

Latvijas Universitātes Latvijas Vēstures institūts

BALTIJAS VALSTIS PSRS SASTĀVĀ

NO POSTSTAĻINISMA LĪDZ PĀRBŪVEI

1953–1990

Starptautiska zinātniskā konference

Rīga, 2012. gada 19. aprīlis

Referātu krājums

RĪGA

2014

Institute of Latvian History at the University of Latvia

THE BALTIC STATES IN THE SOVIET UNION

FROM POST-STALINISM TO PERESTROIKA

1953–1990

International Conference
Riga, April 19, 2012
Proceedings of the Conference

R I G A
2014

Институт истории Латвии Латвийского университета

СТРАНЫ БАЛТИИ В СОСТАВЕ СССР

ОТ ПОСТСТАЛИНИЗМА ДО ПЕРЕСТРОЙКИ

1953–1990

Международная научная конференция
Рига, 19 апреля 2012 года
Сборник докладов

Р И Г А
2014

Recenzenti:

PhD *Marjo Mela* (Somija)
Dr. hist. *Grigorij Smirins* (Latvija)

Рецензенты:

PhD *Марьо Мела* (Финляндия)
Dr. hist. *Григорий Смирин* (Латвия)

Baltijas valstis PSRS sastāvā: no poststalinisma līdz pārbūvei. 1953–1990. Starp. zin. konf.
Rīga, 2012. gada 19. aprīlis: referātu krājums / LU Latvijas vēstures institūts; Rīga, 2014. – 254 lpp.

ISBN 978-9934-14-063-1

Krājums satur starptautiskas zinātniskās konferences materiālus, kurā piedalījās Latvijas, Lietuvas, Krievijas, Francijas un ASV pētnieki. Pirmoreiz profesionālie vēsturnieki, ka arī ekonomisti, demogrāfi, citu sociālo zinātņu pārstāvji piedalījās Baltijas valstu atrašanas PSRS sastāvā periodā no 1953. līdz 1990. gadam dažādu aspektu apspriešanā.

В сборнике представлены материалы международной научной конференции с участием исследователей из Латвии, Литвы, России, Франции и США. Впервые профессиональные историки, а также экономисты, демографы, представители других социальных наук приняли участие в обсуждении различных аспектов нахождения стран Балтии в составе СССР в период с 1953 по 1990 г.

The reports presented in the issue were made by researchers from Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, France, the USA, at the international scientific conference. For the first time ever professional historians together with economists, demographers, representatives of other social sciences discussed various aspects of Baltic States as part of the USSR during the period from 1953 till 1990.

Krājums apspriests Latvijas Universitātes aģentūras "Latvijas Vēstures institūts" Zinātniskās padomes sēdē 2013. gada 18. februārī, protokols Nr. 1, izraksts Nr. 2, pieņemts lēmums rekomendēt izdošanai. Konferences organizēšanu atbalstīja Latvijas nodibinājums "N.E.V.A."

Сборник обсуждён на заседании Научного совета агентства "Институт истории Латвии" Латвийского университета 18 февраля 2013 г., протокол № 1, выписка № 2, принято решение рекомендовать к изданию. Конференция организована при поддержке латвийского фонда "N.E.V.A."

The conference proceedings were discussed at the Academic board meeting of Latvian university agency "Institute of Latvian history" on February 18th, 2013. Record No. 1, statement No. 2, recommended for publishing. The conference was arranged with the help of Latvian foundation "N.E.V.A."

ISBN 978-9934-14-063-1

© Latvijas Universitātes Latvijas Vēstures institūts, 2014
© Amber Bridge Baltic fonds, 2014
© A.Jakovļevs, foto uz vāka, 2014

Savienības spēks un padomju intelektuāļu autonomijas jautājums (Lietuvas rakstnieku, mākslinieku un komponistu piemērs)

Viļus Ivanauskas

Kopsavilkums

Tas fakts, ka padomju sistēmā kultūras elite bija iesaistīta sovetizācijas pasākumos, kalpo par piemēru kompartijas nebeidzamajiem mēģinājumiem izmantot intelektuāļus indoktrinācijas nolūkos. Dažādi šo pasākumu plānošanas un pielietošanas pētījumi attiecībā uz Padomju Lietuvu vēl sociālisma periodā parāda, ka līdz ar neskaitāmajiem formālajiem noteikumiem, pastāvēja neformālie noteikumi, kas balstījās uz privātiem kontaktiem un ikdienas dzīvi, un dažādos laikos, it īpaši vēlā sociālisma periodā, atstāja daudz lielāku iespaidu nekā oficiālie procesi. Šai rakstā tiek analizēts, kādā veidā neformālo kontaktu sfēra ļāva nodrošināt zināmu vēlā sociālisma perioda padomju intelektuāļu patstāvības līmeni. Šķietamā indoktrinācija ne vienmēr atainoja viņu nostāju un reālos paradumus, kas Lietuvas apstākļos mainījās dažādu padomju periodu laikā. Daži šādu intelektuāļu paveidi bija konformisti, taču daudzos gadījumos šis konformisms atšķīrās no padomju "konjunktūras" un veidoja legālas opozīcijas zonu padomju elites ietvaros. Tas izrādījās ļoti svarīgs vēlākās nacionālās identitātes mobilizācijas un padomju sistēmas sagraušanas faktors. Aplūkojot augsto statusu, ko baudīja padomju radošās savienības, raksta autors raksturo Lietuvas rakstniekus, māksliniekus un komponistus, it īpaši to dalību elitē, mijiedarbību ar sistēmu un alternatīvās intereses. Radošās savienības var tikt analizētas kā iespaidīgs strukturāls elements, kas sniedza īsta, profesionāla mākslinieka, komponista vai rakstnieka statusu un nodrošināja pakļaušanos oficiālajai ideoloģijai, uzturot sociālistiskā reālisma principu. Taču tai pašā laikā radošo savienību darbību iespaidoja neformāls dzīvesveids un sociālās attiecības.

The Power of Networks and the Autonomy of Soviet Intellectuals (The Case of Lithuanian Writers, Painters and Composers)

*Vilius Ivanauskas**

Introduction

In Soviet Lithuania, the Creative Unions were created just after the initial Soviet occupation at which time a number of left oriented local intellectuals actively participated in Lithuania's incorporation into the USSR and helped to legitimise this process. The famous slogan '*bring Stalin's sun to Lithuania*' was the metaphorical expression of such behaviour. In August 1940, mostly local intellectuals of humanities were part of the delegation that signed the accession documents to join the Soviet Union. The most visible were local writers. The famous phrase from Stalin's speech at the home of Maxim Gorki intended to define the role of writers as *the engineers of human spirit*¹. Similarly Lenin and Stalin put their expectations towards cinematography: it is important medium for educating the masses in the ways, means and successes of Communism. The other cultural fields (arts, theatre, music) also had similar expectations in the Soviet projection.

The demand for intellectual's role in the socialist system has been described by Antonio Gramsci: 'functionally to be integrated into the structure of proletariat'². Therefore, all cultural actions were enclosed into the formal structure: "organizations", "committees", "organized activities", "memberships", "cultural collectives", "annual action plans" were compulsory forms for the official activities. During the interviews a respondent mentioned, that every initiative / activity needed to be institutionalized and be based on strict formalities and procedures, but when one did not have a very appropriate idea for the controllers one still could expect to express it through the legal channels on finding an appropriate form³. Anthropologist Alexei Yurchak similarly speaks about the Soviet hegemony of the "form" and the authoritative discourse, which did not recognize the right to interpret communist ideology, but accepted some interpretations of everyday routine (*performative shift*). Not questioning a valid Soviet terminology, still it was possible to pour a new meaning into the Soviet linguistic

* vilius.ivanauskas@googlemail.com.

¹ See No. 38: Vospominaniye K. L. Zelinskogo "Vecher u Gorkogo" (26 oktyabr'a 1932 goda) // Mezhdru molotom i nakoval'nei. Soyuz sovetskikh pisatelei SSSR. Dokumenty i komentary. Moscow, 2011. P. 163.

² Sassoon A. S. The People, Intellectuals and Specialized knowledge // The Legacy of Antonio Gramsci. Duke University Press, 1986. Boundary 2. T. 14, № 3. Pavasaris, p. 137–168.

³ Interview with archeologist R. Rimantienė.

form. Thus, Soviet reality became reduced to discursive simulacra⁴ and this feature increasingly became the core of late socialism period.

Creative Unions can be analyzed as the influential element of such organized Soviet structure, which provides the status for being a real painter, composer or writer, supports the processes of writing, publishing or playing, and ensures the compliance of such activities with authoritative discourse by sticking to the principle of socialist realism. After Soviet occupation Creative union were projected as the element of total ideological control, which during the end of 40's and the beginning of 50's has been routinized⁵. Formally looking Creative unions embodied the task to involve the intellectual to serve to the system and spread Soviet values to the society at large. In this structure control mechanism of the ideas and cultural production was deployed by structural (CK, Glavlit, internal reviews, etc.) or personal surveillance (influential controllers, party members or *anonimka*).

Though after 48 years the Initiative group of Sąjūdis was created (June, 1988) by the intellectuals working at official institutions or organizations. The major part of the 35 members was from humanities and included the authoritative writers, composers, painters as well as the leaders of creative unions. The leader of Sąjūdis was the member of Composer's union. There were 6 members from Union of Writers, 3 persons from the Union of Cinematographers, 3 from Union of Composers, 2 from the Union of Artists, etc. All of them were people renowned to the public and belonged to official cultural establishment, but at the same time they clearly attached themselves to the line, which permanently attempted to mobilize the national identity. Keeping in mind that such people were involved in the Soviet cultural policy, it is important to see how those people expressed national interests within the Soviet framework. Here, alongside with the institutionalized processes we could speak not only about the cultural life effected by bureaucratic processes, but also influenced by informal sphere. This attitude helps to understand the source of dynamics of ideas and the ability of the system to define the official writers, painters or composers. How this ability has changed from stalinism to late socialism?

Historiography of Eastern European countries is very often filled with the normative approach leaving aside the methods of social science. By applying social theory there are more possibilities to observe the changing identities, variation between formal and informal practices, and to analyse the erosion of the system revealing the specifics of official channel not only the underground activities. Those findings of alternative positions of some intellectuals among local official organisations in Soviet Lithuania could be observed looking at the factor of social networks, which often helped to expand the boundaries of socialist realism. After Stalinist period when massive terror ceased and especially during the Thaw, it would be an exaggeration to argue that freedom came, but there was more evidence of power fragmentation and less strict control mechanisms. A. Walicki describes this late socialism as the period

⁴ Yurchak A. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton University Press, 2005.

⁵ Streikus A. *Ideologinė cenzūra Lietuvoje 1948–1955.: sistemos derinimas, Genocidas ir rezistencija*. Vilnius, 2009. P. 73–90.

when a "loss of revolutionary dynamics"⁶ occurred and the communist utopia fell⁷. Late socialism, which began after famous Khrushchev's speech in 1956, resulted in more moderate works in the local movies, books and plays, as well as the increasing interpersonal influences among the artists. Here, the concept of *social network* could be applied to illustrate how the structure of relationships around a person or a group affected beliefs or behaviours. The study of Lithuanian Soviet society made by political scientist Aine Ramonaite, which attempted to explain the genesis of Sąjūdis (Lithuanian national movement) has shown⁸ that network theory could be actively applied to the (post)totalitarian societies, which usually are interpreted as being too atomized and lacking social relations. Several scholars have paid attention to the role of informal social relations as one of the most important tools to achieve not only better quality consumption (*blat* relations⁹), but also as an informal sphere to share varying attitudes and values¹⁰, emphasizing the importance of informality and hidden means in strengthening national identity. The ability of intelligentsia circles (*kruzhki*¹¹) to ensure incorporation or rejection was a defining characteristic of the continuity of these social networks and their influence on the sharing of ideas and various initiatives among the members of the circles, as well as helping to interpret the ideas (movies, books, play, pictures) of their colleagues.

Research material for the study included archival material, interviews with Lithuanian Soviet writers, literature critics and other cultural elite members of Soviet Lithuania, as well as memoirs and published diaries.

1. Network of artists (cultural workers) and the mobilization of ethno-national identities

Dominant context shaping Soviet national policy was based on the ideas of internationalism and "blossoming of the nation" (*rascvet nacji*), and "blossoming" in this text becomes a powerful metaphor, bringing out several competing meanings, national aspirations and the strategies of local cultural elite. Blossoming⁷ was the metaphor of progress and covered the industrialization and other development (e.g. *promotion of high culture*) and all this were presented as the meaningful Soviet achievements¹². Otherwise, the "blossoming" was just the first step in the hierarchy of

⁶ Karl Dietrich Bracher interprets this revolutionary dynamics as the core of totalitarianism (see: *Kershaw I. The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*. London : Arnold, 2000. P. 45–46).

⁷ Walicki A. *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom: The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia*. Stanford, 1995.

⁸ Ramonaite A. *Stipriųjų ir silpnųjų ryšių svarba protesto mobilizacijai: Sąjūdžio genezė ir raida 1987–1988 metais // Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai*. 2011. № 2 (29). ISSN 1392–3358.

⁹ Ledeneva A. 'Russia's Economy of Favors: Blat, Networking and Informal Exchange' // *Russian, Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

¹⁰ Klumbys V. *Lietuvos kultūrinio elito elgsenos modeliai Sovietmečiu [The Behaviour Models among Cultural Elites during the Soviet Period]: Doctoral dissertation Vilnius, 2009.*

¹¹ Walker B. *Kruzhok Culture: The Meaning of Patronage in the Early Soviet Literary World // Contemporary European History*. 2001. Vol. 11, № 1. February. P. 107–123.

¹² Many of these achievements were presented not only during Soviet times, but also in the biographies of former Soviet officials, who had made decisions on them.

Lenin's national policy. Other steps were *rapprochement the nations (sblizhenije)* and *merging nations (sliyanie)*, and expressed the aims to homogenize Soviet society. Most commonly used terms were the *blossoming* and *rapprochement*, but *merge* becomes also valid again as a concept in the late socialism under the rule of Brezhnev¹³, when Russian language policy was forced upon the system of education¹⁴ after the Tashkent conferences.

All this reveals that Soviet system guaranteed certain attention to titular nations. For instance, Y. Slezkine acknowledged that the official policy fostered national identity in the Soviet Union, which was combined with the Soviet modernisation process. R. Suny similarly made his contribution by arguing that ethno-national identities were helped to emerge by the Soviet state and were related to the Soviet republics. This helped dominated nations in 15 republics to mobilize their national identity (policy of *korenizatsiya*) and to diminish the influence of center policy¹⁵. But at the same time the system provided restriction for broader expression of ethno-national interests. Being blamed as the nationalist and representing values, symbols of bourgeois nationalism or western cosmopolitanism was one of the most reprehensible labels for the cultural worker and could paralyze their career. Such authors as poets S. Geda, T. Venclova, writer J. Aputis, painter A. Tarabilda, sculptor V. Vildžiūnas and some other people during different periods felt on themselves the consequences of such a narrow criteria of an appropriate behavior.

Hence, the analysis of social network reveals situations and trends when during late socialism cultural workers/intellectuals attempted to expand or negotiate upon the broader boundaries for ethno-national themes. *Trust* in the closer circles helped to share various ideas. The achieved authority or position in different organizations helped to promote and support the ideas of the members of the *circle*, or to suspend the works and careers of competitors, especially if the ideas reflected the conflict between different networks. The power to interpret whether certain work meets the requirements of censorship was not based solely on the formal rules of the GLAVLIT or party instructions. For instance, during the period of 1948–50 GLAVLIT actively played the role to make the breakup achieving the ideologisation of Lithuanian cultural life, identifying the mistakes of separate writers, artist, journalist, etc. or naming the situations of bourgeois nationalism¹⁶. Although the conclusions of GLAVLIT's bureaucrats also belonged to the subjective personal interpretations. Dissident and poet T. Venclova emphasized that GLAVLIT's conclusions were typically non-cancellable, but its functions' were not clearly defined and widely known. According to him, the main censorship increasingly has been made at the earliest stage by the

¹³ Vilius Ivanauskas, Rusų kalbos vaidmuo stiprinant Sovietinį tapatumą ir nacionalinę politiką Sovietinėje sistemoje 8–9 dešimtmečiuose (en. The role of Russian language strengthening Soviet identity and Soviet national policy in 70–80s), Lietuvosistorijosmetraštis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2007. № 2.

¹⁴ Speech of the vicepresident academician P. Fedosov of USSR Science academy in Tashkent conference in 1979, Rusijos federacijos valstybinis archyvas (State archive of the Russian federation. F. R9563. O–1. E–3660. L–54–58).

¹⁵ Sunny R. G. The Revenge of the Past Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of Soviet Union. Stanford University Press, 1993.

¹⁶ Streikus A. Ideologinė cenzūra Lietuvoje 1948–1955.: sistemos derinimas. Genocidas ir rezistencija. Vilnius, 2009. P. 73–90.

authors themselves or their editors¹⁷. During the interviews, former secretary of ideology for the Lithuanian Communist Party L. Šepetys, as well as the former UW chairman A. Maldonis, and the former editor of the newspaper *Literature and Art* V. Reimeris, argued that the staff of GLAVLIT were dominantly bureaucrats who followed strict rules, but still there was some room for interpretation and the censors frequently were incompetent to understand Aesopian meanings. Also, the personal relationship between the management of UW and GLAVLIT influenced decisions in ambiguous situations when the question was whether to publish or not to publish a book¹⁸. Former editor A. Baltakis agreed with this position and remembered a situation when the deputy chairman of GLAVLIT personally called him and warned that he could lose his position because of inappropriate drafts of articles for a journal. This conversation provided an opportunity to negotiate and sometimes to save the criticized texts.

In this article I briefly present several networks, which reveal dynamics of ideas better than institutional processes and which were more moderate than some circles of their more indoctrinated colleagues.

2. Writers

During the Soviet period we could identify at least 3 major generations of Lithuanian writers, who expressed different relations with the Soviet system and nation-building processes. The generational factor also was a background for "kruzok identity". The first generation actively participated legitimizing Soviet order in occupied Lithuania, second generation came onto the stage during Khrushchev's Thaw and embodied the spirit of *shest'desiatniki*, search of new forms, but it also became part of establishment, third generation had ambivalent relation with the system feeling permanent critique from the ideologists of the communist party and Union of writers and showing skepticism towards realities of Soviet life and stifled rituals. Nevertheless, both second and third generations expressed more variety in the literature content than first generation, and this expressed not so much the openness of the official channels, as the support of closer environment assisting to share the attitudes and use the institutional positions (if any) to fight against any possible critique. The circle helped to promote more variety in cultural field and make negotiations within the formal framework.

The second generation did not express the antagonism towards Soviet regime, and sustained communist values, most of them believed in better socialism, the so-called 'socialism with a human face'. Triumvirate of Marcinkevičius, Maldonis, Baltakis¹⁹ were in close personal relations with Moscow's *shest'desiatniki* poets R. Rozdestvensky, V. Aksionov and A. Voznesensky. Those Lithuanian writers

¹⁷ Manau, kad... Pokalbiai su Tomu Venclova. Vilnius, 2000. P. 15.

¹⁸ The respondents remember that they had a much better relationship with the Deputy Director of the local GLAVLIT than with the Chairman of GLAVLIT.

¹⁹ They were from the same course of literature studies in Vilnius University, all of them were born in 1930. They were close friends, talented poets and the privileged intellectuals, having access to nomenclature position. The influence of their personal friendship (network) on the life of local UW was recognized during the interviews of those poets, as well as other authors and literature critics.

favored more universalism, which contrasted with the simple patterns of social realism provided by their older colleagues (T. Tilvytis, A. Guzevičius-Gudaitis). After Brezhnev gained power in 1964 and especially after the Prague Spring of 1968, there was a collective disappointment among some intellectuals regarding Soviet values. This generation took the main power position in local WU establishment and did not lose their position after third generation came onto the stage in late 60's and 70's. For instance, A. Baltakis and his colleagues adopted the model of the central UW to ensure appropriate control reducing the threats coming from the 'wrong' younger writers permanently pushing them to choose the topics closer to the working man instead of playing with the formalism and avoiding the themes of working man. On the other hand, such author from 2nd generation as J. Marcinkevicius, who was not only official and privileged author, but during Brezhnev became a key figure of the period gradually producing ethno-national and historical symbols. Through the WU networks and the privileged status J. Marcinkevicius opened legal channel to say more than his colleagues dared. His historical dramas overlapped with the demand coming from society over the national line and increasingly transformed his status from *poet of people* to *national poet*. His influential colleagues and friends supported him and kept in the privileged status in the eyes of upper officials. During the 70's his dramas were shown in National drama theatre in Vilnius and gained enormous popularity among local audience, including some members of Lithuanian nomenclatura circles. The dramas (Mindaugas, Mazvydas, Katedra) were full of historical interpretation providing the insights into realities of modern life through ancient stories. The more defiant position of younger authors, such as T. Venclova, S. Geda, M. Martinaitis, S. Geda, J. Aputis, J. Mikelinskas, J. Vaiciunaite and several other authors, representatives of the third generation, confronted the regime. The members of their *kruzhok* promoted the archaic lifestyle and observed the Soviet reality with irony. The poetry of Sigitas Geda and Marcelijus Martinaitis had been actively used by alternative musicians ranging from the so-called "intellectual music" to rock music. They also personally participated in various initiatives of local intelligentsia ensuring the protection of historic heritage, preserving the nature or preserving the memory of prewar writers.

3. Artists

It is important to mention the line of abstractionism in the 60–80's with the works of V. Kisarauskas, J. Švažas, Katinas, etc., they demonstrated the oppositional stream, and after Krushchev's dismay towards Moscow abstractionists²⁰, they also became fair game of local critique. Their network or the wider circle including their students tried to expose and discuss in private environment the search for better expression, finding forms that were rather closer to sketches than the original works. In the 70–80's the closer circle of Graphics section of Artists' Union with such personalities as B. Leonavicius, A. Steponavicius, R. Gibavičius, V. Valius, Šimulynas emerged. It was distinguished not only by creative collaboration, but also by intense personal interactions, and it increasingly became the most critical circle within the Artist's Union. The fact that

²⁰ In 1962 Krushchev sharply criticized abstractionism as incomprehensible art, and warned separate artists (e.g. Ernst Neizvestny). This critical attitude was repeated in separate Soviet republics where local abstractionists were attacked critically.

several of them later became active members of Sajudis was the consequence of their demand to discover and use various forms and contents beyond the limitations of the social realism. There were also several other networks of painters/artists. In the 70's the circle of *arsininkai* emerged. They tended to portray the grimness of the Soviet reality. The exponents of this circle: Šaltenis, Švėgžda, Kuras and Dereškevičius were comrades both in their work environment and in their private lives. The group of *arsininkai*, which had shaped the Lithuanian expressionism, emphasized that their creations were applicable not so much to abstract things (supposedly aesthetic reality was tolerated by the party) as to the social reality: "When we were students, we saw what a poor stove is standing on the window. If you paint the reality, it reflects the truth. The life of sociability. Rubbish. As if there are no slogans. The older generation has portrayed nationalism, there were Lithuanian national and ethnic inspirations. We looked at the reality... we thought it is also necessary to talk about the reality of Soviet life"²¹.

It could be mentioned that many of those different circles used the opportunity to meet in the House of Vildziunai, (artists and sculptors), which became the significant place sharing otherness between Vilnius intelligentsia. M. Vildžiūnienė-Ladigaitė was the daughter of interwar general Kazys-Ladiga, who was sentenced to capital punishment during the first Soviet occupation in 1941. The House of Vildziunai also became the place where old intelligentsia met the new one, and different cultural workers could exchange their criticism among themselves. Even the role of old intelligentsia in the Soviet Lithuania was limited, the accumulated cultural capital enabled them to achieve a relatively large part of the new progressively thinking intellectuals, sharing their views, and naturally stimulating the historical memory.

Most of these circles representatives were strangers to open propaganda channels and pure careerism, which were vehicles for many of their colleagues, who were not above visualizing the ideas of revolution, Lenin's portraits, Soviet symbols and etc. As one respondent noted, "those, who wanted more money and faster honors, did not avoid doing these things"²².

4. Composers

During late socialism we could identify in the milieu of composers the triumvirate of Feliksas Bajoras, Bronius Kutavicius and Osvaldas Balakauskas, who shaped the phenomena of intellectual modern music in the 70's and guaranteed the emergence of Lithuanian theme based on ethnic nostalgia in the content of such music. For instance, the music of Kutavicius was called as "pagan avantgardism". He created several significant operas with the elements of paganism, a mix of several cultures. It was interesting that he used the poetry of aforementioned poet Sigitas Geda, which was often criticized by the party. The music of these composers stood in poignant contrast to the standard Soviet music. The network element was also important. They were friends who lived in the neighbourhood. They were in close relation with such

²¹ Interview with painter A. Šaltenis.

²² Interview with painter and the signatory of Lithuanian independence Arvydu Šalteniu, July 12, 2010.

musicologist as Vytautas Landsbergis, musician Donatas Katkus and several other composers who collectively supported the spread of more original music, preserving the tradition of Ciurlionis or integrating the world's achievements to their music. Until the perestroika this network has been kept away from the important position in the composers union, even though they increasingly gained a significant authority in the composers environment and the society at large. This network became very active during the national revival and also supported the leadership of Landsbergis in the "Sajūdis" national movement. Being Deputy chairman of the Board of the Lithuanian Composers union professor Julius Juzeliūnas, who was the teacher of Feliksas Bajoras and such moderate musicians/or composers as Vytautas Laurušas, Onutė Narbutaitė, Mindaugas Urbaitis, gradually grew and turned into active defenders preserving national music and supporters of Lithuanian song festivals during the Soviet time²³, and one of most active members of Sajudis. At the time when Sajudis became a mass movement, J. Juzeliūnas took the position of Chairman of the Board of Commission of Stalin's Crimes investigations. The aforementioned composer O. Balakauskas also actively participated in Sajudis structures. It is interesting that prerequisites for such position of those composers were their moderate orientation and distance, which was dependent on network values²⁴, from their more ideological colleagues.

The lists of intellectual network, which supported the otherness in the content of their actions and creativity, could also be prolonged, mentioning similar groups in the Union of Cinematographers. There was a clear trend of functioning wider network of more moderate but critical intellectuals, who maintained very close links among themselves in various private or even public spheres (café "Neringa", private Salons). The networks were very determined in spreading the values, ideas and the pattern of behaviour or ensuring the moral support of local intellectuals.

The circles/kruzhki varied in walks of life and their attitudes towards the system. They covered different sociocultural orientations and values. The ones that emerged in the 60's illustrated the response to the Soviet constructivism during the Thaw and expressed the primordialistic ideas, and those of the 70 and the 80's oriented themselves to the modernism, innovations and expression of everyday absurd. On the other hand, almost all of them tried to discover more variety within the existing channels and actively used the cracks of erosion in the Soviet system, illustrating the availability of local intellectuals "find a form" and support for more innovative or alternative ideas maneuvering in the dogmatic cultural sphere.

Conclusions

The fact that cultural elite in the Soviet system were fully involved in the Sovietization policies, illustrates the permanent attempts of the party to use intellectuals for indoctrination, but does not reflect their mainstream position and real practices, which in Lithuania varied during different Soviet periods. Some of intellectuals of this kind were conformists, but in many cases this conformism overlapped with the distinction

²³ Balakauskas O. Pilietinės pareigos žmogus // Straipsniai. Kalbos. Pokalbiai. Amžininkų atsiminimai / Julius Juzeliūnas. Vilnius, 2002. P. 497.

²⁴ Čekatauskaitė J. Lietuva išėjo iš mados. Pokalbiai su Donatu Katkumi. Vilnius, 2010.

from Soviet *konjunktura* and shaped "legal-opposition zone" within the Soviet establishment. This became very meaningful for mobilising the national identity and strengthening the destruction of the Soviet system.

These artists did not limit participation in an informal environment and did not disassociate themselves from the official channels. However, certain circles affected the content of the ideas and helped to bring alternatives to the formal space, which can be named as legal zone of opposition. Thus, the artists' position expressed not only informal strategies, but it also *de facto* changed the official culture creating the heterogeneous layers of Soviet culture.

The activities of dominated Soviet cultural workers (intellectuals) not only shows the extent to which the system defined the identity and purpose of a particular profession (e.g. writers – engineers of human souls), but also often embodied the ability of intellectuals to overcome the "captive mind"²⁵. The ability of Soviet intellectuals to influence the dynamics of the totalitarian society has been defined by the observation, that the leading cultural workers (intellectuals) even during the condition of enormous control were able to reflect socio-cultural-political reality and to find alternative ways to disseminate more ideas than there were officially determined.

²⁵ Milosz C. Captive mind. Vintage, 1990.