They gathered people from different republics in the Army and Summer Camps. The authority created the image of “stranger” and “enemy”: Soviet against Germans or Soviet – non-Soviet. The Soviet government underlined the unity of the USSR through visuals: the cinema, posters and stamps. They understood the didactic function of popular culture: songs, cinema, and festivals – all these instruments were used to give people a feeling of unity and togetherness.

However, Soviet identity was a phenomenon that also increased among the citizens. Many of them were not satisfied with the government, with living conditions and a lack of information. They had their “little tactics of the habitat” which helped them to enjoy their life and to survive in the Soviet system. People could identify “Sovietness” in each other: they had a common sense of humor and common lifestyles. Some citizens were Soviet in ideology, while others were simply part of the Soviet system.

The second chapter discussed European identity. There have been many books written on European identity. However, when we start to investigate this, we face numerous theories, opinions, books and research. I tried to analyze a wide range of theories and points of view and to form my own opinion on the question of European identity. I sought to answer questions of how European identity can be built according to
national identity patterns and the difference between European identity and EU identity. Finally, I aimed to establish whether they exist at all.

National identity is defined by the common territory, myths, historical memories, mass culture, common legislation and common economy with territorial mobility for all citizens. Nations need to have common boundaries and the feeling of patriotism. Nationhood as a concept of “imagined community” expresses a strong sense of fraternity and the will to die for the motherland. From this perspective I investigated if European people have these feelings towards the European Union. Many researchers had doubts about this. Some historians stated that European citizens do not have common myths and history and they lack shared symbols. I concluded that skepticism on the comparison between national identity and European identity constructions expresses itself in the lack of patriotic feelings of Europeans towards the European Union. Also, because the EU does not have enough shared myths and histories.

In order to investigate this question, I researched the idea of Europe and concluded that the concept of Europe as the cradle of civilization is a very significant moment for the feeling of Europeaness. I concluded that territory and history of the European continent are the foundations for European identity and that this forms the basis for European Union identity.

European identity is constructed from two directions: top-down and bottom-up. Top-down initiatives come from the European institutions. They have created the concept of the EU passport, EURO currency, an EU flag, anthem, as well as free movement of goods and people, common legislation and EU prizes, awards and sporting competitions. The EU is promoted through symbols: they are depicted on stamps, on money and there are buildings and sculptures that symbolize Europe. The bottom-up initiatives come from European citizens. Exchange programs such as Erasmus and Socrates play an important role in building connections among EU citizens. People become more mobile and open; they have more possibilities to engage with other European citizens, and to study more about their traditions and cultures. Marriages and children who were born to EU citizens of different nationalities also have a greater likelihood of feeling European. However, the issue of patriotism and the will to die for
the European Union remains outstanding: most likely, because the European Union needs more time for the creation of European identity. National identities in Europe were constructed over two centuries, while the concept of European identity is less than fifty years old.

In the last chapter I compared the Soviet and EU policies on identity construction. The main differences are that the USSR was a totalitarian state based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology with centralized control and a clear image of the leader; whilst the EU is a union of sovereign governments based on liberal ideals, human rights and the promotion of soft power. We observed that both Unions faced the problem of multiple national identities, peaceful coexistence of nations within a union, tolerance and mutual interest inside the formation of states.

The creation of identity in the Soviet Union and the EU came from top-down and bottom-up. I found some similarities in the activities of authorities, for example, policies using symbolism: anthems, flags, money, stamps, posters, architecture; the creation of shared myths, heroes and stories; TV programs, common holidays and some others. However, the top-down policies on the creation of identity in the USSR were implemented to a larger extent than in the EU. There were more Soviet heroes, more influence on mass culture; there was Russian language which played a role of a common language. The Soviet Union promoted patriotism towards the Soviet state, created the concept of Motherland and promoted it through mass culture. The system of education in the USSR was equal in all republics, there were the same textbooks and programs, and also Soviet history was taught in the same way. The promotion of identity in the USSR was directed at all people, regardless of their social class, education, age or sex. As we see in the EU, the feeling of European identity is more characteristic of young educated Europeans.

The bottom-up activities in the USSR had another character. Soviet citizens had “tactics of habitat”: people had recognizable symbols, ideals, slang, jokes, and a similar lifestyle, which made them members of the “imaginary Soviet community”. “Soviet” in this context does not necessarily imply communism and the Soviet government; it is the name given to people who were born in the USSR. This is a recognizable identifier for
members of this community, who lived in the USSR under Soviet regulations and policies.

EU citizens establish personal contacts through exchange programs, which I described in the second chapter. The educational programs encourage young people to be tolerant and friendly towards other European citizens. According to the recent investigations, new European generations will be more open and integrated; the European Union is in its infancy compared with the Soviet Union, which existed for 73 years.

Trying to answer the question: “How can the experience of creating Soviet identity be useful for the EU?” I can draw the conclusion that due to the totalitarian nature of the Soviet Union, it was able to demonstrate governmental activities that regulated all spheres of citizens’ lives. The European Union is a different political formation and it does not aim to intrude into the private lives of EU citizens. However, in order to strengthen the feeling of European identity, an attractive ideology needs to be elaborated, which will promote European values and diversity towards all people: regardless their education, age, sex or type of employment. In this process the EU could borrow some instruments from the USSR: the development of symbols, the creation of European movies which promote the feeling of “Europeaness”, the implementation of common lessons of history at all European schools and the creation of European heroes.

For bottom-up policies, the EU could learn from the experience of Soviet citizens, who were also able to share a common sense of humor and friendly relations towards each other even after the collapse of the USSR.

It is important to understand, that the USSR existed for 73 years, which spanned two or three generations. The EU is a relatively young formation, which may perhaps after several generations obtain a stronger feeling of unity among EU citizens. If not, the EU may need to revise its approach and look for ways to make EU identity more attractive and relevant for citizens, perhaps by enhancing a shared sense of patriotism and fraternity.
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