



This paper was originally published by Sage as:
Lehmann, M., & Oberländer, A. (2020). **Introduction: Socialism to be embodied.** *East European Politics and Societies: and Cultures*, 34(4), 802–816. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325420921917>

This publication is with permission of the rights owner freely accessible due to an Alliance licence and a national licence (funded by the DFG, German Research Foundation) respectively.

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, nontransferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Provided by:

Max Planck Institute for Human Development
Library and Research Information
library@mpib-berlin.mpg.de



Introduction: Socialism to Be Embodied

Maike Lehmann 

Universität Bremen, Bremen, Germany

Alexandra Oberländer

Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

East European Politics and Societies and Cultures

Volume 34 Number 4

November 2020 802–816

© 2020 SAGE Publications

10.1177/0888325420921917

journals.sagepub.com/home/eeep

hosted at

<http://online.sagepub.com>

While the ideal of the New Socialist Wo/Man was never fully realized and seems to have been abandoned across the Eastern Bloc after 1953, the question still arises what role individuals were to play within the socialist system. As dichotomous conceptualizations of state and society have been repeatedly criticized in recent years, we propose to look at how the role of the individual was imagined by different actors in Eastern European countries and how the ideals inherent in these imaginations were (to be) embodied. One possible avenue would be to explore the role of official language for subjectivization processes as they have been discussed during the last twenty years in Soviet studies. We, however, want to turn the attention towards the body and its role in shaping the individual in a cluster dealing with the impact family, gender, and dis/ability (were meant to) have on the formation of an individual body and its place within broader society. This is to explore some of the ways in which anybody could become somebody in socialist Eastern Europe and might help to shift the attention from dichotomous conceptualizations of political dogma and social practice towards an exploration of socialism as a diverse, yet specific cultural system.

Keywords: *socialism; body; family; disability; subjectivity*

The transformation of individuals was central to the socialist project as the revolutionary project needed revolutionized people for its utopian idea of a communist society. Hence, the Bolsheviks set out to transform minds and bodies to foster ideal Wo/Men: healthy and fit, enthusiastic and spirited, sober and calculating, (re-)productive and caring, self-managed and efficient. In many modern political utopias, the body was getting a lot of attention as the locus of physical and psychological strength. “Mens sana in corpore sano” also applies to the Bolshevik project, but what that was supposed to entail evolved over time. In the 1920s, homosexuality was de-criminalized in the Soviet Union, divorce was a matter of signing a paper and abortion was the pregnant woman’s decision.¹ In the long run, however, traditional categories crept back into the agenda of the New Wo/Men, not least because these policies intersected with other developments that made them problematic for party politicians and the people affected by them.² This was not only the case in the Soviet Union, but also in the Eastern European states that became part of the Eastern Bloc

after 1945 where emancipatory legislation stood alongside traditional gender roles and communal ideas seemed to compete with national(ist) traditions.

Accordingly, socialism's universal claim on people's minds and bodies was never completely consistent and neither easily implemented nor ever fully achieved. This led to a tradition within the historiography dealing with the Eastern Bloc to emphasize the state's failure to produce the textbook *New Wo/Man: Citizens of socialist states*, it is argued, rather "adapted to the system" or "domesticated" it instead of fully embracing the socialist vision and would turn to either active confrontation or passive resistance if they saw their sense of justice infringed upon. Party leaders in Central Eastern Europe for their part are assumed to have abandoned the project to transform people's subjectivities after Stalin's death as they not only allowed people to retreat from the public into the private realm, but also emphasized national identities, implemented pro-consumer policies, and fostered traditional gender roles.³

The contributions to this special section want to revisit this paradigm "of a great retreat Eastern European style" by looking at how the socialist project was to be embodied by men and women in the decades after 1953. Bodies often remain on the periphery of historiographical attention although they are acknowledged as potent political symbols. If interest turns to them, bodies are often approached in two ways that seem mutually exclusive: either they are seen as the site of inescapable control, whether in connection to overbearing if not violent states or internalized rules that make the "soul the prison of the body."⁴ Or bodies are presented as sources of resistance and change.⁵ While the former is often understood as if people have no impact on the power relations or the social contexts they are embedded in, the latter purports that agency only lies in resistance. Yet, bodies are situated at the intersection of physical manifestation and discursive construction of both power relations and cultural systems. This very intersection entails the contradictory, politically charged, changeable, and fragmented production and reproduction of discourses and everyday interactions that in turn reveal bodies as entities that are not solely products of disciplinary politics or simply sites of resistance but inhabit the whole spectrum between these two seemingly exclusionary antipodes. Bodies thus allow for an exploration of the ways in which socialism was not just received and re/negotiated as a state ideology but also how it was re/envisioned, molded, and embodied by different actors.

Shifting attention to this spectrum goes against the enduring—and often implicit—rationale of studying socialist societies that remains oriented toward an either/or frame of success versus failure. In the same vein, binaries and dichotomies between state and society, public and private, socialist-progressive, and traditional-conservative continue to structure evaluations of "real existing socialism" despite the many critiques of this approach. Binaries, dichotomies, and dialectics appear to be a central device for ordering the world⁶ and of course were also part and parcel of socialist teachings. They were, thus, also integral to (self-)conceptualizations in and of socialist society. The seemingly clear-cut divisions between public and private, socialism and nationalism, or traditional and progressive

policies help to categorize historical developments according to a seemingly unambiguous system. But they often overshadow how these aspects would not only be posited as opposites but also overlap, inform, and exist alongside each other to mold bodies, lives, and worldviews beyond theories, dogmas, and analytical assessments. If we try to conceptualize socialism not just as a (former) “other” or a political dogma imposed by a small group of party leaders and criticized and thus (presumably nothing but) subverted by “the people”,⁷ but to think about it more broadly as an evolving cultural system “of inherited conceptions [both from before and after the formation of the socialist state] expressed in symbolic forms by means of which [wo/]men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life,”⁸ we not only refocus our attention onto the evolution of socialist societies. We also acknowledge the men and women living in one or the other state within the Eastern Bloc as acting subjects that shaped the cultural formations that also animated them.⁹ A look at how men and women (were to) embody socialism provides a road to a better understanding of a culture that—like every other culture—was at once an institution, a practice and a process which, the apparent conflicts, contradictions, fissures, and growing diversity notwithstanding, retained a specificity that ensured cohesion despite considerable upheaval in the 35 years after Stalin’s death.¹⁰

The contributions to this cluster of articles turn their attention toward the body and its role in shaping the individual as they were to be defined by family, gender, and dis/ability. Family, gender, and disability are all central for as much as intersecting factors of forming an individual, its body, and its place within broader society. They influence to a great degree how *anybody* becomes *somebody*,¹¹ to be recognizable, and become recognized along the intersecting lines of institutional rules, social practices, and cultural conceptions. This is also true for socialism. Even as the officially promoted ideals of the New Wo/Man were never realized and Party leaders allegedly abandoned this particular vision after 1953, literature, film, scientific advice literature, and other media geared towards popular consumption did not cease to advertise role models, overtly or implicitly meant to represent specific, if evolving socialist ideals.¹² While heroic depictions of almost superhuman New Wo/Men might have become less present in public spaces, representations of ideal, fully realized individuals and their role within the broader scheme of things were (to be) consumed in the more intimate spaces of the family home through TV shows and different kinds of reading materials. Yet, these representations were not simply prescriptions set by state and party institutions. How women and men were to embody socialism was defined by multiple actors who provided their audiences with directions for becoming *somebody* within the socialist (cultural) system. Thus, there were multiple participants beyond the party who negotiated cultural and social formations that entailed a diverse, yet specific, “ensemble of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, fear, and so forth that [were to] animate the subject.”¹³

The “subject” and “subjectivity,” often used as synonyms for the “individual,” are contentious subject matters within Eastern European history. One could debate

whether the discussion on Stalinist subjectivities that has shaped the debates about Soviet history in the last 20 years¹⁴ would be applicable to the larger “Eastern Bloc” after 1945, 1953, and 1968. After all, the socialist tradition and the political circumstances, social structures, cultural legacies, and generational constellations under which state socialism was introduced in these countries differed markedly from the interwar years in the Soviet Union. Accordingly, the promotion of the ideal of New Wo/Men and the role ascribed to the individual were not the same as in the Soviet Union. While for the Soviet Union, diaries and other speech acts made the impact and negotiation of socialism palpable, at least for some sections of society,¹⁵ the language of socialism, it seems, never influenced societies in Central Eastern Europe to the same extent. But does that devalue subjectivity as a subject matter for the historiography on the region? Does the alleged abandonment of the vision of the New Wo/Man necessarily imply an abandonment of the values, ideals, and identities that had been folded into that vision?

We would like to argue that exploring Eastern European subjectivities and their ties to promoted ideals and different tropes of identity embedded in official as much as social discourse might render interesting insights into the evolution of socialism as a cultural system.¹⁶ While there are first attempts to ponder questions about the impact of language, models, and practices offered to the citizens of different socialist states in Eastern Europe beyond the formulaic,¹⁷ we want to offer an additional avenue into the subject matter in this article cluster on the body as it was defined by family, gender, and dis/ability. In order to access the (ideal) ways to become somebody within the socialist cultural system, the contributions by Peter Hallama, Frank Henschel, and Natalia Pamuła look at the representations of ideal citizens and, in extension to established lines of inquiry, their bodies. To put representations as they were developed by experts, writers, and other elite members of different socialist societies center stage is not without problems, of course, as experts and members of the intelligentsia help to perpetuate power relations and establish the rules by which populations are ruled, societies are organized, and the past and present are understood.¹⁸ But the fact that they do this and that they are at the same time not independent of the cultural systems with their particular social structures, power relations, and emotive rules they help to shape makes them nevertheless interesting objects of investigation. Thus, both vantage points onto experts not only offer opportunities to revisit the “great retreat” and its implications but also provide insights into how representations re/produce social facts¹⁹ and, along with this, how they are (to be) embodied.

Family and gendered bodies are, at the same time, not entirely new topics for the historiography of the socialist experience even as they have received differing degrees of attention. While not being able to cover the whole scholarship for the overall Eastern Bloc, the remainder of this introduction will pick up on the issues of gender and the socialist body to link them to the questions discussed by the different contributions to this issue.

What Was Socialist about Gender in the Eastern Bloc?

Family and sexuality are part and parcel of the historiographical discussions on the new gender roles proclaimed with the introduction of state socialism. The most obvious distinction of gendered notions in the Eastern Bloc was the centrality of women's legal and social emancipation in implementing socialist regimes after 1945. Like the Soviet Union, the new socialist states aimed at introducing equality between sexes from the very beginning of their existence. Decisive for establishing equality from Poland to Bulgaria was bringing women into "productive," that is industrial, labour. For the late 1940s and early 1950s, we see roaring rates of women's employment in the socialist regimes of Eastern Europe. Indeed, women's access to labour markets is generally interpreted as one of the main achievements of socialism, an area in which the West at least until the late 1970s considerably lagged behind.²⁰ In Romania, for instance, in 1970, 74.9 percent of women between twenty and fifty-nine years old were employed outside the home, in contrast to 54.2 percent in the United Kingdom and 51.2 percent in France.²¹ Women's emancipation was more than just a mere propaganda tool or a lip service of socialist rule.²² In Eastern Europe, the "original equalizing zeal of the Stalinist period" effectively established women's equality in public and private life, introduced health care systems that acknowledged pregnancy and motherhood and established universal education.²³ Especially in the very beginning of the socialist experiment in Eastern Europe women entered professions that, like coal mining, used to be a domain of men.²⁴ After World War II, women were migrating into the newly industrialized regions, hoping for a better life and thus dreaming a dream that was once a male privilege. As Katherine Lebow observed, Stalinism in Polish Nowa Huta meant progress for women while in the homeland of Stalinism the very same epoch (late 1940s and early 1950s) brought about a conservative backlash in emancipation politics. This non-synchronism between propagating and introducing women's emancipation in the Eastern Bloc and fortifying a conservative position on women's emancipation in the homeland of state socialism is striking. While in many areas of socialist policy the new socialist states and parties emulated the Soviet model, in gender politics they did not.²⁵ This sort of autonomy all over Eastern European states in a relatively crucial field of communist politics still needs to be explored. Why were these young socialist states so keen on implementing progressive gender politics in the beginning? And what were women and men living and working in the "Eastern Bloc" to make of this claim of progressivism over the decades?

However, the scope of emancipation in the Eastern Bloc has been precarious and thus in the long run mirrored the developments in the Soviet Union. Accordingly, many scholars have noted that equality for women was never a goal in itself but instrumental. Although women were integral to the work forces across Eastern Europe, their wages were considerably lower and they were severely underrepresented in more prestigious jobs. Unemployment rates of women were always higher

than those of men.²⁶ They were needed as a cheap labour force, which is not the same as taking them seriously as citizens or economic actors. Almost all over the bloc, rural women entering the urban workforce elicited moral panic about uncontrolled sexuality in industrialized and urban areas. In the midst of legal discourses of equality for women, state socialism succeeded in not only establishing a double burden (wage labour and care-work) but a triple burden (labour, care, and an active public life) for its female members. One could argue that this made it even more difficult for women to become somebody in a socialist society, even without the actual effects on their bodies taken into account. But it was this triple burden that women occasionally rebelled against as in the case of Leningrad feminists who demanded the right to stay at home and care for their families.²⁷ Curiously, we generally know much more about women who addressed problems they faced and, thus, seem to confirm state socialism's failures than about women who were not necessarily party activists, but whose identities might have been affected in diverse ways by the progressive promises state socialism offered (if often only in theory).²⁸

Gendered notions of reproductive labour were omnipresent. Patriarchal attitudes towards women were never really gone. The initial revolutionary spirit of the late 1940s did not last long. It seems to never have been as fervent as the Bolshevik zeal in the 1920s in the first place. Socialist Eastern Europe rarely developed feminist voices which would have criticized the institution of the family as a bulwark of bourgeois attitudes and thus aimed at demolishing the "traditional" labour division in the household.²⁹ Among other factors, this lacuna contributed to a relatively quick rollback in terms of gender policy that set in with the demise of Stalinism in the mid-1950s. The reasons for such a rollback were similar across the Eastern Bloc while often featuring specific determinants such as Catholicism in Poland.

In general, however, women enjoyed greater freedom than their comrades in the West. The fact that most of the women worked and earned their own money, for example, influenced their decision making and led to greater autonomy for women. Young women in the socialist 1960s and 1970s lived a very different life than their mothers and grandmothers: They chose their husbands not for economic reasons because they themselves as workers were able to provide for themselves. They postponed marriage for career or educational reasons. Some of those achievements, like the larger role in being a breadwinner or showing greater autonomy in marriage decisions, survived the traditionalization of gender roles starting all over the socialist bloc in the 1960s.³⁰ As traditional gender roles were reinforced, women were again increasingly seen as mothers and wives and less as workers. Many socialist states had implemented relatively liberal family laws in the 1940s and 1950s only to gradually withdraw them since the 1960s.³¹ In Bulgaria, for instance, in the 1950s family policies were aimed at diminishing the role of family by abandoning the legal discrimination of "illegitimate" children and introducing special support for single mothers. Although such a policy did not necessarily lead to a more open moral attitude towards single mothers, the policy differed immensely from the pro-family

policy of the 1960s. These relatively conservative family politics were one of the main reasons for the backlash in gender politics. Rather than wishing for the traditional family to wither away most socialist states (not to mention socialist states with a strong religious tradition) wished for the family to be the elementary unit of socialist society. Some socialist states even claimed to be “its best defenders.”³² But this was not solely to preserve traditional family models. Its basic functions were procreation and the education of the future socialist Wo/Man. Those two duties almost entirely rested upon the women’s shoulders. This is especially striking when looking at the role of grandmothers as those who effectively raised children while their daughters and grandchildren’s mothers went to work. Grandfathers for instance are rarely to be found in narratives about being raised by grandparents.

However, as much as this traditional backlash is acknowledged for the entire socialist bloc since the late 1960s, developments in recalibrating male roles within the families are less known. In his discussion of changing notions of fatherhood in the GDR Peter Hallama illustrates that the new “era of the family” did not leave men untouched.³³ The more family politics became a social and demographic issue in which the socialist state exceedingly interfered in order to guarantee an upbringing of children in healthy families, the role of the father gained in importance for the well-being of the child. The socialist duty of the New Man thus was no longer confined to being a diligent worker, but also a caring father who would take care of his children’s emotional and physical needs. The propagation of a new fatherhood, however, did not extend into a re-interpretation of household duties. Men doing the dishes or the laundry remained a joke for satirical magazines, as Claire McCallum recently demonstrated for the post-war Soviet Union.³⁴ The changing notions of fatherhood were thus confined to the realm of education and family politics and did not affect traditional notions of gender and what it meant to be a man. The gendered division of labour persisted in the sense that cooking and cleaning remained a women’s issue. Nevertheless, as Jill Massino has shown for the Romanian case, men were more and more to be seen “buying” food. The peculiarities of late socialist economies invited men to participate in “food procurement” as this was an activity that required “time, energy, and fortitude” and as such asserted the male role of being the breadwinner.³⁵

As much as there is failure in gender and family politics there is also a certain tradition of nostalgia among women of the former socialist bloc as already demonstrated for the Bulgarian case.³⁶ In hindsight, women appreciate the impact of gender equality in socialism, which to some extent did change hierarchies within families.³⁷ Scholars often cite issues of money and patriarchy for re-establishing the family as the kernel of a socialist society since the 1960s. In this narrative, planned economies appreciated the unpaid labor of reproductive work within the private sphere as opposed to financing canteens, kindergartens and laundries, whose services were usually criticized for being of poor quality anyway. Beyond money, patriarchal moral traditions nourished certain gender roles in which unregulated sexuality and the role

of the caring mother would not fit into one frame. However, in many cases among the socialist Eastern European states, there is a third very important factor contributing to a conservative gender policy: nationalism. Such a link is obvious in the pro-natalist policies of the Czechoslovakian state that tried to curb the birth rate of its minorities (see Henschel's contribution, for example), not to mention the sterilization programs for Sinti and Roma in the Eastern Bloc. The relatively liberal abortion laws contributed to anxieties about demography and shrinking populations in most Eastern European states, particularly in Romania.³⁸ To which extent nationalism and conservative family politics are interlinked with objectives of the socialist state is demonstrated in Natalia Pamula's contribution on Polish young adult literature. Here, the socialist welfare state is entirely dissolved into the socialist family.³⁹ It is the family where young adults were to realize their duties as socialist subjects in overcoming the inhibitions of their disabled bodies to then aspire for a full working life outside the home. Thus, utopian ideals were not entirely dissolved after 1953.

Peter Hallama's article on changing notions of masculinity and fatherhood in the GDR offers a similar perspective into the family as a site for developing the socialist individual. Party discussions and advice literature of the 1960s reveal not so much a departure from the socialist goal to transform the individual as an affirmation of this objective: progressive elements are present within the state's reproductive policies as modern marriage is conceived as a union of true love and equality between partners that are unaffected by the economic concerns of capitalist countries; both men and women are meant to contribute to a successful marriage and therefore securing a socialist subjectivity for their children; and affective masculinity is epitomized in a new understanding of a present and caring fatherhood that was to ensure true equality not just at work but also at home.

These contributions raise important questions about gendered subjectivities as they were imagined by the state, the experts, and the population alike. The visions of a new fatherhood analyzed by Hallama or the Young Adult literature in Pamula's case is aimed at the creation of a healthy, productive family life. The diverse attitudes toward gender roles and married life discussed in their contributions allow a glimpse of the inconsistencies, fissures, and growing diversity within the socialist cultural system, which was still anchored in a shared vision of a collective body whose destiny was to be performed and realized by individual actors.

Dis/abled and "Difficult" Bodies under Socialism

While gender and sexuality by now constitute an established field of inquiry for Eastern European studies, the bodies of socialist citizens have attracted attention primarily in regards to the visual depiction of the New Man and Woman or the display of bodily unity of the socialist collective in sports and May parades.⁴⁰ Even if the new socialist states in Eastern Europe promoted not quite the same enthusiasm

after 1945 over the malleability of the human body as had the Bolsheviks in the 1920s, they still started out with the factory model of collective displays of bodies resonant with early Soviet ideas that the human body could be trained to become a machine.⁴¹ In sync with the established paradigm of a “great retreat” in Eastern Europe after 1953, Petr Roubald has however pointed out a marked shift from the idea of the body’s malleability towards more conservative conceptions about the unchanging “nature” of the male and the female body and a renewed emphasis on the nation, especially during the period of normalization.⁴²

But bodies were central also beyond mass displays. They were not only needed to build and work in the industrial structures as well as the modern socialist cities needed to make socialism a reality, but also to house and display the transformed subjectivity of the individual citizen.⁴³ For both capacities, the ability to work was again crucial. Working was one of the major avenues to be or become somebody. This is resonant not only in the visual representation of able-bodied workers and peasants fighting physically deformed capitalists and wreckers.⁴⁴ Conscientious work was also the crucial reference point in tales about the transformative power of sports that then help the individual to improve its productivity at work.⁴⁵ The link between mind, body, and work is yet again present in the concern over teen pregnancies and masturbation as unproductive activities that were linked to the diversion of energy from work due to exhaustion, antisocial behavior, and nervous disorders associated with early sexual activity outside of a stable marriage between conscious adults.⁴⁶ But what about those individuals whose bodies prevented them from participating fully in the work process?

All socialist states faced the difficulty of mobilizing enough able-bodied workers while dealing with the aftermath of considerable destruction and a drop in their populations during the war. Interestingly, the fate of invalids after the war is rarely discussed further for the Eastern European countries whereas the issue of disabled veterans of the victorious Red Army has received some attention.⁴⁷ One might assume that the question of who had been wounded when and under which circumstances as the different war parties crossed Eastern European territories was too much of a touchy subject to address. Whatever the ambiguity of the war years might have carried in postwar Eastern Europe, Natalia Pamuła’s contribution indicates that the issue was not ignored entirely. Yet, the implications of the war experience were apparently diverted to the future as narratives established from the 1950s and through the 1970s presented young readers with stories about teenagers transcending the bodily limitations that the war had inflicted on them to become full (working) members of the socialist society.

While discussion about the bodily (and mental) consequences of war remains scarce, there are in general very few instances in which disability is addressed beyond general assessments of the insufficient support for the disabled by state institutions and the discrimination of disabled citizens for the decades before 1989.⁴⁸ Although care and integration of the disabled was as much part of the

progressive agenda of socialist states as the emancipation of women,⁴⁹ the field of disability studies is yet to be explored in East European studies. Part of the problem is that despite its potential to betray dispositions and constellations that otherwise remain below the surface, disability is not a unitary phenomenon, the disabled not a unitary group, and only few had the opportunity to speak up and represent themselves. So far this ability to speak up and participate seems to have been dependent on how easily one or the other group of disabled individuals could be integrated into the work process and society at large.⁵⁰ Another inhibition might be the definition of disability as “defectiveness” by scientists and practitioners under state socialism. The discipline of “defectology” acknowledged the wide spectrum of impairments to be addressed, but nevertheless promoted a unified approach to them. The conviction was that with the right pedagogic approach, “defective” children could be turned into productive citizens.⁵¹

While this is again a field primarily addressed for the Soviet Union, Frank Henschel’s chapter on “defectiveness” as it became defined in socialist Czechoslovakia offers new insights beyond the Soviet case. As he analyses the discipline of defectology and its approach to children not only with physical, mental, and sensual disabilities, but also to children with behavioral and social-emotional problems he can demonstrate how diverse representations of “defective” children affected their actual treatment over the years. Initially, the assumption was that these children could not become useful and working citizens as long as they remained in their families’ care. The expanding system of special institutions designed to re-educate “difficult children” in the tradition of Soviet pedagogue Antonin Makarenko focused on work as the primary tool for re-socialization until the 1980s. Work, thus, retained its defining role as a transformative force of integrating the individual into the socialist community and, thus, make it a socialist subject. Yet, over the years, families and non-residential counselling came to represent viable alternatives to institutional approaches. In practice, strategies of re-integration entailed individualized approaches as well as gendered prejudice and ethnic discrimination, revealing the diverse, and often divergent, factors that shaped socialist pedagogy in Czechoslovakia. With “difficult” girls, unregulated sexuality was blamed for nearly every kind of deviance. Henschel connects this discourse on female youth delinquency to traditional gender roles. Ethnicity, on the other hand, featured more and more prominently in the perception of “defectiveness” among Czechoslovak pedagogues from the 1960s to the 1980s. The integration of Romani children into the socialist collective was proclaimed a humanist endeavor, while in practice ethnicity and “defectiveness” became interlinked more and more in scientists’ assessments despite their explicit rejection of racial categories. As “gypsies”, these children were increasingly segregated and could only be integrated into the larger Czechoslovak community when becoming foster children in non-Romani families. This does not only indicate how ascription and representation determined agency, but also identifies the family as a key site for the formation of socialist subjects (to be).

This brings up ethnicity and the nation for the discussion of socialism as a cultural system. National identities are traditionally seen as powerful antidotes to the socialist ideology and for some Eastern European states national factors seem to have replaced the socialist project after 1953. How children were (meant) to integrate themselves into a larger collective in the “Eastern Bloc” might be conducive for a conversation on the links between these two presumed antipodes. While Henschel’s contribution highlights the exclusionary function of ethnicity and strong homogenizing tendencies in this respect, Natalia Pamuła explores how difference was (to be) overcome through narratives and silences that were to foster children’s integration into a socialist nation. Pamuła analyses representations of young bodies overcoming disability in socialist Poland. Overcoming disability is regarded as a crucial contribution to the resurrection of the Polish nation after World War II, while unsuccessful rehabilitation is presented as a personal failure and mischief. Analyzing the narratives on rehabilitation of—incidentally mostly female—teenage bodies, Pamuła explores how one can become somebody even as they have to deal with serious bodily inhibitions, but also addresses the question of who owns a body. While factors that seem to be remote from socialism—the nation, the family and nature—appear to play the key role and symbols of socialist power are conspicuously absent, the narratives of the individual’s duty to transform its disabled body through self-discipline, commitment, and perseverance correlate with similar individuation narratives dominating in the Soviet Union during the 1930s that placed the responsibility to act, to become an able-bodied socialist citizen, with the individual.⁵²

Author Note

The articles in this cluster were first discussed at the second workshop “The Many Faces of Late Socialism: The Individual in the Eastern Bloc, 1953-1988,” held in Cologne (Germany) on 19 June–1 July 2017. The project was funded by a UoC Advanced Postdoc Grant (DFG Exzellenz). Besides the *EEPS* reviewers, we would like to thank Diana Georgescu for her comments on the section on socialist bodies and the participants of the workshop for a lively discussion.

ORCID iD

Maike Lehmann  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4601-3822>

Notes

1. A. Krylova, “Bolshevik Feminism and Gender Agendas of Communism,” in *The Cambridge History of Communism*, vol. I., *World Revolution and Communism in One Country, 1917-1941*, ed. S. Pond and S. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 424–48; I. Roldugina, “Pochemu my takie ljudi? Raneesovetskie gomoseksualy ot pervogo litsa: Novye istochniki po istorii gomoseksual’nykh identichnostei v Rossii,” *Ab Imperio* 2 (2016): 183–216; W. Goldman, *Women, the State, and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Social Life, 1917-1936* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); A. E. Gorsuch, “A Woman Is Not a Man: The Culture of Gender and Generation in Soviet Russia,” *Slavic Review* 55 (1996): 636–60.

2. Goldman, *Women, the State, and Revolution*; S. Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), chap. 5; D. Healey, "Homosexual Existence and Existing Socialism: New Light on the Repression of Male Homosexuality in Stalin's Russia," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 8 (2002): 349–78.

3. For two more recent statements to this effect, see B. Porter-Szüc, "Exclusionary Egalitarianism and the New Cold War," *Slavic Review* 76 (2017): S88; D. Jarosz, "Citizens of Communist Poland as 'Small Individualists,'" *Acta Poloniae Historica* 105 (2012): 157–77. For a perspective emphasizing repression and disenfranchisement after 1953, see, e.g., H. Havelková and L. Oates-Indruchová, eds., *The Politics of Gender Culture under State Socialism: An Expropriated Voice* (London: Routledge, 2014). For attempts to marry traditional gender roles and visions of equality before 1953, see M. Fidelis, *Women, Communism, and Industrialization in Postwar Poland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

4. M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1977), 30.

5. M. Schroer, "Zur Soziologie des Körpers," in *Soziologie des Körpers*, ed. M. Schroer (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 2005), 7–47.

6. E. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); L. Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994); B. Paloff, "East Is Always Further East," *East European Politics and Societies* 28 (2014): 687–92.

7. A. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); M. Lehmann, "Apricot Socialism: National Past, the Soviet Project and the Imagining of Community in Late Soviet Armenia," *Slavic Review* 74 (2015): 9–31.

8. C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Fontana Press, [1973] 1993), 89.

9. Subjectivities are understood here as "cultural formations and inner states of acting subjects" that unite a whole "ensemble of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, fear, and so forth that animate the subject," which are at the same time "cultural and social formations that shape, organize, and provoke those modes of affect, thought and so on." See S. B. Ortner, "Subjectivity and Cultural Critique," *Anthropological Theory* 5 (2005): 31.

10. W. H. Sewell, "The Concept(s) of Culture," in *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*, ed. G. M. Spiegel (New York: Routledge, 2005), 76–97.

11. N. Murad, "Individuum, Subjekt und somebody: Subjektivierung als Körpererfahrung," in *Techniken der Subjektivierung*, ed. A. Gelhard, T. Alkemeyers, and N. Ricken (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2013), 203–10.

12. P. Bren and M. Neuburger, "Introduction," in *Communism Unwrapped: Consumption in Cold War Eastern Europe*, ed. P. Bren and M. Neuburger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 7; P. Bren, *The Greengrocer and His TV: The Culture of Communism after the 1968 Prague Spring* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010); S. Reid, "Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev," *Slavic Review* 61 (2002): 211–56.

13. Ortner, "Subjectivity and cultural critique," 31.

14. J. Hellbeck, *Revolution on My Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); A. Krylova, "The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 1 (2000): 119–46; I. Halfin, *Terror in My Soul: Communist Autobiographies on Trial* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); E. Naimark, "On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars Who Make Them," *Russian Review* 60 (2001): 307–15; C. Chatterjee and K. Petrone, "Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity: The Soviet Case in Historical Perspective," *Slavic Review* 67 (2008): 967–87.

15. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*; C. Humphrey, "The 'Creative Bureaucrat': Conflicts in the Production of Soviet Communist Party Discourse," *Inner Asia* 10 (2008): 5–35; S. Gerasimov, "Becoming a Soviet Plebeian Subject: The Story of Mark Miller Told by Himself," *Ab Imperio* 1 (2017): 183–210.

16. After all, diaries written within the context of a socialist social agenda are not unheard of in Central Eastern Europe before and after the war, considering the large sociological project to collect workers' diaries in Poland that continued into the late 1960s. Even if one might doubt the genuineness of

the diaries sent in to a contest to be published, it might still be worthwhile exploring the ways in which diary writers employed certain tropes and made sense of their life in a socialist country. For the project to collect workers' diaries, see K. Lebow, "Autobiography as Complaint: Polish Social Memoir between the World Wars," *Laboratorium: Russian Review of Social Research* 6 (2014): 13–26.

17. P. Petrov, ed., *Vernaculars of Communism: Language, Ideology and Power in Soviet Union and Eastern Europe* (London: Routledge, 2015). See also S. Lambert, "Zwischen ideologischem Anspruch und lebensweltlicher Realität: Sozialistische Subjekte in der Tschechoslowakei, 1953-1963" (PhD diss., University of Cologne, 2019).

18. J. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1992] 2011).

19. P. Rabinow, "Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-modernity in Anthropology," in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, ed. J. Clifford and G. Marcus (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986), 234–61. See also M. Foucault, *History of Madness* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 204.

20. Fidelis, *Women, Communism and Industrialization*; K. Lebow, *Unfinished Utopia: Nowa Huta, Stalinism, and Polish Society, 1949-56* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013); U. Brunnbauer, "'The Most Natural Function of Women': Ambiguous Party Policies and Female Experiences in Socialist Bulgaria," in *Gender Politics and Everyday Life in State Socialist Eastern and Central Europe*, ed. S. Penn and J. Massino (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 77–96. On numbers of women's participation in the labour force, see J. Massino and S. Penn, "Introduction," in Penn and Massino, ed., *Gender Politics and Everyday Life*, fn 5.

21. Numbers taken from J. Massino, "Something Old, Something New: Marital Roles and Relations in State Socialist Romania," *Journals of Women's History* 22 (2010): 37.

22. The Eastern European achievements in women's emancipation have been often downplayed. See Kristen Ghodsee, "Rethinking State Socialist Mass Women's Organizations: The Committee of the Bulgarian Women's Movement and the United Nations Decade for Women," *Journal of Women's History* 24 (2012): 50.

23. B. Havelková, "The Three Stages of Gender in Law," in Havelková and Oates-Indruchová, *The Politics of Gender Culture*, 31.

24. See Fidelis, *Women, Communism and Industrialization*; Lebow, *Unfinished Utopia*.

25. See P. Kolář, *Der Spätstalinismus: Ideologie und Utopie einer Epoche* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2016).

26. N. Jarska, "Gender and Labour in Post-war Communist Poland: Female Unemployment 1945-1970," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 110 (2014): 49–85.

27. A stance that—along with other issues like the unimportance of "femininity"—clashed with Western understandings of the feminist agenda. See A. Stephan, *Von der Küche auf den Roten Platz. Lebenswege sowjetischer Dissidentinnen* (Zürich: Pano, 2005).

28. See Kristen Ghodsee, *The Left Side of History: World War II and the Unfulfilled Promise of Communism in Eastern Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 183.

29. See, e.g., A. Ghit, "Professionals' and Amateurs' Pasts: A Decolonizing Reading of Post-war Romanian Histories of Gendered Interwar Activism," *European Review of History* 25 (2018): 21–44.

30. See Brunnbauer, "'The Most Natural Function of Women.'"

31. For the Czechoslovakian case, see K. Lišková, *Sexual Liberation, Socialist Style: Communist Czechoslovakia and the Science of Desire, 1945–1989* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Havelková, "The Three Stages of Gender in Law."

32. Quoted in U. Brunnbauer and K. Taylor, "Creating a 'Socialist Way of Life': Family and Reproduction Politics in Bulgaria, 1944-1989," *Continuity and Change* 19 (2004): 284.

33. Havelková, "The Three Stages of Gender in Law," 44. On the GDR and sexuality, see J. McLellan, *Love in the Time of Communism: Intimacy and Sexuality in the GDR* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

34. C. McCallum, *The Fate of the New Man: Representing and Reconstructing Masculinity in Soviet Visual Culture, 1945-1965* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2018), 160–92; C. McCallum, “Man about the House: Male Domesticity and Fatherhood in Soviet Visual Satire Under Khrushchev,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Women and Gender in Twentieth-Century Russia and the Soviet Union*, ed. Melanie Ilic (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 331–47.
35. Massino, “Something Old,” 51. On gender and food in the Late Soviet Union, see A. Lakhtikova, A. Brintlinger, and I. Glushchenko, eds., *Seasoned Socialism: Gender and Food in Late Soviet Everyday Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019).
36. K. Ghodsee, “Red Nostalgia? Communism, Women’s Emancipation, and Economic Transformation in Bulgaria,” *L’Homme: Zeitschrift für feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 15 (2004): 23–36.
37. K. Verdery, *What Was Socialism and What Comes Next?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
38. G. Kligman, *The Politics of Duplicity: Controlling Reproduction in Ceausescu’s Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
39. On the socialist welfare state, see P. Perkowski, “Wedded to Welfare? Working Mothers and the Welfare State in Communist Poland,” *Slavic Review* 72 (2017): 455–80; M. Mazurek, “From Welfare-State to Self-Welfare: Everyday Opposition among Textile Female Workers,” in *Gender Politics and Mass Dictatorship: Global Perspectives*, ed. J.-H. Lim and K. Petrone (Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 278–300.
40. P. Roubald, “The Body of the Nation: The Czechoslovak Spartakiades from a Gender Perspective,” in Havelková and Oates-Indruchová, *The Politics of Gender Culture*, 188–210; R. Krakovsky, *Rituel Du 1er Mai En Tchecoslovaquie, 1948-1989* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2004); S. Satjukov and Rainer Gries, eds., *Sozialistische Helden: Eine Kulturgeschichte von Propagandafiguren in Osteuropa und der DDR* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 2002); M. Rolf, “Die schönen Körper des Kommunismus: Sportparaden in der Sowjetunion der dreißiger Jahre,” in *Sport zwischen Ost und West: Beiträge zur Sportgeschichte Osteuropas im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. A. Malz, S. Rohdewald, and S. Wiederkehr (Osnabrück: fibre, 2007), 309–25. See also C. Chatterjee, *Celebrating Women: Gender, Festival Culture and Bolshevik Ideology, 1910-1939* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002).
41. Roubald, “The Body of the Nation,” 146. For the vision of the body as a machine of the Soviet avant-garde, see J. Vaingurt, “Poetry of Labour and Labour of Poetry: The Universal Language of Aleksei Gastev’s Biomechanics,” *Russian Review* 67 (2008): 209–29; A. Olenina, “Lev Kuleshov, Soviet Reflexology, and Labour Efficiency Studies,” *Discourse* 35 (2013): 297–336.
42. Roubald, “The Body of the Nation,” 150 ff.
43. M. Wilkinson Johnson, *Training Socialist Citizens: Sports and the State in East Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 65–69.
44. V. Bonnell, *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters under Lenin and Stalin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); S. Satjukov and Rainer Gries, *Sozialistische Helden*; D. Wolf, *Über Riesen und Zwerge: Tschechoslowakische Amerika- und Sowjetunionbilder, 1948-1989* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), chap. 2.
45. Johnson, *Training Socialist Citizens*, 66, 70.
46. F. Lee Bernstein, *The Dictatorship of Sex: Lifestyle Advice for the Soviet Masses* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2007), 132, 143.
47. For the spectrum in the treatment of Soviet disabled veterans see McCallum, *Fate of the New Man*, 64–96; V. Dunham, “Images of the Disabled, Especially the Wounded in Soviet Literature,” in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, ed. L. Siegelbaum and W. O. McCagg (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), 151–66; B. Fieseler, “The Bitter Legacy of the ‘Great Patriotic War’: Red Army Disabled Soldiers under Late Stalinism,” in *Late Stalinist Russia: Society between Reconstruction and Reinvention*, ed. J. Fürst (London: Routledge, 2006), 46–61; C. McCallum, “Scorched by the Fire of War: Masculinity, War Wounds and Disability in Soviet Visual Culture, 1941-65,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 93 (2015): 251–85.

48. For such references in research on the post-socialist period see D. Završsek, "Those Who Do Not Work Shall Not Eat! A Comparative Perspective on the Ideology of Work within Eastern European Disability Discourses," in *Disability in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: History, policy and everyday life*, ed. M. Rasell and E. Iarskaia-Smirnova (London: Routledge, 2014), 187.

49. M. Rasell and E. Iarskaia-Smirnova, "Conceptualizing Disability in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union," in *Disability in Eastern Europe*, 4. See also L. Siegelbaum and W. O. McCagg, "Introduction," in L. Siegelbaum and W. O. McCagg, *The Disabled in the Soviet Union*, 4.

50. C. Shaw, "'We Have No Need to Lock Ourselves Away': Space, Marginality, and the Negotiation of Deaf Identity in Late Soviet Moscow," *Slavic Review* 74 (2015): 59–78.

51. W. O. McCagg, "The Origins of Defectology," in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union*, 53.

52. L. Kaganovsky, *How the Soviet Man Was Unmade: Cultural Fantasy and Male Subjectivity under Stalin* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008); A. Krylova, "Imagining Socialism in the Soviet century," *Social History* 42 (2017): 315–41.

Maike Lehmann is an affiliate at the Research Center for Eastern European Studies at the University of Bremen. She was earlier a Junior Professor for Modern Eastern European History at the University of Cologne. She is working on a book about the encounters between Soviet dissidents and their Western supporters during the late Cold War.

Alexandra Oberländer is a researcher with the Max-Planck-Institute for Human Development, Berlin and an associate editor of *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. She has published on the perception of sexual violence in Late Imperial Russia and is currently writing an *Emotional and Cultural History of Work in the Late Soviet Union*.