

ІСТОРИЯ УКРАЇНИ

UDC 94 (477.87) «1953/1964»

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-5984/2021/2.1>**Váradi N.F.**

Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education

EVERYDAY LIFE AND CROSS-BORDER RELATIONS IN TRANSCARPATHTIA DURING THE KHRUSHCHEV ERA

After the death of J. Stalin, in the period of the Khrushchev “thaw” (1953–1964) some positive changes were traced in the Soviet Union, as well as in Transcarpathia region, which was the “Western gate” of the USSR: fewer repressions, partial liberalization of political life, slight weakening of the totalitarian regime, lots of political, economic and social reforms. In Transcarpathia, the Soviet authorities did their utmost to ensure that the area was fully integrated into the Soviet system. During the implementation of planned economy, quantity prevailed over quality. During the Khrushchev era, the main goals of the Transcarpathian political leadership were among others eliminating but at least reducing unemployment, improving the trade, establishing and deepening friendly relations and co-operation with neighbouring countries, developing tourism and infrastructure, reducing housing shortages, developing urban industries, which entailed the acceleration of urbanization processes etc. The food and light industry started to develop. The milling industry also developed, as the Soviet troops stationed in Central Europe were supplied from Transcarpathia. The period from 1953 to 1964 were years of great reorganization and failure in the Soviet Union. It became increasingly clear that Khrushchev’s reforms would not realize the hopes to improve the economy and to raise the standard of living of society. Generally, Khrushchev’s policy was inconsistent and debatable. In addition, the secretary-general surrounded himself with toadies, so poorly selected his advisers, blindly trusted them, which had increasingly serious consequences and caused his fall. The Presidium of the Communist Party at the October Congress of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, in 1964 dismissed N. Khrushchev.

Key words: Transcarpathia during 1953–1964, border, USSR, Hungarian People’s Republic, cooperation.

Due to its geopolitical situation, Transcarpathia received significant attention from Soviet leaders. The area was of strategic importance in terms of transport from east to west, it was considered a “western gate”. A significant part of the electricity, gas and oil exports to Europe flowed through the region. The Mir electricity transmission line, the Druzhba [15, ol. 159–160], the Soyuz, and the Urengoy – Pomary – Uzhgorod pipelines [9, ol. 95–96] were also situated in the region. The Chop-Batevo area became an important transshipment area for the transport of goods, where significant freight traffic was handled on the railway with a wide and narrow gauge and a transshipment station [8, ol. 321–325]. The problem outlined in the article, scholars considered in passing [1–15], it did not become the main subject of historical research.

The purpose of the article is to identify key features of everyday life and cross-border relations in Transcarpathia during the Khrushchev era.

After Stalin’s death, i. e. after 1953, the trade, economy, public catering and public services in Transcarpathia improved significantly, and positive changes took place in society as well. New products appeared on store shelves, breadlines were reduced, many basic everyday goods could be bought freely [7, c. 190]. The prices of food and manufactured goods, clothes and shoes were reduced. The prices of fruits and vegetables decreased the most – by 50% [14, ol. 270]. Fish delicacies, such as sturgeon caviar, herring were available in almost every town and village grocery store, even in bigger quantities. The situation was similar with sausage preparations, which no longer had to be imported to the region, and they

were even shipped to other counties of the USSR. Cheese, eggs, various preserves, vegetables and fruits were available in sufficient quantities. According to statistics, surpluses of fruit and meat occurred multiple times in the region, so they were transported to the All-Soviet warehouse [67, p. 21]. However, the statistics often did not correspond to reality. There were often a shortage of food and people standing in lines for meat and dairy products. The leadership of the party was well aware of this. This is also evidenced by the fact that May 10–28, 1960 the district party committees discussed at length and in detail the letter from the USSR Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party on “*Serious Deficiencies in the Production and Stockpiling of meat and milk in the kolkhozes of the republic*” [42, p. 1–35], which called for the improvement of the situation and rectification of errors.

Each April, the government issued a decree to reduce state retail prices for food and industrial goods. In 1954, food became 5–10% cheaper, while industrial goods became 10–15% cheaper. These price reductions were probably intended to distract the public from the stagnation of agriculture, the light and food industries [10, ol. 219].

In the 1950’s, there were downright shortages of non-food products. The supply of goods was disrupted, becoming a serious problem, so they had to be delivered to the region from other areas. This was well seen by the regional party leadership, so on March 9, 1954, a resolution was passed “*To expand the production of everyday consumer goods, increase the number of products and improve the quality of products*” [18, p. 1–168] Then, with similar resolutions, this need was reaffirmed again and again, but the situation hardly changed. By the 1960’s, the most necessary products were mostly available on the market, but their quality did not meet the needs of customers. As a result, the number of imported products increased significantly, mainly from China, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Hungarian People’s Republic, the GDR and the FRG, as these were more popular among the population [7, c. 190].

There was a tendency to falsify statistical reports, the so-called “*pripiskas*”, i. e. additions. Fearing political retaliation, local leaders reported untrue, magnified data in their reports to the top management. It was due to the “*boosted*” economic indicators that the agriculture of the countryside in need of subsidization had been overestimated, thus on February 26, 1958 Transcarpathia was awarded the Order of Lenin [15, ol. 153; 23, p. 1–15]. The award was presented by Ye. Furtseva on May 23, 1958, in Uzhgorod.

Then there was a rally at the “*Avangard*” stadium [11, ol. 86]. In the following years, Transcarpathians had the opportunity to attend numerous similar celebrations [10, ol. 235]. Several member republics sent welcome telegrams to the region’s leadership on the occasion of the landmark event [24, p. 1–36].

During the development of the culture of service provision, the specialization of trade and the introduction of new forms and methods of services progressed. Trade organizations began to work with manufacturers on a contractual basis. Wholesale fairs were held annually in the region and in the republic, and more and more potential suppliers and product sources were sought outside the region and republic. In 1957, the first self-service grocery store was opened in the Mukachevo. The consumer cooperative opened the first self-service bookstore in Svaliava and a self-service grocery store in Solotvyno, Tyachiv district. The expansion of the network of self-service stores began, the basics of market research and demand assessment were established. The state-owned commercial company Uzhgorod, and the consumers’ cooperative in Mukachevo set up advertising companies. Over time, forms of service such as sales based on a product sample appeared, during which those samples were displayed in shop windows or on store shelves.

All new social laws of 1956–1957 [10, ol. 219, 224; 15, ol. 161; 32, p. 1; 60, p. 1–89] directly related to Transcarpathia.

According to the resolution of the Transcarpathian Regional Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party of 22 April 1959 – “*On Measures to Improve Public Services*”, repair shops for the repair of technical equipment, sewing workshops, photography, barber and shoemakers’ shops opened in cities and larger villages [16, p. 80–81]. By the end of 1960, there were 792 different installation, repair and service workshops in the region, 333 of them in the villages.

In the 1960’s, the resolution “*On the Measures for the Further Development of Trade in Transcarpathia*” adopted by the regional party committee on October 25, 1960, became applicable. The resolution establishing this was approved at the level of UkrSSR on September 13, 1960 [40, p. 1–28; 54, p. 9–10].

Among other things, this resolution marked the beginning of a new, better era of commercial and retail services, as well as public catering in the region [58, p. 1–13]. Between 1961 and 1965, 333 stores and 30 pharmacies were opened to strengthen the material and technical background of the trade. The number of people employed in them exceeded one thousand [36, p. 1–75]. During the implementation of the mentioned resolution, significant efforts were made to

organize the operation of confectioneries, bakeries, and dairy and delicatessen shops. In the larger grocery stores, coffee corners were set up. The prices of obsolete, outdated, low-quality products were reduced. Self-service stores were first allowed to clear potential losses, but only up to 0,15% of turnover. The previous practice of reducing the wages of employees working in retail and catering if the expectations regarding turnover were not met was revoked. In the towns and villages of the region, numerous pavilions, shops, boutiques, tents, cafes, snack bars and canteens were established in the streets, hospitals, town centres, parks and numerous public areas. The sale of equipment and devices intended for long-term use with payments in instalments also began. Although steps were taken and a number of documents aimed at further boosting trade were adopted in the Khrushchev era both at the upper and regional levels, some of the planned measures were not implemented in time and many were never implemented [53, p. 1–14; 71, p. 1–10; 73, p. 1–23].

At the XXI congress of the party from 27 January to 5 February 1959, a 7-year plan (1959–1965) was adopted [12, ol. 374–375; 31; 32]. Livelihood, education and health care were guaranteed by the state. Above all, however, a great deal of attention was drawn by the huge housing constructions. Khrushchev ordered the construction of housing estates to raise living standards. These were called “mikroraion” in Russian, the five-story blocks of flats (“khrushchevka”) with the tiny, cramped, uncomfortable apartments, with usually eight square meters per person, and often several generations lived together. They already had central district heating, i. e. a built-in heating system in the walls, a water block. They were originally aimed as free of charge social housing to those in need and planned for 25 (max. 40 years). These apartments also housed “professionals” and their families arriving in Transcarpathia [74, p. 58]. In addition, service accommodation was provided to reserve military officers in Transcarpathia and their families, for example, to 303 reserve officers in 1960 [53, p. 1–2]. The khrushchevkas were one-, two-, or three-room flats, and one of their greatest advantages was that they were built relatively cheaply and in a short time.

During the construction of new housing, according to the resolution adopted on October 25, 1960, during the construction of housing estates and blocks of flats, business premises and public catering premises had to be established on the ground floor of the houses.

In the private sector, the average dwelling house was 8 × 10 m and later 10 × 19 m with 2 or 3 rooms,

built on a base from adobe or brick and with a roof covered with slate or tile. There could be a well dug in the yard, a toilet, a summer kitchen, farm buildings. The garden and yard had to be surrounded by a fence [14, ol. 270].

Employees in the region extensively participated in socialist labour competitions. As a result, the planned trade and development plans were exceeded. To increase socialist competition, various awards, medals, and flags¹ were created for companies as well as trade organizations. In many cases, the awarding of these was not fair, as evidenced by numerous accounts in the documents of the Transcarpathian Regional State Archives [43, p. 1–73]. The competition took place not only at the corporate but also at the individual level. The Stakhanovist movement also reached enormous proportions [19, p. 1–136].

On October 13, 1958, at the initiative of the Moscow Railways, the movement “let’s learn to work and live in a communist manner” [15, ol. 156] began. Then in all areas – companies, firms, collective farms, pharmacies, etc. – the competition between individuals and working groups began for the titles of pioneer of communist work and communist work collective. They were employees, companies, kolkhozes, etc. that showed increased productivity, that is, those who worked with full effort, whose goal was to exceed and outperform the established norms and deadlines. The official honorary title was accompanied by a certificate, a badge, and a cash reward, which acted as a significant incentive [45, p. 1–143]. And as bigger holidays approached, this movement was further expanded [66, p. 1–97].

From the beginning of the 1950’s, the sale of books among the population increased year by year, and the book trade strengthened [22, p. 1–60]. Book authors, book distributors, publishers, and intellectuals also joined the sale of the books. Booksellers also delivered books to the farms of the kolkhozes, to the brigades, the factories, resort areas, and to many other places. There was significant coordination between book publishers and authors [30, p. 1–191].

On 31 May 1960, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party adopted a resolution on the “situation of the book trade and measures for its development”, and on 11 July 1960 the CC of

¹ Perekhidni praporu (Перехідні прапори), and Perekhidni Chervoni Praporu (перехідні Червоні прапори). The so-called transitional flags and transitional red flags were awarded for success in socialist competitions between regions and districts of the Soviet republics, in recognition of the successful implementation of plans and socialist commitments, increasing the production and sale of agricultural and livestock products, improving their quality, and ensuring high results.

the UCP adopted a similar resolution entitled “On the situation of the book trade and measures for its development in Ukraine”. The objectives and details of this document were discussed in October 1960 at the meetings of all district and city party committees in Transcarpathia. In order to increase the book trade, several new bookstores and book kiosks were opened. The main goal was to increase book sales by 104 percent in 11 months. The bookstores where two or more salespeople worked did not have a day off or lunch break, i. e. permanent opening hours were provided [35, p. 97–100].

Each of the 13 districts published its own newspapers, the columns of which reported on the development and performance of industrial companies and agricultural establishments, as well as other aspects of the social and economic life. From 1959, all district papers were published three times a week. In 1960, the district newspapers had 49,900 permanent press subscribers, compared to only 36,000 in 1959 [For example: 35, p. 21–25]. This number grew every year, which is why numerous steps were taken to improve the quality of newspapers and make them easier to deliver [29, p. 1–81].

Wall press was an important aspect of Soviet community and political life. The bulletin boards appeared in schools, at the Uzhgorod State University, in other educational institutions, and at production plants. Without them, hospitals, research institutes, and other facilities could not exist. Bulletin boards were mostly published on public holidays and reflected the lives of the work communities [56, p. 1–69].

In 1955, the permanent radio station was put into operation. According to a resolution [47, p. 1–23; 48, p. 1–141] made by the UCP Regional Committee on 11 November 1959, radio services had to be improved and then full “radioing” of the villages in Transcarpathia [59, p. 1–6] was carried out in several districts. On March 23, 1960, the UCP CK (Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party) passed a resolution entitled “On Improving Radio Services in Ukraine,” the main purpose of which was to strengthen communist ideological education as part of the seven-year plan [35, p. 60, 101–105]. The Uzhgorod radio station broadcast “Fresh News” twice a day in Ukrainian and Hungarian, as well as a summary of regional newspapers, literary and musical programs for agricultural and forestry workers [14, ol. 230].

As the party leadership in the region considered television to be an important tool for ideological education, especially as it planned to make its programs available to residents of the 4 surrounding countries,

they had since 1957 repeatedly asked the USSR Council of Ministers to allow the establishment of a television in Uzhgorod, which was scheduled to be launched by 1961 at the latest [49, p. 26]. Finally, the regional television studio began broadcasting in black and white and colour in 1967 after the television station and repeater were handed over [14, ol. 230, 272].

However, the press, radio, and TV remained under serious control [33, p. 1–43]. Of course, ideological work, ideological education were the most important tasks of the press. All print media existed and operated under the ideological guidelines, party- and state-level decisions of the ruling communist and party organizations.

In order to strengthen the ideological work, both the CPSU and the county leadership passed a number of resolutions, such as the January 9, 1960, resolution of the CPSU entitled “The Task of Party Propaganda in Modern Conditions” [35, p. 31]. Party propaganda and ideological work were strengthened in libraries [34, p. 1–53].

The electricity supply of the settlements was being set up [25, p. 1–44] and telephone lines were introduced. However, the phone was available after a long queue and, as it was a luxury item, so it was owned mainly by executives [17, p. 1–48].

In May 1958, the USSR passed a law “On a more effective fight against anti-social elements”. In reality, convictions were handed down bypassing the court, and defendants could not seek legal protection. There were those who, with the help of this “law,” took revenge on others, such as people living in slightly better conditions, thus depriving them of their wealth accumulated through diligent work [64, p. 1–151].

Other anti-social activities were subjected to serious police proceedings and thoroughly investigated. Several of them were sentenced by the court to prison [64, p. 1–151]. Drunkards, alcoholics and the unemployed, for example, were considered anti-social [63, p. 1–14; 65, p. 1–90].

On January 15–22, 1959, a national census was held in the Soviet Union [28, p. 10–11]. Preparations for this began in the region in 1957 [26, p. 1–43; 27, p. 1–25]. The questionnaires included 15 questions, including questions on nationality and native language. In accordance with the official instructions given to the counting commissioners, everyone could answer the questions independently, and citizens were not asked for an identity card or other identification. In families where the husband and wife were of different nationalities, they could decide for themselves which nationality they considered themselves to belong to. In the case of minor children, the nationality of the

mother was considered authoritative. For children who could not yet speak, their mother's native language was recognized as their native language, too [10, ol. 229]. According to preliminary data prepared by the Transcarpathian Regional Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party and the Transcarpathian Regional Executive Committee, and by the head of the Transcarpathian County Statistical Office, Strigin on June 3, 1958, the population of Transcarpathia was 922,808 people. Of these, 144,894 people were Hungarians [28, p. 10–11]. However, according to the data of the conducted census, the population of Transcarpathia was 920,200 people, which means an increase of 112,800 people, or 14%, compared to the data of the official census of 1950 [13, ol. 104]. Of these, 686,464, i. e. 74,6% of the population were of Ukrainian nationality, and 146,247, i. e. 15,8% of the population were Hungarians [41, p. 11].

In the first quarter of 1961 (January – March), a financial reform was implemented in the country [41, p. 11]. A lot of the work involved in exchanging banknotes had to be done by commercial workers, as old banknotes were accepted in trade and new ones were given back as change. The process of this was planned at the end of 1960 [41, p. 1–47; 50, p. 1–35; 55, p. 1–81]. All this was not easy, as it was necessary to ensure that the total turnover of the products was transparent with both the old and the new prices. The old roubles were exchanged in a 10:1 ratio, unlike before, this time in unlimited quantities. Salaries, prices and service fees were recalculated in the same proportion. However, this did not improve the financial situation [10, ol. 241].

In the early 1950's, diversified cross-border relations developed between Transcarpathia and the surrounding countries, affecting agriculture, sports [For example: 36, p. 1], culture [For example: 70, p. 4], health, industry, almost all economic and social areas, various holidays [For example: 36, p. 2].

On April 4, 1955, the Hungarian delegation from Szabolcs-Szatmár County arrived at the Chop border crossing [20, p. 1–6]. The members of the delegation became familiar with the life and work performance of the Hungarian youth and exchanged experiences with them. Representatives of the Transcarpathian youth were presented with a baton of friendship [14, ol. 357]. The youth organizations of the two border regions agreed on further friendly relations and active cooperation [36, p. 1–75].

At the end of 1955, agricultural workers from Transcarpathia and Szabolcs-Szatmár regions concluded agreements to organize socialist labour competitions. The first agreement on such a competition

was reached between the Engels kolkhoz in Kosyno, Berehove district, and the Barabás trade union in the Hungarian People's Republic [21, p. 1–34].

Friendship between Transcarpathia and the Socialist Republic of Romania developed somewhat later than with the regions of the Hungarian People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The first Transcarpathian delegation visited Baia Mare in 1958 as part of the celebrations for the “*liberation*” of Romania [5, c. 60].

Subsequently, cooperation with the border regions of neighbouring states increasingly affected the manufacturing industry. At the state level, increasing attention was paid to cooperation at the local and regional levels, and cross-border relations were a priority in the development of socialist economic integration, especially with regard to the development and operation of cross-border infrastructure [6, c. 21–107].

In 1956, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet government adopted a resolution, in consultation with the European socialist states, to expand close cross-border friendly relations between the regions of the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Socialist Republic of Romania. The relevant resolutions were adopted by the party organizations of the border regions and defined the areas of cross-border affiliation. In September and October 1956, several treaties were concluded between the Transcarpathian region, the Eastern Slovak region of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Szabolcs-Szatmár region, and the Satu Mare area of the Socialist Republic of Romania [5, c. 60].

In 1960, Transcarpathia's relations with the neighbouring Szabolcs-Szatmár region and the Eastern Slovak region accelerated even more. The Hungarian and Slovak delegations came to the region one after another. In October, for example, a Hungarian industrial and a Slovak youth delegation visited Berehove. Of course, the guests were shown the leading factories (winery, furniture factory), farms (the Lenin and the Red Flag kolkhozes), and the Berehove delegations in the neighbouring regions and districts were welcomed similarly [14, ol. 240].

In the early 1960s, the practice of cross-border relations involved the discussion and compilation of annual plans for cross-border co-operation by regional party committees, and later these plans were drawn up for two years. In this way, the relations between the border regions included planning, and the more distant perspective could be taken into account. As the central party organizations entrusted the local party commit-

tees with the regulation of cross-border relations, they were referred to as the relations established along the line of the local party organizations [5, c. 60].

Among the plans for co-operation and exchange of experience top priority was assigned to the study of the work of party organizations and committees supervising various aspects of social life, as well as the work of party organizations and ideological work, promoting the social and economic development of cities and regions, as well as mutual transfer of experience in work communities and other areas of life.

Various forms of cross-border co-operation were established, for example: exchange of work experience in different industries such as meetings of construction, transport, workers and professionals, mutual assistance between partners in the form of currency-free cross-border product exchange, trade between cross-border trade organizations, etc. Cooperation on the development and interaction of cross-border transport infrastructures was particularly important. The exchange of experience as a form of cooperation did not require special legal regulation. This cooperation did not require large investments either, but at the same time it brought economic benefits to both parties [14, ol. 231–232].

In June 1960, for example, a delegation of Szabolcs-Szatmár regional party representatives visited Mukachevo. The members of the delegation became familiar with the work of the party organizations of the Mukachevo City Party Committee, the local knitwear factory and the furniture factory [38, p. 1]. In the Irshava district, a delegation of Hungarian party employees became familiar with the sovkhos “Za nove zhyttia” in Bilky, the Dovhe sawmill, the Kushnytsia forestry and the political work of the party organizations operating there [38, p. 6].

Another important trend in friendly relations was the exchange of experience and cooperation between trade unions and Komsomol organizations. Issues covered during the exchange of experience included the role of local councils in carrying out tasks related to cultural and economic production, the role of NGOs in the development of socialist democracy, and the education and training of Soviet trade union and Komsomol resources [44, p. 1–44; 46, p. 1–117].

As a result of the exchange of experience over the years, permanent forms of cooperation developed in different branches of production activity. The four most common of these were: a) exchanges of teams, cutting-edge brigades, production innovators, professionals seconded to partners to study cutting-edge work directly in the workplace, learn to use new equipment and use advanced technologies, new techniques and technical processes needed to carry out various operations etc. [2]; b) exchange of information materials in various forms and contents, which facilitated a better understanding of the experiences of foreign partners; during the so-called the “friendship bus” exchange program, employees of one company travelled to a foreign affiliate and inquired about the life, c) activities, and daily lives of the particular work community, who gave exhaustive and professional answers to the questions of the friends on the friendship bus [1, c. 32–34]; d) exchange involving specialized tourist groups, which generally consisted of employees working in the same or a similar industry. The program of visits of these groups abroad included visits to companies with a similar profile and learning about production experience, working conditions and various activities [5, c. 46–63].

The practical aim of the exchange of experience was to introduce technical innovations, increase

Table 1

Number of delegations that visited Transcarpathia in 1958–1960 [37, p. 1]

| Name of the delegation | From the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic | | | From the Hungarian People’s Republic | | | From the Socialist Republic of Romania | | |
|---|--|------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|--|------|------|
| | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 |
| Party workers and employees of public authorities | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Industrial employees | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Agricultural employees | 1 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cultural employees | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Athletes | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Youth | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total number of delegations | 11 | 21 | 17 ² | 4 | 23 | 25 | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| Total number of visitors | 148 | 245 | 128 | 83 | 322 | 279 | 16 | 63 | 34 |

²The source contains 17, but the numbers add up to 15.

productivity, save raw materials, fuels and energy resources, etc.

The exchange of experience in the field of agricultural production in the framework of cross-border cooperation was also intense. The adjacent location of agricultural land, the almost identical climatic conditions and structure of the farming zones all provided favourable conditions for the mutual exchange of experience between agricultural companies [4, c. 23–64].

The many years of experience in acquiring and applying foreign experience and its effectiveness attracted the attention of communities, organizations, various levels of government and party leadership, and led them to pay more attention to the exchange of experiences, to analyse these processes and their benefits.

The adoption of foreign experiences did not mean their exact copying or imitation. The experience of the partner had to be treated creatively, taking into account the specifics, conditions, traditions, environment, etc. of the domestic production. Documents kept in the Transcarpathian Regional State Archives prove that the delegations travelling abroad had to prepare serious reports, analyses and summaries after their return. Among other things, it was expected that each delegation travelling abroad would draw up a task plan for the exchange of experiences, specifying the issues to be studied, the form and duration of the analysis. The team or brigade consisted of employees who were able to perform the set tasks to the sufficient extent and within the planned timeframe.

Steps were taken to develop tourism as well. While in 1955 227 people visited 8 different countries as tourists, in 1960 this number was already close to 7 thousand people in 23 countries. In addition, 860 of them were “visits to capitalist countries”. Most tourists reportedly “*behaved appropriately, but there were those who did not behave as expected abroad*” [54, p. 5–6].

On November 27, 1959, the resolution “On Improving the work with foreign tourists visiting the region” was adopted, which was a regionalized version of the resolution “On Improving the work with foreign tourists visiting the USSR” (October 9, 1959). To implement it, the “Inturist” travel company consulted with all relevant organizations in the region. For example, with party leadership, executive committees of towns and cities, industry, trade, transport companies [38, p. 1–3]. The tour guide staff was sent for three months of further training. In addition, Hungarian-language interpreters were sent to Kiev to acquire the knowledge needed to guide tourists.

70 Hungarian and Czech interpreters were recruited. 25 of them were sent for a 20-day interpreter-guide course in March 1960, who then worked in Uzhgorod, Lviv, Kiev [38, p. 7–8]. In Uzhgorod, the hotels set up 60 places for foreign tourists and distributed a brochure to visitors about the sights of Uzhgorod and in the area of Uzhgorod – Mukachevo – Svaliava – Uzhok pass [38, p. 23–24]. Year after year, more emphasis was placed on the development of tourism [73, p. 1–48].

From 1 May 1960, in accordance with the decree no. 1030-447 adopted by the Council of Ministers of the USSR on 2 September 1959, a scheduled bus service was launched on the Kiev – Lviv – Stryi – Uzhgorod line, mainly for foreign tourists, and negotiations began with the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to open a border crossing on the Krčava-Uzhgorod section [38, p. 19]. In Uzhgorod, near the Hotel “Verkhovyna”, a kiosk was opened, where tourists could buy various souvenirs, postcards, books, etc. 18 special so-called “friendship trains for foreign tourists” were also set up. These were staffed by 112 Hungarian and Czech interpreters. In addition, there were 7 “friendship trains with Soviet tourists” that transported Soviet tourists to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Hungarian People’s Republic [38, p. 23–24]. Thanks to the developments, in the first half of 1960, 42,233 tourists from 26 different countries visited the region, including 138 people from France, 125 people from the USA, 56 people from Italy, and so on [38, p. 25].

Of course, kinship visits were categorized and recorded separately. Thus, according to archival data, in 1960, 5,451 people arrived in Transcarpathia to visit relatives. Among them 2901 travelled from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, 2244 from the Hungarian People’s Republic, 173 from the Socialist Republic of Romania, 28 from the Polish People’s Republic, 11 from France, 3 from Norway etc. [38, p. 29].

On 12 May 1962, in accordance with Decree no. 1156 issued by the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, an entry and exit checkpoint was set up in the town of Chop for foreign tourists travelling by car on the Hungarian People’s Republic-Chop-Uzhgorod-Kiev road section [61, p. 1].

Compared to the national level, Transcarpathia had a well-developed transport infrastructure, which contributed to the region becoming a tourist and holiday area of national importance. In January 1960, the UCP Central Committee issued a decree “On the development of Transcarpathian resort centres and tourism for the period between 1960 and 1965”,

which also covered the development of sports facilities [39, p. 1–56].

By 1964, 15 sanatoriums (with 2,2 thousand beds) and three resorts (with 500 beds) were welcoming their guests. The natural medicinal waters of the balneological centres of Poliana and Syniak were especially popular. During the mentioned period, 7,2 thousand health care workers were employed in Transcarpathia, 1,500 of which were doctors. Experts determined that the water from about 400 springs in the region had a healing effect [14, ol. 267].

This was also facilitated by Decree No. 456 issued by the USSR Ministry of Health of 24 August 1961, which aimed to improve the health care of the population [51, p. 3]. According to this decree, the number of sanatoriums, hospital rooms, and hospital beds was increased, and various developments, constructions and renovations were carried out in health care institutions. The number of pharmacies was also increased, as well as the amount of drug stocks shipped to the region [51, p. 13–14; 68, p. 1–40]. The care of health care workers was improved, too, and the authorities dealt more with the employment issues of hospitals and sanatoriums [69, p. 1–10].

By the mid-1960's, the total length of the Transcarpathian railway network reached 641 km. The Chop – Mukachevo – Stryi-Lviv, Chop – Uzhgorod – Lviv, Chop – Rakhiv – Ivano-Frankivsk lines handled significant railway traffic. Chop, Mukachevo, Batevo and Uzhgorod-2 were the largest railway junctions. Uzhgorod-2 was the first railway junction in the Soviet Union where border guards and customs officers from two countries carried out inspections together (and not on either side of the border separately). The Chop railway hub was of strategic importance in the Soviet Union. The railwaymen of Chop on the Soviet side, Záhony on the Hungarian side and Čierna nad

Tisou on the Czechoslovak side cooperated closely [14, ol. 266].

In 1962, the Moscow – Kiev – Lviv – Uzhgorod – Budapest – Prague main railway line was handed over [57, p. 6]. The passenger service was continuously improved, for this purpose various regulations were made. For example, on September 10, 1963, the Transcarpathian Regional Committee of the UCP issued a decree “On Improving Passenger Service”, which resulted in opening cafes, buffets, restaurants at railway and bus stations, where special attention was paid to providing meals for children, such as dairy products, and to hygiene [67, p. 19–20].

By the mid-1960's, the paved road network expanded to 3,000 km. Two of the three main routes ran along the western border section, and the third was part of the pan-European transport corridor [14, ol. 267].

The Uzhgorod airport, which was built during the Czechoslovak rule of Transcarpathia and opened in 1929, reopened after the war in November 1945, so Uzhgorod was directly connected by air with Moscow, Kiev, Lviv, Kharkiv, Donetsk, Odessa, Simferopol and other Soviet cities [14, ol. 267].

As for public transport, ticket prices were very low. The prices of utilities, gas and electricity were also low and stable.

Overall, the period from 1953 to 1964 was a time of great reorganizations and failures in the Soviet Union. It became increasingly apparent that Khrushchev's reforms would not fulfil the hopes placed in them, according to which it would have served to improve the economy and raise the living standards of the society. In addition, the Secretary-General surrounded himself with toadies, poorly selected his advisers, and blindly trusted them, which resulted in increasingly serious consequences and eventually his departure from power.

References:

1. Дяченко Б., Газуда Л., Биркович В. Особливості транскордонного українсько-угорського співробітництва. *Вісник КНТЕУ*. 2007. Вип. 1. С. 32–38.
2. Жулканич Н. Розвиток транскордонного співробітництва у Карпатському регіоні (на прикладі АРК Закарпатської області). *Історична панорама*. 2004. № 2. URL: <http://politics.ellib.org.ua/pages-4732.html>
3. Прикордонне співробітництво: регіональні трансформації і перспективи / В.П. Мікловда та ін. Ужгород : Бреза А.Е., 2012. 226 с.
4. Передрий А. Агропромисловий комплекс стран – членов СЕВ. Львов, 1987. С. 23–64.
5. Устыч И. Развитие рыночных отношений в приграничном сотрудничестве. Институт социальных и экономических проблем зарубежных стран АН УССР : научный доклад. *Проблемы развития приграничных экономических отношений СССР с европейскими странами – членами СЕВ*. 1990. Вып. 3. С. 46–63.
6. Приграничное сотрудничество социалистических стран: опыт, проблемы, перспективы / Г. Шманько и др. 1990.
7. Региональные аспекты приграничного экономического сотрудничества СССР со странами СЕВ / Г. Шманько и др. Москва, 1983.

8. Beregszászi A. A kárpátaljai Bátyú település // Lokális világok. Együttélés a Kárpát-medencében. Magyarország az ezredfordulón. Stratégiai tanulmányok a Magyar Tudományos Akadémián. Bp., 2003.
9. Brenzovics L. Kárpátalja történetének korszakai és gazdasági-társadalmi helyzete a XX. században // Kárpátalja. Ed. Baranyi Béla. Pécs – Bp. 2009.
10. Csanádi G. Sorsfordító évek sodrásában. Uzhgorod, 2004.
11. Dupka G. A szovjet hatóságok megtorló tevékenysége Kárpátalján (1944–1991). Uzhgorod – Budapest, 2014.
12. Krausz T. Közép-, Kelet- és Délkelet-Európa országai a második világháború után. Szovjetunió (1945–1991) // 20. századi egyetemes történet – I. kötet. Európa. Budapest 2005.
13. Molnár D. I. Perifériáról perifériára. Kárpátalja népessége 1869-től napjainkig // MTA TK Kisebbségkutató Intézet. Budapest 2018.
14. Oficinskij R. A szovjet időszak sajátosságai Kárpátalja történetében // Kárpátalja 1919–2009. Bp. 2010.
15. Tokár M. et al: Kárpátalja évszámokban 1867–2010. Uzhgorod. 2011.
16. Transcarpathian Regional State Archive (TRSA). F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 156.
17. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 2303.
18. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 2529.
19. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 2533.
20. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 2705.
21. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3067.
22. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3070.
23. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3213.
24. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3214.
25. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3301.
26. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3320.
27. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3321.
28. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3457.
29. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3502.
30. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 1. D. Nr. 3503.
31. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 7.
32. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 11.
33. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 66.
34. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 69.
35. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 75.
36. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 76.
37. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 77.
38. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 85.
39. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 86.
40. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 92.
41. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 93.
42. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 98.
43. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 99.
44. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 101.
45. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 107.
46. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 108.
47. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 144.
48. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 145.
49. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 167.
50. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 271.
51. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 332.
52. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 333.
53. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 335.
54. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 337.
55. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 339.
56. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 404.
57. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 407.
58. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 411.
59. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 473.
60. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 495.

61. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 555.
62. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 560.
63. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 561.
64. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 562.
65. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 563.
66. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 580.
67. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 622.
68. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 635.
69. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 636.
70. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 694.
71. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 697.
72. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 746.
73. TRSA. F. 1. Op. 5. D. Nr. 753.
74. TRSA. F. П-1. Op. 1. Od. zb. 1783.

Вароді Н.Ф. ПОВСЯКДЕННЕ ЖИТТЯ Й ТРАНСКОРДОННІ ВІДНОСИНИ НА ЗАКАРПАТТІ ПРОТЯГОМ ПЕРІОДУ ХРУЩОВА

Після смерті Й. Сталіна в період хрущовської «відлиги» (1953–1964) простежуються деякі позитивні зміни в Радянському Союзі, а також у Закарпатській області, яка була «Західною брамою» СРСР: менш інтенсивні репресії, часткова лібералізація політичного життя, незначне послаблення тоталітарного режиму, безліч політичних, економічних і соціальних реформ. На Закарпатті радянська влада зробила все від неї залежне, щоб ця територія була повністю інтегрована у радянську систему. Під час реалізації планової економіки кількість переважала над якістю. За часів епохи Хрущова основними цілями політичного керівництва Закарпаття були, зокрема, ліквідація, принаймні зменшення рівня безробіття, поживлення торгівлі, встановлення та поглиблення дружніх відносин і співпраці із сусідніми країнами, розвиток туризму й інфраструктури, вирішення проблеми з дефіцитом житла, розвиток міської промисловості, що сприяло прискоренню урбанізації, тощо. Почали розвиватися харчова та легка промисловість. Удосконалювалася і фрезерна промисловість, оскільки радянські війська, дислоковані у Центральній Європі, отримували постачання із Закарпаття. Період із 1953 по 1964 р. був часом великої реорганізації та невдач у Радянському Союзі. Ставало дедалі зрозумілішим, що хрущовські реформи не допомагають утілитися надіям на поліпшення економіки та підвищення рівня життя суспільства. Загалом політика Хрущова була непослідовною та дискусійною. Окрім того, генеральний секретар оточував себе недоброзичливцями, так хибно відбирав своїх радників, сліпо довіряв їм, що це мало все більш серйозні наслідки та призвело до його падіння. Президія Комуністичної партії на Жовтневому з'їзді ЦК Компартії Радянського Союзу 1964 р. звільнила М. Хрущова.

Ключові слова: Закарпаття 1953–1964 рр., кордон, УРСР, Угорська Народна Республіка, співпраця.