

Disputes over history textbooks in Russia

Yoko Tateishi

1 Disputes over school textbooks in modern Russia

Creating “the Concept of New Textbooks”

It is well known that in Russia from the 1980s to 1990s, political conflicts intertwined with disputes over history. In particular, immediately after the collapse of the USSR, the view that the USSR featured harsher totalitarianism than Nazi Germany pervaded, and the history of the Soviet Union triggered serious conflicts among society. In this context, history education and school textbooks that transmitted the official national history to the next generations attracted much interest.¹ Observing the widening gap between the teaching of history in schools and the disputes over history in society, in May 1988 the State Committee of Teaching of the USSR resolved to end the end-of-year examination on Soviet history.² The Russian Federation tried to set new guidelines for history classes, and a variety of textbooks appeared after the liberalization of publishing. These books differed greatly in their interpretations of history, and the interest of school teachers became concentrated on school textbooks rather than the official guidelines on teaching history.³ On the other hand, in the 1990s, the view that conflated Stalinism with Nazism, as two types of totalitarianism, spread in eastern Europe.

Amid these internal and external conditions, teaching guidelines and a system of official inspection of school textbooks were set in Russia in the 2000s. At

¹ Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyouiku to Dainiji Sekaitaisen no Kioku* (the Teaching of History and the Memory of World War II in Modern Russia), *Slavic Studies*, no. 62, 2015, pp. 31-39; Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Jikokushi Kyoukasyo no Doukou: 20 Seikishi no Byousya wo Chuushinni* (History Textbooks in Modern Russia: Descriptions of the 20th Century), *Northeast Asian Studies*, no. 20, 2016, p. 133.

² R.W. Davies, *Perestroika to Rekishizou no Tenkan*, Iwanami Shoten, 1990 (R.W. Davies, *Soviet History in the Gorbachev Revolution*, Macmillan, 1989), pp. 294-295.

³ Л.Н. Алексашкина. Эволюция образовательных стандартов и школьные курсы истории (1990-2010-е гг.) // Преподавание истории и обществознания в школе (ПИОШ). №4. 2016.

the same time, conflicts with countries in Eastern Europe concerning the evaluation of World War II, the role of the USSR in the war, and the foreign policies of the USSR after the war became more serious. The ruling party (United Russia), the executive office of the president, and the Ministry of Education and Science tried to make textbooks on modern Russian history and to establish the Presidential Committee for Countering the Distortions of History that Harm the Interests of Russia.

In February 2013, at the Committee on National Relations, President Putin emphasized the importance of Russian language and history as a means to deepen mutual understanding among the nationalities in Russian Federation. In addition, he said that school textbooks needed to be based on “a single framework,” and that not only the Ministry of Education and Science but also the Association of Russian History and the Association of Military History needed to participate in creating such school textbooks. After that, the Association of Russian History, along with other organizations, started work on new guidelines for history textbooks and “the Concept of New Textbooks and Reference Books of Methods of Teaching History” (hereafter “the Concept”) was published that same year.⁴

The creation of “the Concept” invited many dissenting opinions from intellectuals and teachers, who criticized the government for trying to intervene in the teaching of history. Considering these criticisms, Putin, the president of the Association of Russian History (Naryshikin), and other leaders of the Ministry of Education and Sciences repeatedly said that the aim of “the Concept” was not to enforce any interpretation of history or to establish one official textbook, but rather to build a consensus on national history textbooks.

On the other hand, support for a unified framework for history textbooks exists among teachers, intellectuals, and parents. They think that too many textbooks make things difficult for students studying for the Governmental Entrance Examination for Higher Educational Institutes. Some teachers also regard difference in contents of textbooks as a problem, and some desire stabilization of the official national history, which has drastically changed since the

⁴ Tateishi, *Gendai Rosshiano Rekishikyoku*, pp. 39-40.

1980s. In addition, some historians and teachers believe that a unified framework for textbooks could mitigate the conflicts about national history in society and could become a means of reconciliation with the past for Russian society.⁵ These views show that the creation of history textbooks still attracts much political and social attention.

“The Concept” in detail

“The Concept” is an 83-page document created by the Association of Russian History, historians and intellectuals from the Academy of Sciences, and university and school teachers in October 2013. It consists of an introduction that refers to the aim of national history education and a “standard of history and culture” that refers to proposals concerning teaching and national history textbooks, outlines each period from ancient times to 2012, and lists topics and names to be included in textbooks. In addition, at the end of the text can be found “the List of Difficult Problems about Russian History” (hereafter “the List”).⁶ “The List” contains 20 topics that are targets of disputes and are difficult to teach in schools. According to historian Aleksandr Chubarian, the joint president of the Association of Russian History, “the List,” especially the part concerning the history of the twentieth century, was written early in the process of creating “the Concept.”⁷ The draft of “the Concept” was published in July 2013 in academic journals and on the websites of the Ministry of Education and Science, the Association of Russian History, and the Association of Military History. Opinions were collected over two months. At the same time, it was discussed at conferences of the Association of

⁵ Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo ga Egaku Dainiji Sekaitaisen to Daisokoku Sensou (World War II and the Great Patriotic War in History Textbooks in Modern Russia)*, *Eurasian Studies*, no. 53, 2016, p. 9; О.Н. Шапарина. Проблема единого учебника истории. Краткий обзор совещения ученых, деятелей образования, учителей истории в РАО. // Преподавание истории в школе (ПИШ). №9. 2013. С.14; А. Кочегаров. Страсти по единому учебнику истории. // ПИОШ. №8. 2013; Ю. С. Рябцев. Новый учебник истории - каким ему быть? // ПИОШ. №10. 2013. С. 63; Крутлый стол “Перспективы исторического образования в России: проблемы или достижения?” // ПИОШ. №5. 2013. С. 21-23.

⁶ For details, see Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Jikokushi Kyoukasyo*, pp. 134-137; Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo*, p. 10; <http://минобрнауки.рф/новости/3485>

⁷ Коммерсант. 31. 10. 2013. <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2332034>

Teachers, Parents, and Veterans.⁸ According to Chubarian, about 600 opinions were collected and most of them concerned twentieth-century national history. Thereafter, revisions to “the Concept” were made to incorporate these opinions and the final version was presented to Putin in November.⁹

“The Concept” proposes making textbooks that emphasize the construction and development of Russia, to show the inseparability of Russian history from world history. It also says that they should pay attention to the Patriotic War of 1812 and the Great Patriotic War (the Soviet-German War during World War II) so as to foster patriotism and national consciousness, tolerance, and pride for the fatherland. At the same time, “the Concept” says that what is most important is national accomplishments in fields other than war, such as the creation of the multi-national and multi-religion Russian society, as well as academic and cultural achievements. In addition, the interpretation of Russian history as a series of victories and successes is wrong, “the Concept” says, and textbooks should not stay silent about tragedies such as the Revolution, the Civil War, and political repression, proposing to emphasize the experience of overcoming these tragedies by Russians and other peoples of Russia.¹⁰

2 “The Standard of History and Culture” and “the List of Difficult Problems in Russian History”

The inspection of history textbooks

In January 2014, at a meeting of the authors of “the Concept” and Putin, it was decided that new textbooks and reference books for history teachers that covered teaching in accordance with “the Concept” would be made by the Ministry of Education and Sciences and the Association of Russian History. In addition, at a meeting of the Ministry of Education and Sciences in February 2015, it was declared that Russian history textbooks on the current list of textbooks

⁸ Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyouiku*, p. 40; <http://mon-ru.livejournal.com/68273.html> (all online sources accessed on January 6, 2017); <http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/3968>; <http://минобрнауки.рф/новости/3485>; *Российская газета*. 21. 12. 2010.

⁹ <http://mon-ru.livejournal.com/68273.html>; <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2332034>

¹⁰ Концепция нового учебно-методического комплекса по отечественной истории в PDF (Концепция). <http://rushistory.org/proekty/kontsepsiya-novogo-uchebno-metodicheskogo-kompleksa-po-otechestvennoj-istorii.html#histcult> С. 10-11.

recommended by the ministry and those that would be made in the future were to be inspected by the Association of Russian History to check whether they are accordance with “the Concept.”¹¹ After the meeting, the textbooks on the current list of textbooks recommended by the ministry were inspected by the Association of Russian History, a process that employed over a hundred specialists who had no connection to the publishers as well as the authors of these textbooks, and the examination result was approved by the Ministry of Education and Sciences in May. It resolved to withdraw recommendations for all five textbooks on national history, and new textbooks from the publishers Prosvechenie, Drofa, and Russkoe Slovo were included in the list recommended by the ministry. It was also decided that these new textbooks were to be used in schools from 2015, although old textbooks were permitted to be used until they deteriorated over time.¹²

Among the new textbooks, one for 10th graders that covers the twentieth century has not yet been published; therefore, this paper examines the content of the textbook by Prosvechenie concerning the Stalin period (from the 1930s to 1953), which attracts much political and social attention, and compares it with the content of a textbook by Drofa and some old textbooks.^{13,14}

The Stalin era in the textbook by Prosvechenie

The new textbook by Prosvechenie was written by more than 20 historians, including Anatolii Torkunov, one of the joint presidents of the Association of Russian History and the Institute of International Relations at Moscow, which is attached to the Ministry of Foreign Relations. The textbook, which is for 10th graders, covers the twentieth century and was written by eight eminent historians of twentieth-century history, such as Khlevniuk and Aleksandr Danilov.

¹¹ <http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5245>

¹² <http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5613>; <http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5812>; <http://rushistory.org/sobytiya/anonsy/01-09-2015-v-shkoly-strany-postupyat-novye-uchebniki-istorii.html>; http://old.prosv.ru/info.aspx?ob_no=45291

¹³ О.В. Волобуев, С.П. Карпачёв, П.Н. Романов. История России: Начало XX - начало XXI века. Москва: Дрофа, 2016. As for textbooks by Drofa, see Tateishi, Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo, pp. 9-14; Tateishi, Gendai Roshia no Jikokushi Kyoukasyo, pp. 133-146.

¹⁴ А. В. Торкунов (ред.) История России. 10 класс. Учебник для общеобразовательных организаций. Часть 1-3. Москва: Просвещение, 2016.

Prosvechenie held a web conference in May in which about 1500 history teachers participated and Aleksandr Danilov, one of the authors of the textbooks, and the director of the Center of Education of Humanities at Prosvechenie answered questions from teachers.¹⁵ After being asked about “the List,” Danilov answered that the textbooks by Prosvechenie created “historians dispute” paragraphs that explain the problems in “the List” and present several interpretations of these problems. In an interview with the newspaper *Russiiskaya Gazeta* concerning “the Concept,” Torkunov said that it was possible to show a variety of interpretations of history even in one textbook. As his remark shows, the “historians dispute” paragraphs were created to show students the existence of disputes concerning national history and that there are a variety of interpretation of these topics.¹⁶

The USSR in the 1930s

In discussing the 1930s, when the Stalin regime was established, the textbook refers to the modernization and cultural development both of Russian and non-Russian nations, and the rise in the level of education, but also explains the harsh political repression, forced collectivization of agriculture, and starvation. For example, on a famine in the 1930s, the textbook says that the leaders of the Communist Party prohibited reporting on it, and in spite of the spread of starvation, much grain was exported to gain funds for industrialization. In addition, the textbook includes part of a diary that notes the tragic situation in villages of the time. Moreover, the “historians dispute” paragraphs introduce various interpretations. For example, the opinion of Fortunatov that the collectivization of agriculture established a regime of “military-feudalistic exploitation” in rural areas and the regime satisfied top-ranking party-governmental officials for decades is covered, as is the view of Utokin that Russian peasants traditionally had an inclination toward the collective use of

¹⁵ http://old.prosv.ru/info.aspx?ob_no=45291

¹⁶ http://old.prosv.ru/info.aspx?ob_no=45308; http://www.samara.edu.ru/pedagogam/professional/detail.php?IBLOCK_ID=63&SECTION_ID=&ELEMENT_ID=17932; Российская газета. 08. 06. 2015.

lands and Stalin used this orientation for industrialization and rural economics.¹⁷

As for the massive political repression of the late 1930s, the textbook refers to the case of the western area of Ukraine and Belorussia, which was incorporated into the Soviet Union after the conclusion of a secret protocol with Nazi Germany in 1939. It explains that many people were exiled to Siberia or other places after facing groundless accusations of anti-Soviet activities. It then gives students some tasks, such as comparing the Stalin era with the period immediately after the October Revolution and the 1920s, and exploring the characteristics of the political regime of the 1930s Soviet Union.¹⁸

World War II and the Soviet-German War

As for the foreign policy of the late 1930s, the textbook says that the Munich Agreement of 1938 became the turning point for Soviet policy, which had tried to build a collective security system. After the agreement Stalin commenced negotiations with Hitler, although he gave priority to negotiations with Britain and France. However, according to the textbook, the failure of the negotiation with Poland strengthened the distrust of the Soviet Union toward Britain and France, which supported Poland, and Stalin knew that Germany and Britain had tried to conclude a nonaggression pact in secret.¹⁹

The Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact of 1939 is explained as being proposed by Germany, with the Soviet Union using it to strengthen its defense capability. In addition, the textbook says that the government of Poland considered the pact as regarding “new partitions of Poland.” According to the book, when the Red Army occupied eastern Poland in September 1939, the Polish government had already defected and the Ukrainians and Belarusians barely resisted the Red Army. On the other hand, it illustrates that after the incorporation of eastern Poland, a lot of people were exiled on the suspicion of participating in anti-Soviet activities. As for the “Katin incident,” it covers the massacre of Polish officials in

¹⁷ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.1. С. 6, 136-142, 156, 166.

¹⁸ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.1. С. 144-148.

¹⁹ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.1. С. 168, 170-172. As for old textbooks, see Ta teishi, Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyuiku.

Katin and other places, where thousands of Polish officials who were taken prisoner by the Soviet Union were executed in the forest of Katin.²⁰

As for the incorporation of Baltic countries in 1940, the textbook explains that under the excuse of stopping anti-Soviet Army activities, the Soviet Union demanded these countries create new governments, who then asked the USSR for incorporation. In Romania, under pressure from the USSR, Bessarabia and North Bukovina were incorporated. The textbooks says that these incorporations were compulsory, and Soviet policy, which did not consider the peculiarity of these areas, triggered national conflicts.²¹

The textbook illustrates the Soviet-German War using a lot of posters, photographs, and maps. According to the textbook, many secret agents, as well as Winston Churchill, warned about the German plan of aggression toward the Soviet Union; however, different information was given to Moscow. Because of this incorrect information, Stalin failed to prepare for German aggression. The “historians dispute” paragraph about this topic introduces two opinions: one is from Victor Danilov, who states that Stalin planned aggression against Germany, although it was not accomplished because of the poor condition of the Red Army. The other opinion is from Naumov, who says that there is no evidence of an aggression plan by the Soviet Union toward Germany.²²

As for the increase in patriotism during the war, while explaining the role of religion, mass media, and the arts, the textbook emphasizes that the reason for victory was the solidarity of the nations in the Soviet Union. At the same time, it covers the activation of national movements during the war, such as the protests over the national policy in 1930s, and introduces the case of the Baltic countries, Ukraine, and other areas. In addition, it devotes many pages to explaining in detail the unreasonable forced migration of non-Russian nationals accused of pro-German activities, explaining the cases of Germans, Chechens, Crimean Tatars, and others living in the Soviet Union. The textbook talks about the 144,000 people who died from hunger, cold, and illness during the transfer and

²⁰ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.1. С. 145, 172; Ч.2. С. 4, 90.

²¹ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.1. С. 152; Ч. 2. С. 4-5.

²² Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.2. С. 11-12.

asks students whether it is possible to justify the pro-German activities and fighting with the Stalin regime.²³

The USSR after the war

The textbook emphasizes the Soviet Union's contribution to the victory against Germany and Japan and explains that the victory set the foundation for social integration and generated hope for a better future among society. According to the textbook, this was helpful during the difficult post-war recovery period. However, it notes that there remained many problems, such as poor living standards, a decline in the birth rate, a housing shortage, and the material and cultural disparities between cities and rural areas.

According to the textbook, academic and artistic organizations developed; however, the sciences were closely integrated into the military during the Cold War. Severe censorship and enforcement of ideology had a damaging influence. In addition, as in the prewar period, not only propaganda but also repressive measures were used to stabilize society. Regarding ethnic policy, while elites from minority nations increased and national cultures developed, harsh control and repression were implemented, especially in the western area of Ukraine and Belorussia and the Baltic countries, where armed conflicts continued. Moreover, the textbook notes that the Cold War, deteriorating relations with Israel, and the alliance between the US and Israel triggered criticism and repressions of Jews in the USSR. In 1948, Stalin arranged the assassination of the famous stage director Mikhoels, and the policy of the time spread chauvinism throughout the artistic and academic fields.²⁴

The textbook explains that in January 1953, 55 million people, 3 percent of the whole population of the USSR, were imprisoned in concentration camps or jails. In addition, it asks students some questions, such as about the peculiar method used by the regime to stabilize society and the contradiction in the ethnic policies of the postwar period.²⁵

²³ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.2. С. 51-55.

²⁴ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.2. С. 92-93, 95, 97, 101-102.

²⁵ Торкунов (ред.) История России. Ч.2. С. 91, 97, 99.

In the early Cold War period, the textbooks notes, the battle with Nazism enhanced the position of communists in many countries. However, after the leader of Yugoslavia, Tito, who came into conflict with Stalin, built a friendship with Western countries, Stalin increased the pressure on the other socialist countries and arrests and executions of Eastern European leaders took place. As the book says, the intervention of the USSR weakened the solidarity of the socialist countries and generated discontent in them. Then, the death of Stalin in March 1953 triggered tremendous shock and fear among society and many people recalled that Stalin liberated the world from the terror of Nazism. At the same time, the book illustrates the variety of reactions from society to Stalin's death by noting that it became a symbol of liberation and relief from the fear of death for the victims of political repression and their friends and families.²⁶

3 Similarities and differences in the textbooks by Prosvechenie and Drofa and some old textbooks

Differences between the textbooks by Prosvechenie and Drofa

One of the differences between the textbooks of Drofa and Prosvechenie is their length. While Drofa illustrates the history of the twentieth century in one textbook, Prosveshenie devotes three textbooks; therefore, the latter gives more detailed descriptions and materials on twentieth-century national history.

The textbooks by Drofa emphasize that the official interpretation of history could change according to the internal and external political situations, and that there are conflicts over interpretations of history among several countries. These policies are mirrored by a question in one textbook that asks students the official Ukrainian name for the famine that occurred in 1930s USSR. The textbook also explains that it was only in the 1980s that the Soviet Union officially took responsibility for the "Katin incident," and in 2010 the State Duma (Lower House) adopted an official resolution that declared the incident as a crime by the Stalin regime. Moreover, it tasks students with researching the situation with monuments to Soviet soldiers built in the Socialist period in Eastern Europe, or

²⁶ Торкунов (ред). История России. Ч.2. С. 75, 104, 114-115.

the task of examining the changes to and disputes over the official announcement of the number of Soviet citizen deaths during the Soviet-German War.²⁷ On the other hand, the textbooks by Prosvechenie include “historians dispute” paragraphs to introduce various opinions about controversial topics.

As Izhumskii notes, the textbooks by Prosvechenie illustrate the foreign policies of the USSR from the 1930s to World War II more positively. One of the most remarkable differences is the evaluations of Stalin during the Soviet-German War. For example, Drofa’s textbook covers Stalin’s failure to trust the secret agents’ information that Hitler planned aggression against the Soviet Union, which caused many Soviet citizens to lose their lives during the war.²⁸ On the other hand, as mentioned above, the textbook from Prosvechenie notes that different information was given to Moscow at that time. In addition, it explains that when Stalin died many people remembered him as the leader of the war victory.

As mentioned previously, the textbook of Prosveshchenie says that the Nonaggression Pact and the secret protocol were concluded through German initiative and asks students why the USSR “was forced” to conclude the pact. Izhumskii criticizes this description for intentionally hiding the existence of differing opinions and for giving students the impression that the pact was unavoidable. In addition, he also doubts the descriptions in the textbook that when the Soviet Army occupied Poland, the Polish government had already fled the country, and that Britain was prepared to conclude a nonaggression pact with Germany. Moreover, he also notes that the description in the textbook that the Baltic countries and Finland “were isolated” from Russia after World War I is illogical, because the majority of these countries were not Russian and such a description is nothing but an explanation of territory expansions from the Soviet point of view.²⁹

On the other hand, as for the political repression and failed economic policy during the Stalin era, the textbooks by Prosvechenie emphasize Stalin’s

²⁷ Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo*, pp. 11-13; Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Jikokushi Kyoukasyo*, p. 140.

²⁸ Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo*, pp. 12-13.

²⁹ Торкунов (ред.) *История России. Ч.1. С. 173-174*; А.Б. Изюмский. *Трудные вопросы в современном школьном учебнике. // ПИИШ. №3. 2016. С. 20-21.*

responsibility, as does that by Drofa.

Differences between new and old textbooks

When comparing the textbooks by Drofa and Prosvechenie with old textbooks, it can be seen that they have common features, such as questions to students and copious photographs, posters, maps, and documents, including diaries and recollections by Soviet citizens and Communist Party resolutions. In other words, they make an effort to provide materials to help students ponder the meaning of historical topics. Considering this, some history teachers say that there are no significant differences between new and old textbooks.³⁰

Nevertheless, we can see some differences between them. For example, regarding the incorporation of eastern Poland into the Soviet Union in 1939, each old textbook has its own view; some of them refer solely to the official Soviet explanation that the aim of the incorporation was the protection of the Ukrainians and Belarusians there, while others illustrate the difference in perception between Poles and Ukrainians and Belarusians. On the other hand, the new textbooks from Drofa and Prosvechenie both explain the differences between the official Soviet explanation and the recognition by the Polish government. In addition, some old textbooks do not refer to the “Katin incident,” while the new textbooks cover it.

The new textbooks explain the existence of the dispute over Stalin’s plan of aggression against Germany, although some old books refer only to the Germany plan of aggression against the Soviet Union. As for the responsibility for the outbreak of World War II, the Soviet Union’s official stance considered the appeasement policy of Western countries as allowing Hitler’s aggressive war. However, the political reform in the 1980s made this view controversial and this topic has attracted much attention since then. There are a variety of controversial points here, such as whether the Nonaggression Pact with Germany was the only choice for the Soviet Union, who started the process of concluding the pact and when, whether the USSR also had the responsibility for the outbreak of the war or

³⁰ Российская газета. 04. 04. 2016.

not, and the evaluation of the Nonaggression Pact.³¹

For example, one of the authors of the textbook by Prosvechenie, Aleksandr Danilov, believes that Stalin knew of the German plan of aggression against the Soviet Union and gathered a massive army at the border; however, he ordered war preparations only after Germany attacked the USSR, so that Germany could not criticize the USSR for breaking the Nonaggression Pact.³² Reflecting these disputes, there were no common descriptions of this topic in the old textbooks. On the other hand, as with the textbooks by Prosvechenie, that by Drofa also explains the disputes on the topic, referring to the opinion that Stalin was prepared to attack Germany and the German attack on the USSR was implemented to prevent aggression by the Soviet Union.³³

Considering that “the Concept” refers to the political repression of minority nations in the 1930s and the “Katin incident” as topics that should be covered in textbooks, the proposals in “the Concept” and the discussions about it could lead to a consensus on the content of history textbooks.³⁴

Conclusion

Upon being asked by a journalist from the newspaper *Rossiiskaia Gazeta* about the possibility of unifying national history textbooks under “the Concept,” Torkunov answered that any anxiety is useless because it was possible to study a variety of views on Soviet history even during the period when there was only one textbook in schools.³⁵ Such a remark seems to show his own experience of

³¹ In Russia, more than 670 books on World War II and the period immediately before it were published from 1992 to 2006. В.П. Смирнов. Мюнхенская конференция и советско-германский пакт о ненападении в дискуссиях российских историков. // Международный кризис 1939 года в трактовках российских и польских историков. Москва, 2009. С. 10, 29; А.Б. Ананченко, В.П. Попов, В.Ж. Цветков, Д.О. Чураков. Проблемы советской истории должны объединять и воспитывать. // ПИИШ. №9. 2015. С. 20-22.

³² А.А. Данилов. Ответственная история. Москва, 2003. С. 225.

³³ Волобуев, Карпачёв, Романов. История России. С. 153.

³⁴ Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo*, pp. 11-12; Tateishi, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyouiku*, p. 47; Концепция. С. 56. For examples of textbooks that do not refer to the “Katin incident” and the disputes over Stalin’s plan to attack Germany, see В.А. Шестаков, М.М. Горинов, Е.Е. Вяземский. История России. Москва, 2011.

³⁵ Российская газета. 08. 06. 2015.

studying history during the relaxation of ideological control under Brezhnev and the drastic changes to the official national history during the *Perestroika*. However, some intellectuals have expressed concern about political intervention in the study and teaching of history and the unification of textbook content. In addition, some historians have cautioned that the unification of textbooks by the government could lead to the breakup of society.³⁶

In the aforementioned interview, Torkunov insists that in newly established countries, the problems with the politicization of history are linked with the search for national identity, while in other countries, these problems are related to political and geographical peculiarities. According to this division, one might consider Russia as currently in the second phase after the political and social confusions of the 1990s. At a joint meeting of the Ministry of Education and Sciences, the Academy of Sciences of Russia, and the Russian Academy of Education on the teaching of modern national history held in December 2000, Kiselev, the first vice-minister of the Ministry of Education and Sciences, said that there was relative stability and a broad consensus in society, and that this made it possible for historical science not to break up society but rather to help it integrate.³⁷ However, as “the List of Difficult Problems” explicitly shows, many politicians and intellectuals consider the creation of an official national history that could integrate society as an incomplete task, even now. The reasons why Putin and other political leaders pay attention to the teaching of national history and textbooks seem to be not only the conflicts with other countries over the interpretation of history, but also the fear that a lack of consensus on national history could divide society.³⁸

Although conflicts with foreign countries could be mitigated by improving relations between governments, it is uncertain if the creation of “the Concept” and new textbooks can solve domestic disputes. As the pedagogue Barabanov points out, it is necessary to build consensus about the past in countries that experienced

³⁶ Шапарина. Проблема единого учебника истории. С. 15.

³⁷ Всероссийская научно-практическая конференция “Проблемы преподавания новейшей отечественной истории.” // Новая и новейшая история. №6. 2002. С. 5.

³⁸ Аначенко, Попов, Цветков, Чураков. Проблемы советской истории. С. 15-16.

drastic changes so that they can proceed with long-term active social discussions.³⁹ This could be an important turning point for the relationship between Russian politics and national history: will “the Concept” and the new textbooks foster such a social discussion or will they become political measure used to repress such discussions?

Davies, R.W., *Perestroika to Rekishizou no Tenkan*, Iwanami Shoten, 1990 (R.W. Davies, *Soviet History in the Gorbachev Revolution*, Macmillan, 1989).

Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyouiku to Dainiji Sekaitaisen no Kioku* (the Teaching of History and the Memory of World War II in Modern Russia), *Slavic Studies*, no. 62, 2015.

Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Rekishi Kyoukasyo ga Egaku Dainiji Sekaitaisen to Daisokoku Sensou* (World War II and the Great Patriotic War in History Textbooks in Modern Russia), *Eurasian Studies*, no. 53, 2016.

Tateishi Yoko, *Gendai Roshia no Jikokushi Kyoukasyo no Doukou: 20 Seikishi no Byousya wo Chuushinni* (History Textbooks in Modern Russia: Descriptions of the 20th Century), *Northeast Asian Studies*, no. 20, 2016.

Алексапкина, Л.Н. Эволюция образовательных стандартов и школьные курсы истории (1990-2010-е гг.) // Преподавание истории и обществознания в школе (ПИОШ). №4. 2016.

Ананченко, А.Б., Попов, В.П., Цветков, В.Ж., Чураков, Д.О., Проблемы советское истории должны объединять и воспитывать. // Преподавание истории и обществознания в школе (ПИШ). №9. 2015

Волобуев, О.В., Карпачёв, С.П., Романов, П.Н., История России: Начало XX - начало XXI века. Москва: Дрофа, 2016.

Всероссийская научно-практическая конференция “Проблемы преподавания новейшей отечественной истории.” // Новая и новейшая история. №6. 2002.

Данилов. А.А., *Отечественная история*. Москва, 2003.

Единый учебник истории: обсуждение в РАО. // ПИОШ. №9. 2013.

Изыумский, А.Б., Трудные вопросы в современном школьном учебнике. // Преподавание истории в школе (ПИШ). №3. 2016.

Кочегаров, А. Страсти по единому учебнику истории. // ПИОШ. №8. 2013.

Круглый стол “Перспективы исторического образования в России: проблемы или достижения?” // ПИОШ. №5. 2013.

Российская газета.

Рябцев, Ю. С. Новый учебник истории - каким ему быть? // ПИОШ. №10. 2013.

Торкунов, А. В.(ред.) История России. 10 класс. Учебник для общеобразовательных организаций. Часть 1-3. Москва: Просвещение, 2016.

³⁹ Единый учебник истории: обсуждение в РАО. // ПИОШ. №9. 2013. С. 47.

Смирнов. В.П., Мюнхенская конференция и советско-германский пакт о ненападении в дискуссиях российских историков. // Международный кризис 1939 года в трактовках российских и польских историков. Москва, 2009.

Шапарина, О.Н. Проблема единого учебника истории. Краткий обзор совещения ученых, деятелей образования, учителей истории в РАО. // ПИИШ. №9. 2013.

Шестаков, В.А., Горинов, М.М., Вяземский, Е.Е., История России. Москва, 2011.

<http://mon-ru.livejournal.com/68273.html>

http://old.prosv.ru/info.aspx?ob_no=45291

http://old.prosv.ru/info.aspx?ob_no=45308

<http://rushistory.org/proekty/kontsepsiya-novogo-uchebno-metodicheskogo-kompleksa-po-ot-echestvennoj-istorii.html#histcult>

<http://rushistory.org/sobytiya/anonsy/01-09-2015-v-shkoly-strany-postupyat-novye-uchebniki-istorii.html>

<http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2332034>

http://www.samara.edu.ru/pedagogam/professional/detail.php?IBLOCK_ID=63&SECTION_ID=&ELEMENT_ID=1793

<http://минобрнауки.рф/новости/3485>

<http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/3968>

<http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5245>

<http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5613>

<http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/5812>