

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.8.1.18>

RODZINA VS PAŃSTWO: DONOSY W SYSTEMIE WARTOŚCI SPOŁECZEŃSTWA RADZIECKIEGO W LATACH 30.

Oksana Lavri-Honcharova

aspirantka Wydziału Historii i Filozofii

Odeskiego Narodowego Uniwersytetu imienia I.I. Miecznikowa (Odessa, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8412-3769

e-mail: lavrioksana@gmail.com

Adnotacja. Życiu społecznemu w ZSRR w latach 30. towarzyszyły ciągle innowacje i eksperymenty, które władze radzieckie realizowały w ramach polityki budowania „nowego społeczeństwa”. Wymuszona industrializacja, realizacja planów pięcioletnich, ciągła kolektywizacja i głód w latach 1932-1933 jako jej rezultat doprowadziły do zaostrzenia hysterii, zwiększenia strachu, zniekształcenia odpowiedniego postrzegania rzeczywistości.

Pomogło to Partii Komunistycznej mocno utrzymać władzę, równoległe przeprowadzając faliste czystki. Donosy w tym nowym systemie wartości uznano za dobry czyn, obowiązek każdego świadomego obywatela wobec państwa.

Badając szereg badań z zakresu psychologii i etyki autorka dokonała analizy tego, w jaki sposób w masach propagowano donoszenie o zastępowaniu ideałów i w jaki sposób władza niszczyła więzi rodzinne i tworzyła nowe społeczeństwo.

Artykuł kładzie nacisk na rolę donosów w społeczeństwie i rodzinie. Prawdomówność, sumienie i sprzeciw w ZSRR traktowano jako coś nieprawdziwego, niepodobnego.

Słowa kluczowe: donos, sumienie, seksoty, ZSRR, świadomość, donosiciel, WCzK, Departament specjalny, Pawlik Morozow, GPU, interesowny donos, bezinteresowny donos, KC KPZR (b), NKWD.

FAMILY VS STATE: DENUNCIATIONS IN THE VALUE SYSTEM OF SOVIET SOCIETY OF THE 1930S

Oksana Lavri-Honcharova

Postgraduate Student at the Faculty of History and Philosophy

Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University (Odesa, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8412-3769

e-mail: lavrioksana@gmail.com

Abstract. Public life in the USSR during the 1930s was accompanied by constant innovations and experiments, which the Soviet government implemented as part of a policy to build a «new society.» Forced industrialization, five-year plans implementation, collectivization, and the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a result, led to hysteria, fear, adequate perception of reality distortion.

It helped the Communist Party hold on to power by carrying out wavelike purges. Denunciations in this new system of values were considered a conscientious act, the duty of every conscious citizen to the state.

Studying several research in psychology and ethics, the author analyzed how the masses propagated advocacy for the replacement of ideals and how the government destroyed family ties and formed a new society.

The article emphasizes the role of denunciations in society and in the family. Truthfulness, conscience, and dissent in the USSR were seen as something wrong, unnatural.

Key words: denunciation, conscience, secret cooperation, USSR, consciousness, informer, Extraordinary commission, Special Department, Pavlik Morozov, DPU, selfish denunciation, selfless denunciation, Central Committee of the CPSU (b), NKVD.

СІМ'Я VS ДЕРЖАВА: ДОНОСИ В СИСТЕМІ ЦІННОСТЕЙ РАДЯНСЬКОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА 1930-Х РОКІВ

Оксана Лаврі-Гончарова

аспірантка факультету історії і філософії

Одеського національного університету імені І.І. Мечникова (Одеса, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8412-3769

e-mail: lavrioksana@gmail.com

Анотація. Суспільне життя у СРСР упродовж 1930-х років супроводжувалося постійними новаціями та експериментами, які радянська влада реалізовувала в рамках політики побудови «нового суспільства». Форсована індустріалізація, виконання п'ятирічних планів, суцільна колективізація і Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. як їх результат призводили до нагнітання істерії, посилення страху, викривлення адекватного сприйняття реальності.

Це допомагало комуністичній партії міцно утримувати владу, паралельно здійснюючи хвилеподібні чистки. Доноси у цій новій системі цінностей вважалися сумлінним учинком, обов'язком кожного свідомого громадянина перед державою.

Вивчаючи низку досліджень із психології та етики, авторка зробила аналіз того, як у масах пропагувалося виказування за заміну ідеалів та як влада руйнувала сімейні зв'язки та формувала нове суспільство.

У статті робиться наголос на ролі доносів у суспільстві та сім'ї. Правдивість, сумління та інакомислення в СРСР розглядалися як щось невірне, неприродне.

Ключові слова: донос, совість, сексоти, СРСР, свідомість, донощик, ВЧК, Спецвідділ, Павлик Морозов, ДПУ, корисливий донос, безкорисливий донос, ЦК ВКП(б), НКВС.

Conscience is a feeling of moral goodness or reproach in one's own behavior or intentions. It would seem that minor concessions will not hurt, but in reality, they threaten to change ideas and motives, which will eventually lead to a change of personality. By making us feel physical suffering, the conscience saves the individual from collapse.

However, honesty and the ability to subordinate biological motives to social ones are not enough for a person to be considered full-fledged. Psychologists and philosophers have studied what is conscience and how it manifests itself in humans. Psychologist D. Leontiev believed that it is finally formed in adolescence when people are not only subject to social and moral motives but also aware of their own motives and build their own hierarchy.

According to the Soviet politician L. Shapiro, in the totalitarian regime, ideology: legitimizes the system, mobilizes the masses to fulfill the tasks set by the ruling elite, and also performs the function of «moral anesthesia» (Shapiro, 1972: 144).

According to the H. Vélez research, (Vélez, 2009: 121) human actions entail free decisions about goals and means. These actions have an ethical dimension, as they relate to the possibility of making the right choice based on an analysis of the nature of actions, intentions, and circumstances. For example, the physician, when making decisions, applies his knowledge of science to the specific goal to which the action seeks. Important dimension of professional work is growing in the exercise of virtues. Prudence stands out as the key to correct judgment among these virtues.

The author believes that with our individual conscience we are aware of deeply adhered to moral principles. It encourages us to act according to principles. Thanks to them, we evaluate our character, our behavior, and, ultimately, our «Ego». Different philosophical and religious approaches and common sense, in turn, emphasize aspects of this broad characteristic.

In any of these cases, conscience is determined by its inner and subjective nature. Thus, it embodies knowledge of values, awareness of the moral principles by which we are guided, or self-esteem, or the motivation for action that occurs within us (as opposed to external impositions). This inner and subjective nature of conscience is also depicted in the etymological relationship between the concepts of «conscience» and «consciousness» (Boobbyer, 2016).

When we talk about conscience, we often mean thinking about ourselves as moral people and about our moral behavior. Through it, we test ourselves as if we are our own internal judge. The image of a person, often divided into two persons, one acting and the other observing the behavior of the former; this points to the original concept of «conscience» in the Greek world, at least from the V century BC. (Sorabji, 2014: 12). But such self-knowledge can also be considered as shared with other people within us, such as God (gods) or other imaginary witnesses, for example, an enthusiastic philosopher, according to Epicurus (Sorabji, 2014: 24), or an impartial viewer, according to A Smith (Smith, 1976). Thus God (gods) or his substitutes (for example, an authoritarian leader in a totalitarian state) can be a god (gods) of a certain religion or a postulate of a practical reason, such reflections can be found in the works of E. Kant (Kant, 1991). In his research, he emphasizes «practical» reason, in which the idea of a higher authority shapes the case of moral behavior that motivates people to action.

According to the research by H. Arendt (Arendt, 1971: 417-446), the characteristics of conscience acts as self-esteem. It is associated with negative feelings such as shame, guilt, fear, remorse. Although these feelings are typical of the Christian understanding of conscience, they should not be tied to religious views: for most of us, even in common parlance, conscience is what most often evokes negative feelings, for example, we often speak of «bites of conscience» which causes us remorse. This word, in turn, comes from the Latin «remordere», ie «bite again». However, you can feel a joyful conscience, which praises and is proud of their own moral merits. Examples of a happy conscience can be found in Cicero and some Latin Stoics (Sorabji, 2014: 25-30).

In the Soviet Union, two systems of conscience were used: one that caused remorse (conscience as to whether to properly denounce others), and the other as a good conscience (secret cooperation, denunciation, or team up to the authorities). One Soviet figure once emphasized that the Soviet people followed Stalin's policy «not out of fear but out of conscience» (Peck, 1983: 107). It is easy to assume that the Soviet intelligentsia has always used a model of life in which a cruel and oppressive state constantly tried to undermine their freedom and autonomy. A study of Stepan Pidlubny's diary highlighted the way in which Soviet citizens in the 1930s tried to shape their identity from the point of view of the Soviet state (Hellbeck, 1996: 77-116).

The Soviet system itself was often a frame of reference with which people measured themselves. It is quite probable that some intellectuals, both during and after Stalin's rule, instinctively considered the position of the Soviet state to be normal, and their own attempts to express their opinion to be something abnormal. It was much easier to use slogans during conversations and constantly look for traitors.

There are other factors that complicate the situation. For example, to artificially separate relations with the state on a moral level from relations with friends or relatives. Most Soviet residents believed that the state inflicted less

moral pain on them than other environmental issues. However, what made people become informers? First of all, the threat of not reporting when others have already done it. The second was a desire to move up the career ladder. However, let's understand from the beginning what denunciation is and what is the essence of this terminology.

Denunciation is the information that is reported by an individual to the authorities. It can be in both written and oral forms. Millions of people believe that denunciation is the right way. Society believed that it was better to live under a rigid and all-controlling government than under «anarchy and arbitrariness.» There was a belief among the people that denunciation strengthens their strong power. According to journalist V. Zilgalov, in Stalin's time, denunciation became a form of participation in political life. It was the tool for influencing political reality (Borodina, 1980: 16-23).

Denunciation itself is a multifaceted phenomenon. It combines different boundaries of individual and social relations. From the information point of view, everything is simple — the main thing was to pass information about an individual or group of people they were trying to hide. From a psychological point of view, a person must be ready to become a whistleblower. It was necessary to be constantly «stimulated» by ideology and collective actions. It's like creating a concept of ideas about one's country: it's like a «fortress» besieged by enemies, which needs to be protected by all available means, not counting family ties. This thesis leads to the next border — family. The informer must be prepared for the fact that relatives may suffer; he/she must draw up a «correct» hierarchy of values that will justify the actions. It is necessary to put the interests of the whole (country) above the part (personality, friends, family) (Nekhamkyn, 2014).

With the advent of Soviet power in the political arena, denunciations were actively promoted. People who knew several foreign languages and had good public speaking skills were sent to establish contacts with representatives «on the ground.» To fully control the political situation in the country, the government created a special body «All-Russian Emergency Commission» (VCHK), which issued a circular stating:

1) Every communist must listen to the conversations that go around him/her, and report about the suspect to the Special Department;

2) At the place of their service, each communist must observe suspicious persons, and inform the Special Department;

3) Every communist must provide the Special Department with evidence of the general mood of the institution or part of the troops where he/she serves;

4) None of the communists has the right to refuse to testify about a person;

5) He/she cannot refuse the order to get acquainted with this or that person on the instructions of the Special Department, to go to the specified house and to inform them about what was said there (Brandenburhskyy, 1926: 1-37).

Denunciation among children.

A striking example, which received a lot of attention in the press (especially children's) was the statement of Pavlik Morozov. This case was characterized by the fact that the boy denounced his father, betrayed him for the sake of Soviet «justice». According to the general concept, Pavlik reported that his father was an enemy of the Soviet government. This act was later set as an example for children, saying that the family should not interfere with the prosperity of the country. Nine-year-olds were raised on the example of a «snitching hero.» Pioneers should always be ready to speak to the authorities. They denounced mostly their parents with the idea that «no class enemy had any chance.» («Rozhdennyye v SSSR ...», 2016) Everyone was to be a pioneer. The abandonment of the red tie led to exile in society, careful control by the authorities, and lack of a future career. Authorities stressed that slander and betrayal of their loved ones could be a guarantee of personal safety. This testified to the government's desire to educate a new generation of Soviet society that could abandon its past for the sake of «building a bright future.» (Pavlov, 2002: 19)

Soviet leaders liked to repeat that there is no way back in history, that is, the development of society cannot be reversed. However, in reality, the «leader» still succeeded. The damage to morality was so profound that even after Stalin's death the result was obvious. The writer V. Gubarev boasted in the quoted memoirs: «In thirty years we have weeded out a lot of couch grass.» The following statesmen used the same methods. The question remained acute: to denunciate or not to denunciate? Any kind of denunciation was immoral in the family. Although it was contrary to the interests of society as a whole and serves the interests of the family. And without a family, there is no society.

Authorities needed constant political denunciation. Everything was calm until you start recruiting. Having identified the «victim,» they called home, offered to meet, called to a special department. It all started with blackmail, threatening families, allegedly preventing the son/daughter from entering the institute. In this way, they shook the peace in the family, the future career. Then they promised a better position, the opportunity to read spectacular books. They were asking nonsense questions about the statements of a neighbor. It was better, of course, to be silent, but then they would call until you tell the «truth.» If you say, «I'm sorry, but unfortunately, I didn't hear anything...» they will not believe and will call again and again because you are nobody to them, you are «material,» according to the words of V. Lenin. «They positioned themselves as real Leninists, they were the state, they were the party, they were the law and you couldn't escape anywhere.» («Solovky ...», 1998)

Who is to blame for what happened to P. Morozov? Pavlik himself? His ancestors? Family? School? System? Historical conditions? All? No one? First of all, we must understand that Pavlik is the least guilty because he is a child. Personality begins with a choice, and he and the other children of the 1930s had no choice. In addition, he cannot be held responsible for what happened on his behalf after his death. Criminals are those who were engaged

in recruitment, the principles of raising children in order to stay in power. Unfortunately, Pavlik became a symbol of Soviet sociocide, an ideologically justified terror organized by one party.

The idea of involving children in denunciations under Stalinism received widespread state support. The education of denunciation has become an important area of ideological activity. The report was presented as a new quality of the Soviet people: as openness and honesty, as criticism that led to the improvement of life, as a necessary means to achieve a high goal, in which many informers sincerely believed.

Pavlik Morozov became a symbol of heroism. «Pionerska Pravda» wrote, «Pavlik does not feel sorry for anyone: his father got caught — Pavlik betrayed him, his grandfather got caught — Pavlik betrayed him. Pavlik was educated by a pioneer organization.» In the newspaper «Yunnyy pioneer» in the article «Trotsky's scoundrel brutally killed a pioneer» («Trots'kist-s'kyi merzotnyk...», 1937: 1) it was stated that the stepfather killed a 12-year-old boy because he [the stepfather] was a «Trotskyist.» The article mentions the brutal murder of a child in detail. The editors did it on purpose, to arouse hatred in readers, and to awaken in children the desire to be a hero, even posthumously.

After the promotion of Pavlyk's symbol, many imitators appeared in the USSR. A boy, Mykola Myagotin, was shot dead in the village of Kolesnikove. According to the information, when he became a pioneer, he listened to the conversations of adults. He reported everything he could hear to the village council. A friend of the boy «reported» about the «class enemies.» The case was heard in court twice. During the trial, it turned out that Mykola had exposed no one. On the contrary, he had stolen sunflower seeds from a collective farm field (to eat something). During another session, there appeared another version. They said he was exposed by a Red Army guard guarding the field. As a result of the argument, the guard shot the boy, Mykola fell, and his friend (Petro) escaped. We can find these testimonies in the first record of the interrogation. But, surprisingly, in the transcript of the second interrogation, Petro suddenly changed the testimony that Mykola was killed by two of his older brothers. Thus, two innocent people (brothers) were added to the list of boys' murders. To make the case political, investigators added a few more people «kulaks» to the list. As a result, in the case of Mykola Myagotin's murder, five were sentenced to execution, six to ten years in prison, and one to one year of forced labor. A week later, Mykola's friend disappeared without a trace, his mother killed herself, and Mykola was declared a pioneer and a hero (Voytolovska, 1991: 34-46).

Another case also appeared during the Holodomor (1932-1933). It was Pronya Kolybin, who denounced his mother because she was gathering ears and grain in the field to feed him. The mother was imprisoned, and the child was sent to the pioneer camp «Artek» to rest.

The next case is concerned with a schoolboy Mitya Gordienko. He denounced a married couple who were gathering fallen grains in a field. As a result, the husband was sentenced to death and the wife to ten years in prison in solitary confinement. For this denunciation, Mitya received a personal watch, a pioneer suit, boots, and an annual subscription to the newspaper «Lenins'ki vnuchata.» As you can see, Pavlik was not the only «pioneer hero.» There were more than thirty such informers who «died the death of the brave child.» Historian Yu. Druzhnikov gave examples of eight more cases of murder of children due to statements that took place before the murder of P. Morozov. The first to be killed was also Pavlo, named Tesla, from the village Sorochyntsi. He denounced his father five years earlier, before P. Morozov. Seven other murders were linked to collectivization in the village and one to «enemies of the people» in Donetsk.

Denunciations among the adults.

Expressions also flourished in relations among labor collectives. Those who were going to settle in the cities and gain a foothold in the enterprises tried in every way to shine as active supporters of the manner of Stalin's policy. They first pointed at fellow villagers, and then at comrades in the shop. Such «activists» often became secret members of the DPU. Such people were often called «parasites,» «scoundrels» («Ukrayinske radyanske ...», 2012: 105-106).

In the V. Kozlov research, you can find a classification of denunciations based on archival documents (Kozlov, 1998: 101). According to the article, depending on the author and the motives for writing, denunciations can be divided into «selfless denunciation» and «selfish denunciation.»

«Selfless denunciations» were written without visible personal motives, which were covered by the desire for justice, to identify «enemies of the people and of the party.» Such denunciations can be found in the newspapers. They were usually written by people who sincerely believed in the justice of the party. Career goals can also be included in this category. In the decision of the plenum on January 20, 1938, it is mentioned that one should also be vigilant towards «career communists» and thus justify the mass repression without prosecution (Bordyugov, 1992).

Denunciations usually were called «references,» «reports,» «friendly notes.» Denunciation can be considered a synonym of the report. Informers usually used such phrases as, «I consider it necessary to inform you in the following...» (Kozlov, 1998: 102) «Selfless denunciations» were often anonymous, or signed with pseudonyms «yours,» «partisan,» «Red Army soldier,» «member of the party.» (Kozlov, 1998: 103).

«Selfish denunciations» were written to protect the personal interests of the author. Such statements were directed against superiors, colleagues, neighbors. They could also be used as means of self-defense. It has become customary to «tear off masks» from «enemies,» even if they were relatives. A. Solzhenitsyn wrote that denunciation was used even in a struggle between lovers; a husband killed an unwanted lover, a wife killed a mistress, or a mistress killed a wife (Solzhenitsyn, 1962). According to one of the archival-investigative cases, O. Popandopulo suggested in a letter that V. Sazanov's roommate could have written a denunciation about her. «She wrote all sorts of nonsense about me to the District Council and the City Council, such as the fact that I am a foreigner, a non-labor element, etc. But this is a lie.» (Popandopulo, 1937: 18)

The motive for the «selfish denunciation» could be the desire to secretly take revenge on the offender, and most often it was the subject of superiors. «Complaints-denunciations» were often written in the party. The authors were already clearly pursuing personal goals, fighting injustice to them personally. For example, the apartment was robbed by someone and the owner could write that the whole area was affected by criminal attacks, and the authorities ignore people's complaints (Kozlov, 1998: 105). Or in a report to the Chairman of RBC A. Nelupenko, the informer wrote that the case of haymaking in the district is under threat, that the village councils are implementing the proven plans; that they have a criminal attitude to the deployment of hard targets for kulak wealthy farms (Brynosh & Petrovskyy, 2006: 32-33).

Not only ordinary citizens reported because the authorities trained listening professionals who could hear, interpret and report correctly. These were special secret agents (mentioned above in the secret cooperation) who could be friends, acquaintances, classmates at university, relatives, husbands, wives, etc. They were trained to report to the authorities. These secret agents were called «secret cooperators.» According to S. Bilokin, after a frontal review of archival and investigative cases, in the USSR secret cooperation was as common as being a teacher, journalist, etc. (Bilokin, 2012: 44). According to N. Lakinskaya, who described her student years at the Machnikov University (1934-1939), anyone could be a secret agent. She mentioned that her classmate Ida was a secret reporter. She denounced many of the students, and after they were under the supervision of the NKVD (Lakynska, 2007: 131-133).

Secret agents were also subjected to purges. K. Borodchak wrote in the interrogation report on August 11, 1937, that she was a secret member of the NKVD and had provided false reports. According to E. Petrovskyy, because of a manic vision of enemies around and constant complaints about this, the authorities placed a citizen S. Irzhova in a psychiatric hospital for ten days (Petrovskyy, 2005: 835).

There were also just enthusiasts who considered it their duty to convey. In his closing remarks at the February-March (1937) plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B.), Stalin mentioned the example of a woman Nikolaenko, who throughout the year signaled how «vile Trotskyists,» «agents of fascism,» could gain the Central Committee's trust. (Shapoval, 2001: 203-206). M. Khrushchev also mentioned this person in his diary, «When I left Moscow for Ukraine, Stalin warned me that there was such a woman called Nikolayenko and that I should pay attention to her. They said she could help me in the fight against enemies of the people.» («Nekotoryye posledstviya ... », 1999).

We must not forget that those who did not want to report were also punished. In the operative order of the NKVD № 00486... of August 15, 1937 (on the repression of the wives of «traitors to the homeland»), there were mentioned that those wives who sheltered the convicts were also arrested; those who could know about their counter-revolutionary activities and did not report. The Penal Code provided for imprisonment for 10 years for failure to report a betrayal of the Motherland («Reabilitovani istoriyeyu ...», 2010: 414-415).

The ideological basis was supported by the periodical press. Even before Pavlik Morozov's death, the official publication of the Children's Communist Movement reported that there had been cases of murder for the statements of «the best comrades-in-arms who are fiercely fighting against left-wing detachments and right-wing conciliators.» The newspaper «Pionerska Pravda» had been publishing articles about little reporters with their names and portraits. Children, in turn, imbued with the idea and denounced their teachers, friends, parents.

The regional newspaper «Chornomorska Komuna» promoted the informer as a true Soviet citizen who took an active position and did not reduce his vigilance for «traitors.» The newspaper also promotes the struggle «for the bright future of the country» and announces the struggle against the Trotskyists-Zinovievs. On the first page, there were articles about revolutionary vigilance and the rise of the power of the party, «... We must resolutely eradicate complacency that brings the party only harm. All party work must be saturated with true Bolshevik vigilance, effective detailed criticism, and deep mastery of the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin.» («Rozchavyty hadiv ...», 1937: 4)

In the «Letters to the Editors» section, readers had the opportunity to publish their complaints or dissatisfaction with someone's work. All segments of the population and institutions came under surveillance. The names of those who «do not do the job to the end» were openly written, as well as the names of institutions in which «sanitary norms are not observed.» In June 1937, there was a new column called «Idle heads of state farms.» The editors had been publishing names of the head of the state farm and publicly humiliated him.

American Family Foundation in 1986 offered a great definition of the cult. They said, «A cult (totalitarian type) is a course where a group or movement has an extreme degree of devotion to a person who unethically uses manipulative techniques of subjugation and control.

The characteristic of totalitarian cult includes isolation from former friends and family, degradation, special methods aimed at increasing suggestibility and subordination, strong group pressure, information management, elimination of personal or critical judgment, the desire to develop complete dependence on the group and fear of leaving it, etc.» (Stuart, 1986: 16)

The «game of exposure» was imbued with family relationships and relationships among close friends. Some researchers like to call this period an «epidemic» or even a «genocide» against others. To show the scale of this phenomenon, «informers of the denunciation movement» we should also mention that these secret agents spread their cases in the press. Thus, according to one of the fabricated cases, a resident of Kyiv allegedly reported to two hundred and thirty people (there are not so many acquaintances, except for friends on social networks). Another popular example of pseudo- «strikers» was spread in Poltava. The press wrote that the man «exposed» the entire

«terrorist organization» in which he worked. Another example is about the Artemov family, which turned denunciations into a family business. A husband and wife, two sons, and three daughters wrote denunciations on one hundred and seventy-two people.

Thus, the state policy of that time can be described, citing as an example a quote from Solonevych, «No, the state is not me, nor a man, nor a worker. The state, for us, is a completely external force that has forcibly placed us in the service of goals completely alien to us.» (Solonevych, 2000: 20) However, people did not want to accept the principles that were established in society, they tried to adapt to that political reality. Thus, speech became the norm of the mentality, and those who disagreed with it, or were too fanatical about the case, became victims and «enemies of the people.» Most well-educated people in the Soviet Union faced a dilemma of how to overcome the disparity between what the Soviet regime asserted about itself and the reality of how it was actually experienced.

Towards the end of its existence, the Soviet regime no longer existed, but the administrative apparatus demanded that people believe in the official ideology.

People were publicly required to express themselves in «correct» ideological terms. They were forced to participate in a number of rituals or procedures: for example, entering and graduating from university usually meant belonging to the Komsomol, or passing an exam in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, meant a career opportunity (Boobbyer, 2016).

Not using the right nor participating in rituals meant a person does not accept the «rules of the game.» This decision could lead to a career risk and, in some cases, family prospects. Language (slogans) and ritual performed an integrative function: they gave the Soviet Union a common identity around which society could unite.

The obsessive desire to listen, observe, and control one's own people was a hallmark of Soviet power from its very first steps. For this purpose, special structures were created, the tool of which was a man. The information obtained was used in various ways: to control the administrative apparatus, to deduct the opposition, to probe the mood of the population, and for political repression.

It was not a specific case. P. Morozov was one of the few examples that reflected the situation of the 1930s in the USSR. To this day, there are speculations about whether Pavlik existed at all, or whether he was symbolically invented for propaganda, as well as «enemies of the people.» Denunciation has become an everyday social practice in all spheres of life. Education on the example of the act of P. Morozov was an essential part in the formation of the future obedient Soviet man. The cynicism of the next generation became widespread. The party nurtured honesty by the example of meanness, devotion by the example of betrayal. However, over time, it became increasingly difficult to explain to children why it is necessary to do low deeds for the sake of high ideals.

Bibliography:

1. Arendt H. Thinking and moral considerations. *Social Research*, issue 38(3). 1971. P. 417–446.
2. Boobbyer P. Truth-telling, Conscience and Dissent in Late Soviet Russia: Evidence from Oral Histories. *European History Quarterly Copyright*. SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 30(4). 2000. P. 553–585.
3. Hellbeck J. Fashioning the Stalinist Soul: The Diary of Stepan Podlubnyi, in Fitzpatrick, Stalinism. *New Directions*, 1996. P. 77-116.
4. Kant I. The Metaphysic of Morals. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*. 2018. P. 277. DOI: 10.1017/9781316091388 (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
5. Peck S. People of the Lie. London. 1983. P. 107.
6. Shapiro L. Totalitarianism. *New York: Praeger*. 1972. P. 144.
7. Smith A. The Theory of Moral Sentiments, D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie (eds.). *Oxford: Oxford University Press*. 1976. 412.
8. Stuart A. Wright and Elizabeth S. Piper. Families and Cults: Familial Factors Related to Youth Leaving or Remaining in Deviant Religious Groups. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 48, No. 1. 1986, P. 15-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352224>. (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
9. Sorabji R. Moral Conscience Through the Ages. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*, 2014. P. 25-30.
10. Vélez Fr. J. Freedom of Conscience in Ethical Decision Making. *The Linacre Quarterly*, issue 76:2. 2009. P. 120-132. DOI: 10.1179/002436309803889232. (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
11. Білокін С. Секоти як елемент механізму державного управління в СРСР (1917–1941 рр.). *Україна ХХ ст.: культура, ідеологія, політика*. 2012. Вип. 17. С. 40–48.
12. Бордюгов Г.А., Козлов В.А. История и конъюнктура: Субъективные заметки об истории советского общества. Москва : Политиздат, 1992. 352 с.
13. Бородин Г.Я. Политическая культура семьи и воспитание молодого поколения. *Культура семьи как объект социологического исследования*. Свердловск : УНЦ АН СССР, 1980. С. 16–23.
14. Бранденбургский Я.Н. Брак и его правовые последствия. Москва : Юридическое издательство НКВД РСФСР, 1926. 37 с.
15. Бринош І.В., Петровський Е.П. Біль минулого: Нариси з історії репресій 1930-х років серед освітян Одеської області (Іванівський район) / ред. кол.: Л.В. Ковальчук та ін. Одеса : СМІЛ, 2006. 224 с.
16. Войтоловская А.Л. По следам судьбы моего поколения. Сыктывкар : Коми кн. изд-во, 1991. 334 с.
17. Державний архів Одеської області (ДАОО). Ф. Р-8065. Оп. 2. Спр. Спр. 2231-п [Попандопуло О.Дм.]. 1937. 46 арк.
18. Козлов В. Феномен доноса. *Свободная мысль*. 1998. № 4. С. 100–112.
19. Лакинская Н.М. Из студенческой жизни середины ХХ века. 1934–1939 гг.: Воспоминания. Одесса : Астропринт, 2007. 136 с.

20. Наказ НКВС СРСР № 00689 «Про зміни оперативного наказу СРСР № 00486 про порядок арешту дружин «зрадників батьківщини» від 17 жовтня 1938 року. *Реабілітовані історією. Одеська область* : Книга перша / упоряд. Л.В. Ковальчук, Е.П. Петровський. Одеса : АТ «ПЛАСКЕ», 2010. С. 424–426.
21. Нехамкин В.А. Донос как социально-психологический феномен (из отечественного опыта 1930-х годов). *Историческая психология и социология истории*. 2014. Т. 7. № 2. С. 63–79. URL: <https://www.socionauki.ru/journal/articles/254526/> (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
22. Павлов И. Потерянное поколение: Воспоминания узника тюрем Одессы и Киева, лагерей и ссылки на Кольме и в Магадане. Одесса : Астропринт, 2002. 314 с.
23. Петровський Е.П. Одеський обласний відділ народної освіти в період масових репресій 1930-х років: невідомі сторінки історії. *Одеський мартиролог: Дані про репресованих Одеси і Одеської області за роки радянської влади* / уклад.: Л.В. Ковальчук, Г.О. Разумов. Одеса : ОКФА, 2005. Т. 3. С. 827–842.
24. Рожденные в СССР. Последствия советского воспитания. *Sibnovosti*. 2013. 13 мая. URL: <https://krsk.sibnovosti.ru/society/235193-rozhdennyye-v-sssr-posledstviya-sovetskogo-vospitaniya> (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
25. Розчавити гадів. *Чорноморська комуна*. 1937. Січень 23. С. 4.
26. Солженицын А. Один день из жизни Ивана Денисовича. *Libre Book*. 1959. URL: https://librebook.me/odin_den_ivana_denisovicha/vol1/1 (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
27. Солоневич И.Л. Россия в концлагере / подг. текста М.Б. Смолина ; 2-е изд. Москва : Римис, 2000. 560 с.
28. Троцькістський мерзотник по-звірячому вбив піонера. *Юний піонер*. 1937. 3 березня. С. 1.
29. Українське радянське суспільство 30-х років ХХ ст.: нариси повсякденного життя : колективна монографія / відп. ред. С.В. Кульчицький. Київ : Інститут історії України НАН України, 2012. 786 с.
30. Хрущев Н.С. Некоторые последствия убийства Кирова. *Воспоминания*. Москва : Московские новости, 1999. URL: <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/khrushchev1/11.html> (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).
31. Шаповал Ю.І. Україна ХХ століття: Особи та події в контексті важкої історії ; Центр істор. політології Ін-ту політ. і етнонац. дослідж. НАН України, Переяслав-Хмельниць. держ. пед. ін-т ім. Г. Сковороди. Київ : Генеза, 2001. 557 с.
32. Энциклопедия. *Соловки* : вебсайт. URL: www.solovki.ca (дата звернення: 30.04.2021).

References:

1. Arendt, H. (1971), Thinking and moral considerations. *Social Research*, issue 38(3): pp. 417–446. [in English]
2. Bilokin', S. (2012) Seksoty yak element mekhanizmu derzhavnoho upravlinnya v SRSR (1917-1941). [Secret agent as an element of the mechanism of public administration in the USSR]. *Ukrayina KHKH st.: kul'tura, ideolohiya, polityka*. K., issue 17. pp. 40-48. [in Ukrainian]
3. Boobbyer, P. (2000). Truth-telling, Conscience and Dissent in Late Soviet Russia: Evidence from Oral Histories. *European History Quarterly Copyright*. SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 30(4). pp. 553–585. [in English]
4. Bordyugov, G.A. (1992). Istoriya i kon'yunktura: Sub'yektivnyye zametki ob istorii sovetskogo obshchestva. [History and conjuncture: Subjective notes on the history of Soviet society] М., *Politizdat*. 352. [in Russian]
5. Borodina, G. (1980). Politicheskaya kul'tura sem'i i vospitaniya molodogo pokoleniya. [Political culture of the family and the upbringing of the younger generation]. *Kul'tura sem'i kak ob'yekt sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya*. Sverdlovsk: UNTS AN SSSR. pp. 16-23. [in Russian]
6. Brandenburgskiy, Y.N. (1926). Brak i yego pravovyye posledstviya. [Marriage and its legal consequences]. *Yuridicheskoye izdatel'stvo NKVD RSFSR*. М. 37. [in Russian]
7. Brynosh, I.V., Petrovs'kyu E.P. (2006). Bil' mynuloho: Narysy z istoriyi represiy 1930-kh rokiv sered osvityan Odes'koyi oblasti (Ivanivs'kyu rayon). [Essays on the history of repression in the 1930s]. *Red. kol.: L. V. Koval'chuk. Odesa: SMYL*. 224. [in Ukrainian]
8. Derzhavnyy Arkhiv Odes'koyi Oblasti. (1937). [State Archive of Odesa Region]. F. R-8065. Op. 2. Spr.2231-p (Popandopulo O.Dm). 46. [in Ukrainian]
9. Hellbeck J. (1996). Fashioning the Stalinist Soul: The Diary of Stepan Podlubnyi, in Fitzpatrick, Stalinism. *New Directions*, pp. 77-116. [in English]
10. Rozhdennyye v SSSR. posledstviya sovetskogo vospitaniya. (2013). [Born in the USSR. the consequences of Soviet upbringing]. *Sibnovosti*. May 13. <https://krsk.sibnovosti.ru/society/235193-rozhdennyye-v-sssr-posledstviya-sovetskogo-vospitaniya> [in Russian]
11. Kant, I. (2018), The Metaphysic of Morals. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*. 277. DOI: 10.1017/9781316091388 [in English]
12. Khrushchev, N. (1991). Vospominaniya: Nekotoryye posledstviya ubiystva Kirova. [Memoirs: Some Consequences of Kirov's Murder]. *Voyennaya literatura. Memuaristika*. <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/khrushchev1/11.html> [in Russian]
13. Kozlov, V. (1998). Fenomen donosa.[Phenomenon of denunciation] *Svobodnaya mysl'*. issue 4 (april). pp. 100-112. [in Russian]
14. Lakinskaya, N.M. (2007). Iz studencheskoy zhizni serediny KHKH veka. 1934-1939 gg.: Vospominaniya. [From student life in the middle of the twentieth century. 1934-1939: Memories]. Odessa: Astroprint. 136. [in Russian]
15. Nakaz NKVS SRSR № 00689 «Pro zminy operatyvnoho nakazu SRSR № 00486 pro poryadok areshytu druzhyn "zradnykiv bat'kivshchyny"» vid 17 zhovtnya 1938 roku. (2010). Reabilitovani istoriyeyu. Odes'ka oblast': Knyha persha. [Order of the NKVD of the USSR № 00689 "On amendments to the operational order of the USSR № 00486 on the procedure for arresting wives and traitors of the Government" type 17 October 1938]. *Uporyadnyky L. V. Koval'chuk, E. P. Petrovs'kyu*. Odesa: АТ «ПЛАСКЕ», 2010. pp. 424-426. [in Ukrainian]

16. Nekhamkin, V.A. (2014) Donos kak sotsial'no-psikhologicheskii fenomen. [Denunciation as a socio-psychological phenomenon]. *Istoricheskaya psikhologiya i sotsiologiya istorii*. Issue 2, pp. 63–79. <https://bmstu.ru/ps/~nekhamkinva/fileman/download/Донос%20как%20соц.-психол.%20феномен%20%28статья%2C%202014%20год%29.pdf> [in Russian]
17. Pavlov, I. (2002). Poteryannoye pokoleniye: Vospominaniya uznika tyurem Odessa i Kiyeva, lagerey i ssylki na Kolyme i v Magadan. [The Lost Generation: Memories of a Prisoner in Odesa and Kiev Prisons, Camps and Exile in Kolyma and Magadan]. *Astroprint*. Odesa. 314. [in Russian]
18. Peck, S. (1983). People of the Lie. *London*. 107. [in English]
19. Petrovs'kyi, E.P. (2005). Odes'kyi oblasnyi viddil narodnoyi osvity v period masovykh represiy 1930-kh rokiv: nevidomi storinky istoriyi. Odes'kyi martyroloh: Dani pro represovanykh Odesy i Odes'koyi oblasti za roky radyans'koyi vlady. [Odesa regional department of public education during the mass repressions of the 1930s: non-specific histories of history]. *Uklad.: L. V. Kovalchuk, G. O. Razumov*. Odesa: OKFA, T. 3. pp. 827-842. [in Ukrainian]
20. Rozchavyty hadiv. (1937). [Crush reptiles]. *Chornomors'ka komuna*. January 23. 4. [in Ukrainian]
21. Shapiro, L. (1972). Totalitarianism. *New York: Praeger*. 144. [in English]
22. Shapoval, Y.I. (2001). Ukrayina KHKH stolittya: Osoby ta podiyi v konteksti vazhkoyi istoriyi. [Ukraine of the twentieth century: Persons and events in the context of difficult history]. *Tsentr istor. politolohiyi In-tu polit. i etnonats. doslidzh. NAN Ukrayiny, Pereyaslav-Khmel'nyts. derzh. in-t im. H. Skovorody*. K.: Heneza. 557. [in Ukrainian]
23. Smith, A. (1976). The Theory of Moral Sentiments, D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie (eds.). *Oxford: Oxford University Press*. 412. [in English]
24. Solonevich, I.L. (2000). Rossiya v kontslagere. [Russia in a concentration camp]. *Podg. teksta M. B. Smolina*. M.: Rimis. 560. [in Russian]
25. Solovki. (2012). Entsiklopediya [Solovki. Encyclopedia]. *Solovki*. www.solovki.ca [in Russian]
26. Solzhenitsyn, A. (1962). Odin den' iz zhizni Ivana Denisovicha [One day in the life of Ivan Denisovich]. *Libre Book*. https://librebook.me/odin_den_ivana_denisovicha/vol1/1 [in Russian]
27. Sorabji, R. (2014). Moral Conscience Through the Ages. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*, pp. 25-30. [in English]
28. Stuart, A. Wright and Elizabeth S. Piper (1986). Families and Cults: Familial Factors Related to Youth Leaving or Remaining in Deviant Religious Groups. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 48, No. 1 (Feb., 1986), pp. 15-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352224> [in English]
29. Trots'kist-s'kyi merzotnyk po-zviryachomu vbyv pionera. (1937). [The Trotskyite scoundrel brutally killed the pioneer]. *Yunyy pioner*. March 3.1. [in Ukrainian]
30. Ukrayins'ke radyans'ke suspil'stvo 30-kh rr. XX st.: narysy povsyakdennoho zhyttya. (2012). Kolektyvna monohrafiya. [Ukrainian soviet society 30s of the XX cent.: everyday life essays]. *Vidp. red. S. V. Kul'chys'kyi*. K., Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny. 786. [in Ukrainian]
31. Vélez, Fr. Juan (2009) Freedom of Conscience in Ethical Decision Making. *The Linacre Quarterly*, issue 76:2, pp. 120-132, DOI: 10.1179/002436309803889232. [in English]
32. Voytolovskaya, A.L. (1991). Po sledam sud'by moyego pokoleniya. [In the footsteps of the fate of my generation]. *Komi kn. Izd-vo*. Syktyvkar. 334. [in Russian]