

УДК 37.035.6

Konstantin B. UMBRASHKO, doctor of historical sciences, professor, pro-rector on scientific and guiding work, Novosibirsk Teachers' Upgrading and Retraining Institute, Novosibirsk

Sergey A. NELYUBOV, doctor of pedagogical sciences, associate professor, deputy governor of Novosibirsk region, Novosibirsk

From Civil War to Civil Peace: Lessons of National Identity and Patriotism

The Civil War in Russia is an event that left few people indifferent. It is one of the most important events in the process of a formation of national consciousness and social identity among the younger generation's patriotism and love for the Motherland in the arena of modern schools, and remains an urgent problem in the professional growth of teachers. Based on the analysis of views and assessments by foreign and domestic historians and publicists on the events of the Civil war in Russia (1918–1922), the article recommends the showing of this event at the lessons and extracurricular activities on historical examples, where the role of social harmony and reconciliation in the formation of patriotism, and civil position of the individual is undeniable, which will allow us to form objective judgments and representations to students about the main landmarks in the history of this significant event for our Motherland. In this regard, special attention is paid to improving the level of the general methodological readiness of the History teacher in solving the problems of updating the content and technologies of humanitarian education. In particular, this concerns the issue for personal responsibility for a professional teacher to search for grounds in the historical knowledge, historical science in general, for the problematization of the above situation and is covered in this opus. In the context of the stated message by the authors, an attempt is made to present the features of humanitarian knowledge, which is most clearly shown by historical science, dealing with the facts that immediately after their appearance, become the property of the past.

Keywords: professional development of a teacher, cultural self-determination (CSD), the Civil War, patriotism, society, milestones of history, historical memory, historical concept.

Reviewers:

N. E. Bulankina, doctor of philosophy, professor, head of the department of humanities education, Novosibirsk Teachers' Upgrading and retraining Institute

A. V. Zaporozhchenko, candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, head of the department of history, social sciences and economy, Novosibirsk Teachers' Upgrading and retraining Institute

Константин Борисович УМБРАШКО, доктор исторических наук, профессор, проректор по научно-методической работе Новосибирского института повышения квалификации и переподготовки работников образования, г. Новосибирск

Сергей Александрович НЕЛЮБОВ, доктор педагогических наук, доцент, заместитель губернатора Новосибирской области

От гражданской войны к гражданскому миру: уроки национального самосознания и патриотизма

Тема Гражданской войны в России является одной из наиболее значимых в процессе формирования национального самосознания и социальной идентичности подрастающего поколения, патриотизма и любви к Родине в пространстве современной школы, а также остается актуальной проблемой профессионального роста педагога. Основываясь на анализе взглядов и оценок зарубежных и отечественных историков и публицистов на события Гражданской войны в России (1918–1922) в статье, рекомендуется показывать на уроках и внеурочной деятельности это событие на исторических примерах, где роль общественного согласия и примирения в формировании патриотизма, гражданской позиции личности неоспорима, что позволит сформировать объективные суждения и представления обучающихся относительно основных вех в истории этого знаменательного для нашего Отече-

ства события. В этой связи особое внимание в статье уделяется повышению уровня общеметодологической готовности учителя-историка в решении задач обновления содержания и технологий гуманитарного образования. В частности, это касается вопроса личной ответственности педагога-профессионала за поиск оснований в самом историческом знании, исторической науке в целом. Проблематизации обозначенной выше ситуации и посвящен данный текст. В контексте изложенного посыла авторами предпринята попытка представить особенности гуманитарного знания, которые наиболее ярко проявляет историческая наука, имея дело с фактами, которые сразу после появления становятся достоянием прошлого.

Ключевые слова: профессиональный рост педагога, культурное самоопределение, гражданская война, патриотизм, общество, вехи истории, историческая память, историческая концепция.

Рецензенты:

Н. Е. Буланкина, доктор философских наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой гуманитарного образования Новосибирского института повышения квалификации и переподготовки работников образования, г. Новосибирск

А. В. Запороженко, кандидат исторических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой истории, обществознания и экономики Новосибирского института повышения квалификации и переподготовки работников образования, г. Новосибирск

Humanistic realia of modernity as a philosophical aspect of the problem

The strong point for the deployment of the realities of the Third Millennium about the cultural mission of Russian education is considered to be the spiritual and moral development of man, with the help of various aspects of our native and the world culture. The prime goal for both teachers and scientists is to create conditions for the preservation, development culture and moral values. A man who deals with other person cannot deny this realia, because culture and its many expressive means are needed at least in order to formulate knowledge and experience, to preserve it and pass it on to the next generations.

By the same token, the authors are of an opinion that human communication, understanding, mutual understanding and interaction, should be investigated as one of the humanistic realities of polyphonic and multicultural space. The relevance of the problem of the cultural self-determination of an individual, in the sphere of national consciousness and social identity, is no doubt due to the importance of the humanitarian component of education in general, which is understood as a multifaceted component of the information space of modern global culture.

As is the case, realizing the need for purposeful and systematic cultural self-determination (CSD) of students in the multicultural educational space, CSD is considered to be the goal, the result and technology of humanitarian development, and, the self-realization and self-expression during the educational process, primarily, to bring about personal changes of their moral character. According to many researchers of humanistic realities of modernity, the latter is impossible without taking into account value-and-meaning contexts of the methodology of rational cognition and understanding of the multidimensional realities of the objective world from the viewpoint of binary integrity and nonlinear dynamics of development [17], which, undoubtedly, should work on the cultural and humanitarian components of any educational activities. And one of the most im-

portant arguments in favour of the above mentioned concept is the following reality, i. e. the participants of educational innovations become witnesses of these (sometimes "unobservable") modern transformations and processes, which are reflected in schools [32].

A peculiar thing about the Humanities is that the conditions of the origin of many historical facts are peculiar and unique; both the reconstruction of the events and phenomena of recent or ancient times, and experiments, as is the case with natural sciences, is impossible. By the same token, it fully concerns the events which affected the fate of millions of people, i. e. wars, revolutions, social transformations, and reforms. Although the level of development of modern historical science is such that the degree of objectivity in the interpretation of historical sources can be high, the historian inevitably faces the need for taking into account the moods, opinions, judgments of various social groups, political parties and public organizations. The Civil War in Russia has become a likely event that left very few people indifferent.

Civil War as one of the significant events for Humanities and Historical Sciences

In Russian historiography the traditional "red-white" interpretation of the Civil War may be considered from a classical viewpoint. It does not matter, to which of the parties or sides the historian gives the priority and declares more "right". The general concept remains unchanged. It is a paradox but international historiography fully shared this concept, just changed the pluses into minuses and vice versa. According to a modern Russian historian, V. I. Goldin, "the Civil War is closely connected with World War I and Russian Revolution of 1917. The latter was intended, according to the Bolsheviks' leaders, for a world revolution as a result. On the other hand, the Civil War was organically intertwined with the international intervention in Russia, in which the leading powers of the world participated. That is why this problem provoked intense debate for years both in Russia and in the world historiography" [8, p. 6].

In recent decades, there have been qualitative changes in the world and domestic historical science, particularly, in historiography. The previously closed archival collections were opened, stimulating the re-interpretation of the old stereotypes and *cliches*. But the “red and white” shadows are still lingering in the historiographical distant discussions.

The viewpoint of a foreigner, especially a historian, brings additional colours to this concept, and stimulates the evaluation of some events and facts from different perspectives. For certain, the assessments of international scientists may be subjective and often biased. Sometimes they hurt our self-esteem, make us suffer, argue, painfully seek answers to the eternal “Russian questions”. Who are we? Where are we from? Who is to blame? What to do? But assessments “from the outside” can serve as stimulæ for the development of historical thought, and a more scrupulous analysis of our Past.

In the twentieth century, several schools of thought about the Russian Civil War were formed in Western historiography. Many historical schools are associated with several waves of emigration from Russia.

The “Totalitarian” view considered the history of the Civil War in the general context of the history of the Russian revolution. The Bolsheviks came to power — an absurd coincidence, a conspiracy. The victory of the Bolsheviks in this war was the result of *red terror and violence*, according to the historians, R. Pipes, A. Ulam. The “Totalitarian” view was the most ambitious and almost immediately divided into several *trends*. On the one hand, it is “the Power theory.” It denied the great role of the Marxist ideology in the emergence and prosperity of the Soviet power. The main task of the Bolsheviks from the very beginning was the seizure of power and its retention at any cost, even if it would cost millions of human lives. Another one was “the Utopian theory”, according to which the special role of the Bolsheviks ideology and their desire to build a “Paradise” on earth was underlined. It was “the greatest triumph of ideology over real life”, “the biggest fantasy of our century”. The third direction was named “Traditionalism”. The October revolution is a logical result of socio-economic cataclysms and political imperfection of the tsar in Russia [28, p. 11].

The “Revisionist” view drew attention to the behavior of the masses. The October revolution is the result of discontent with the tsarist regime and the consequence of the General crisis (among these historians are Rabinovich, M. Levin) [10]. For many Western historians, the Civil War was the event that predetermined the further development of Soviet society, and became the link with the subsequent era of Stalinism [24].

The “Neo-totalitarian” view emerged in the post-pereestroika period, characterized with what was happening in Russia by a political collapse, but not as a social revolution (R. Pipes) [20; 21].

R. Pipes wrote about the political and moral ugliness of the Bolsheviks, whose immorality of their ideas and poli-

cies must be condemned. The origins of the Bolsheviks’ victory are in the Civil War, in the existence of the control center and brutal terror, which was much more ferocious than in the Whites’ Center. According To R. Pipes, the Bolsheviks’ regime in Russia is a phenomenon of the same origin, compared with the fascist regimes in Italy and Germany. Of both, there were the management, politics, psychology of leaders, in the basis of which are, anti-humanity, hatred of all human beings, in a word, the “animal grin” of primitive mores, exactly repeated in the XXth century and in several regions.

The R. Pipes’ books were debated. M. Malia called his “Russian revolution” “purposeful, important, well written, but a one-sided book” [16, p. 185]. P. Kenz thought that “The Reader closes this long and dark book with relief.” He expressed his regret that R. Pipes was “blinded with a constrained and unattractive ideology, and could not, despite his undoubted erudition, intelligence and talent, reproduce the great story of the Russian Revolution in a convincing manner” [10, p. 351]. Hatred towards the revolution and the revolutionaries did not stimulate the author to express an objective interpretation of the history of the Russian revolution and the Civil War, and to give a “convincing explanation of the victory of the Bolsheviks in the Civil War” [11, p. 267]. R. Pipes ignored the research of many Western historians.

W. N. Brovkin (Harvard) criticizes the “revisionist” and Soviet historiographical traditions. He believes that the “revisionists” created a new mythology of the Civil War, introduced Marxist categories in social analysis and quite unreasonably “considered the victory of the Bolsheviks in the Civil War as a natural and progressive event in the history of the twentieth century” [1, p. 2]. In contrast to the “revisionists” who wrote “about the Bolsheviks’ coming to power” with the peoples’ mass social support, their opponents argued that the Bolsheviks seized power against the will of the majority and held it by some methods of suppression and violence. The concept of “support” of the Bolsheviks by the people, “the triumphal March of Soviet power” requires some clarification. The people did not sanction red terror and dictatorship. The idea that it is possible to win the Civil War against the will of the majority of the population, the researchers did not consider seriously.

In contrast to the key concepts and categories used by the revisionist historiography, their opponents marked that during the Civil War there was no state, but only parts of the old state fighting among themselves. There was no unity in society. At its best, it is a society “torn into pieces”. The history from below should demonstrate the extent to which varied social groups in Russia defended their autonomy and resisted the introduction of a centralized strict dictatorship.

W. N. Brovkin, criticizing the actual disappearance of politicians and politicians in the “revisionist” interpretation of history, initiated the publication of the international collection of the articles dedicated to the problem of “The Bolsheviks in Russian society. The Revolution and the Civil

War" (1997). The aim of this publication was defined as follows, "the study of the relationship of state power — both red and white — with social and political groups, pursuing their own goals in the Russian revolution and the Civil war" [30, p. 3]. Defending the social interpretation of the history against the attacks on the right, some of its representatives admitted reproaches. They believed that politics should fill the gap, the "white spots" of social history.

English historian, Richard Sakwa, pointing to the importance of certain principles of analysis and new methods of Soviet Studies, stressed the need to move away from relativism, associated with the epistemological method of the study ("learning about a historical phenomenon"), to the more categorical nature of the ontological method ("what is the phenomenon") [26, p. 134].

One of the new trends in the approaches to Western historiography in the studies of the Civil War in Russia was "post-modernism". The historians of this view turned to the concept of "discourse" in the explanation of human actions. Language, meaning, history of ideas, the inner world of the masses, the ratio of consciousness and everyday existence as opposed to the social analysis, the problems of social structure and socio-economic interests were brought to the fore. R. G. Suni, for example, suggested the supporters of social and political schools recognize their weaknesses and work together through a "post-modern" synthesis of competing historiographical trends, believing that only in this way historians can advance in the correct understanding of the Russian revolution [29, p. 182].

The analysis of the changing language and vocabulary in the era of revolution and civil war were used by the supporters of the postmodern trend to characterize the changing thinking and psychology of the masses. "New cultural history" is intended, according to its supporters, to qualitatively expand the concept of "social history". In the context of postmodernism both the development of social interpretation of history may take place, and the concepts of investigating the categories of "gender", "ethnic group", "power", "market" and others can expand. The perspectives for the usage of interdisciplinary approach to the Civil War Studies in Russia were justified by the British historian, P. Dukes [5, p. 15].

In the modern international historiography of Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Civil War the interest in regional aspects and local history is growing [6; 9; 18; 19]. This leads to a better, more objective understanding of the events and phenomena of the Civil War in Russia.

Due to the existence of a variety of opinions and approaches to the history of the Civil War in Russia some works of historiographical nature appeared [2; 7; 12; 14; 15; 29]. The problem of the Civil War exists as an integral part of the general publications on the history of Russian revolutions. Foreign authors consider it in a broad chronological framework, from 1899 to 1929 [17; 27; 33].

Here is a presentation of a brief outline of the Civil War in Russia which reflects the concepts of foreign his-

torians of different directions and views. The opus might look like this.

The Civil War in Russia was unleashed by the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks controlled Petrograd, Moscow and Central Russia, but soon found themselves surrounded by hostile forces, internal enemies, that threatened to destroy the Revolution of 1917.

Admiral Kolchak, "Supreme ruler" of the Whites, attacked through the Urals from Siberia. General Denikin was advancing on a broad front up the Volga River, in the Ukraine and Orjel. General Yudenich, and the North-Western Russian army, based in Estonia, twice reached the outskirts of Petrograd.

The Bolsheviks were able to repel these attacks, their regime survived. By the end of 1920, their opponents were expelled, "overturned" in the Black and Baltic sea, and the Pacific ocean. Hundreds of thousands of white soldiers and civilians emigrated.

The "Reds" were able to use internal communication lines and used railways, arsenals and the economy of the most populous provinces of the former Empire. They managed to create the Red Army, which by 1921 had grown to almost five million soldiers.

The "Whites", by contrast, never had troops of more than 250,000 soldiers, were separated by vast distances, and were stationed on the less developed infrastructural periphery of Russia. It is important that "Whites" underestimated the ability of the Bolsheviks to resist.

Trotsky was able to make the Red Army more effective than the experienced "white" generals. He effectively makes the most of the advantages of material resources, and also offered some revolutionary innovations. In particular, the network of political commissars — "devout Bolsheviks", who carried out the political leadership of the Red Army and checked up the loyalty of 50,000 Imperial officers, who were involved by the Bolsheviks to command their forces. He also made the most of "red terror".

On the other hand, cruelty, corruption, disorder and the lack of political and military unity were the main drawbacks for the White Army. Even the most effective soldiers, the Cossacks, were more interested in clamouring for autonomy than for Lenin's expulsion from the Kremlin.

Despite their power in Russia, the Bolsheviks were in international isolation. Their opponents did not enjoy the unlimited support of the allies. The British liberal, Lloyd George, socialist French Prime Minister Clemenceau, and American democratic President Woodrow Wilson were not Lenin's friends. None of them were fascinated by "white generals" whose reactionary purposes they were suspicious of.

Although anti-Bolshevist sentiments were present in the minds of the allied leaders when they decided to intervene in Russia's internal Affairs in 1918, their main interest was focused on World War I, not on the Civil War in Russia. Their main desire was to restructure the Eastern Front and defuse the situation on the Western Front. That motivation disappeared on 11th of November, 1918, Afterwards, most

of the allies focused their efforts on the search of a worthy way-out/exit from Russia.

Moreover, none of the Western powers had much interest in the destruction of a United Russia, they preferred to see this huge country weak, but united. There was fatigue from the World War, from the problems of Germany and the Ottoman Empire, from the economic crisis in Central Europe. Western countries did not want to dive further into the "Russian quagmire". The only force, capable for effective interference in Russia's internal affairs, was Japan. But the memories of the Russian-Japanese War (1904–1905) are still fresh in the memory of the Russians. The intervention of Japan in Russia's internal affairs could not hold the Russians of all political stripes. Thus, let us emphasize again. Most of the allies had directed their efforts both on the search for a worthy withdrawal of their troops from Russia, and on a more effective intervention in its internal affairs.

However, in native historiography the Red Army Victory over the invaders was interpreted in the Stalin Era as "Three campaigns of the Entente". Kolchak, Denikin, and Yudenich were depicted as "Puppets" of western capitalism. But Stalin's historians did not take into account the fact that the victory in the Civil War, which cost about ten million lives of the Russians, was Pyrrhic. It was the victory that helped the Bolsheviks after the collapse of the tsarist Russia to create an image of strong Soviet power that could intimidate the West with its military power. Later, it became the basis for the Cold War. Even Gorbachev, often regarded by foreign historians as a friend of the West, was inclined to mention this victory. The lessons of the Civil War cannot but worry the current leadership of Russia, judging from how rapidly and tragically the events in the Middle East are unfolding.

Thus, in modern international historiography there is a search for new theoretical and methodological approaches, explanations and interpretations of the problems of the Civil War in Russia. It is true that fruitful dialogue between Russian and foreign historians is developing [3; 4; 25; 30; 31]. However, most of the current investigations do reflect, in one way or another, these historiographical trends.

What about Russian historiography and Russian social thought? The topic of the Civil War was relevant for the twentieth century, and it is still relevant nowadays, and it will be relevant in the coming decades. After all, for almost the entire century, old history of Russia is the history of the search for (not always successful) social harmony. This search is still continuing at present.

A hundred years ago, great upheavals changed the life of the Russian state, determined new vectors of policy, economy, and culture of our Motherland, and influenced the future of the world. Therefore, it is quite natural that in recent years in our country historians and publicists are increasingly turning to a comprehensive understanding of the Era of the great Turmoil — the February and October Revolutions of 1917 and the subsequent Civil War, which

became a tragedy for millions of the Russians who did not "fit" into the new socio-economic realities.

Conclusion

The memory of the above events never ceases to arouse people, disputes do not cease, different, sometimes opposite opinions and assessments are expressed. Today, 100 years later, it is time for a scientific understanding and restoration of the objective historical outline of the events of the early twentieth century. Objective knowledge of that time is necessary for us not only for the analysis of historical sources, reconstruction of the reliable facts, construction of scientific concepts of history of the XX century, but also for drawing practical conclusions from the historical experience of Russia.

The great Russian historian, Vasily Klyuchevsky, once said that history teaches nothing, but only punishes for unlearned lessons [13, p. 347]. But for us, the main lesson of these events should still be that history should not divide a society, but serve its harmony and consolidation. Therefore, even the most acute controversy should be based on an objective and respectful attitude to the past and to each other.

Russian President, Vladimir Putin, has repeatedly stressed in his speeches that our society needs an objective, honest and in-depth analysis of the past historical events. He noticed that it is unacceptable to drag the splits, anger, resentment and bitterness of the past into our lives today, in our own political and other interests to speculate on the tragedies that affected each family in Russia, on whatever side of the barricades our ancestors were then. Let us remember: we are one people and Russia is one [22].

The vast majority of our countrymen have a sense of the Motherland. Let the lessons of history serve for reconciliation, the strengthening of social, political and civil harmony, which we have managed to achieve today. History is always more complicated and above unambiguous estimates. That is why scientific and journalistic works on this subject are in great demand as a counterweight to any attempts of simplification and direct falsification. They are in demand in schools, universities, enterprises and reading rooms of scientific libraries.

The centennial of the tragic events can and should confirm the positive changes in our society. If war separates, then memory of it can unite and reconcile. Let us remind ourselves of a common phrase. People are not divided into nationalities, parties — people are divided into smart and stupid, but stupid are divided into nationalities, parties...

References

1. Broukin, V. N. *Behind the Front Lines of the Civil War. Political Parties and Social Movements in Russia. 1918–1922* / V. N. Broukin. — Princeton, 1994.
2. Broukin, V. N. *New Tasks in the Study of the Russian Revolution and Civil War* / V. N. Broukin // *The Bolsheviks*

in Russian Society. The Revolution and the Civil Wars / Ed. by V. N. Brovkin. — New Haven and London, 1997.

3. Civil war in Russia : crossroads of opinions. — М., 1994.

4. Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914–1921 / Ed. by E. Action, V. Chernjaev, W. G. Rosenberg. — London-Sydney-Auckland, 1997.

5. Dukes, P. Nine points of view on the Russian revolution / P. Dukes // Russia, 1917 : a look through the years. — Arkhangelsk, 1998.

6. Figes O. Peasant Russia, Civil War. The Volga Countryside in Revolution 1917–1921 / O. Figes. — Oxford, 1989.

7. Fitzpatrick, Sh. Civil war in Soviet history : Western historiography and interpretations / Sh. Fitzpatrick // Civil war in Russia : crossroads of opinions. — М., 1994.

8. Goldin, V. I. Russia in the Civil war. Essays recent historiography (the second half of 1980's-90's years) / V. I. Goldin. — Arkhangelsk : Borges, 2000.

9. Karasik, T. W. Revolution and Civil War in Arkhangelsk, 1917–1920. Ph. D. dissertation / T. W. Karasik. — Los Angeles : University of California, 1999.

10. Kenez, P. The Prosecution of Soviet History : A Critique of Richard Pipes The Russian Revolution / P. Kenez // The Russian Review. — Vol. 50. — 1991. — P. 351.

11. Kenez, P. The Prosecution of Soviet History, Volume 2 / P. Kenez // The Russian Review. — Vol. 54. — 1995. — P. 267.

12. Kenez, P. Western historiography of the civil war in Russia / P. Kenez // Russia in the XIX–XX centuries. View of foreign historians. — М., 1996.

13. Klyuchevsky, V. O. Aphorisms and thoughts about history / V. O. Klyuchevsky. — М. : Eksmo, 2007. — 479 p.

14. Kowalski, R. The Russian Revolution 1917–1921 / R. Kowalski. — London and New York, 1997. — Part 1 : The Historiography of the Revolution.

15. Malia, M. From under the boulders, but what? Essay on the history of Western Sovietology / M. Malia // Domestic history. — 1997. — № 5.

16. Malia, M. In search of true October (Reflections on Soviet history, Western Sovietology and the new book by Richard Pipes) / M. Malia // Domestic history. — 1992. — № 4.

17. Malia, M. The Soviet Tragedy : A History of Socialism in Russia, 1917–1991 / M. Malia. — New York, 1994.

18. Pereira, N. G. O. Siberia : politics and society in the civil war (1917 to the autumn of 1922.) / N. G. O. Pereira. — М., 1996.

19. Pereira, N. G. O. White Siberia : The Politics of Civil War / N. G. O. Pereira. — McGill Queen's University Press, 1995.

20. Pipes, R. Russia under the Bolshevik Regime 1919–1924 / R. Pipes. — New York, 1994.

21. Pipes, R. The Russian Revolution 1899–1919 / R. Pipes. — New York, 1990.

22. Putin, V. V. Russia we have one [Electronic resource] / V. V. Putin. — URL: <https://politexpert.net/37490-putin-rossiya-u-nas-odna> (date accessed: 03.12.2018).

23. Rabinovich, A. The Bolsheviks come to power. Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd / A. Rabinovich. — М., 1989.

24. Read, C. From Tsar to Soviets : The Russian People and Their Revolution, 1917–21 / C. Read. — New York, 1996.

25. Russia and the world community in the early twentieth century. Theory and practice of relationships. — Vologda, 1998.

26. Sakwa, R. Re-thinking the “war communism” / R. Sakwa // Civil war in Russia : a crossroads of opinions. — М., 1994.

27. Service, R. A History of the Twentieth Century Russia / R. Service. — Cambridge, 1998.

28. Shlapentokh, V. American Sovietology from 1917–1991 : An Attempt at Diagnosis / V. Shlapentokh // Russian History / Histoire Russe. — 1995. — Vol. 22. — No. 4.

29. Suny, R. G. Revision and Retreat in the Historiography of 1917 : Social History and its Critics / R. G. Suny // The Russian Review. — 1994. — Vol. 53. — No. 2.

30. The Bolsheviks in Russian Society. The Revolution and the Civil Wars / Ed. by V. N. Brovkin. — New Haven and London, 1997.

31. The Russian Civil War. Documents from the Russian Archives / Ed. by V. P. Butt, A. B. Murphy, M. A. Myshov and G. R. Swain. — Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London, 1996.

32. Umbrashko, K. Regional history in the formation and development of the personality of students / K. Umbrashko, N. Bulankina // Sibirskii uchitel. — № 1. — P. 69–74.

33. Westwood, J. N. Endurance and Endeavour in Russian History 1812–1992 / J. N. Westwood. — Oxford-New York-Toronto, 1993.

АФОРИЗМ НОМЕРА

Достигнуть цели в воспитании означает привить навыки к самореализации, самовыучке, самоподготовке, к которым выпускник знает, умеет и хочет приложить силу и волю, пользуясь палитрой способов, методов, средств, чтобы реконструировать внешнюю оболочку бытия самостоятельно.

А. Дистервег