

## INTRODUCING THE FORM OF ADDRESS «COMRADE» IN UKRAINIAN SOCIETY IN THE 20-30'S OF THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY, AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Serhiy Serhiienko

PhD in History, Associate Professor  
of the Department of History and Archeology,  
Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University, Severodonetsk  
E-mail: sergsergienko@ukr.net  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9761-0897>

*Based on the literature, periodicals, and archival documents, the process of introducing a new form of address of «Comrade» («Tovarysh») has been considered and the main reason for the ruling party to conduct this process has been indicated. It is emphasized that the new form of address had a significant impact on young people who lacked life experience. The consequences of introducing the form of address of «Comrade» in Ukrainian society are determined. By introducing the form of address of «Comrade» into usage, the Bolsheviks aimed to unite society under their banner. However, the very essence of such a form of address did not tolerate falsehood, and when it was used to address all people, they distorted the meaning of the word of «comrade», which could not but affect its role in the society. Once upon a time in the communication of the young revolutionaries, it was in its place, but in everyday life of the 1920s and 1930s, the form of address of «Comrade» was artificial, contrived and unnatural. Only people united by common interests, ideas, goals could be comrades. The Ukrainian society in the 20-30's did not generally meet those criteria. Therefore, that form of address did not become traditional in communication, although it was widely used under pressure from the authorities. However, the form of address of «Comrade» helped the Bolsheviks to unite a significant part of the youth, who, under certain circumstances, believed in the possibility of creating a just society without grievances and faults. In its turn, it contributed to strengthening the power structures and, in particular, the army. It must be said that the intellectual upper crust of the society understood that the form of address of «Comrade» appropriate in the circle of like-minded people was not suitable for interpersonal communication in everyday life.*

**Keywords:** comrade, relationship, the Bolsheviks, authorities, youth.

**Formulation of the research problem.** The basis of life of any human community is formed by relations between its members, which are rooted in certain traditions at different levels: parents-children, men-women, teachers-students, directors-subordinates, buyer-salesman, colleagues, friends, etc. Changes in historical context make significant adjustments to these traditions. Changes in conditions of social life were particularly noticeable as a result of upheavals of World War I, the revolution and the Bolsheviks' rise to power in Ukraine. Against the background of those changes, people's relations also changed. Along with the objective factors, there were also the subjective ones: the new government started decisive transformations not only in the political and social life, economy, but also in the spiritual life, which it sought to control totally. It is common knowledge that spiritual life determines the quality of relations between people in many aspects. If the church had been the spiritual authority before the turning point of the revolutionary events in Ukraine, then the ruling party began to push the church brutally aside persistently imposing their ideas as for spirituality.

Relations between people in Ukraine were greatly influenced by Russia, as it had been a part of the Russian Empire for centuries. However, they still differed from the Russian ones, which was due to a unique historical past, peculiarities of the national character and culture.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Nowadays, many research studies cover various issues of the 20-30's of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Among the works touching upon the issue of relations in the Ukrainian

society, the two-volume collective monograph «Relationship of the State, Society and Person during the Constructor of the Soviet System in Ukraine, 1917 – 1938» is noteworthy [Відносини].

Researchers still do not stop studying the little-known pages of the history of the 1920's – 1930's [Ryabchenko, 2019; Свистович, 2018], however the specified topic has not been covered in research literature yet.

**The purpose of research.** In this article, the author will attempt to show the process of introducing the form of address of «Comrade» in the interpersonal relations, and the results of this process within the Ukrainian statehood during the specified period.

**Presentation of the research basic material.** When the Bolsheviks came to power, they had no clear idea of how interpersonal relations would develop in the new society. The classics of Marxism thoroughly considered relations between classes, the economic foundations, the political system of the new state, but relations between individuals were at the periphery of their analysis. Obviously, it happened because it was thought that as soon as the collective ownership of the production means were introduced, antagonistic classes would disappear, and human relations would enter the perfect channel. The atmosphere of personal contacts is determined by the level of development of the society, but at the same time, it influences this development to some extent. Any communication begins with an address in a variety of forms. One form is used for business communication, the other one – for intimate, another – for family. However, in today's society, there is a universal form of address

that is dominant and most commonly used. It is «Frau», «Herr» in Germany; «Missis», «Mister», «Sir» in the USA; «Madam», «Monsieur» in France, etc.

As it is known, before the Bolsheviks' rise to power, such an address as «Pan», «Pani» were used in interpersonal relations in Ukraine. There were also other forms such as «Dear Sir», «My friend», etc., but they were used less frequently. Address in interpersonal communication does not only influence this communication, but it is a manifestation of the state of the society, its values, stratification. It is the democratic relations in the society that give rise to the generally accepted dominant form of address in interpersonal relations. There may be other forms, but they are usually not widely used. Compared to the medieval forms of address that had to correspond to the social situation of the person being addressed, introduction of modern forms of address (Pan, Pani, Missis, Mister, Sir, Madam, Monsieur, Frau, Herr, etc.) made relations between people more direct, simple, and at the same time protected from brutality or unnecessary familiarity. Such a form of address as «Pan» («Pani») means showing respect for a partner in communication even in modern society, generally eliminating any humiliation on the part of the addresser. However, in the Russian Empire, such an address as «Pan» («Gospodin») had mostly had signs of inequality in interpersonal communication for a long time. Besides, in the Empire, there was a clear gradation in address depending on the social situation. People generally adhered to that gradation, so the inequality of citizens in the society was constantly emphasized in such a way. There were many examples. But it was highlighted clearly by A. P. Chekhov in his short story «Fat and Thin», which convincingly shown how a change in social situation instantly changed the form of address. In this case, it is necessary to remind the plot. After many years of separation, two schoolmates met by chance. Both were glad to tears. They addressed each other on first-name terms. They recalled school years. However, it suddenly turned out that one of them had already reached the rank of General, and the other had a much lower rank. Equality in communication disappeared immediately. The inferior switched to «Your Excellency» at once. Such a plot reflected the realities of life, i.e., flagrant social inequality in people's communication.

Young revolutionaries were against such inequality. In contrast to the inequality of personal relations in society, they introduced a new form of address of «Comrade» and set the goal to achieve complete social equality in society. First of all, such equality was manifested in interpersonal relations.

During the revolutionary events of 1917 – 1921, the form of address of «Comrade» began to be introduced in Ukraine, which was interpreted as a person ideologically connected with other people taking part in a common cause, struggle together, who saw eye to eye with them, was an associate. It was used in intra-party communication by the Bolsheviks and other left-wing parties. For example, the same address had been used in the ranks of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) since its foundation (1920) until its termination in 1925 [Центральний державний архів громадських

об'єднань України, ф. 8, оп. 1, спр. 119, арк. 254]. Supporters of anarchism – Makhnovtsi – used the same address in their ranks. It was evidenced by the memories of N. I. Makhno himself, as well as of other well-known anarchists acting in Ukraine.

It could be considered that the first step to changing the interpersonal relations in the society was introducing the form of address of «Comrade». The young left-wing revolutionaries believed that they could build a society where all people would be socially equal. The new address was to become one of the foundations on which equality and ideological unity of the society would be built. The idea of the «Kingdom of God», which the church preached, was replaced by the idea of earthly communism by the Bolsheviks with their inherent determination. They deliberately tried to take on the authority that Christianity had in uniting people. A significant step in that direction was the Bolsheviks ignoring the address of «Brothers and sisters» applied to people of the same faith. Obviously, «Brothers and sisters» applied to all members of the society – Christians, regardless of their social status. «Comrade» had to be applied not to all, but only to people belonging to the class of workers or to those who served the class faithfully. Non-working classes were not considered as comrades. The new form of address was set higher than the form of «Brothers and sisters» accepted in Christianity. Both «brothers» and «sisters» could have different political preferences. «Comrades» did not have such a problem. They could have only one common political ideal.

Only once in the long history of the Soviet period did the supreme leader of the state addressed all the citizens of the country as «Brothers and sisters!» It happened on July 3, 1941, when the Red Army suffered terrible defeats from the Hitler coalition. Thus, it was recognized that the church address was more effective in case of an emergency. However, it happened in the 1940s and was only an episode. In general, the Bolsheviks consistently used the form of address of «Comrades».

In 1920, in Ukraine, a poster was issued depicting a worker holding a hammer in his left hand and shaking his right hand with a woman holding a sickle. Both the man and the woman were depicted in Ukrainian national clothes. The text of the poster was in Russian, «Comrades workwomen. Join the Communist Party. Build your life with comrades workmen» [Енциклопедія історії України, 2007, т. 4, с. 511]. Given that a hammer was considered as a symbol of industrial work, and a sickle was a symbol of rural labour, both industrial and rural workers were meant. Thus, the new government emphasized that the form of address of «Comrade» had to be customary in the working environment of Ukraine, both among men and women, both in the city and in the countryside. That also emphasized the idea of gender equality in the new society.

It has long been known that any interpersonal relations are based on some kind of model. In that case, the new leaders of society were such a model of communication. All the subordinates throughout the power structure tried to copy it. The habits and manners of leaders were adopted by the general public, surely, in their own understanding. Although, formally, Ukraine

had its own statehood under the authority of the Bolsheviks, and even with the creation of the USSR, the country could leave it according to the Constitution. Nevertheless, its leadership was concentrated in Moscow. A thoughtful Lenin's plan worked: Ukraine had its statehood and the right to leave the USSR, but its ruling power – the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine (CP(b)U) – was a part of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (AUCP(b)) and had no right to actually leave the Russian AUCP(b). It was only a part of AUCP(b) fully controlled by Moscow. Thus, the actions of the state authority were determined not in Ukraine but in Moscow. There the high-ranking Ukrainian officials were appointed starting with the main person in power – the head of the CP(b)U. They were flesh and blood of the Moscow authorities and had little connection with Ukraine including ethnic origin. Those people were the model of interpersonal communication, but they copied the Moscow bosses. According to V. M. Molotov, who, incidentally, headed the Bolsheviks' organization of Ukraine for a short period in the early 1920s, in the communication of top party leaders of the USSR the norm of address was «Comrade». Comrade Lenin, Comrade Stalin. Volodymyr Illich, Yosyp Visarionovych «did not comply with the rules at that time» [Чуєв].

At the beginning of Stalin's career as a Secretary-General of the AUCP(b), only three people addressed him on first-name terms: K. Voroshylov, S. Ordzhonikidze, and A. Nazaretian, his personal assistant. The other source proved that M. Kalinin, S. Kirov, M. Bukharin, L. Kamieniev had got such a right (apparently, later). Some of those people addressed Stalin as «Koba». It was his party nickname. Occasionally S. Ordzhonikidze called him «Soso» – the shortened form of «Yosyp» [Микоян]. At the same time, the tradition prevailing in Tsarist Russia seemed to start reviving: people addressed those who had a higher position in the society on formal terms, and those who were lower – on first-name terms. In 1930, as Y. I. Chyrkov testified, «Addressing a subordinate person on first-name terms accompanied by a brutal swearing was a well-known leadership style of those years» [Чирков]. In 1930 two highest leaders of the USSR addressed each other as follows: Molotov addressed Stalin as Stalin or Koba, Stalin addressed Molotov as Molotov or Viacheslav, often just Molotoshvili [Чуєв]. Thus, familiarity was also allowed. Nevertheless, the official address was «Comrade». And it was dominant in the interpersonal relations of the Bolsheviks in Ukraine. Gradually, since the first months of the revolutionary events, the form of address of «Comrade» was gradually being introduced in everyday life, firstly in Russia.

G. Solomon recalled that in July 1918, he, a high-ranking official, the First Secretary of the Embassy, arrived in Berlin to represent Soviet Russia. There he was officially introduced to a young girl – the Ambassador's maid, «This is the maid of Comrade Ambassador, comrade Tania. We exchanged handshakes with comrade Tania» [Соломон, 1995, с. 31]. Surely, before 1917, the maid, even the Ambassador's, had not been considered a comrade of a high official. In 1919, on a voluntary basis, the same G. Solomon was a Chairman of the comrades' court of the so-called Second House of the Soviets

(formerly chic Moscow Metropol Hotel), where «masses of common party people» stayed. He recalled that most of the comrades' courts concerned interpersonal relations in the shared kitchen. «The exchange (deliberate or by mistake) of pots, pans, spoons, knives, stealing pots with ready-to-eat food, eggs, and other food from neighbours were the objects of those tedious, dull, and filthy «lawsuits» in most cases. The complainants were crying, shouting at each other, at the judges...». The complainants were not only wives of the Soviet middle-ranking officials, but also women of high-ranking officials. So one day, a complaint was received from V. Antonov-Ovsiienko's wife that «in the kitchen, comrade H. stole a whole pan of milk from her that she had prepared for her children, and just imagine it was in the presence of witnesses» [Соломон, 1995, с. 138]. The address of «Comrade» sounded sarcastic in that case, but at that time, it did not contain sarcasm. Considering that Antonov-Ovsiienko's wife was a part of the Bolsheviks' elite of Ukraine at that time, it could be said that the form of address of «Comrade» was used in everyday life. And that was the dialogue of the Soviet patrol in 1920 in Odesa, with the detained citizens who were the enemies of the Bolshevik authorities but concealed it. (Patrol) – «Where are you from at such a late hour, comrades? (Detained) – Is it late?... Oh, no, what a pity, we don't have a watch!... So, will you take us to the centre, comrades?... (Patrol) – But, comrades, if your documents are OK, you have nothing to be afraid of...» [Шульгин, 1990, с. 395–396]. The dialogue was recorded by one of the detained, with or without intent, but he emphasized the use of a new form of address, which was not usually used by police patrols to the suspected in the 1930s in similar cases. Although in 1929, the prison wardens in Kharkiv prison addressed the prisoners as «Comrades» [Копелев]. But the situation changed soon enough. One of the peasants exiled to the North in the early 1930s stated, «By some unwritten law, we were deprived of the right to use the word «Comrade» when addressing our authorities...» [Твардовский, 1989, с. 17]. Since that time, «Comrade» could only be used addressing loyal citizens. Even L. Trotsky, an associate of the Bolsheviks' leader Lenin, after his expulsion from the USSR, was emphatically addressed «Mr. Trotsky» by one of the leaders of the Communist Party (b) of Ukraine in 1931 [Комуніст, 1931, № 9].

The form of address of «Comrade» in the 1920s penetrated even into such an intimate sphere as relations of lovers and couples. When I. Ilf and E. Petrov humorously presented a scene of a meeting between the married couple O. Bender and Madame Grytsatsuiieva, they did not fantasize at all writing that along with the familiarly gentle «my little gopher», the wife addressed her husband as «Comrade Bender». Recalling those times, poet V. Sosiura wrote that his mistress expressed her desire to create a family with him in the following way, «Comrade Sosiura, let us live together». When in 1920, the same V. Sosiura told his army friends about his love for the charming woman named Olha, then friends began to jokingly address him, «Comrade Olha» – «Comrade Olha, let's go on reconnaissance» [Сосюра, 2010, с. 193; 201]. Thus, a new form of address was being introduced, especially among young people. It

seemed to generate a sense of social equality. It was an indicator of a new society different from the old one – bourgeois. It was the case when at the reception at the Turkish Consulate in Odesa in the early 1930's, the drunk consul addressed the invited representatives of the local authorities as «Comrades» [Майстренко, 1985, с. 230]. Obviously, he wanted to emphasize his closeness to the guests.

However, a sharp increase in the centralization of the political system could not help reviving respect for rank, which was the backbone of all empires for centuries. Although in Soviet times, there was a significant difference. The rank in the Russian Empire meant a lot, but the official's personal fortune also meant a lot. At Soviet time, the personal fortune of the official was rather a negative factor. The rank was the main and the most decisive. As a result, relations between people acquired the character of relations in serfdom, but the level of respect for a man depended not on the number of serfs, but on his/her place in the state structure. Peter's «Table of Ranks» was not formally restored, but was actually revived. The form of address of «Comrade» acquired a different meaning. As a classic of literature noted, if we had not yet caught up with foreigners in some things, we had left them far behind in their ability to address, «it is impossible to list all the nuances and intricacies of our forms of address. The Frenchman and the German will never get and understand all its features and shades; he will speak with a millionaire and a fine tobacco salesman in almost the same voice and in the same language, though, of course, he will humble himself in the soul in front of the first one. We do not have this: we have such wise men who will speak with a landlord who has two hundred souls quite differently than with the one who has three hundred; but with the one who has three hundred, they will speak not like with those who have five hundred, and with those who have five hundred – not like with the one who has eight hundred – in short, even if you count up to a million, you will find many shades» [Гоголь, 1975, с. 349]. When the shades of «Comrade» were not enough, it was enhanced by the words «Dear», «Honoured», «Well-regarded». Ultimately, it led to the fact that, when using the name of the highest person in the state, it was not accompanied by the word «Comrade». That was how the participants of the 1939 Extended Plenum of the Union of Soviet Writers of Ukraine finished their greetings to Stalin, «Long live the father of our joy, the banner of our communist future, our dear Stalin!» [Комуніст, 1939, № 101]. Later, similar things happened as well.

It cannot be said that the form of address of «Comrade» always sounded hypocritical. But it gradually lost its original meaning, and those who opposed depreciation of the traditional revolutionary address were brought to senses, re-educated, or pushed out of their circle by various means. For example, if an ordinary communist in his party committee behaved really as an equal, as a real comrade, then the party functionaries often deprecatingly perceived such behaviour. It was especially true of the highest party committees. The party fellows could prove by their actions that «oil and water don't mix». They usually did not dare to say it.

Obviously, at first, that address created an illusion of equality in communication, but over time its meaning disappeared, and «Comrade» in address of the subordinate to the chief sounded in a completely different tone than in the address of the chief to the subordinate. The word lost its original meaning, as it often happened in human history, and became purely ritualistic. It could have sounded both «Sir», «Dear» and «Scum». S. Golitsyn, a descendant of an ancient princely family, a witness of those events, recalled, «Unfortunately, the word «Comrade» lost its original noble meaning after the revolution. On the contrary, clearly aggressive verbs like «comrades robbed», «comrades evicted», «comrades arrested», etc. were added to it. In the press, in speeches, in reports, all the leaders were necessarily called this fouled, faded word. But among our acquaintances, other words were constantly used, like «Pan», «Pani», «Панове» [Голицын]. As Yu. Marholin noted in the 1940s, «The word «Comrade» has lost any meaning» [Марголин, 1952, с. 107].

Devaluation of the form of address was not a new phenomenon in the territory of the Empire. As early as in the seventeenth century, when the Tsardom of Russia joined new lands, the title of «Prince» sharply leveled off. It was due to the fact that the territories were joined in which each leader received a title of prince, having become an Orthodox. Although most of those princes lived as ordinary peasants. There were so many princes that the address of «Prince» to a stranger acquired a humiliating meaning. The royal decree of 1675 emphasized that calling a person a prince without a name was dishonour and forbade to do it [Карнович, 1991, с. 177]. In 1917, the respectful word «bourgeois» (a resident of the city) also got a humiliating meaning. According to historian G. Kuromii, «In the political discourse of 1917, the word «bourgeois» began to mean a greedy, selfish person, despite its social origin. The term became such an all-encompassing swear word that it was used by both right-wingers and left-wingers» [Куромія, 2002, с. 130]. Then the address of «Bourgeois» remained humiliating, and was used to people who were considered «not one of us». During the NEP, the negative attitude to the «not finished off bourgeois» was noticeable in the society. V. Berezkhov testified that during those years, NEPmen «went to Khreshchatyk to show off in front of the public in the evenings. NEPmen slouching on the seat in a picturesque way, and smoking a fragrant cigar caused passers-by's mixed feelings. Some looked at him with admiration and envy, others cast malicious glances as if threatening to deal with such «not finished off bourgeois» [Бережков, 1993, с. 75]. «Bourgeois» in the eyes of some part of the society was associated with «Pan». It should be said that in the 1920s and early 1930s Ukraine still used the address of «Pan», «Pani», but as an exception. Thus, in the Ukrainian artistic environment, Les Kurbas' mother was addressed as «Pani Wanda», and usually as «Pani Kurbasova» behind her back [Смолич, 1971, с. 374].

It was known that sometimes the address of «Pan», «Pani» could cause such a response as «Pans are in Paris!». There could be no «Pans» in the new proletarian state, where all the people were comrades. Thus, a certain part of the society believed in the sincerity of the form of

address of «Comrade» that it reflected the equality of people, and people who used the address of «Pan» were supporters of those whom the revolution had justly driven out of the country.

The authorities strongly supported the spread of a new form of address in society. For example, everything was done to make the form of address of «Comrade» sound in movies, performances, periodicals, literary works, and songs. Among other things, the so-called «mass» song «Wide is My Motherland» was greatly promoted. It contained such words, «Our proud word «Comrade» is dearer to us than all beautiful words. With this word we are everywhere at home, there is no black or coloured for us, this word is familiar to everyone, with it we can find dear people everywhere». Thus, it was emphasized that the word «Comrade» was a kind of password that defined «us» and «them».

Prominent Ukrainian artists were involved in the promotion of a new form of address. For example, in the second half of the 1920s, a play by Y. Smolych and V. Chistiakova, «Comrade Woman», was staged at the famous Berezil Theater. The production was performed under the direction of the prominent director Les Kurbas. It was an «agitation» dedicated to March 8. But talented artists were staging it [Смолич, 1971, с. 365].

One of the results of introducing «Comrade» into life was the formation of a younger generation, who, under the absence of sufficient life experience, believed in the sincerity of the new address and became reliable support of the Bolsheviks' system. They believed in good slogans and in the possibility of their implementation. Ultimately, as the poet N. Korzhavin testified, such a type of young people was formed, with whom one could do anything using good slogans. And he explained, «In human terms, they were very nice and reliable people. The fact that they were Soviet was their tragedy. They were adamantly convinced that all the Soviet was generally correct, despite the unfortunate cases, and tried to behave properly to resist those «cases» though they succeeded rarely... there was one gap in their «concrete character»: they did not ostracize their comrades, children of «enemies of the people». Now, these people, if alive, (written in the 1980s) are no longer Soviet in their views and beliefs... Many of them are my friends. According to N. Korzhavin, such «faith and trust» in the new government were inherent to the younger generation as a whole in one way or another [Коржавин]. It was confirmed by other witnesses. For example, H. Andreev, being a teenager in the 1920s, became fascinated with the belief in the communist future, which the authorities persistently promoted, but faced the realities of life soon enough, «My head was spinning, I needed to change everything, to rethink the whole absurd, but unshakable belief of a teenager in a new future». Even when he was arrested by the GPU, he could still return to the position of the most loyal supporter of the authorities because, by his own admission, he was «wax» from which «everything could be molded» [Андреев]. Thousands and thousands of young people were such «wax», and the authorities molded what they wanted using their belief in a bright future.

Belief in a bright future had captured young people before the revolutionary events of 1917. It should be

noted that the belief was created by not only the left-wing radicals of the late 19th – early 20th centuries, but also by venerable writers, «soul owners» of young people. In their popular works, they spoke about the inevitability of a happy future for humanity. They believed them. And the Bolsheviks used that belief. Those who were able to grasp the true contours of the Bolsheviks' future in the 1920s were a small minority among the youth.

With the help of propaganda, the authorities were able to pull the younger generation to their side. Not the last role was played by the new form of address of «Comrade». It created the illusion of social equality, endless possibilities when relying on a team of comrades. The youth was attracted to the Bolsheviks. Surely, first of all, the urban youth, but also the rural one, largely turned to the dominant power. People, especially young people, respected power. And the state was such a power. Without the support of the younger generation of the 1920s and 1930s, the Bolsheviks would not have been able to form a solid vertical of power, a capable army, win the war with Germany, and remain in charge of the state for several decades. It is possible to agree with N. Korzhavin that, after all, that young generation, having acquired life experience, understood its naivety and ceased to believe in the sincerity of the authority at a mature age. But in the 20's and 30's, they believed in the ideals that prevailed at that time, and even when they turned out to be «enemies of the people» and got to the Gulag camps, they used the form of address of «Comrade» to those prisoners who considered themselves committed to the ideas of communism. The well-known writer E. Ginsburg imprisoned in the Gulag told about the following case. In the transit camp, she needed to solve a small household issue. She found out that Tamara, a Komsomol activist from Odessa, was the chief, and «easily» (members of the same party!) approached her with her question in the most polite form turning to Tamara as «Comrade». «Tamara's good, straight face... turned red with anger, «Your suitcases have not arrived yet, madam tourist, – she proudly spoke... And don't call me your comrade! I didn't hog down with you...» She cried it in falsetto banging her fist on the table... I worsened the situation by saying, «Sorry, you're not really a comrade – I was wrong». The «party fellow» did not forget those words, having become a camp chief. Two days later, she sent E. Ginsburg, who was barely standing on her feet from exhaustion, scurvy and dystrophic diarrhoea, to load stones in the quarry. People who knew Tamara in Odessa said that she was a very nice active Komsomol girl, friendly to people. Ginsburg noted that she then repeatedly met examples of such a complete change of personality in the context of the camp struggle for survival. «The past has been pushed out irrevocably in some cases. There was another person, and that person was scary. They were like wooden puppet dolls, without attachments, without spiritual life and, most importantly, without memory. Such people acutely hated those who understood the mechanism of their rebirth» [Гинзбург, 1990, с. 220–222].

**Conclusions.** Thus, by introducing the form of address of «Comrade» into usage, the Bolsheviks aimed to unite society under their banner. However, the very

essence of such a form of address did not tolerate falsehood, and when it was used to address all people, they distorted the meaning of the word of “comrade”, which could not but affect its role in the society. Once upon a time in the communication of the young revolutionaries, it was in its place, but in everyday life of the 1920s and 1930s, the form of address of “Comrade” was artificial, contrived and unnatural. Only people united by common interests, ideas, goals could be comrades. The Ukrainian society in the 20-30’s did not generally meet those criteria. Therefore, that form of address did not become traditional in communication, although it was widely used under pressure from the authorities. However, the form of address of «Comrade» helped the Bolsheviks to unite a significant part of the youth, who, under certain circumstances, believed in the possibility of creating a just society without grievances

and faults. In its turn, it contributed to strengthening the power structures and, in particular, the army. It must be said that the intellectual upper crust of the society understood that the form of address of «Comrade» appropriate in the circle of like-minded people was not suitable for interpersonal communication in everyday life. In the so-called «countries of people’s democracy» the traditional form of address of «Pan» did not provoke a negative reaction of the authorities, for example, in Poland it remained the main form of address in interpersonal relations. The form of address of «Comrade» was obligatory, as a rule, only in the ruling Marxist party. In the 1970s and 1980s, there was a debate in the USSR on what form of address instead of «Comrade» should be used in communication with strangers. There were some suggestions. But this is already the topic of the other study.

### Список використаних джерел

- Ryabchenko, O., 2019. Young People Mobilizing for Participation in Communistic Transformations in Rural Areas During the Years of the Collectivization and Holodomor, *Український історичний журнал*, № 3. [Online]. Доступно: <http://resource.history.org.ua/cgi-bin/eiu/history.exe> (дата звернення: 15.01.2020).
- Андреев, Г. *Трудные дороги*. [Online]. Доступно: [https://royallib.com/book/andreev\\_g/trudnie\\_dorogi.html](https://royallib.com/book/andreev_g/trudnie_dorogi.html) (дата звернення: 12.12.2019).
- Бережков, В. М., 1993. *Как я стал переводчиком Сталина*, Москва, 400 с.
- Відносини держави, суспільства і особи під час створення радянського ладу в Україні (1917 – 1938)*, 2013 / С. В. Кульчицький, В. Ю. Васильєв, Г. Г. Єфіменко та ін. (Відп. ред. В. А. Смолій), Київ: Інститут історії України. [Online]. Доступно: <http://resource.history.org.ua/cgi-bin/eiu/history.exe> (дата звернення: 11.10.2019).
- Гинзбург, Е., 1990. *Крутой маршрут*, Москва, 608 с.
- Гоголь, Н. В., 1975. *Повести. Пьесы. Мертвые души*, Москва, 656 с.
- Голицын, С. *Записки уцелевшего*. [Online]. Доступно: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=101547> (дата звернення: 02.12.2019).
- Енциклопедія історії України*, 2007, т. 4, Київ, 528 с.
- Карнович, Е. П., 1991. *Родовые прозвания и титулы в России*, Москва, 254 с.
- Комуніст*, 1931, 9 січня, № 9.
- Комуніст*, 1939, 5 травня, № 101.
- Копелев, Л. *Хранить вечно*. [Online]. Доступно: [https://royallib.com/book/kopelev\\_lev/hranit\\_vechno.html](https://royallib.com/book/kopelev_lev/hranit_vechno.html) (дата звернення: 08.12.2019).
- Коржавин, Н. *В соблазнах кровавой эпохи*. [Online]. Доступно: <https://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=book&num=190> (дата звернення: 10.11.2019).
- Куромія, Гіроакі, 2002. *Свобода і терор у Донбасі: Українсько-російське прикордоння, 1870 – 1990-і роки*, Київ, 510 с.
- Майстренко, І., 1985. *Історія мого покоління*, Едмонтон, 416 с.
- Марголин, Ю., 1952. *Путешествие в страну Зэ-Ка*, Нью-Йорк, 414 с.
- Микоян, А. *Так было*. [Online]. Доступно: [https://royallib.com/book/mikoyan\\_anastas/tak\\_bilo.html](https://royallib.com/book/mikoyan_anastas/tak_bilo.html) (дата звернення: 19.10.2019).
- Свистович, С. М., 2018. Політико-правове регулювання життя радянської громадськості Української СРР в 1920-ті рр., *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського*, т. 29(68), № 2. [Online]. Доступно: [http://www.hist.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/2\\_2018/6.pdf](http://www.hist.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/2_2018/6.pdf) (дата звернення: 11.02.2020).
- Смолич, Ю., 1971. *Рассказ о непокое*, Москва, 560 с.
- Соломон, Г., 1995. *Среди красных вождей*, Москва, 507 с.
- Сосюра, В., 2010. *Третья рота*, Київ, 352 с.
- Твардовский, И., 1989. Страницы пережитого, *Юность*, № 11.
- Центральний державний архів громадських об’єднань України, ф. 8, оп.1, спр. 119, арк. 254.
- Чирков, Ю. *А было все так...* [Online]. Доступно: [https://royallib.com/book/chirkov\\_yuriy/a\\_bilo\\_vse\\_tak.html](https://royallib.com/book/chirkov_yuriy/a_bilo_vse_tak.html) (дата звернення: 10.11.2019).
- Чуев, Ф. *Сорок бесед с Молотовым*. [Online]. Доступно: [https://royallib.com/book/chuev\\_feliks/sto\\_sorok\\_besed\\_s\\_molotovim.html](https://royallib.com/book/chuev_feliks/sto_sorok_besed_s_molotovim.html) (дата звернення: 19.10.2019).
- Шульгин, В., 1990. *Годы. Дни. 1920: Мемуары*, Москва, 822 с.

### References

- Andreev, G. *Trudnye dorogi* [Difficult Roads]. [Online]. Available at: [https://royallib.com/book/andreev\\_g/trudnie\\_dorogi.html](https://royallib.com/book/andreev_g/trudnie_dorogi.html) (accessed: 12.12.2019). (in Russian).
- Berezhkov, V. M., 1993. *Kak ja stal perevodchikom Stalina* [How I became Stalin’s Translator], Moskva, 400 s. (in Russian).
- Central’nyj derzhavnyj arxiv gromads’kyx ob’ednan` Ukrayiny` [Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine], f. 8. op. 1, spr. 119, ark. 254.
- Chirkov Ju. *A bylo vse tak...* [And it was like this...]. [Online]. Available at: [https://royallib.com/book/chirkov\\_yuriy/a\\_bilo\\_vse\\_tak.html](https://royallib.com/book/chirkov_yuriy/a_bilo_vse_tak.html) (accessed: 10.11.2019). (in Russian).

- Chuev F. *Sorok besed s Molotovym* [One hundred and forty interview swith Molotov]. [Online]. Available at: [https://royallib.com/book/chuev\\_feliks/sto\\_sorok\\_besed\\_s\\_molotovim.html](https://royallib.com/book/chuev_feliks/sto_sorok_besed_s_molotovim.html) (accessed: 19.10.2019). (in Russian).
- Ency`klopediya istoriyi Ukrainy` [Encyclopaedia of History of Ukraine], 2007. t. 4, Ky`yiv, 528 s. (in Ukrainian).
- Ginzburg, E., 1990. *Krutoj marshrut* [The Steep Route], Moskva, 608 s. (in Russian).
- Gogol', N. V., 1975. *Povesti. P'esy. Mertvyje dushi* [Tales. Plays. Dead Souls], Moskva, 656 s. (in Russian).
- Golicin, S. *Zapiski ucelevshego* [Notes of a Survivor]. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=101547> (accessed: 02.12.2019). (in Russian).
- Karnovich, E. P., 1991. *Rodovye prozvanija i tituly v Rossii* [Family Names and Titles in Russia], Moskva, 254 s. (in Russian).
- Komunist*, 1931, 9 January, № 9. (in Ukrainian).
- Komunist*, 1939, 5 May, № 101. (in Ukrainian).
- Kopelev, L. *Hranit' vechno* [To Be Preserved Forever]. [Online]. Available at: [https://royallib.com/book/kopelev\\_lev/hranit\\_vechno.html](https://royallib.com/book/kopelev_lev/hranit_vechno.html) (accessed: 08.12.2019). (in Russian).
- KorzHAVIN, N. *V soblznah krovavoj jepohi* [The Bloody Temptations of an Era]. [Online] Available at: <https://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=book&num=190> (accessed: 10.11.2019). (in Russian).
- Kuromiya, Giroaki, 2002. *Svoboda i teror u Donbasi: Ukrayins`ko-rosijs`ke pry`kordonnya, 1870 – 1990-i roky`* [Freedom and Terror in the Donbas: A Ukrainian-Russian Borderland, 1870 –1990], Ky`yiv, 510 s. (in Ukrainian).
- Majstrenko, I., 1985. *Istoriya mogo pokolinnya* [History of my Generation], Edmonton, 416 s. (in Ukrainian).
- Margolin, Ju., 1952. *Puteshestvie v stranu Zje-Ka* [Journey to the Country Ze-Ka], N'ju-Jork, 414 s. (in Russian).
- Mikojan, A. *Tak bylo* [So it was]. [Online]. Available at: [https://royallib.com/book/mikoyan\\_anastas/tak\\_bilo.html](https://royallib.com/book/mikoyan_anastas/tak_bilo.html) (accessed: 19.10.2019). (in Russian).
- Ryabchenko, O., 2019. Young People Mobilizing for Participation in Communistic Transformations in Rural Areas During the Years of the Collectivization and Holodomor, *Ukrayins`ky`j istory`chny`j zhurnal* [Ukrainian historical journal], № 3. [Online]. Available at: <http://resource.history.org.ua/cgi-bin/eiu/history.exe> (accessed: 15.10.2019). (in English).
- Shul'gin, V., 1990. *Gody. Dni. 1920: Memuary* [Years. Days. 1920: Memoirs], Moskva, 822 s. (in Russian).
- Smolich, Ju., 1971. *Rasskaz o nepokoe* [Tale of Unrest], Moskva, 560 s. (in Russian).
- Solomon, G., 1995. *Sredi krasnyh vozhdzej* [Among the Red Leaders], Moskva, 507 s. (in Russian).
- Sosyura, V., 2010. *Tretya rota* [The Third Company], Ky`yiv, 352 s. (in Ukrainian).
- Svy`stovy`ch, S. M., 2018. Polity`ko-pravove reguluvannya zhy`ttya radjans`koyi gromads`kosti Ukrayins`koyi SRR v 1920-ti rr [Political and Legal Regulation of Life of the Soviet Public of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1920s] *Vcheni zapysky` Tavrijs`kogo nacional`nogo univ`ersy`tetu imeni V. I. Vernads`kogo*. 2018, t29(68) №2. [Online]. Available at: [http://www.hist.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/2\\_2018/6.pdf](http://www.hist.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/2_2018/6.pdf) (accessed: 11.02.2020). (in Ukrainian).
- Tvardovskij, I., 1989. *Stranicy perezhitogo* [Pages of the Experienced]. *Junost'*, № 11. (in Russian).
- Vidnosy`ny` derzhavy`, suspil`stva i osoby` pid chas stvorennya radjans`kogo ladu v Ukrayini (1917-1938), 2013 / S.V. Kul`chy`cz`ky`j, V.Yu. Vasy`l`yev, G.G. Yefimenko ta in. (Vidp. red. V.A. Smolij) [Relationship of the State, Society and Person during the Constructor of the Soviet System in Ukraine (1917-1938)], Ky`yiv: Insty`tut istoriyi Ukrainy`. [Online]. Available at: <http://resource.history.org.ua/cgi-bin/eiu/history.exe> (accessed: 11.10.2019). (in Ukrainian).

## РЕЗЮМЕ

### ВПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ФОРМИ ЗВЕРТАННЯ «ТОВАРИШ» В УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВІ У 20–30-І РР. ХХ СТ. ТА ЙОГО НАСЛІДКИ

Сергієнко Сергій Юрійович

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії та археології,  
Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля,  
м. Сєверодонецьк

На основі літератури, періодичних видань та архівних документів розглянуто процес впровадження в життя нової форми звертання «товариш» та вказано основну причину запуску правлячою партією цього процесу. Підкреслено, що нова форма звертання мала значний вплив на молодь, якій не вистачало життєвого досвіду. Визначені наслідки впровадження форми звертання «товариш» в українському суспільстві. Впроваджуючи в обіг звертання «товариш», більшовики мали на меті згуртувати суспільство під своїм прапором. Але сама суть такої форми звертання не терпіла фальші і коли таким чином зверталися до всіх людей, то відбувалося перекручування змісту слова «товариш», що не могло не вплинути на його значення у суспільстві. Колись у спілкуванні молодих революціонерів воно було доречним, але в повсякденному житті 1920 – 1930-х років звертання «товариш» було штучним, надуманим та неприродним. Товаришами могли бути лише люди, які пов'язані спільними інтересами, ідеями, метою. Українське суспільство 20-30-х рр. ХХ ст. у цілому таким критерієм не відповідало. Тому дана форма звертання не стала традиційною у спілкуванні, хоча під тиском влади застосовувалася досить широко. Однак, звертання «товариш» допомогло більшовикам згуртувати значну частину молоді, яка в силу певних обставин повірила у можливість створення цілком справедливого суспільства без кривд і недоліків. Це, в свою чергу, посприяло зміцненню владних структур і, зокрема, армії. Інтелектуальна верхівка суспільства розуміла, що звертання «товариш», котре було цілком відповідним у колі однодумців, не підходило для міжособового спілкування у повсякденному житті.

**Ключові слова:** товариш, взаємовідносини, більшовики, влада, молодь.