

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31110/consensus/2025-02/052-059>

УДК (UDC) 930.1 (477)-058.243 «1946-1965»

**INDUSTRY AND WORKFORCE OF THE UKRAINIAN SSR
DURING THE POSTWAR YEARS (1946-1965): THE GENESIS OF THE HISTORIOSOPHICAL
CONCEPT OF UKRAINIAN-CENTERED HISTORIOGRAPHY**

Dmytro Nefodov*

Abstract

The article highlights the key milestones in the formation of the historiosophical concept of Ukraine-centered historiography of the 1990s in the context of the study of industrial development and workforce in the Ukrainian SSR during the postwar years (1946-1965). It has been noted that the significant and positive changes in the theoretical, methodological, conceptual and historiosophical fields of Ukrainian history, which began in the perestroika period, were further developed during the 1990s. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that the unexpectedly powerful impetus for a thorough reconsideration of Ukraine's entire history as well as the postwar twentieth century and the role of Ukrainian workforce and industry during this time was not the result of the internal logic of the historical science development.

The transformation of national historiography was notably propelled by a robust external political motivation in 1991, which, along with the groundwork that had been laid, initiated a thorough reconsideration of the field. The development of an independent national historical science has led to numerous conceptual and fundamental questions for its scholars. These questions focus on the perspectives and contexts from which Ukrainian history should be the studied and written (and frequently rewritten). For the sake of real, not just paper, independence and, at the same time, for integration into the world historical community, a course of Ukraine-centeredness was chosen on the basis of theoretical and methodological principles generally accepted by the world scientific community and modern methods and technologies of historical epistemology. In the context of renewal, the only possible solution was to find comprehensive, integrated approaches to the object of study and to combine the methodological and methodical principles of historical knowledge, proven through years of practical application, with new ones.

The main conclusion of the early 1990s was the understanding that researchers should focus on people (humanity, communities, social groups), that is, the history of the Ukrainian postwar industry and workforce should be studied from a historical and anthropocentric perspectives.

Keywords: historiography, enterprise, postwar reconstruction, industry, workforce, Ukrainian SSR

* Doctor of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the History Department, Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding, Mykolaiv, Ukraine. E-mail: nefyodovdv@gmail.com.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1992-7271>

**ПРОМИСЛОВІСТЬ ТА РОБІТНИЦТВО УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ РСР
У ПОВОЄННИЙ ПЕРІОД (1946–1965 РР.):
ГЕНЕЗА ІСТОРІОСОФСЬКОЇ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ УКРАЇНОЦЕНТРИЧНОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ**

Дмитро Нефьодов*

Анотація

Стаття присвячена висвітленню ключових віх становлення історіософської концепції україноцентричної історіографії 1990-х рр. в контексті дослідження промислового розвитку та робітництва УРСР у повоєнний період (1946–1965). Зазначено, що розпочаті в перебудовчу добу помітні й позитивні зрушення в теоретико-методологічній, концептуальній та історіософській областях історії України отримали активне продовження в 1990-ті рр. Водночас слід зазначити, що неочікувано потужний поштовх до радикального переосмислення як усієї історії України, так і повоєнного двадцятиріччя і місця українського робітництва та промисловості в цей період став наслідком не внутрішньої логіки розвитку безпосередньо історичної науки.

Оновлення поступу вітчизняного історіописання зазнало потужного зовнішнього політичного імпульсу 1991 р., який, у сполученні з підготовленим ґрунтом, сприяв започаткуванню радикального переосмислення вітчизняного історіописання. З'ясовано, що формування незалежної вітчизняної історичної науки поставило перед її представниками ряд концептуальних, фундаментальних, засадничих питань: з яких позицій та в якому контексті, під яким кутом зору слід вивчати і писати (а часто – і переписувати) українську історію. Задля реального, а не паперового унезалежнення та водночас для інтеграції в світову історичну спільноту обрано курс на україноцентризм на загальноприйнятих світовим науковим товариством теоретико-методологічних засадах і сучасних методиках і технологіях історичної гносеології. В умовах оновлення єдино можливим стало рішення про необхідність віднайдення комплексних інтегральних підходів до об'єкта дослідження та поєднання вже опанованих й апробованих багаторічною практикою методологічних і методичних засад історичного пізнання з новими.

Головним умовиводом початку 1990-х рр. стало розуміння того, що в фокусі уваги дослідників має перебувати людина (людність, спільноти, соціальні групи), тобто вивчати історію української повоєнної промисловості та робітництва слід з історико-антропоцентричних позицій.

Ключові слова: історіографія, підприємство, повоєнна відбудова, промисловість, робітництво, УРСР

Цитування: Нефьодов, Д. (2025). Промисловість та робітництво Української РСР у повоєнний період (1946–1965 рр.): генеза історіософської концепції україноцентричної історіографії. *Консенсус*, 2, 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.31110/consensus/2025-02/052-059>

URL: <https://konsensus.net.ua/index.php/konsensus/article/view/168>

* Доктор історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії Національного університету кораблебудування імені адмірала Макарова, Миколаїв, Україна. E-mail: nefvodovdv@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1992-7271>

Problem Statement. Ukraine's independence, the well-known events of the early 1990s, the development of a democratic society and the final victory of pluralism of opinions resulted the abandonment of the principle of party affiliation in the scientific community and the possibility of multi-vector development for social science. The development of the latest theoretical and methodological foundations, cognitive tools, the formation of Ukraine-centered thematic areas, and the accumulation of factual material contributed to the formation of national historiography.

The significant and beneficial developments in the theoretical, methodological, conceptual, and historiosophical fields of Ukrainian history that began in the perestroika era were actively continued in the 1990s. Nonetheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that the unexpectedly strong motivation for a thorough reconsideration of Ukraine's entire history, particularly concerning its workforce and industry in the postwar twentieth century, was not merely a product of the internal dynamics of historical scholarship. The renewal of national historiography was significantly influenced by a powerful external political catalyst in 1991, which, along with the groundwork laid prior, initiated a radical reconsideration of national historiography.

Following the collapse of the USSR and the rise of an independent Ukraine, national historical research attained a sovereign status. The restructuring of academic institutions occurred smoothly, with staff retention in both higher education and research institutions, resulting in no significant material or ethical upheaval. At the same time, the ban on the Communist Party resulted in the elimination of the Soviet-era historical-party component of historical knowledge, which allowed Ukrainian historical science to progress on a democratic basis. The lack of lustration and politically motivated personnel conflicts contributed to the preservation of human resources. Furthermore, most national scholars accepted the notion of Ukrainian statehood and the independence of historical research.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The studies by O. Dodonov, O. Surhai, Ya. Hrytsak, and D. Nefodov include various aspects that are indirectly related to the subject matter of our research.

Considering the degree of influence of theoretical and methodological achievements and historiosophical insights of the past on historiography, and what is more on the specific historical issues, **the article aims** to highlight the genesis of the historiosophical concept of Ukrainian-centered historiography of the 1990s in the context of industrial development and workforce study in the Ukrainian SSR during the postwar years (1946-1965).

Presentation of the basic material. Historiosophical contributions of L. Zashkilniak, Ya. Kalakura, S. Kulchytskyi, L. Taran, O. Reient, and I. Kolesnyk have been of paramount importance in the evolution and establishment of independent Ukrainian historiography, particularly in addressing significant theoretical and methodological concerns.

L. Zashkilniak claims that the modern national historiographic process is developing largely under the influence of the methodological positions of romanticism and positivism developed in the nineteenth century/ With regard to the social purpose of historical knowledge, this methodology, despite its claims to objectivity and impartiality, serves specific political and ideological needs that force one to perceive the past and produce knowledge with a predetermined result. The scholar emphasizes that world historiography, from which Ukrainian scholarship was isolated for a long time, has gone through the period of “modernity” associated with attempts to impartially examine historical processes in their socio-cultural diversity and has taken a decisive step towards “postmodernity” over the past quarter century. The main significance of postmodernism is an attempt to free oneself from the dictates of a predetermined vision of the past from the standpoint of an ideologized present, based on which the past was approached selectively, choosing from it what seemed worthy of attention, but distorted the past reality, imposing an inappropriate reflection on it. The work proves that the modern world historical science requires a new vision of the past, when it is not about the “external history” of objects, but about the “internal history” of subjects, that is, about the direct history of “man” syncretistically connected with the accumulation and use of the achievements of his genius. Man, personality, individuality become the alpha and omega of history¹.

Assessing the development of modern Ukrainian historiography, T. Popova pays special attention to the study of the processes of its institutionalization, understanding this term as the formation of its cognitive system, infrastructure and system of relations with society, which together acquires a complete form at the disciplinary stage of development of this branch of historical knowledge. In the process of cognitive institutionalization, a consensus is formed on the main segments of historiographical knowledge as components of the cognitive system of historiography: the definition of historiographical issues, the corpus of historiographical sources and methods of working with them, the formation of the theory and methodology of historiographical research, and the creation of historiographical concepts. The concept of social institutionalization is predominantly reflected at the infrastructural level, where the organization of historiographical science is visible in both material and non-material dimensions. Materially, this encompasses the formation of a historiographical community and a network of institutions, including academic departments, commissions, chairs, and specialized dissertation councils. Furthermore, historiography has been institutionalized as an academic discipline within the professional training of historians, supported by the emergence of historiographical publications. Non-materially, it pertains to the development of a framework of norms that guide historians’ research practices².

¹ Зашкільняк Л. Інтелектуальна історія: спроба конвенції (деякі методологічні міркування). *Ейдос*. 2005. № 1. С. 32.

² Попова Т. Об інституалізації історіографії. *Спеціальні історичні дисципліни: питання теорії та методики*. Зб. наук. праць. Вип. 3. Київ, 1999. С. 64-65.

Emphasizing the significance of humanitarian aspects in Ukrainian science, O. Reient is of the opinion that since Ukraine's independence, there has been a widespread misunderstanding among both the public and government officials. This misunderstanding posits that only scientific disciplines yielding direct economic outcomes deserve support, while the humanities are viewed merely as contributors to value systems, societal needs, and the moral and legal environment of the state. The status of the humanities in the country is notably influenced by the diminishing distinction between fundamental and applied research; moreover, the social relevance of humanitarian research surpasses that of natural and exact scientific researches. We support the researcher's viewpoint that modern historical science must not overlook its processes of self-justification and self-identification, as doing so could lead to its own inhibition and a drift towards quasi-science³.

L. Taran accentuates the necessity of preventing the young national science from regressing into provincialism. The scholar highlights that a crucial goal for Ukrainian and global historiography is to surpass positivism and Marxism, paving the way for methodological pluralism. This evolution will allow for a novel interpretation of Ukraine's historical development both as a whole and its specific components⁴.

According to O. Yas, a contemporary person is at the crossroads of "different, competing, complementary, sometimes kaleidoscopic information environments", and this fact leads to deep immersion in virtual space, a continuous pursuit of information⁵. The warning of the famous Ukrainian historiographer Ya. Kalakura is in line with this message, as he notes that the complex and contradictory process of returning historical science to its natural functions during the transition and transformation of Ukrainian society from Soviet totalitarianism to democracy encounters not only a general crisis in all spheres of public life, including science, education and culture, but also resistance from conservative forces, carriers of the old ideology. A kind of quintessence of Ya. Kalakura's work is the conclusion that the priority for contemporary Ukrainian historians is to create a scientific history of the Ukrainian people in the context of the civilizational dimension, which professes humanistic, anthropological, synergistic and axiological approaches⁶.

In a similar vein, A. Ziakun infers that the effective selection and extensive application of diverse methodological tools can prevent the straightforward substitution of Marxism with any other ideology, thereby avoiding its subsequent absolutization⁷.

³ Реєнт О.П. Сучасна історична наука в Україні: шляхи поступу. *Український історичний журнал*. 1999. № 3. С. 20.

⁴ Таран Л.В. Провідні тенденції світової історіографії в ХХ ст. та проблема кризи сучасної історичної науки. *Український історичний журнал*. 1998. № 5. С. 30–39; 1999. № 1. С. 85–91.

⁵ Ясь О. Якою має бути сучасна українська історіографія. *Ейдос*. 2015. № 8. С. 359.

⁶ Калакура Я. Цивілізаційні орієнтири новітньої української історіографії. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. Зб. наук. праць. Вип. 24. Київ, 2014. С. 24.

⁷ Зякун А. Українська історична наука 90-х років ХХ століття: пошук нових методологічних координат. *Світогляд – Філософія – Релігія*: Зб. наук. пр. Суми: ДВНЗ «УАБС НБУ», 2011. № 1. С. 55.

In accordance with V. Bondar, the transition of many national historians from Soviet and imperial narratives to a national framework can be likened to a “weathervane” reorientation. However, this change has produced rather basic elements within the national historiographical canon, marked by ritualistic appeals to patriotism, a simplistic black-and-white moral perspective, and a superficial transition from the Soviet model of “socialist construction” to a national model promoting “Ukrainian statehood”⁸.

A significant work in the theoretical and methodological field of national historiography is I. Kolesnyk’s “Ukrainian Historiography: Conceptual History” which, according to the author, aimed to “recreate the conceptual history of historiography as a theoretical and historical exploration of historical science in the Ukrainian context”⁹. The researcher’s insights about the difficult transition of historiography from colloquialism to a theoretical concept, from the practices of historical writing, description and criticism of events, history-science to its transformation into a special field, a reflective discipline, and the self-awareness of science are relevant and accurate. The paper addresses the necessity for clarifying terminology and providing explanations regarding the concept of ‘historiography’. This need is underscored by the 2006 methodological seminar titled “New Ukrainian Historiography: Images, Methods, Directions,” where researcher H. Kasianov identified various challenges facing contemporary historiography. Among these challenges, he highlighted issues related to terminology, the quality of scholarly texts, the conversion of theories into practical applications, the education of specialists, and the neglect of the gap between the author and their text, which can lead to overly personal debates¹⁰.

In the collective monograph titled “Disciplinary Dimensions of Ukrainian Historiography,” the authors explore the impact of globalization and informatization on the competitiveness of historical knowledge, which has consequently transformed the status and responsibilities of historiography. Revealing a wide range of problems regarding the formation of national historiography, V. Bondar rightly notes that the modern world sees historians not as impartial commentators or coders of the greatness of a particular culture, nation or class, but rather as translators and mediators, as well as social therapists who help society “assimilate” episodes from the past, while Ukrainian historians only to some extent fit into this relatively new role for them¹¹.

Despite non-significant shortcomings, assessing the conceptual development of the latest national historiography, K. Hlomoza noted such positive developments as expanding access to the full range of works by national and foreign authors, the

⁸ Бондар В. Сучасна українська історіографія: підсумки і виклики. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні* / Гол. редкол. В.А. Смолій; відп. ред. О.А. Удод. Київ: НАН України. Ін-т історії України, 2014. Вип. 25. С. 98.

⁹ Колесник І. Українська історіографія: концептуальна історія. Київ: Ін-т історії України НАН України, 2013. С. 24.

¹⁰ Матеріали методологічного семінару «Нова українська історіографія: образи, методи, напрями», Київ, 17 січня 2006 р. *Ейдос*. 2006. Вип 2. Ч. 1. С. 14.

¹¹ Дисциплінарні виміри української історіографії: Колективна монографія / Відп. ред. та керівник авт. колективу О.А. Удод. Київ: НАН України. Ін-т історії України, 2015. С. 276.

disappearance of the division between national and diaspora science, strengthening contacts with foreign experts, the introduction of a large number of sources into scientific circulation, increased attention to regional and microhistory, the tendency to “professionalize” historical science, and immunity to quasi-patriotic rhetoric¹².

We agree that historiography had and still has a special status in terms of methodological reorientation of national historical science and, along with scientific, cognitive, and educational functions, is gaining wide significance, becoming a means of shaping the people’s historical and national-state consciousness¹³. Contemporary historians use the achievements of Western methodology, in particular intellectual history, cultural anthropology, microhistory, social and economic history, history of mentalities and everyday life, psychohistory, gender history, history of ideas, and oral history.

Contemporary researchers have proven that the ideological course of the postwar era seriously deformed the socio-political life of Ukrainian society, which, in turn, led to a loss of knowledge about the real state and needs of society. The ideology of compulsion caused internal protest and distrust of critically minded citizens; some of whom turned to living by double standards¹⁴.

Conclusions. The formation of an independent national historical science posed a number of conceptual, fundamental, and basic questions to its representatives: from what positions and in what context, from what angle, Ukrainian history should be studied and written (and often rewritten). For the sake of real, not just paper, independence and, at the same time, for integration into the global historical community, a course of Ukraine-centeredness was chosen on the basis of theoretical and methodological principles generally accepted by the world scientific community and modern methods and technologies of historical epistemology. In the context of renewal, the only possible solution was to find comprehensive, integrated approaches to the object of study and to combine the methodological and methodical foundations of historical knowledge already studied and tested over many years of practice with new ones. A key conclusion drawn in the early 1990s was the recognition that researchers should prioritize the study of individuals – encompassing humanity, communities, and social groups – indicating that the history of Ukrainian post-war industry and workforce ought to be examined through a historical and anthropocentric lens.

REFERENCES

Bondar, V. (2014). Suchasna ukrainska istoriohrafia: pidsumky i vyklyky. [Modern Ukrainian historiography: results and challenges]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini. Zb. nauk. Prats, 25*. 95–113 [in Ukrainian].

¹² Гломозда К.Ю. Стан української історіографії та визначення її ролі в сучасному суспільстві. *Магістеріум. Історичні студії*. Київ, 2004. Вип. 17. С. 89.

¹³ Дисциплінарні виміри української історіографії: Колективна монографія / Відп. ред. та керівник авт. колективу О.А. Удод. Київ: НАН України. Ін-т історії України, 2015. С. 137.

¹⁴ Суспільно-політичні трансформації в Україні: від задумів до реалій / В.Ф. Солдатенко (кер.) та ін. Київ. Парламентське вид-во, 2009. С. 416.

- Udod, O.A. (Ed.). (2015). *Dystsyplinarni vymiry ukrainskoi istoriohrafii: Kolektyvna monohrafiia* [Disciplinary dimensions of Ukrainian historiography: Collective monograph]. Institute of History of Ukraine, NAS of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
- Hlomozdza, K.Yu. (2004). Stan ukrainskoi istoriohrafii ta vyznachennia yii roli v suchasnomu suspilstvi [The state of Ukrainian historiography and the definition of its role in modern society]. *Mahisterium. Istorychni studii*, 17, 81–91 [in Ukrainian].
- Kalakura, Ya. (2014). Tsyvilizatsiini oriientyry novitnoi ukrainskoi istoriohrafii [Civilizational guidelines of modern Ukrainian historiography]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, 24, 23–37 [in Ukrainian].
- Kolesnyk, I. (2013). *Ukrainska istoriohrafii: Kontseptualna istoriia* [Ukrainian historiography: Conceptual history]. Institute of History of Ukraine, NAS of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
- Materialy metodolohichnoho seminaru “Nova ukrainska istoriohrafii: obrazy, metody, napriamy” [Materials of the methodological seminar “New Ukrainian historiography: Images, methods, directions”]. (2006, January 17). *Eidos*, 2 (1), 9–16 [in Ukrainian].
- Popova, T. (1999). Ob ynstytualyzatsyy ystoriografyy [On the institutionalization of historiography]. *Spetsialni istorychni dystsypliny: Pytannia teorii ta metodyky: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, 3, 54–68 [in Ukrainian].
- Reient, O.P. (1999). Suchasna istorychna nauka v Ukraini: shliakhy postupu [Modern historical science in Ukraine: Ways forward]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 3, 3–22 [in Ukrainian].
- Suspilno-politychni transformatsii v Ukraini: vid zadumiv do realii [Socio-political transformations in Ukraine: From ideas to realities]. (2009). *V.F. Soldatenko* (Ker.) ta in. Parliamentary Publishing House [in Ukrainian].
- Taran, L.V. (1999). Providni tendentsii svitovoi istoriohrafii v XX st. ta problema kryzy suchasnoi istorychnoi nauky [Leading trends in world historiography in the 20th century and the problem of the crisis of modern historical science]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1, 85–91 [in Ukrainian].
- Yas, O. (2015). Yakoiu maie buty suchasna ukrainska istoriohrafii [What should modern Ukrainian historiography be like]. *Eidos*, 8, 359–365 [in Ukrainian].
- Zashkilniak, L. (2005). Intelektualna istoriia: sproba konventsii (deiaki metodolohichni mirkuvannia) [Intellectual history: An attempt at a convention (Some methodological considerations)]. *Eidos*, 1, 28–35 [in Ukrainian].
- Ziakun, A. (2011). Ukrainska istorychna nauka 90-kh rokiv XX stolittia: poshuk novykh metodolohichnykh koordynat [Ukrainian historical science in the 1990s: The search for new methodological coordinates]. *Svitohliad – Filosofiia – Relihiia: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, 1, 50–58 [in Ukrainian].