Beyond the Divide

Simo Mikkonen
Pia Koivunen

The Cold War isn't thawing; it is burning with a deadly heat. Communism isn't sleeping; it is, as always, plotting, scheming, working, fighting.

—Richard M. Nixon

If you want to make peace, you don't talk to your friends. You talk to your enemies.

—Moshe Dayan

The politicians always told us that the Cold War stand-off could only change by way of nuclear war. None of them believed that such systemic change was possible.

—Lech Walesa

Cold War is over but Cold War thinking survives.

—Joseph Rotblat

The Cold War is already history. Still, it has maintained a surprisingly strong role in defining European historiography to this day. For example, widely used concepts such as "post-Socialism" or "countries of the former Soviet bloc" presuppose that the countries located east of "the Iron Curtain" were detached from their western neighbors and have only recently started to become like them. In this book, we argue that the Cold War era saw not only the division of Europe into two warring camps, but that there were also a plenty of connections over the East-West divide. Instead of two separate histories of Europe, these connections speak for entangled histories, urging us to go beyond the binational orientation

and examine simultaneous interaction of several countries, people, and organizations.

The research on the Cold War and related issues has expanded during the past twenty years, and today it is completely legitimate to study topics that were still unthinkable quite recently, like interaction and cooperation between Capitalist and Socialist worlds, or the cultural and social implications of the conflict. Furthermore, there have also been an increasing number of studies investigating how the Cold War affected the everyday life of ordinary citizens or whether the Cold War even mattered to them at all. Despite the emergence and current presentability of culturally and socially flavored Cold War research, much still remains unknown.

This volume seeks to alter the way in which intra-European Cold War–era connections are perceived. Previous focus on superpower relations in Cold War research has resulted in the emphasis of East-West division. It is true that, for much of the twentieth century, both the Soviet Union and the United States had a major impact on Europe in intellectual, political, and cultural terms; their mere existence troubled, excited, outraged, and inspired people all over Europe. Often one superpower was seen as completely alien, while the other was considered as the savior of Europe. However, instead of being merely allies to superpowers, European countries were independent actors that harbored intentions and objectives beyond the superpower axis. These connections deserve more attention. For many of these countries, the relationships to countries on the other side of the Iron Curtain were often not so much about the Cold War as they were about normal dealings between two countries, and a number of these contacts were not new but originated from the prewar period. This kind of interaction escapes the traditional conception of the Cold War, and this has likely been the reason why they have not been examined extensively outside national scholarship.[1]

The European perspective is particularly important in the area of transnational networks and their implications on the Cold War–era relations. While the Soviet Union and the United States were far from each other and, in many respects, far from Europe, the countries in Europe were close to each other geographically, culturally, and even linguistically.

The research task of this volume is to study an area that has been given too little attention: we aim to explore various manifestations of transnational connections between European countries on the opposite sides of the East-West division. While countries in the West were theoretically free with regard to their foreign policy and international issues, many of them had committed themselves to NATO or U.S. policies, and there were limitations on travel and the movement of goods and ideas to the East, but also from the East. For example, it was the Western countries in 1951 that

most vigorously tried to prevent young people from traveling to the third World Festival of Youth and Students held in Eastern Berlin.[2] In the East, the Soviet Union had set strict limitations on the amount of foreign connections Socialist countries could have, preferring connections within the Socialist camp over external ones. Yet, these limitations were far from all-encompassing. As some recent studies have shown, the barrier dividing the Socialist and Capitalist worlds was not fully impervious. Beneath the seemingly bipolar structure, there were corporations, organizations, unofficial networks, and individuals interacting, connecting, and communicating. This makes the division rather elastic or semipermeable.[3]

The emergence of transnational networks that eventually made the East-West division softer and penetrable, as opposed to being an "Iron Curtain," can be traced back to the post-Stalinist era.[4] A transnational history of European Cold War relations enables us to explore questions that are fundamentally important for our understanding not only of the demise of one-party Socialism, but also of its persistence, heritage, and influence, which can still be felt today. Socialist leaders believed they could modernize their countries and compete with Western democracies by openly challenging them and learning from them. This seems to have been the logic behind the opening of official connections after Stalin's death. Cultural exchanges resulted in growing interaction on lower levels. The process, however, took several decades and is still poorly understood. While several scholars have referred to the role of Western cultural influence in the Socialist sphere, few have examined interactions or the role of Socialist countries and societies in this process.

This book departs from this platform and takes the analysis of interactions during the Cold War era to the next level by arguing that despite the rhetoric of two separate worlds, Eastern and Western European societies and people were entangled in a number of ways. This volume, then, is not so much about the Cold War per se, but rather about the attempts to overcome it, the Cold War mainly providing the chronological context for the study.

Transnationalism, forming the focal point of this volume, encompasses the flow of ideas, people, and processes between a number of countries in the opposite camps. Apart from Socialist and Capitalist countries, there are examples of countries located between the blocs, such as Switzerland, Finland, and Yugoslavia, which further complicate the picture of Europe under the supposed aegis of competing superpowers. Through this volume, we hope to produce new knowledge about the prerequisites and opportunities of different countries for transnational connections as well as about the role of different layers of people in transnational networks. We do not question the existence of travel limitations or political suppression in

most European countries of the time—the division was quite real for many people. However, we do argue that the East-West division was far from comprehensive and has been exaggerated. Without this perspective, the post–Cold War integration of Europe becomes difficult to understand. Societies in the East and the West during the Cold War were not fundamentally different; neither were they fully separated during the Cold War. The process of European integration has pointed out that some countries belonging to the Cold War East have had difficulties with integration, while others have had very few problems.[5] Comprehensive research on European mobility and interaction helps us to understand some of the causes that supported, and in some cases prevented, the emergence of East-West connections, and it also leads to an understanding of their implications.

Beyond Cold War Studies?

In order to position ourselves within the extensive field of international studies addressing the post–World War II Europe, we feel it is necessary to take a brief look at the more than two decades that have passed since the end of the Cold War. The fall of the Iron Curtain made it possible to rewrite the history of the Cold War era as previously closed archives of Socialist countries were opened. This marked the beginning of a new era that has been particularly beneficial for Russian and East European, or Eurasian, studies. Yet, the main focus has been on the developments within national borders; interest in the developments transcending national borders has been much more modest. Some general developments, particularly in the English-language literature, are evident, pointing to paths that many of our chapters have also followed.

One of the significant shifts has been the cultural turn in the study of international relations and diplomatic history of the Cold War era. The cultural turn has expanded the focus from diplomats, nation states, and blocs to non-state actors. Until quite recently, the cultural aspects of the superpower rivalry, often known as the cultural Cold War, have mainly been studied from the U.S. perspective.[6] The cultural Cold War as an approach has its roots in diplomatic and international history. It is primarily focused on activities that are closely related to states' pursuits but are not equal to foreign policy or foreign relations. According to Gordon Johnston, the cultural Cold War can be divided into three areas: (1) the relations between the bloc leaders (the United States and the USSR); (2) the spheres of influence of the USSR and the United States (Western and Eastern Europe); and (3) "individual nation-states."[7]

Scholarship on the Cold War widened and became more multifaceted after the interest in the impacts and different features of the conflict began to attract attention beyond the confines of traditional political history and international relations. The arrival of cultural and social historians, media and film researchers, anthropologists, and many others has brought about new approaches, new methodological openings, and new sets of questions. With studies on arts, media, consumer culture, and grassroots activities, the understanding of the Cold War as a conflict, and especially its impact on ordinary people, has become more fragmented and multifaceted, but also less politically motivated.

There have been a few comparative projects analyzing cultures and the Cold War in Europe. Patrick Major and Rana Mitter's volume, *Across the Blocs: Cultural and Social History of the Cold War* sought to transcend the cultural Cold War into the realm of the cultural and social history of the Cold War.[8] Two recent volumes more or less follow this agenda. *Divided Dreamworlds: The Cultural Cold War in Western and Eastern Europe,* edited by Peter Romijn, Giles Scott-Smith, and Joes Segal, focuses primarily on cultural diplomacy by analyzing the differences and similarities between the two visions of the future world, Capitalism and Socialism. A great difference from most studies on the cultural Cold War is that *Divided Dreamworlds* does not treat the East only as an object of the cultural Cold War; it also grants the visionaries of the Socialist utopia, an alternative form of modern life, the right to their views.[9] *Cold War Cultures,* another recent volume edited by Annette Vowinckel, Marcus Payk, and Thomas Lindenberger, focuses on comparing European cultures during the Cold War and evaluating whether a particular European Cold War culture or cultures existed. The most valuable contribution of the volume is the notion that national, regional, and local trends, politics, and cultures played their own roles in shaping the realities in different parts of Europe during the Cold War. As was concluded by the editors of *Cold War Cultures,* Europe "was more than just a buffer area between the superpowers."[10] Dialogue, thus, is needed between the research areas of international relations and national histories.

Another field that needs to be discussed in relation to transnationalism is Russian and Eastern European studies. The transnational approach has reached Eastern European studies, most richly seen in studies of everyday life, consumer culture, and fashion in Eastern Europe during Socialism and the Cold War period.[11] More recently, studies on mobility, educational exchanges, and economic integration within the Socialist world, or "the second world," have shed new light on the picture of the Socialist countries so long dominated by the sketches of the scholars of the totalitarian school.[12]

Toward Transnational History of Postwar Europe

We aim at furthering many of the aforementioned developments by tackling Cold War–era cultural connections within Europe. We also address a few source-related problems. Many of our chapters use either previously little-exploited source types, such as oral history, or exploit unofficial archival materials—that is, documents produced by institutes and individuals unofficially involved in foreign connections.

Spanning the wide gap between Eastern and Western Europe is a notable challenge for research related to Cold War–era Europe. Many countries, even of the former Soviet Union, have now become integral parts of the European Union and NATO. Yet, European historiographies still remain separate, with Eastern Europe seen as a lost area during the Cold War, with only the fall of the Iron Curtain giving them a chance to catch up with the West. Such an approach greatly distorts the big picture. The Soviet impact on Europe should not be underestimated, but viewing Eastern and Western Europe as completely detached societies, or East European societies as passive when compared to Western ones, blurs the picture. It is precisely European transnational networks during the Cold War, their dynamics, and their impact that might help us obtain a better understanding of the significance and heritage of the Cold War in the European context.

We underline the importance of transnational networks and their meaning to average people. On a broad scale, increasing foreign connections offered Europeans a glimpse of the world on the other side of the Iron Curtain in the form of films and exhibitions, books and arts, foreign visitors, and even tourism. Reciprocal flow of influences had an energizing impact on average citizens, and that enabled functioning connections abroad. While there was certainly a political dimension to the East-West cultural exchanges at the governmental level, their significance for individuals was often very different. This volume, thus, shifts the focus from the area of international relations toward transnational ones, from a state-to-state level toward a people-to-people level. Not forgetting traditional diplomacy, the focus is nevertheless on the unofficial actions of diplomats and cultural diplomacy, by which we understand a way of interacting with the outside world by means of various forms of culture, such as educational and scientific exchanges, artistic tours, and exhibitions. In other words, our book concentrates on the thin line between the efforts of official and nongovernmental organizations.

When considering the East-West division, a transnational approach seems to offer tools for understanding the viewpoints of both sides. The last few years have produced a couple of groundbreaking works that underline the promise of the transnational approach, even if these works deal

mostly with interwar Europe.[13] Already in the 1930s, the supposedly intro-
verted and xenophobic Soviet society was harboring several ties to Europe,
and Soviet experts closely followed European ideas on state practices and
modernization, as well as in arts, sciences, and culture.[14] While the end of
World War II changed things notably and interaction between the eastern
and western parts of Europe became more difficult, the Soviet example,
after which Socialist Eastern Europe was modeled, proves that interaction
was not impossible.

According to Michael David-Fox, transnational studies seem to offer an
unusual opportunity to theorize geographical and ideological border cross-
ings that would have significant repercussions on our understanding of
international developments.[15] The transnational approach is apparent in
several works that do not explicitly name themselves transnational. In her
work about Soviet tourism, Anne Gorsuch pointed out that Soviet tourism
to the West was originally politically motivated, but its realizations showed
that the persons involved had little interest in the political aims of the
Soviet Communist Party. Gorsuch is at the core of transnational connec-
tions when regarding tourism as one of the most important aspects of the
transformation of the image of the West in the minds of Soviet people, as
it gave them a first-hand chance to evaluate the images provided for them
by the Soviet government. It provides insight about the dynamics related
to foreign connections in different layers, ranging from the government
perspective to that of a Soviet individual.[16]

The opening of the Soviet Union to the world during the Khrushchev
era allowed for increased connections between European countries in the
East and the West. Socialist participation in World's Fairs (particularly the
Brussels Expo 58), Soviet-sponsored World Festivals of Youth and Students
(especially the one held in Moscow in 1957), bilateral agreements on cul-
tural exchanges between governments, and tourism beyond the Iron Cur-
tain all contributed to the change. While the implications of this change
have never been extensively studied and no theoretical background has
so far been created, there are some works that promise groundbreaking
results for a transnational approach.[17] This new research on Socialist coun-
tries and their changing place in the world underlines the need for further
studies with a cultural and transnational perspective on Cold War–era
relations.

Extensive East-West transnational networks had little to do with open
dissent even if they were separate from government aims. When foreign
traveling became possible and East-West cultural exchanges got under way,
people involved were carefully selected. The first groups were often mem-
bers of the scientific and cultural elite, a group that was believed to con-
vey the ideological message of peaceful coexistence better than politicians.

However, particularly in the field of arts, instead of merely choosing talented individuals, whole performing troupes, often consisting of hundreds of members, traveled abroad on tours of several weeks.[18] At the same time, cultural exchanges quickly expanded to include broader segments of these societies. In a few years, it became very hard to control people's interactions abroad. Several chapters in the book illustrate that few cared about the political aims set by the Communist parties, youth leagues, or other Socialist organizations. Travelers from Socialist countries in some cases might have reiterated the official propaganda in official meetings and interviews, but, for most of them, even this was something they cared little for. What really mattered was that foreign contacts allowed them to travel or to get access to goods, as well as foreign intellectual products and currents.

Eventually, cultural exchanges developed into very lively interaction. Even if the Socialist authorities did not like the fact that its citizens had close dealings with the West, they considered the benefits to outweigh the drawbacks. The actual creation and major expansion of Socialist cultural diplomacy were based on the assumed appeal of Socialism. The price, an influx of Western influences into the Socialist sphere, was at first considered manageable. However, through exchange programs, scientists, scholars, athletes, and artists, even ordinary people, were able to establish foreign ties to an unparalleled extent. This resulted in interaction that had been unimaginable during the Stalin era. Despite crackdowns in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) and increased limitations of the Brezhnev era, it was too late to shut the channels with the rest of Europe. What was considered a battle for hearts and minds by the superpower leaders was for many Soviet individuals primarily just a chance to go abroad and pursue their personal goals.

Transnational History and Cold War–era Europe

This volume raises some methodological and conceptual challenges that need to be addressed in order to explain how individual chapters contribute to the whole. First, transnational history itself is not an established concept. Rather, it is differently understood among scholarly fields, as several of the chapters point out. Second, in the study of Cold War–era European history, the transnational approach is something that has received attention but is still very rarely adopted in practice. We provide several examples of the transnational approach by understanding it as the movement of people, ideas, goods, and practices and the impacts and implications of these movements. The implications of the transfer of knowledge, ideas, and practices lie at the heart of the transnational approach, which

seems to promise a better understanding of the mechanism of exchange as well as a more balanced approach to the nature of European connections in the Cold War era than has been typical of other superpower-centered Cold War studies.

One of the key problems related to transnational history is that its definition is largely derived from the U.S. context.[19] This is problematic because of the divergence of European counties, many of them with checkered national backgrounds. However, if "transnational" is used to refer to the cross-border movement of ideas, people, and goods, and transnational history promises to bring together scholars who formerly concentrated on their respective national areas, then this constraint appears to be an irrelevant terminological quibble. The crucial boundary here is the political and ideological borderline between the East and the West that has been supposed to divide Europe. It has also been called a transsystemic boundary, marking the point of interaction between two different systems.[20] Yet, we emphasize not interaction between two homogenous systems but interaction between sometimes very different representatives of these systems as well as attempts to escape the confines of their respective systems. For us, transnationalism is not only about the movement of people or ideas but also about the impacts and implications of imported models and practices, foreign images, and culture, since it is precisely these that make the existence of transnational networks so important.[21]

Interest beyond national history has been a general trend among historians and other scholars used to conducting their studies in the framework of national units. This change is methodologically very important. In European historiography, the change has been a visible one, and the expansion of the European Union in particular has contributed to the growth of a transnational consciousness. Yet, even in Europe, the terms seem to have been dictated by Western Europe. Former Socialist countries from Eastern Europe have been seen to return to Europe, rather than Europe coming together and forming something new. In the case of Cold War Europe, superpowers spread their own versions of internationalism, which were essentially geopolitical, encouraging interaction within the respective camp rather than outside of it. Consequently, transnational processes within these camps, rather than between them, have been researched.[22] Furthermore, while the transnational approach has been discussed in relation to Cold War–era Western Europe, especially in the case of the European Union, this approach has been less typical in relation to East-West interaction during the same era.

The transnational approach, then, is not a monolithic structure but rather a heterogeneous approach that determines methodological choices. In many ways, it attaches to the endeavor to denationalize history that has

resulted from the decline of the traditional political emphasis during the 1970s and 1980s in favor of social and cultural history mentioned before. This has also led to an emphasis on the individual and the local, sometimes resulting in the loss of the big picture. The last two decades have seen the revival of international history, but with a greater emphasis on cooperation and shared goals than before, when interstate tensions were more commonly in focus. We seek to answer to this endeavor. Non-state actors, individuals, grassroots movements, the complex relationship between non-state actors, and state involvement in their activities are all features that have greatly enriched our understanding of these transnational phenomena.[23]

The transnational approach would seem to help to solve not only problems of fragmentation but also source-related methodological problems. For example, actions in the international scene during the Cold War have quite often been seen as government-motivated and controlled, which is partly a result of an overreliance on state-produced materials. Certainly, the governments on both sides were at the helm, but they were hardly controlling everything. Many of our chapters either primarily use or supplement their source base with oral history, reminiscences, unofficial archival sources, and other materials to provide the extragovernmental perspective on foreign connections. Previous examples of such an approach have brought about groundbreaking results.[24] It has been pointed out that instead of so-called Cold War internationalism, which was typically geopolitical nationalism, there were genuine attempts to implement the real idea of internationalism. Often these endeavors involved non-state actors, both individuals and NGOs. This volume underlines that the line between state actors and NGOs was sometimes fuzzy.

In an attempt to define internationalism, Akira Iriye discusses in *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* the ways in which globalization has shaped nations' behavior. Iriye uses the term "internationalism" when he refers to attempts to transcend national rivalries that were so characteristic of twentieth-century Europe. According to Iriye, the important factor in overcoming parochialism and hatred of "the other" was the development of an alternative definition of world affairs.[25] Such striving has been highly visible in the European project, but simultaneously, and perhaps even more importantly, it was a feature of transnational networks that stretched across the East-West division. Iriye's approach emphasizes "cultural internationalism" (as distinguished from the economic internationalism currently associated with globalism) that consists of cross-national cultural communication, understanding, and cooperation. This leads to states having a more mature understanding of one another and a nurturing of shared concerns and interests.[26]

On the Socialist side, the formation of international organizations seemed to have similar goals, connecting people beyond national, ethnic, and political boundaries. The Soviet Union established networks of international organizations dedicated to peace, including the World Peace Council, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Trade Union, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the International Union of Students. However, quite quickly they came to be associated with Soviet propaganda efforts rather than genuine attempts to facilitate transnational mobility. Even if accusations were made by western politicians and mainstream media that these organizations were nothing more than subversion and propaganda, not everyone agreed. As recent studies on the Soviet-dominated World Festivals of Youth and Students, for example, have shown, instead of the organization and orchestration from above, these multinational festivals also generated uncontrollable forms of transnational exchange and interaction at the grassroots level.[27] Several of our chapters address the relationship of such international organizations with western NGOs and governments, shedding light on the birth of transnational networks. Especially during the Brezhnev era, some of these networks manifested themselves in dissident-related activities and grassroots activism, as recent literature suggests.[28]

The interplay of personal and public as well as official and unofficial activities is an important feature of a transnational approach and also reflected by our chapters. With regard to personal motivation and people's experiences of foreign activities, Ulf Hannerz has investigated conditions in which national identities can weaken, making smaller units in foreign connections stand out. Hannerz has pointed out that "a great many real relationships to people and places may cross boundaries. Intimate circles and small networks can be involved here; the transnational is not always immense in scale."[29] Furthermore, Eric Hobsbawm, in his *Nations and Nationalism since 1780,* has been skeptical about the strength of nations in the era of globalization. He has suggested that the passiveness of nation states has led to the strengthening of transnational structures.[30] We argue that Cold War Europe manifests these features, with transnational networks embracing broader segments of society, often people outside the immediate power structures.

In the European context, the transnational approach has most often been discussed in connection with comparative history. Indeed, especially in Germany the last two decades have seen a strong transnational orientation in the form of comparative history. Classical comparative history was characterized by a systematic search for differences and similarities, often lacking interaction, and therefore new approaches have been developed. Especially the concept of "transfer" has indicated a shift toward more dy-

namic comparative history. In Michel Espagne's definition, transfer is the process through which the norms and representations of one culture appear in another. Transfer studies follow the transmission of one culture into another, analyzing the process of change.[31] The theoretical problem in this approach vis-à-vis this volume is that "transfer" allocates a passive role to the recipient. Indeed, Peter Burke has stated that the process is rarely a one-way street and that ideas and practices are more typically adapted to their new cultural environment—that is, "translated."[32] To take the transfer approach further, Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann have introduced the idea of *histoire croisée*, entangled history, which acknowledges that societies are different and that a successful comparison requires multiple perspectives. Furthermore, entangled history urges us to go beyond the binational orientation that has typically prevailed in transnational research.[33]

We do not aim at comparing different societies, but rather set our sights on a more concise picture of interaction within Cold War Europe. Processes and interactions between Eastern and Western Europe during the Cold War should not be perceived as binational phenomena, which they never were, but as processes that entailed several countries and different layers of society, from the grass roots to national governments and supranational organizations. With this volume, we offer an empirical example of entangled history in the context of Cold War Europe. Furthermore, we show that the definition of Europe, or the West (not speaking of the East), depends heavily on the observer. We hope to feed further discussion about the benefits of the transnational approach for recent European history, nurture discussion about possible differences and similarities between transnational approaches in Western and Eastern European contexts, and finally bring them closer to each other.

Eluding Concepts

Cold War

The Cold War has typically been understood as foreign operations in Europe within the framework of emphasizing antagonism and juxtaposition of rival ideological and economic systems. A transnational setting reveals attempts to overcome Cold War boundaries: a striving for détente and peaceful solutions. These currents were strong among average people as well as the cultural intelligentsia on both sides, but they tend to be overlooked in the traditional Cold War narrative. The study of how certain images and cultural icons contributed to the efforts to transcend Cold War boundaries is also one of the promising fields of Soviet transnational

history. Even when it comes to U.S.-Soviet relations, some points of departure have been discovered in the Cold War narrative, such as space collaboration in the 1970s and early 1980s, which was significant not only for science but also for East-West transnational relations in Cold War–era Europe. According to Andrew Jenks, space exploration represented, for many, a way "to transcend Cold War hostilities and to forge a new kind of global community."[34] Scientific and scholarly cooperation was truly an important part of the development of transnational relations, as Sampsa Kaataja's chapter on cooperation in the realm of cybernetics points out.

More recent Cold War studies have been essentially multidisciplinary, which is an important aspect of this volume as well. In many ways, transnationalism provides for this multidisciplinarity but without the constraints of the Cold War. Fruitful cooperation is taking place between history, art history, anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies in an area where research used to be conducted solely by political scientists. This promises to enhance the big picture of European interaction in the shadow of the superpower conflict, possibly helping to explain the current outlook of Europe.

We should be, however, careful when applying "the Cold War" to a new type of research. David Caute wisely warned us in 2003 about not attaching the "fashionable" label "Cold War" to topics that have no real connection to the actual conflict.[35] Caute's warning is still relevant today. When studying exchanges, mobility, and transfers, it is easy to talk about "Cold War interactions" and "Cold War exchanges." The superpower conflict limited contacts between people in the East and the West, but quite often attempts at East-West dialogue aimed at overcoming Cold War limitations. The further we go from the competition and battle between the superpowers, the less significant the conflict, and thus the concept itself, seems to become. Moreover, when looking at the postwar period from the perspective of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the Cold War appears as a Western concept, not much used in the national contexts of Eastern Europe. The Cold War is viable as a context, particularly in the chronological sense, but as a paradigm it becomes a limiting factor, making it difficult to investigate exchanges, interactions, and culture in the postwar period.

Europe

As we focus on Europe, it is necessary to discuss what we understand as Europe in the postwar period. In the traditional view, postwar Europe is seen as Communist Eastern Europe and Capitalist Western Europe. Furthermore, when European integration is discussed, primacy is usually given to the West over the East. The picture is, nonetheless, more nuanced, and we

may find various groupings among the European countries depending on the defining factors. In terms of military alliances, there were the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, but also the so-called neutrals or the countries that were not allied with either of the blocs, such as Austria, Switzerland, Finland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia. Moreover, some of the Capitalist countries on the Western side of the divide, such as France, Italy, and Finland, all had strong Communist parties and popular friendship societies with the Soviet Union, as Sonja Großman points out in her chapter.[36] It is also important to note that the new Socialist countries within the Soviet sphere of influence and defined by one ideology were far from being a culturally, politically, economically, or religiously coherent area in the pre–World War II era.[37] Examples in this volume of Czechoslovakia (Václav Šmidrkal), Hungary (Anssi Halmesvirta), and Romania (Beatrice Scutaru) make a strong case that several of these countries had more natural ties to their Western neighbors than to Russia.

French demographer Alfred Sauvy famously captured the division of Europe—and the whole world—by coining the term "third world." It implied the first world (Capitalist countries), the second world (Socialist countries), and the third world (colonies and ex-colonies under the rule of first-world states). This categorization has proved its persistence as recent studies on transnational relations and interaction between the Socialist bloc and the rest of the world have made use of the term "second world."[38] Because we confine our focus on Europe and European interaction and because our focus is not only on states, we prefer to talk about Western and Eastern Europe.

Transnational Networks

Finally, we need to address the sometimes thin line between diplomatic action and transnational networks and define what kinds of actions fall to the latter category. Communication, interaction, and cooperation can mean different things in different circumstances. The term "diplomacy" in its different functions seems to be a key element when studying Cold War interactions. It is typical for culturally oriented Cold War studies that the focus is on less formal and less official levels of state activities instead of traditional diplomacy. Nevertheless, the state seems to be involved in these activities one way or another, and therefore the concept of diplomacy is in place. There are more or less state-controlled cultural programs that can be defined as cultural diplomacy or public diplomacy—a state's communication with foreign publics. Thus, it is a branch of diplomacy that is concerned with developing and sustaining relations with foreign states and their people through arts, popular culture, and education. However,

cultural diplomacy sometimes comes close to propaganda, especially in connection with the Cold War, and it is not always clear were the line goes.[39] At the other end of the spectrum, we may find informal diplomacy, citizen diplomacy, or private diplomacy, which go yet further from the endeavors of a state but are, nonetheless, linked to state aims. In this volume, Giles Scott-Smith introduces the term "parallel diplomacy," by which he refers to individual enterprises that fostered official state aims without being commanded by a state.

Besides cultural or public diplomacy, a typical form of transnational activity during the Cold War was grassroots networking that contradicted or even consciously battled the official aims of a state. This kind of activity includes dissident networks, the human rights movement, and also private people-to-people communication. A common element in grassroots activism is that it is born "from below," from the needs of individuals, and it is characterized by loose institutional structures.[40] All the chapters of this volume address the sort of issues mentioned above, actions that are partly diplomacy but partly manifestations of individual aims running contrary to government aims. Marianne Rostgaard, Nicolas Badalassi, and Matthieu Gillabert, together with Scott-Smith, all point toward the interplay between official, semi-official, and unofficial motives in East-West connections in this volume. However, as Anna Matyska, Sonja Großmann, and Sampsa Kaataja point out, the same interplay can be found from the Soviet side. Even in Socialist systems, there were contrary aims that complicated the diplomacy of Socialist countries and suggest that a transnational approach to foreign connections provides important perspectives that would otherwise be lost or would emerge as incomprehensible.

The Structure of This Volume

This volume is divided into four parts, each of which analyses transnational processes in Cold War Europe from different angles. The first part deals with the interplay of official and unofficial diplomacy. The second part focuses on academic networks and mobility within the world of science. The third section analyses interaction between nongovernmental and semi-governmental institutions, such as friendship societies of the Soviet style. The fourth and last part of the volume considers the ways in which professional and family networks undermined the East-West division and encouraged border crossings.

Chronologically, the chapters move from the immediate post−World War II years to the early 1980s, emphasizing particularly the 1950s and 1960s, when new policies and approaches toward the other part of Europe

seem to have developed on both sides. As Šmidrkal's chapter suggests, the Socialist interpretation of the West, combined with strict limitations on foreign connections, gradually cut the former connections of East Central Europe with the post–World War II West. Several chapters suggest that the death of Stalin in 1953 was not only a point of change vis-à-vis international relations and diplomacy, but also on the lower levels concerning the movement of people, ideas, processes, and goods. The suppression and limitations of foreign connections in the Stalin era were partly reversed, opening up new possibilities for transnational networks. While it was the area of cultural diplomacy that seemed to reserve the central stage, many individuals and both professional and personal networks played an important role very early on, as Francesca Rolandi suggests in her chapter about Italian-Yugoslav networks.

By choosing a number of European countries, we have aimed at showing that despite the processes being different in distinct regions and systems, transnational networks can be found throughout the Cold War–era Europe. Despite the existence of several case studies on such connections, what has been lacking is a more complete picture of what happened in Europe during the Cold War years in this respect. If we are to understand the rapid changes in Europe since the 1980s, we must examine Cold War Europe and transnational networks that were built during these decades. Otherwise we turn a blind-eye to the fact that Europe was seeking common nominators, mutual language, and lively connections beyond national and systemic borders even during an era that has been considered to be one of hostility and strict East-West division.

Simo Mikkonen is an Academy Research Fellow in the Department of History and Ethnology at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. He is the author of *State Composers and the Red Courtiers: Music, Ideology, and Politics in the Soviet 1930s* (2009).

Pia Koivunen is a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute of Advanced Social Research at the University of Tampere, Finland. Her Ph.D. dissertation *Performing Peace and Friendship: The World Youth Festival as a Tool of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy, 1947–1957* (2013) studied the Soviet role in the Cultural Cold War. Koivunen has published widely on the World Youth Festivals and is preparing a monograph on Soviet cultural diplomacy.

Notes

1. For an exception among studies of Cold War Europe, see S. Autio-Sarasmo and K. Miklóssy, *Reassessing Cold War Europe* (London: Routledge, 2011).

2. N. Rutter, "The Western Wall: The Iron Curtain Recast in Midsummer 1951," in *Cold War Crossings: International Travel and Exchange across the Soviet Bloc,* ed. P. Babiracki and K. Zimmer (College Station, TX: A&M UP, 2014), 78–106.

3. G. Péteri, "Nylon Curtain: Transnational and Transsystemic Tendencies in the Cultural Life of State-Socialist Russia and East-Central Europe," *Slavonica* 10, no. 2 (2004): 113–23; S. Autio-Sarasmo and K. Miklóssy, "Introduction," in *Reassessing Cold War Europe,* ed. S. Autio-Sarasmo and K. Miklóssy (London: Routledge, 2011), 6; M. David-Fox, "The Iron Curtain as Semi-Permeable Membrane: Origins and Demise of the Stalinist Superiority Complex," in *Cold War Crossings,* ed. Babiracki and Zimmer, 14–39.

4. While transnational connections between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world existed even under Stalin, these were much more limited in scope than after 1953. On Stalin era transnational connections, see, e.g., M. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to Soviet Russia, 1921–1941* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); K. Clark, *Moscow, The Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931–1941* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).

5. See, e.g., M. Conway and K. K. Patel, eds., *Europeanization in the Twentieth Century: Historical Approaches* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010).

6. W. L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945–1961* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1997); Y. Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2003); L. Belmonte, *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

7. G. Johnston, "Revisiting the Cultural Cold War," *Social History* 35, no. 3 (2010): 295.

8. P. Major and R. Mitter, "East is East and West is West? Towards a Comparative Socio-Cultural History of the Cold War," in *Across the Blocs: Cold War Cultural and Social History,* ed. R. Mitter and P. Major (London: Frank Cass, 2004), 3.

9. G. Scott-Smith, and J. Segal, "Introduction: Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West," in *Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West,* ed. P. Romijn, G. Scott-Smith, and J. Segal (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2012), 1–9.

10. A. Vowinckel, M. Payk, and T. Lindenberger, "European Cold War Culture(s)? An Introduction," in *Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies,* ed. A. Vowinckel, M. Payk, and T. Lindenberger (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 6, 9, 17.

11. S. E. Reid and D. Crowley, eds., *Style and Socialism: Modernity and Material Culture in Postwar Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 2000); D. Crowley and S. E. Reid, eds., *Pleasures in Socialism. Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2010); D. Koleva, ed., *Negotiating Normality: Everyday Lives in Socialist Institutions* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2012); M. Fulbrook, *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); P. Bren and M. Neuberger, eds., *Communism Unwrapped: Consumption in Cold War Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

12. For a thorough overview of the studies on Soviet bloc interactions during the Cold War and of a paradigm shift in Russian and East European Studies, see P. Babiracki, "Interfacing the Soviet Bloc: Recent Literature and New Paradigms," *Ab Imperio* 12, no. 4 (2011), 376–407. See also S. Kansikas, *Socialist Countries Face the European Community: Soviet Bloc Controversies over East-West Trade* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014); A. E. Gorsuch and D. P. Koenker, eds., *Socialist Sixties: Crossing Borders in the Second World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013); Babiracki and Zimmer eds., *Cold War Crossings.*

13. David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment*; M. David-Fox, P. Holquist, and A. Martin, eds., *Fascination and Enmity: Russia and Germany as Entangled Histories, 1914–1945* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012).

14. D. L. Hoffman, *Cultivating the Masses: Modern State Practices and Soviet Socialism, 1917–1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Clark, *Moscow, The Fourth Rome*; David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment.*

15. M. David-Fox, "The Implications of Transnationalism," *Kritika* 12, no. 4 (Fall 2011): 885–904.

16. A. E. Gorsuch, *All This is Your World. Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

17. D. Caute, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); S. E. Reid, "Who Will Beat Whom? Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959," *Kritika* 9, no. 4 (Fall 2008), 855–904; P. Koivunen, "Performing Peace and Friendship: The World Youth Festival as a Tool of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy, 1947–1957," (Ph.D. diss., University of Tampere, 2013); J. Krekola and S. Mikkonen, "Backlash of the Free World: US presence at the World Youth Festival in Helsinki, 1962," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 36, no. 2 (2011), 230–55.

18. See, e.g., S. Mikkonen, "Winning Hearts and Minds? The Soviet Musical Intelligentsia in the Struggle against the United States during the Early Cold War," in *Twentieth-Century Music and Politics,* ed. P. Fairclough (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); P. Koivunen, "Overcoming Cold War Boundaries at the World Youth Festivals,", in *Reassessing Cold War Europe,* ed. Autio-Sarasmo and Miklóssy, 175–192.

19. See, e.g., C. A. Bayly et al., "AHR Conversation: On Transnational History," *American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (2006), 1140–65. The transnational approach is seen as reaching beyond a focus that was typically fixed within the confines of a nation-state.

20. Péteri, "Nylon Curtain," 113–23.

21. David-Fox, "The Implications of Transnationalism," 885–904.

22. See, e.g., R. Wagnleitner, *Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: The Cultural Mission of the United States in Austria after the Second World War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Mitter and Major eds., *Across the Blocs.*

23. Various roles and positions of non-state actors in cultural diplomacy are well discussed in J. C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. Donfried eds., *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).

24. M. Evangelista, *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); S. B. Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

25. A. Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 15–16.

26. Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order*, 17–20.

27. See, e.g., Koivunen, "Performing Peace and Friendship".

28. F. Kind-Kovacs and J. Labov, eds., *Samizdat, Tamizdat, and Beyond: Transnational Media During and After Socialism* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013).

29. U. Hannerz, "The Withering Away of the Nation?" *Ethnos* 58, no. 3–4 (1993), 377–91.

30. E. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

31. M. Espagne, "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle," *Genèses* no. 17 (1994), 112–21.

32. P. Burke, "Translating Knowledge, Translating Cultures," in *Kultureller Austausch in der Frühen Neuzeit,* ed. Michael North (Köln: Böhlau, 2009), 69–77.

33. M. Werner and B. Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison: "*Histoire croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity," *History and Theory* 45 (February 2006), 30–50; H. Kaelble, "Between Comparison and Transfers—and What Now?" in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives,* ed. H.-G. Haupt and J. Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009).

34. A. Jenks, "Transnational History and Space Flight," *Russian History Blog,* 5 October 2011. http://russianhistoryblog.org/2011/10/transnational-history-and-space-flight/.

35. D. Caute, "Foreword," in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945–1960,* ed. G. Scott-Smith and H. Krabbendam (London: Routledge, 2003), vii.

36. P. Lange and M. Vannicelli, eds., *The Communist Parties of Italy, France and Spain: Postwar Change and Continuity* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1981); A. F. Upton, *The Communist Parties of Scandinavia and Finland* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973).

37. A. Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe 1944–56* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), xxvi–xxvii.

38. Gorsuch and Koenker, eds., *Socialist Sixties*; Babiracki and Zimmermann, eds., *Cold War Crossings.*

39. J. C. E. Gienow-Hecht, "What Are We Searching for? Culture, Diplomacy, Agent, and the State," in *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy,* ed. J. C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 3–11; C. Luke and M. Kersel, *U.S. Cultural Diplomacy and Archaeology: Soft Power, Hard Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 2–5.

40. Kind-Kovács and Labov, eds., *Samizdat, Tamizdat, and Beyond.*