

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33216/1998-7927-2019-254-6-53-61>

UDC 94(477)“1930/1940”

## THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL REPRESSION OF THE 1930s OF THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY IN UKRAINE ON PERSONAL RELATIONS AMONG CIVIL SERVANTS AND INTELLIGENTSIA

Serhiienko S. Y.

### ВПЛИВ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ РЕПРЕСІЙ 30-Х РР. ХХ СТ. В УКРАЇНІ НА ОСОБИСТІ ВІДНОСИНИ В СЕРЕДОВИЩІ ДЕРЖАВНИХ СЛУЖБОВЦІВ ТА ІНТЕЛІГЕНЦІЇ

Сергієнко С. Ю.

*On the basis of literature, mass media and archival sources, the impact of political repression of the 1930s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on personal relations among civil servants and the intelligentsia of Ukraine is highlighted. It is noted that the authorities deliberately, through political repression and insidious actions distorted personal relations among people in order to prevent their unity aiming to withstand the existing regime. The result was distortion of personal relations of people, decrease in mutual trust, sincerity, growth of deceit and hypocrisy. The author emphasizes that even the fundamental relations of all mankind, like family ones, were subjected to distort. An issue for further research is identified.*

**Key words:** political repression, personal relations, civil servants, intelligentsia.

**Introduction.** With the beginning of the so-called collectivization, political repression began to intensify. In Ukraine, that growth was ominously manifested by the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, which began in March 1930 in Kharkiv, and due to which more than 30 thousand people were arrested, killed or exiled [1, p. 752]. It was a terrible attack on the Ukrainian intelligentsia that defended the interests of their people. Further attacks were not long in coming. Everybody who did not show obedience to the authorities was repressed. Political repression in Ukraine in the 1930s was studied by a number of specialists who presented a comprehensive coverage of the problem [2]. The massive nature of repression and its negative impact on the life of the society is an axiom nowadays. But now there is a lack of special studies devoted to the impact of political repression on personal communication among civil servants and the intelligentsia. The author of the article will try to determine the prime aim of that influence, its manifestations in the society and the main consequences.

**Presentation of the research basic material.** A researcher of the social life of the 1930s can undoubtedly conclude that political repression played a leading role in the state policy. It was driven by the highest authorities, which did not allow manifestations of “spinelessness” in fulfilment of their will. No one should have resisted that will. The authorities were relying first and foremost on a strong, proved and obedient structure – the Communist Party, which, in fact, was the ruling state body in the 1930s. All of more or less influential state officials were its members. In case of exclusion from the ruling party, the official automatically lost his post. Therefore, we can say that party functionaries and officials of various ranks were civil servants who acted as a cohesive force. Only the other cohesive force could compete with it. Those authorities clearly understood and cautiously watched such force not to be created in any way. Appropriate preventive work was carried out. A writer, and then, a high-ranking official of the USSR (Head of the Union of Soviet writers) K. Fedin, was perceptive. During a meeting with the emigrant R. Gul abroad at the end of the 1920s, he explained why people did not sing “Budenny’s March” and “Little Bricks” in the USSR, which used to be very popular songs, “Both “Budenny’s March” and “Little Bricks” disappeared because all the people were singing them, and our authorities do not like our nation to unite in something, even in a song” [3]. Only the ruling party had to unite people under its flag. A similar statement was also expressed by an academician D. Lykhachov. He noted that during approximately the same years, the authorities eliminated the so-called “tea houses”, which served only tea and there were no alcoholic beverages. Sober people gathered there and discussed their topical problems. Tea houses “were not accidentally destroyed: it was very convenient for people to speak, or rather, to converse on

different topics. And it was very dangerous for the authorities. Work and keep silent. Believe in everything official – nothing more” [4]. There were many characteristics of the Bolshevik Party, made by well-known people. They make it possible to understand what kind of people provided its capacity. A Russian philosopher I. A. Ilin believed that as a result of the October Revolution of 1917, “personally dishonest, self-conceited, ignorant, greedy, cruel and immoral” people came to power [5, p. 927]. A well-known writer V. Voinovych believed that a significant part of the Leninist party “consisted of people who were cruel, narrow-minded, but devoted to the ideals they followed, personally decent and even capable of self-sacrifice” [6]. The author of the famous memoirs “Russia in a Concentration Camp” I. Solonevych, characterizing the party of the 1920s-1930s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, emphasized that it was “calm, confident, very reasonable and immeasurably impudent force” [7]. There are many generalizing characteristics of the ruling party, but no matter what the party was, none of the experts would deny that its influence penetrated the whole society. At the same time, political repression, which may include the so-called “cleansing”, were also directed at it, which could not but affect personal relations of the party members. Those relations were increasingly penetrated by suspicion, distrust and meanness. From the very beginning of its existence, the ruling party was a strictly centralized organization that left its stamp on relations among its members. Any subordination generates insincerity in communication. The Communist Party of the Bolsheviks of Ukraine was an inseparable part of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and had all the features of that party, but there were some specific points. The Ukrainian part of the party was always under suspicion of commitment to so-called bourgeois nationalism and to separatist tendencies to some extent. That gave rise to distrust of the local Communists and “strengthening” the Ukrainian party personnel, primarily, high-ranking officials, appointed by Moscow. In the 1920s-1930s, exclusively non-Ukrainians were in charge of the CP(B)U.

However, in the 1920s, members of the ruling party could communicate with each other quite frankly. For example, they could frankly show hatred of Stalin and call him a “martinet” in their personal conversations [8, p. 211]. But since the early 1930s, personal relations among party members have lost their sincerity. One of the leaders of Kyiv oblast described interpersonal relations among the local authorities to his old close friend during the Holodomor in Ukraine, “I cannot express my thoughts and feelings even to my closest friends without a risk of being betrayed. Even the most honest man of all my employees and acquaintances, who shares my way of looking at things deep in his heart will immediately run away and betray me, seeing a provocateur in me, who tests his reaction to my seditious talk. He will do it just in case, for the purpose of self-protection. Do you think that among our oblast activists there is anyone who will dare talk to each other about the real causes of

the hunger? Never, no matter what! Not everyone risks having such talks even in the family. All these people are spoiled to the depths of their souls. All of them are poisoned by hatred, mutual suspicion and envy. Anyway, I have not met a man among them, with whom I could speak sincerely yet” [9, p. 219].

As a result of intensification of arrests in the second half of the 1930s, relations in the ruling party became not just mistrustful, but extremely tense. That was how V. Kravchenko described the events of the summer of 1936 in Nikopol. During the meeting of the city activists, “the old sense of partnership has disappeared... A few months ago, one could hear a loud greeting, “Hey, Comrade Kravchenko!” “Ah, here you are, old chap!” There was a friendly exchange of gossip, anecdotes, talks on shop and party affairs. Now there was only intense silence. Everyone kept away from each other, as if beware of a deadly infection. Save yourself, be careful! Avoid neighbours! You seemed to hear those words everywhere”. During the meeting there was read a letter of the Central Committee of the AUCP (B). “The purpose of the letter was quite clear. The audience felt fear. As in the past we used to look for “enemies” among the whole population, then we had to look for them in our own ranks! In the future, you will be measured by the amount of your denunciations on your most trusted friends. Spineless and weak characters that will put personal friendship above the party interests will have to know the consequences of such “insincerity”. M. Khataievych was late. He was a Secretary of the Regional Committee, a member of the Central Committee of the AUCP (B). He went to the tribune surrounded by guards. “Perhaps, it was the most terrible news: guards and revolvers at the meeting of the active party members!” M. Khataievych’s speech was in the spirit of the letter of the Central Committee of the AUCP (B). “Since that moment, it became a matter of “honour” to denounce on and expose “secret enemies” of the party. You were afraid to talk to your closest friends. You were separated from friends, relatives and employees. As if they were infected, they were carriers of a terrible epidemic bacilli that spread across the country. You forgot that once there used to be such things as frankness, devotion, friendship in the world”... “Last remnants of partnership disappeared among us. Meeting each other in the streets or in the corridors, we, technical and party workers, looked at each other with astonishment. “How could it be? You are still alive”, our looks expressed” [10]. It was in the 1920s or 1930s when a fundamental rotation of the party personnel took place, which determined personal relations in the party environment and, above all, among functionaries. N. Mandelstam noted that by the middle of the 1920s, former members of underground organisations were met among the party figures everywhere: rough, confident in their undoubted rightness. They willingly started discussions, agitated, were often rude. Gradually they were replaced by round-headed blondes in embroidered Ukrainian shirts, such “nice guys” with jauntily fun and completely artificial manners, jokes and demonstrative

brutality. Silly diplomats came to their place – every their word was worth its weight in gold, they did not say many words, did not give any promises, but gave an impression of powerful and influential people [11, p. 131]. The latter came in the 1930s and sincerity was not their strong point.

The atmosphere of mutual distrust, suspicion in personal communication seized not only the ruling party, but, to a greater or lesser extent, all strata of the Ukrainian society. There is reason to believe that distrust in personal relations among people, especially those who held more or less responsible positions, was deliberately developed by the ruling elite. V. Kravchenko said that when he was appointed to a high position in a government institution at the beginning of the 1940s, the representative of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) immediately gave him a guide on how to build relations with colleagues. "The essence of his lecture was that I should not trust anyone and keep in mind that others also do not trust me. There must be written evidence, detailed reports on each meeting or conversation. Mutual distrust was not only a fact in the Soviet apparatus; it was a recognized, obligatory way of life, the only chance for self-protection" [10]. It was also true for the scientific intelligentsia. As S. Holitsyn mentioned when he was appointed to a position in "Hydroproject" research institute, he met a friend whom he had not seen for a long time, "I began to talk with him about this and that. He interrupted me and said that the most strict order was to speak only on official topics, then looked around and whispered, pointing out the window, "You see, there is a prison to the left, and a home for the insane to the right, and we are candidates either here or there" [12]. In personal relations of the intelligentsia, there increasingly appeared meanness and provocation. In the early 1930s, a student from one of Odessa universities came to his elder friend, holding a responsible post, for advice: how to escape persecution. He was a son of a dekulakized peasant and if someone knew about it, then he would be expelled from the university. The friend advised to move to the other city as soon as possible. That student did not follow the advice of the experienced friend for some reason. He stayed in Odessa, but was not arrested. Thus, the experienced friend concluded that it was a provocation. There were often situations when, because of the fear of provocation, an honest man became a denunciator. Thus, I. Bahrianyi considered a writer Oleksii Pravdiuk to be a Bolshevik's agent who "put Bahrianyi into prison". Oleksii Pravdiuk, being a Petliurist in the past, knew that he was followed and therefore considered I. Bahrianyi a provocateur who started "counterrevolutionary" talks with him in order to find a reason for arrest. O. Pravdiuk decided to act proactively and denounced on I. Bahrianyi to the State Political Directorate. I. Bahrianyi was sent to prison. Later O. Pravdiuk recognized his mistake and in conversations with a faithful friend warned not talk much with him, because he had had "such a story with a poet I. Bahrianyi and he suffered". [8, p. 238; p. 265-266].

Such situations were not rare. It was not only in Ukraine. In 1934 a poet O. Mandelstam, living in Moscow in the early 1930s, received a request from his colleague, a well-known connoisseur of poetry, "not to read dangerous poems because he will have to denounce about it..." [11, p. 85].

Was it then worth wondering that in the late 1930s at the beginning of the 1940s, the concept of "a decent man" was "a rare phenomenon" [13]. And personal relations in the society were determined by its majority. It could be argued that this majority was formed by political repression.

During the training of specialists (i.e., future civil servants and people of intelligent professions), an atmosphere of distrust and pretentiousness was created in educational establishments. According to eyewitnesses, distrust in personal relations among students was very tangible. One of them argued, "Life forced students not to trust each other. That distrust suppressed, everyone knew perfectly well that among them somebody certainly was an informer, but they often did not guess who exactly it was and suspected everyone. And sometimes they knew and were scared" [14, p. 660]. A historian O. Riabchenko notes, "In order to have an opportunity to continue their studies, students were forced to conceal their political views or preferences... Students had to master the Bolshevik's rhetoric in order to convince all kinds of commissions in their "sincerity" to the authorities, and they did it to be able to graduate and find their place in a new society" [14, p. 683-684]. In relations among students of those years the most terrible was indifference to the other person's fate according to an eyewitness A. Rybakov. He stressed that indifference, "turned into mass cruelty, became the flag of the era" [15, p. 65]. A. Rybakov generalized the experience of the Soviet Union. Can Ukraine differ in this regard? Judging by the documents and literature, it did not differ, although there were some nuances. The nuance of Ukraine was that students and teachers were persecuted for "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" regardless of their ethnic origin, which also brought specific features to relations among young people and their teachers. Young people who were poisoned by suspicion denounced on their teachers and sometimes they were not only malicious losers, but also talented students. It is known that the genius physicist L. Landau was imprisoned in 1937 after denunciation of one of his best students in Kharkiv. When L. Landau became famous, the denunciator came to him to the Institute of Physical Problems to apologize. [16]. That situation could not help causing distrust and hypocrisy among students and teachers, and in the future, hypocrisy was manifested in the society leadership, as young specialists eventually became in charge of industry, agriculture, social sphere, etc.

At the end of the 1920s in the early 1930s, the authorities began to encourage employees' "courageous exposure, despite the personality" of the negative qualities of colleagues in every way. There were lots of expositors. As a witness says, "Each figure that rose in

those years used that method of exposing his chief at least once. Otherwise, how will you take his place?" [11, p. 84]. Such a situation did not make a positive contribution to personal relations among colleagues. Their sincerity was out of question.

People got used to thinking one thing, but saying what the authorities wanted to hear, i.e. hypocrising. That phenomenon penetrated even the intelligentsia, which was brought up on the principles of Christian morality. It was mass repressions that "transformed" that part of the intelligentsia. K. Nikitenko notes that, for example, M. Rylskyi, at an official event dedicated to the signing of The German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact in 1939, stressed, "I am happy". And in a private conversation he said that he really thought, "I do not see the compelling reasons that forced us to attack Poland still. It contradicts humanity and justice that we have always been calling for so much. Here I write poems every day that glorify the courage of the Soviet troops and the wisdom of our policy, and there is no enthusiasm in my heart" [17]. Well, the new intelligentsia was brought up on the postulate of Lenin that everything that was for the sake of communism was moral. Everything that harmed communism was immoral, and one should decisively fight against the immoral. And they fought. Not only ignoramus fought, but also talented people. Once in the Ukrainian public-political, literary artistic and scientific "Chervonyi Shliakh" magazine, which was published in Kharkiv in 1923-1936, and since January 1931 was the body of the Federation of Unions of Soviet Writers of Ukraine, there was published a novel by Ya. Mamontov, in which there were such lines, "A deceived village is sleeping, covered with snow and proclamations". Taking into account the following mass collectivization and its consequences, the given phrase precisely reflected the historical moment. But this is from the point of view of the present. At that time, that phrase "desperately outraged" a young talented poet V. Sosiura, who called it "true counterrevolution", and told the editor that he would go to complain to the Central Committee, which greatly scared the man. V. Sosiura pitied the editor and did not go to the Central Committee. But when a writer I. Mykytenko was forgiven after having concealed his own social origin because he rehabilitated himself by creative activity, V. Sosiura insisted that I. Mykytenko "deepened the crime of concealing his social origin from the party even further by his creativity". Thus, the young intellectual sincerely tried to put Lenin morality into practice. The atmosphere of mass repression affected V. Sosiura so much that when his wife was arrested, he "was depressed spiritually as a poet and as a man", but "believed that the NKVD was the sword of the proletariat dictatorship, and once Mary was arrested, it meant there was a reason" [18, p. 220, 272, 302]. There were a lot of such cases. Mass repression distorted personal relations in the family. The idea of family relations, which used to be much respected in Ukraine for centuries, was subjected to constant attacks by the authorities, who believed that in the family circle not family, but class feel-

ings should take the first place. Family feelings were seen as secondary compared to the class ones. The top of the class was the state of the proletariat dictatorship, which occupied the historical place of the Motherland. In vital values of a man the family had to retreat to the second place compared to the state with its policy.

According to eyewitnesses, there were people who demanded a special careful consideration of family members. A member of the AUCP (B) P. Nikolaienko can be a bright example. She called not to believe even one's father, let alone wife. And although M. Khrushchev, who knew P. Nikolaienko well, considered her to be crazy [19], was forced to support her, because at the February-March plenum of the Central Committee of the AUCP (B) 1937, Y. Stalin praised P. Nikolaienko, who, in his opinion, "exposed the family, the bourgeois-philistine approach to the personnel" [20, p. 24]. By the way, Y. Stalin himself sent some of his relatives to camps and to the underworld. He provided a personal example to follow. In the ruling party, during regular cleansing, there were persecuted the Communists, who did not break off with relatives not loyal to the authorities. Here are the resolutions adopted by Starobilsk District Committee of the CP (B) in 1929, "To suggest to break off any contact with any relatives of wife deprived of electoral rights", "To give a severe reprimand for instability as a party member who has not broken off with relatives of wife deprived of electoral rights", "To expel from the party for communication with kulaks, deprived of electoral rights" [21, p. 22, 27, 39]. In the 1930s, such resolutions were even crueler.

In February 1935, a student of Kharkiv University L. Kopeliev was expelled from the Komsomol only because his cousin was a "Trotskyist who was not disarmed" [22]. The capital did not lag behind. In 1937, in Kyiv, Yu. Starovoitov was expelled from the party doubting the lawfulness of his son's arrest and bringing parcels to him [23, p. 186]. In the second half of the 1930s, that approach reached its climax. Relatives who did not relate directly to the family of the arrested were persecuted. So, when in a newspaper in the city of Izium of Kharkiv oblast there was a note that a local educator was a nationalist, not only he and his sister – a biology teacher in the city of Zmiiv were fired, but "the question was raised" about dismissal of her husband [24]. Personal communication with close relatives who did not please the authorities was considered inadmissible. In order to avoid the axe of repression, there was one way out – to publicly renounce family ties with "enemies of the people", though such a step did not always save. In the 1930s, newspapers began to publish notes, "I bring to the attention of the public that I, such and such, broke off all relations with my father (a pop, a merchant, a former officer, etc.)." Contemporaries recorded cases when students of higher education establishments were invited to the direction and insistently offered to sign a renunciation of their parents. At the same time, they tried to assure that it was a pure formality that a person could remain in the same relations with his/her parents

as before, “no one would follow him/her”. Otherwise, there was inevitable expulsion [12]. Family relations were to be subordinated to the interests of the dictatorship. And although the family, according to the theory of Marxism, was the centre of the society, it could be ruthlessly destroyed for the sake of the state interests.

The idea of finding enemies of the people in their own family was supported by the legend about Pavlik Morozov, who, for the sake of state interests, destroyed his own father. This act was persistently imposed on the society and, above all, on its youth as an example of the behaviour of children in relation to parents. Some other “examples” of personal relations in the family were also provided. For example, a nineteen-year-old boy killed his own father, brother and sister, “who betrayed the cause of the revolution”. Four years later, he became a political commissar of Kamianets workers’ faculty [14, p. 605]. The killing of close relatives went beyond the limits of the Ukrainian mentality as well as mentality of any civilized society. A famous character of the times of Zaporizhian Sich Marco “the Cursed” who had killed his child, his mother and sister, was cursed by his father and doomed to eternal wanderings. He is clearly a negative character of the Ukrainian folklore [25, p. 842]. The exception is the literature character Taras Bulba. But in that case, it was a question of treason not to political institutions, but to interests of the family, the Cossack community. Though the issue is disputable and requires research.

Under the pressure of repression and corresponding education, some of children of the arrested high-ranking officials confirmed any slander against their own parents to investigators without a doubt. One of them stated in advance that he would say everything that the investigator would order during the interrogation, even if he had to doom both his father and his mother, “They have already lived their lives, but I need to think of myself.” A writer R. Ivanov-Razumnyk, who referred to those facts, called that behaviour “a worthy fruit of the communist upbringing” [13]. But there were those who believed that the Soviet authorities were not mistaken and their parents were really enemies. Such children tried to show their loyalty to the authorities. One can agree that the “communist upbringing” corrupted them, but it affected not everyone. Perhaps genes also played their role. R. Ivanov-Razumnyk described the behaviour of children of the Soviet high-ranking officials, among whom there were many people with distorted ideas about morality, and they were simply animals by nature. They, surely, passed their genetic pool to their children. So, paternal genes determined the behaviour of children. However, there were those who did not recognize parents as enemies. Perhaps, other parental genes played their role there. Mass repression together with corresponding education created conditions in the society where not parents but the state personified by Stalin took the first place in lives of children. Often in families belonging to the upper strata of the society, children said that they loved Stalin more than their parents.

Under special control of the state there were relations among the creative intelligentsia. The authorities managed to breed mutual distrust in that environment through repression. Everyone who tried to defend the freedom of creativity was mercilessly punished. At the same time, those who faithfully served the authorities were encouraged, in fact, even deliberately spoiled. People with strong sense of self-esteem tried not to yield to temptation of power. But, as they say, those who were not being broken did not break. Some were “smashed”, and some, without brutal coercion, took the path indicated by the authorities. Among them there were many talented people. It happened for a variety of reasons: some knew that they had to work in a way favourable for the authorities, some sincerely believed in virtues of the intentions of the Bolsheviks and tried to support them, and some simply sought material wealth. As a talented writer N. Mandelstam said with bitter irony, “Some cried when selling themselves, as Yu. Olesha, others licked their lips like Kataiev” [3]. It should be noted that that talented Yu. Olesha and V. Kataiev began their creative career in Ukraine. Under such conditions, personal relations of the Ukrainian artists did not have a solid basis for frankness, sincerity and benevolence. However, in the 1920s, there was no “coercion to defend the official line of the AUCP (B)” [8, p. 192]. A famous writer R. Gul noted, “During the years of NEP, writers were still semi-free” [3]. As a Ukrainian writer H. Kostiuk recalled, in the late 1920s and even in the 1930s, “we were not afraid of each other and were friendly sincere in our thoughts and tricks. After one or two glasses our souls luxuriated in freedom of comrade self-expression. Everyone told or read something of his own, intimate, inquisitive, intriguing, not intended or forbidden for general use. There was such an atmosphere when everyone wanted to reveal their suppressed or hidden thoughts.” And in September 1935, in Kyiv, the same writer talked with his colleague D. Kopytsia in his flat where the latter read his play reflecting the horror of the Holodomor of 1933 and asked to evaluate the work. H. Kostiuk suspected that he was trapped. He began to talk about common things, but then he could not resist and frankly said, “But, actually, why did you write that tragedy? After all, you cannot expect that it will be staged.” Then they spoke a lot and parted almost friends. When being arrested in November 1935, H. Kostiuk doubted, “And what if Kopytsia immediately went and reported everything to the NKVD? Or what if Kopytsia had already been arrested and his play were in the hands of investigators, and he already told them about reading it to me and our conversation about it?” [26, p. 291, 496-497]. Similar thoughts tortured not only arrested writers, as the unarrested ones also thought of possible provocations. Therefore, frankness could only be on topics that concerned politics in no way, for example, about hunting or culinary preferences. If there were any conversations which concerned politics to some extent, then frankness disappeared. The atmosphere of fear, which was becoming deeper in the society, did not allow frankness in personal relations.

Inside the informers of the NKVD there were also talented, seemingly decent artists. The reports on meetings with his close friend O. Dovzhenko were regularly written to the NKVD, for example, by Y. Smolych. However, he tried to show his interlocutor as loyal to the authorities [27]. As N. Mandelstam said, “It was the most horrible that you did not expect those people to be involved in this (denouncing)” [11, p. 86].

Ukraine was no exception in this regard. Insincerity, deceit in relations of the intelligentsia was in other republics of the USSR. Thus, in the middle of the 1930s, the 60th anniversary of a famous professor Oshman, the Head of the Medical Department was celebrated in Azerbaijan. Close friends came to the party. However, an uninvited guest arrived – an Associate Professor of the Department. “Bowling and apologizing, the uninvited guest said that he could not help congratulating the honoured chef at home and giving the most expensive gift for him. Then he gave Oshman something big like a samovar, wrapped in hard paper. Oshman was confused, mechanically took the middle of the package with both hands, it opened at the bottom, and a bust of Stalin fell on the floor, having crashed into several pieces. There was a dead silence. – “We need to take away everything, and then glue it together”, the impressed Professor whispered. The Associate Professor suddenly cried. “You broke the most expensive thing that I’ve had”... At night, everyone was arrested”. A special meeting gave three years of imprisonment to the Professor and his wife, children and guests got five years for counter-revolutionary activity. The Associate Professor was a provocateur who became the Head of the Department [28].

An interesting case is presented by a famous opera singer G. Vyshnevskaya. Once after the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPSU, when the process of rehabilitation of the victims of the Stalin regime began, a poorly dressed woman came to Moscow’s Bolshoi Theatre and asked to call the People’s Artist of the USSR H. Neliapp. Then a quote goes, “The famous tenor of the Bolshoi Theatre, slowly, with dignity, in a gentleman’s manner, is going down the stairs, covered with a red carpet... The woman, who was sitting below, silently rose to meet him. He came to her, “Good afternoon”. She was silent. “Did you want to see me?” And suddenly she opened her mouth and spat in his face! “Here you are, beast, for destroying my husband and my family! But I have survived to spit in your snout! Damn you! She turned and left”. The Director of the opera company explained to H. Vyshnevskaya that once H. Neliapp destroyed many people. He said, “Doesn’t he look like such a person? So, that’s it, that looking at him, it would never come to your mind” [29, p. 207]. H. Neliapp died of a heart attack shortly afterwards. He was only 52 years old. His life seemed to be a success, but apparently the people destroyed by him were still bothering his conscience. Ultimately, he became the victim of those relations that developed in the artistic environment in the 1930s under the influence of political repression. The state managed to change the perception of decent people of honour and

dignity that they sincerely believed that it was necessary to report on their relatives, and considered it a civil duty. We can illustrate this with such a fact. A very famous actress of the 1930s T. Okunievskaya once came to film shooting in Kyiv. After the shooting, the film’s creative team went to a cafe, where they had a friendly conversation over a glass of wine. Soon the film director sent a denunciation to the appropriate body that during the conversation T. Okunievskaya said that all Communists were lying and dishonest people. T. Okunievskaya was imprisoned at the Gulag. After Stalin’s death, the question about her rehabilitation arose. A face-to-face encounter of the actress with the denunciator was arranged. The police officer asked the investigator and the public prosecutor during the face-to-face encounter, “If you were told such things about Communists, would you denounce?” The answer was, “Absolutely! You are right, surely, we would write...” [30]. Thus, the society and, above all, its leadership were deeply penetrated by confidence that hiding thoughts expressed during personal communication with colleagues and friends from the authorities was a crime. Here you can add that the film director knew well, if he did not denounce, then someone else would do it, and he would be imprisoned for not denouncing. That was the atmosphere of personal relations as a result of mass political repression and massive fear caused by it in the society.

The state widely involved talented writers, prominent filmmakers, theatre figures in popularizing the postulate that “the interests of the state’s policy are above any private interests”. In 1924, B. Lavreniov wrote a story about the events of the Civil War “The Forty-First”, in which the girl killed her beloved boyfriend for joining the White Guard. And this piece of art was professionally filmed. In 1926, the play “Liubov Yarova” was written, which, without exaggeration, triumphantly was put in all the theatres of both Ukraine and the Soviet Union. Only one critic of the USSR called the play “reactionary” during a conversation with a colleague [31]. Others praised it in all ways. “Liubov Yarova” was presented as an example of a revolutionary performance. As evidenced in O. Bulhakov’s diary, Stalin himself ordered to put “Liubov Yarova” in theatres [32, p. 52]. Those who know this work can recognize its good artistic level, but the idea conveyed in it is reactionary – close family ties are nothing compared to the political preferences. The author of the play K. Treniov was awarded the Stalin Prize. The totalitarian state was supposed to be closer and dearer than father, mother, husband, wife. This could not but affect personal relations in the family.

**Conclusions.** Thus, political repression of the 1930s, especially in the second half, was primarily aimed at the intelligentsia and civil servants. It was necessary to prepare officials of various ranks and the intelligentsia for the unconquerable regime service. This, of course, in no way means that political repression of the 1930s passed by peasants and workers. But their main focus in the second half of the 1930s was civil servants and the intelligentsia. The authorities used the fear of

repression to influence personal relations, but did not disdain of provocations, encouragement of denunciations and other insidious methods. Repression greatly influenced personal relations in those strata in a long-term way. The main purpose of that influence was to prevent unification of people, especially those who were potentially able to create an organized force in the opposition to the authorities. Describing the situation in the Ukrainian branch of the ruling party in the 1960s and 1970s, its leader, P. Shelest, wrote, "... it is dangerous to tell the truth even in the party bodies, one should watch out each word, even if you know it is fair. You are being watched, everything is denounced. You may even not know who can do it. There is firm agency and spying everywhere. How it is all disgusting!" [33]. That was the long-term result of political repression of the 1930s. Sincere friendship, frankness, and trust disappeared from personal relations of the ruling class and the intelligentsia, with some rare exceptions. The only chance for self-protection was painful caution, distrust, hypocrisy. The family feeling, which had been the basis of personal relations in the family for centuries, was given a secondary role. The first place was occupied by devotion to the regime personified by its leader. Stalin needed personnel, for whom his authority would be higher than any other authority, including a family member or the most faithful friend. Only such personnel whose personal relations were based on mutual suspicion and mistrust could fulfil all the wishes of the leader. In personal relations of civil servants and the intelligentsia, an atmosphere was created in which a stray word to a colleague, neighbour or friend became known to the authorities and received its response. The regime's tentacles penetrated the most intimate personal relations. We can state that the authority of the 1930s achieved its goal. Mutual distrust among civil servants and the intelligentsia became an integral part of personal relations. No one completely trusted anybody. In that way, conspiracy against the existing system was prevented. However, it should be noted that a significant part of young people often sincerely perceived the power's propaganda about justification of political repression. The problem of the impact of that repression on personal relations of young people should be considered separately.

#### References

1. Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy. – T.9. – K., 2012. – 944 s.
2. Shapoval Yu.I. Ukraina 20-50 rokov: storinky nenapysanoi istorii / Yu.I. Shapoval. – K., 1993. – 351 s.; Kostiuk H.O. Stalinizm v Ukraini (heneza i naslidky): Doslidzhennia i sposterezhenia suchasnyka / H.O. Kostiuk. – K., 1995. – 508 s.; Kuromiia H. Svoboda i teror u Donbasi / H. Kuromiia – K., 2002. – 510 s.; Zahorodnii I. Vtracheni pokolinnia / I. Zahorodnii – Vinnytsia, 2012. – 848 s.; Dovbnia. O.A. Politychni represii proty protestantskykh denominatsii u Radianskii Ukraini (1920-1930-ti roky): istoriohrafichnyi aspekt [Elektronnyi resurs] / O.A. Dovbnia // Sumskyi istoryko-arkhivnyi zhurnal. – 2018. – № XXX. – DOI: doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2018.i30.p5. –
3. Hul R. Ya unes Rossyiu. – T. 1. [Elektronnyi resurs] / R. Hul. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://mirknig.su/knigi/history/230000-ya-unes-rossiyu-apologiya-emigracii-tom-i-rossiya-v-germanii.html>
4. Lykhachev D. Vospomynania. [Elektronnyi resurs] / D. Lykhachev. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://avidreaders.ru/book/vospominaniya9.html>
5. Ystoryia Rossyy. XX vek. Tom 1. 1894-1939 / Pod redaktsyi A. B. Zubova. – M., 2010. – 1023 s.
6. Voinovych V. Antysovetskyi Sovetskyi Soiuz. [Elektronnyi resurs] / V. Voinovych. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=11799>
7. Solonevych Y. Rossyia v kontslahere. [Elektronnyi resurs] / Y. Solonevych. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=53651>
8. Maistrenko I. Istoriia moho pokolinnia / I. Maistrenko. – Edmonton, 1985. – 416 s.
9. Hoichenko D. Krasnyi apokalypsys: skvoz raskulachyvanye y holodomor / D. Hoichenko. – K., 2013. – 400 s.
10. Kravchenko V. Ya yzbral svobodu. [Elektronnyi resurs] / V. Kravchenko. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://avidreaders.ru/book/ya-izbral-svobodu.html>
11. Mandelshtam N. Vospomynania / N. Mandelshtam. – M., 1989. – 479 s.
12. Holytsyn S. Zapysky utselevsheho. [Elektronnyi resurs] / S. Holytsyn. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=101547>
13. Yvanov-Razumnyk R. Tiurmy y ssylky. [Elektronnyi resurs] / R. Yvanov-Razumnyk. – Rezhym dostupu: [https://royallib.com/book/ivanovrazumnik\\_r/tyurmi\\_i\\_ssilki.html](https://royallib.com/book/ivanovrazumnik_r/tyurmi_i_ssilki.html)
14. Vidnosyny derzhavy, suspilstva i osoby pid chas stvorennia radianskoho ladu v Ukraini (1917-1938) / Vidpovidalnyi red. V. Smolii. – K., 2013. – T.2. – 812 s.
15. Rybakov A. Roman-vospomynanye / A. Rybakov. – M., 2005. – 378 s.
16. Landau-Drobantseva K. Akademyk Landau: kak my zhyly. [Elektronnyi resurs] / K. Landau-Drobantseva. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://coollib.net/b/78078>
17. Nikitenko K. Na kulturnomu fronti bez zmin / K. Nikitenko // Dzerkalo tyzhnia. – 2015. – №30.
18. Sosiura V. Tretia Rota / V. Sosiura. – K., 2010. – 352 s.
19. Khrushchev N. Vospomynania. – Kn.1. [Elektronnyi resurs] / N. Khrushchev. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/khrushchev1/index.html>
20. Bolshevyk. – 1937. – №7.
21. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Luhanskoi oblasti. – F.24, op.1, spr. 178.
22. Kopelev L. Khranyt vechno [Elektronnyi resurs] / L. Kopelev. – Rezhym dostupu: [https://royallib.com/book/kopelev\\_lev/hranit\\_vechno.html](https://royallib.com/book/kopelev_lev/hranit_vechno.html)
23. Khlevniuk O. 1937-i: Stalyn, NKVD y sovetskoe obshchestvo. / O. Khlevniuk – M., 1992. – 270 s.
24. Komunist. – 20.01.1938.
25. Dovzhenko O. Shchodennyky. / O. Dovzhenko – Kharkiv, 2013. – 879 s.
26. Kostiuk H. Zustrichi i proshchannia. Knyha persha. / H. Kostiuk – Edmonton, 1987. – 743 s.
27. Hrabovskyi S. Khto navkolo mene? / S. Hrabovskyi // Den. – 12.09.2014.
28. Chyrkov Yu. A bylo vse tak... [Elektronnyi resurs] / Yu. Chyrkov. – Rezhym dostupu: [https://royallib.com/book/chirkov\\_yuriy/a\\_bilo\\_vse\\_tak.html](https://royallib.com/book/chirkov_yuriy/a_bilo_vse_tak.html)

29. Vyshnevskaja H. Halyna: Ystoryia zhyzny. / H. Vyshnevskaja – М., 1991. – 556 s.
30. Okunevskaja T. Tatianyn den. [Elektronnyi resurs] / T. Okunevskaja. – Rezhym dostupu: [https://royallib.com/book/okunevskaya\\_tatyana/tatianin\\_d\\_en.html](https://royallib.com/book/okunevskaya_tatyana/tatianin_d_en.html)
31. Bulhakova E., Liandres S. Vospomnaniya o Mykhayle Bulhakove. [Elektronnyi resurs] / E. Bulhakova, S. Liandres. – Rezhym dostupu: <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=583945>
32. Bulhakova E. Dnevnyk / E. Bulhakova – М., 1990. – 400 s.
33. Shelest P. Da ne sudymy budete. [Elektronnyi resurs] / P. Shelest. – Rezhym dostupu: [https://royallib.com/book/neizvestno/shelest\\_da\\_ne\\_sudim\\_i\\_budete.html](https://royallib.com/book/neizvestno/shelest_da_ne_sudim_i_budete.html)

### Л і т е р а т у р а

1. Енциклопедія історії України. – Т.9. – К., 2012. – 944 с.
2. Шаповал Ю. І. Україна 20-50 років: сторінки ненаписаної історії / Ю. І. Шаповал. – К., 1993. – 351 с.; Костюк Г. О. Сталінізм в Україні (генеза і наслідки): Дослідження і спостереження сучасника / Г. О. Костюк. – К., 1995. – 508 с.; Куромія Г. Свобода і терор у Донбасі / Г. Куромія – К., 2002. – 510 с.; Загородній І. Втрачені покоління / І. Загородній – Вінниця, 2012. – 848 с.; Довбня. О. А. Політичні репресії проти протестантських деномінацій у Радянській Україні (1920-1930-ті роки): історіографічний аспект [Електронний ресурс] / О. А. Довбня // Сумський історико-архівний журнал. – 2018. – № XXX. – DOI: [doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2018.i30.p5](http://doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2018.i30.p5). – Режим доступу: <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/69692> та ін.
3. Гуль Р. Я унес Россию. – Т. 1. [Електронний ресурс] / Р. Гуль. – Режим доступу: <http://mirknig.su/kitni/history/230000-ya-unes-rossiyu-apologiya-emigracii-tom-i-rossiya-v-germanii.html>
4. Лихачев Д. Воспоминания. [Електронний ресурс] / Д. Лихачев. – Режим доступу: <https://avidreaders.ru/book/vospominaniya9.html>
5. История России. XX век. Том 1. 1894-1939 / Под редакцией А. Б. Зубова. – М., 2010. – 1023 с.
6. Войнович В. Антисоветский Советский Союз. [Електронний ресурс] / В. Войнович. – Режим доступу: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=11799>
7. Солоневич И. Россия в концлагере. [Електронний ресурс] / И. Солоневич. – Режим доступу: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=53651>
8. Майстренко І. Історія мого покоління / І. Майстренко. – Едмонтон, 1985. – 416 с.
9. Гойченко Д. Красный апокалипсис: сквозь раскулачивание и голодомор / Д. Гойченко. – К., 2013. – 400 с.
10. Кравченко В. Я избрал свободу. [Електронний ресурс] / В. Кравченко. – Режим доступу: <https://avidreaders.ru/book/ya-izbral-svobodu.html>
11. Мандельштам Н. Воспоминания / Н. Мандельштам. – М., 1989. – 479 с.
12. Голицын С. Записки уцелевшего. [Електронний ресурс] / С. Голицын. – Режим доступу: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=101547>
13. Иванов-Разумник Р. Тюрмы и ссылки. [Електронний ресурс] / Р. Иванов-Разумник. – Режим доступу: [https://royallib.com/book/ivanovrazumnik\\_r/tyurmi\\_i\\_ssilki.html](https://royallib.com/book/ivanovrazumnik_r/tyurmi_i_ssilki.html)
14. Відносини держави, суспільства і особи під час створення радянського ладу в Україні (1917-1938) / Відповідальний ред. В. Смолій. – К., 2013. – Т.2. – 812 с.
15. Рыбаков А. Роман-воспоминание / А. Рыбаков. – М., 2005. – 378 с.
16. Ландау-Дробанцева К. Академик Ландау: как мы жили. [Електронний ресурс] / К. Ландау-Дробанцева. – Режим доступу: <https://coollib.net/b/78078>
17. Нікітенко К. На культурному фронті без змін / К. Нікітенко // Дзеркало тижня. – 2015. – №30.
18. Сосюра В. Третья Рота / В. Сосюра. – К., 2010. – 352 с.
19. Хрущев Н. Воспоминания. – Кн.1. [Електронний ресурс] / Н. Хрущев. – Режим доступу: <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/khrushchev1/index.html>
20. Большевик. – 1937. – №7.
21. Державний архів Луганської області. – Ф.24, оп.1, спр. 178.
22. Копелев Л. Хранить вечно [Електронний ресурс] / Л. Копелев. – Режим доступу: [https://royallib.com/book/kopelev\\_lev/hranit\\_vechno.html](https://royallib.com/book/kopelev_lev/hranit_vechno.html)
23. Хлевнюк О. 1937-й: Сталин, НКВД и советское общество. / О. Хлевнюк – М., 1992. – 270 с.
24. Комуніст. – 20.01.1938.
25. Довженко О. Щоденники. / О. Довженко – Харків, 2013. – 879 с.
26. Костюк Г. Зустрічі і прощання. Книга перша. / Г. Костюк – Едмонтон, 1987. – 743 с.
27. Грабовський С. Хто навколо мене? / С. Грабовський // День. – 12.09. 2014.
28. Чирков Ю. А было все так... [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Чирков. – Режим доступу: [https://royallib.com/book/chirkov\\_yuriy/a\\_bilo\\_vse\\_tak.html](https://royallib.com/book/chirkov_yuriy/a_bilo_vse_tak.html)
29. Вишневская Г. Галина: История жизни. / Г. Вишневская – М., 1991. – 556 с.
30. Окуневская Т. Татьяна день. [Електронний ресурс] / Т. Окуневская. – Режим доступу: [https://royallib.com/book/okunevskaya\\_tatyana/tatianin\\_d\\_en.html](https://royallib.com/book/okunevskaya_tatyana/tatianin_d_en.html)
31. Булгакова Е., Ляндрес С. Воспоминания о Михаиле Булгакове. [Електронний ресурс] / Е. Булгакова, С. Ляндрес. – Режим доступу: <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=583945>
32. Булгакова Е. Дневник / Е. Булгакова – М., 1990. – 400 с.
33. Шелест П. Да не судимы будете. [Електронний ресурс] / П. Шелест. – Режим доступу: [https://royallib.com/book/neizvestno/shelest\\_da\\_ne\\_sudim\\_i\\_budete.html](https://royallib.com/book/neizvestno/shelest_da_ne_sudim_i_budete.html)

### Сергієнко С. Ю. Вплив політичних репресій 30-х рр. XX ст. в Україні на особисті відносини в середовищі державних службовців та інтелігенції.

*На основі літератури, матеріалів засобів масової інформації та архівних джерел висвітлений вплив політичних репресій 30-х рр. XX століття на особисті відносини в колі державних службовців та інтелігенції України. Відзначено, що влада цілеспрямовано, за допомогою політичних репресій та підступних дій спотворювала особисті відносини між людьми з метою не допустити їхнього єднання для опору існуючому режиму. Результатом стало викривлення особистих відносин людей, зниження взаємної довіри, щирості, зростання підступності і лицемірства. Автор підкреслює, що тиску з метою спотворення зазнали навіть такі фундаментальні для всього людства відносини, як сімейні. Визначена проблема для подальшого дослідження.*

**Ключові слова:** політичні репресії, особисті відносини, державні службовці, інтелігенція.



**Сергиенко С.Ю. Влияние политических репрессий 30-х гг. XX в. в Украине на личные отношения в среде государственных служащих и интеллигенции.**

*На основе литературы, материалов средств массовой информации и архивных источников освещено влияние политических репрессий 30-х гг. XX века на личные отношения в кругу государственных служащих и интеллигенции Украины. Отмечено, что власть целенаправленно, с помощью политических репрессий и коварных действий искажала личные отношения между людьми с целью не допустить их объединения для сопротивления существующему режиму. Результатом стало искривление личных отношений людей, снижение взаимного доверия, искренности, рост коварства и лицемерия. Автор подчеркивает, что давлению с целью искажения подверглись даже такие фундаментальные для всего человечества отноше-*

*ния, как семейные. Определена проблема для дальнейшего исследования.*

***Ключевые слова:** политические репрессии, личные отношения, государственные служащие, интеллигенция.*

**Сергієнко С. Ю.** – к.і.н., доц., доцент кафедри історії та археології Східноукраїнського національного університету ім. В.Даля, e-mail: [sergsergienko@ukr.net](mailto:sergsergienko@ukr.net)

Стаття подана 23.05.2019.