

DOI: 10.21847/1728-9343.2021.2(3).244789

BOGDAN BEZPALKO,

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

e-mail: b.bezpalko.asp@kubg.edu.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-6081-2428

ENEMY IMAGE CREATION IN TEXTBOOKS OF HISTORY OF THE USSR DURING THE 1930-s: ON THE EXAMPLE OF “THE BRIEF COURSE OF HISTORY OF THE USSR” OF A. SCHESTAKOV

The enemy image creation in the textbook “The Brief Course of History of the USSR” written by A. Schestakov was considered in the article. Moreover, historiography of the issue was analyzed. It relates to the Soviet time as well as to modernity. Despite the insufficient attention to the issue from the foreign specialists, the works, directly concerned the issue, were presented. The main changes of that system of school education led to its unification and requirements’ establishment to a lesson of history in general and a necessity of a textbook’s design in particular. A role of A. Schestakov, who was one of the first who designed an “ideal” textbook of history for the Soviet authorities, was revealed. His career growth and work under the Marxist-Leninist ideology that facilitated to reach the settled goal were presented.

The process of negative connotations’ modification, regarding the forces against which the Bolsheviks had struggled, was followed. For instance, considering the period of ancient history, the author criticized the rich. A negative image was deepened when religion was involved in the middle Ages. Priests and monks weren’t accepted only as “alien”, but much more negatively as “hostile” compared to the rich. The special negative coloring was applied to the rich peasants; the term “kurkul” was used for their description. The closer A. Schestakov was in his historical narration to the 20th century, the brighter was enemy image creation of the internal and external enemies. The first one was the embodiment of all forces against which the Bolsheviks had been struggling. The definition a “counter-revolutionary” was used to mark such “enemies”. The second category was presented as “The Entente Powers” and “the Fascists” who seized power in Germany and Italy.

Key words: *enemy image, textbook, history, the USSR, the Bolshevik’s propaganda, education.*

Introduction

An enemy image was one of the key issues in the information policy of the Bolsheviks’ power. Frequently, under the cover of struggling with various enemies, competitors who could threat a regime were eliminated. Especially the mentioned process was intensified in the 1930-s, when all power was concentrated in the hands of J. Stalin. He rejected nativization policy and began total russification aimed at the new Soviet society establishment. The school sphere was considered as a necessary tool for achieving the aim. Thus, it was harmonized with returning to classroom framework system. A role of a lesson of history had increased in that light. It was cancelled in the 1920-s as a separate subject, however it was returned during the following decade. The authorities were fully aware of that fact that it was impossible to form a Soviet identity without exploiting history. Therefore, an issue regarding “ideal” textbook design that could convey an essence of Soviet interpretation of the past as well as division of such crucial notions as “friend-or-foe” and shape an enemy image was urgent. The studies of the mentioned issue can help clearly understand the methods of Soviet propaganda in the educational sphere during the inter-war period, especially in the light of image crea-

tion. Nowadays the issue is not completely discovered, this fact makes our work additionally urgent.

The issues regarding the Soviet school system has been popular among the scientists, the first works appeared during the time of the USSR. They had general character due to the state control under the educational sphere. Consequently, the crucial element is the works of the Ukrainian authors that were published abroad. The work of S. Siropolk “The history of education in Ukraine” published in Lviv in 1937 was one of them. The reissue of the book was only in 2001. The author comprehensively analyzed establishment of the Ukrainian educational system. Regarding to the referred period, S. Siropolk mentions the Bolsheviks’ attempts to design “the correct” history (2001: 912). More attention to school subjects and their ideological content was paid by G. Vaschenko during the 1920-1930-s. His work “The project of the educational system of Ukraine” issued in Vienna in 1957. The researcher observed the drawbacks of Ukrainization policy’s condemnation in the educational sphere.

The interest to the Soviet educational system of the 1920-1930-s has increased during the period of the Ukrainian national renaissance and reestablishment of the Ukrainian state. For instance, O. Pometun in her mo-

nograph "School Historical Education: Ways of Development and Problems" issued in 1995 considered educational reforms as one of the means of informational influence on the Soviet society. The period of school system's establishment of the USSR is one of the significant parts of the study (*Pometun, 1995: 200*). One more general work that reveals the organizing principles of school education of the USSR at the beginning of the 20th century is thesis of V. Borisov "Establishment and Development of Secondary Education in Ukraine during the 1920-1930-s", issued in 2003 (*Borisov, 2003: 190*). The PhD thesis of O. Diatlova "Integrated textbooks from social studies during the 20-30-s of the 20th century" appeared five years later. Considering the methodology of history teaching, the author mentioned the issue of enemy image in school education. Despite having taken the textbooks related to social studies as a study subject, a part of them was history. Having analyzed the component, that is a subject of our study, O. Diatlova has done it generally and in the context of a broader subject (*Diatlova, 2008: 228*).

Regarding the foreign authors, we would like to define the work of Jon Lauglo with the title "Soviet Education Policy 1917-1935: From Ideology to Bureaucratic Control" (2014). Considering an ideological sphere of education, the author has briefly touched an issue of enemy image creation; nevertheless it is not precisely done in the historical textbooks. An issue related to the teachers' staff in the informational policy of the Bolsheviks in the educational sphere was highlighted by Thomas Ewing in his work "A Stalinist Celebrity Teacher: Gender, Professional, and Political Identities in Soviet Culture of the 1930s" (2014). One more crucial study that reveals the Bolshevik's propaganda at school during the 1930-s belonged to the researchers Iveta Silova and Garine Palandjian. A connection between the state policy and school education that was aimed at forming Soviet identity among children was revealed in their work "Soviet Empire, Childhood, and Education" (2018).

The works that are not concentrated on an enemy image however address to the mentioned issue during defined chronological years are important as well. Here we would like to distinguish a work of the doctor of psychology affiliated to Indiana University Matthew D. Pauly "Building Socialism in the National Classroom: Education and Language policy in Soviet Ukraine, 1923-30" (2005). He analyzes a linguistic aspect of Soviet propaganda in the USSR. The author emphasizes the importance of reforms that had brought Ukrainian language closer to Russian language. In this perspective the researcher mentions that those who were against the Bolshevik's linguistic policy were negatively accepted. The article "Language and Education in the Soviet Ukraine" written by Harold R. Weinstein (2014) expands the mentioned issue.

Although we need to mention the works that partially address to our issue or consider the issue during the other chronological limits. For instance, Mervyn Matthews issued the book "Education in the Soviet Union: Policies and Institutions since Stalin" in 2021. The author impartially defines accessibility of the main types of educational institutions, courses' content and Soviet endeavors to combine the existence of the educational system with their conscious economic and social necessities (*Matt-*

hews, 2021: 221). The monograph of Joanna Wojdon with the title "Communist Propaganda at School: The World of the Reading Primers from the Soviet Bloc, 1949-1989" was published in 2021. Considering propaganda at Soviet school, the author referred to the issue of enemy image creation in comparison with the previous researcher. She draws attention to the importance of those materials that were used at learning process (*Wojdon, 2021: 153*).

Therefore, we state the fact that the mentioned issue hasn't gained sufficient popularity among the foreign authors. The presented works are predominantly related to the general educational system of the USSR and Ukrainian USSR during the 1930-s. Enemy image creation at a lesson of history in general and in a textbook in particular was not a central issue in those works. As a result the presented issue hasn't sufficiently studied nowadays.

Methods

The aim of the work is to reveal the peculiarities of enemy image creation in historical textbooks of the Soviet Union on the example of the work "The Brief Course of History of the USSR" written by A. Schestakov. In this light it is crucial to identify such ideological constructions as "alien", "hostile", "enemy". The cross-cutting method of analysis was used to reach the goal. Due to its application, we divided a text of the textbook into the building blocks according to the problematic-chronological principle and defined a structural component with negative connotation in each of them. This fact provided an opportunity to define the main features that the author had included in the meaning "hostile" and followed the correlation with the historical events, facts mentioned in the textbook.

We used such scientific approach as imagology to present the genesis of images from "alien" to "enemy". Despite the mentioned method formed as one of the approaches of comparative literature studies, nowadays it is widely used in historical studies. It facilitated to follow an evolution of "enemy" image within our study in the different historical periods via identification of such categories as "alien", "hostile", "kurkul", "counter-revolutionary", "fascist".

Results and Discussion

Andriy Vasyliovych Schestakov issues "The Brief Course of History of the USSR" in 1937. Nevertheless, his textbook was a result of a long process that had begun earlier. The Soviet authorities didn't immediately realize a necessity to write a new textbook of history. School sphere had to be unified at first. As it had experienced a period of experiments in the decade before. One of them presented elimination of classroom framework system and a lesson of history as a separate subject. A new policy supported by J. Stalin claimed clear institutional structuring for the deeper control under them (*Pasternak, 1979: 314*).

The author's contribution was in the fact that he could accept the Soviet view on the past and demonstrated its vision in his textbook which obtained a lot of awards, but the main in that situation was J. Stalin's personal approval. It is representative according to our issue. Actually, it was an example for all other textbooks of history that

were characterized by the common scheme of layout. If we study it, we can clearly understand the main propagandistic constructs used by the authorities on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, as the Soviet textbooks couldn't ideologically contradict "The Brief Course of History of the USSR". We are interested in an aspect of enemy image creation. Nevertheless, we initially need to discover the main peculiarities of school system reforming and establishing requirements to a textbook of history for the detailed study of our issue.

The mentioned process began in 1930. The order of the CPSU (b) "About common compulsory primary education" that prescribed mandatory character of obtaining education by the children from eight to ten years old, was issued at that time (*Nevinchana, 2006: 110*). The mentioned order formed a steady base for the further stabilization of school system. In 1932 the process was followed, due to the insistence of the Communist party, a school obtained the following structure: primary school (1-4 grades), incomplete secondary school (1-7 grades), secondary school (1-9 grades). Based on that fact classroom framework system was renewed till 1934 (*Polotskiy, 1930: 10*).

It should be mentioned that the issue regarding new reforms in schooling was not raised by education secretariat that should obviously be the first one to react to an educational problem, but by the party that had taken an exclusive role of a ruler of the USSR and substituted all official elements of power. A process of ideological paradigms purification by the authorities, in particular those related to a lesson of history and historical textbooks, occurred simultaneously with educational system structuring. Meeting that goal, the CPSU (b) ratified an order "About civil history teaching at schools of the USSR" in 1934. The document declared a new form of teaching history. It was not based on an integrated course any more, but officially on separate lessons. We need to notice the fact that according to the mentioned order the necessity of writing new textbooks of history was separately emphasized¹.

Hence, a process of textbooks' writing speeded up; the requirements to them depicted the authority's understanding of the historical past. The main attention was paid to the issues related to the complex history of the USSR. At the beginning of August 1934, the first drafts of the future conception of its teaching appeared. However, they were rejected by J. Stalin, A. Zdanov, S. Kirov. In their appeal "Comments on the textbook of history of the USSR" (August, 8th 1934) the party leaders criticized the concept of history offered by M. Vanagom and B. Grekov that according to their thought was designed under the influence of imperial paradigm. Moreover, in the expressions of the party leaders we can follow the ideas of socialism, Marxism that are a source for the positive images in contrast to bourgeoisie and capitalism. The mentioned ideological confrontation should have become a cross-cutting idea in the future textbooks².

The next step in consideration of structure of history and textbooks respectively occurred in 1936. Discussion of historical themes and general paradigm was of a general nature. The articles of scientists as well as of state leaders were published in mass media. Professor V. Bystrianskyi had a significant impact in the mentioned context. He also took part in "national" discussion of the issue by publishing his article in the newspaper "Pravda" (1936)³. The high-impact publication of the famous Soviet journalist Karl Radek⁴ was issued that year. Having expressed their thoughts regarding the historical past, the authors also mentioned the importance of historical textbooks' creation that would take into consideration the previous criticism.

Andriy Vasyliovych Schestakov was one of the first who performed the governmental task and obtained the personal approval by J. Stalin. He was born in the village Solombala (the former Archangelsk province) on October 24th, 1877. When he was twenty he demonstrated an interest to socialistic ideas, and became a member of social-democratic circle at that time. He performed party orders in Ural in 1901, later he moved to work to Donbas and after that to Odessa. He worked as a local newspapers' editor in Voronezh during the civil war in Russia in 1917. He became a head of Moscow department of the main political education since 1921. Simultaneously, he got a position of a head and later a director of "Museum of revolution of the USSR"⁵.

His further career was at Voronezh State University where he was accepted in 1928. Working as a lecturer of history, Andriy Vasyliovych designed his own method of teaching the subject and was interested in modernization of educational system. However, the main sphere of his activity was in providing consultations for the university specialists due to a course design of Russian history based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Later A. Schestakov moved to Moscow and worked at Moscow State University also as a lecturer of history. In 1936 he finished his work under the course "The Brief Course of History of the USSR" that was recognized to be the best and recommended for printing (*Prochorov, 1969: 483*).

Therefore, the mentioned author is famous in the historical sphere. His activity was closely connected with the Marxist idea and the career only proved his devotion to the communist party.

"The Brief Course of History of the USSR" written by A. Schestakov is composed of fifteen subparagraphs presented in chronological order. The textbook begins with an introduction in which the author emphasizes that it covers history of the whole USSR, rather than some particular republics. In the introduction the USSR was described as a singular socialistic country on the planet. The process of studying the textbook by pupils permits to know how people lived in the ancient time, how the peoples of the USSR were struggling with their enemies

¹ About teaching of civil history at schools of the USSR. Historical materials URL: <http://istmat.info/node/40824>.

² Stalin J., Zdanov A., Kirov S. Comments on the textbook of history of the USSR. Works. V. 14. Moscow, "Pisatel" publishing house. 1997. P. 40.

³ Bystrianskiy V. Critical comments regarding textbooks of history of the USSR. Pravda. 1936. February, 1st. No 31. P. 6.

⁴ Radek K. The meaning of history for the revolutionary proletariat. Pravda. 1936. January, 27th. 1936 r. No 26. P. 3.

⁵ Duschenko E. Schestakov and establishment of historical education at universities of the USSR. URL: <http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/history/2010/02/2010-02-15.pdf>

and how their motherland became socialistic⁶. Thus, we have concluded that there was an issue regarding enemies among three the most crucial issues in the introduction. This fact defines the author's priority.

The first chapter of the textbook that describes ancient history has the title "Our motherland in the distant past". The author didn't use a word "enemy" regarding various events in that section. He rather depicted something as having a "hostile" character to the socialistic order. A life of the cave people who lived in families was brightly described at the very beginning. The equality among men who commonly hunted, ate, cultivated land and defended themselves against the aliens was underlined. However as time passed, the tribal community was separated into families. The process was presented in negative light. A. Schestakov wrote that the family members began to seize land, food, means of labor according to their own will without sharing with others. They were "the exploiters", who formed their own army and captured their neighbors. The stolen goods were not divided equally the most part was in their hands. For obtaining extra profit, some members of families began to use free labor of the captured men as well as of their own people⁷.

A negative image of the rich and their "exploitative essence" is immediately shaped. The mentioned construct was also noted by the researcher Jon Lauglo who in his work "Soviet Education Policy 1917-1935: From Ideology to Bureaucratic Control" drew attention to negative image creation of the rich that the Bolsheviks used in their struggle against the political opponents (Lauglo, 2014: 285-299). We need to mention that the family institute was discredited as it was predominantly blamed for social income inequality. The material was presented within the textbook in that light that all readers were gently pushed in favor of a collective way of life, accepting privacy as social treason. Family, private property and well-being were those things that children should accept as something "alien" for a Soviet man.

The following historical period was the middle Ages depicted in the textbook through descriptions, generally by the Slavic tribes of Rus and after its division by independent principalities. Rostov, Suzdal and Moscow's principalities were central among them. Compared to the previous negative connotations regarding the rich, an image of "alien" and even "hostile" was much more clearly defined in the period of the middle Ages.

For instance, talking about Rus, the author raised a question about religion for the first time. Olga's description and her contacts with Christianity were distinguished among the other dukes. According to the author her trip to Constantinople was explained by her will of acquiring experience in state administration. Nevertheless, when she observed as "the priests" regarded imperial power as sacred one, she endeavored to implement Christianity with the aim to unite society and strengthened duke's power. Any more useful things that could bring Christiani-

ty were not mentioned. Conversely, commerciality and greed of the general clerical model were emphasized⁸.

The following moment was connected with the duke Volodymyr and christening of Rus. The motivational component was in the duke's wish to be related with a Byzantium emperor and simultaneously strengthen his power. In 988 the fact of christening was positively accepted compared to the prevailing polytheism: "Christianity was a leap forward in Russia's development in comparison with paganism at that time". Regarding a monks' role in the Byzantine Empire, the attention was attracted only to the fact that a duke provided them with money and lands⁹.

Yaroslav was named the Wise, but the textbook didn't explain the reason. The main aspect for A. Schestakov was a collection of laws "Ruska pravda". Owing to A. Schestakov it contained information how to save rights of slave owners, merchants and prominent landowners¹⁰.

Describing the Russian society, the author generalized the privileged layer. It included dukes, army, boyars, priests and monks. They were portrayed to live at the cost of the ordinary population. A place where craftsmen, tradesmen and the poor lived was separately considered. The merchants were associated with exploiters as the craftsmen were depended on them. Moreover, a life of the depended peasants was brightly described. A. Schestakov noted that the dukes and boyars enhanced their power over people in the 11th century, writing laws and conducting trials based on their own will. The text from "Ruska pravda" was provided as an example of legal discrimination, where a fine for a killed noble man was 80 hryvnya and in a similar case regarding a killed peasant only 5 hryvnya had to be paid¹¹.

The internal confrontations were not the single central subjects. The victory of Oleksandr Nevskiy over the German knights who were called villains and who were aimed at Novgorod's destruction was outlined relatively bright¹². "An external enemy" was highlighted in the mentioned episode for the first time, but not the last time. The author continued with Moscow's principality, the main problem of which was confrontation with Lithuanian principality that, in its turn, had a union with Polish kingdom. The reason of such attitude was in remaining the Ukrainian, Belorussian and Russian lands within allies. It was reported to get worse for the people even compared to their sufferings from the own lords: "The Ukrainians, Belarusians and Russians had a tough life under the rule of their dukes and boyars. However, their life became much tougher under the rule of Polish and Lithuanian occupants who had made serfs from them"¹³.

Consequently, "an enemy" began to obtain national features except class affiliation. The text of the textbook represented international situation of the USSR during the 1930-s. That fact was portrayed by Mervyn Matthews in the study "Education in the Soviet Union: Policies and Institutions since Stalin". He wrote about a historical paradigm constructed for pupils with the meaning that Poland and Lithuania like Germany had a threat for their

⁶ Schestakov A. The Brief Course of History of the USSR. The textbook for the 3rd and 4th grades. Moscow. The State tutorially pedagogical publisher, 1937. P. 3.

⁷ Schestakov A. The Brief Course of History of the USSR. The textbook for the 3rd and 4th grades. Moscow. The State tutorially pedagogical publisher, 1937. P. 7.

⁸ Ibid. P. 17.

⁹ Ibid. P. 17.

¹⁰ Ibid. P. 18.

¹¹ Ibid. P. 19.

¹² Ibid. P. 23.

¹³ Ibid. P. 27-30.

state as well as dominated “Russian historical lands” (Matthews, 2021: 221).

The following events connected with the new historical time didn't ideologically differ from the previous ones. The Cossacks were predominantly positively depicted; however the author criticized their attempts to make advantage of the common people. The Russian tsars were increasingly negatively presented closer to the 20th century. Narrating the events of the French Revolution A. Schestakov used the term “counter-revolutionary” for the first time. People who were struggling against a revolution in the midst were defined by the word. They were characterized as the most dangerous enemies¹⁴.

One of the important episodes for our issue happened in the mid-19th century and connected with the abolition of serfdom. The reform itself was criticized in the textbook. Peasants' personal freedom without land was considered as mockery of the people. A. Schestakov summarized that after the abolition of serfdom, the managerial system had changed. The chiefs and headmen appeared in villages. The mentioned positions could occupy only the rich peasants. However, and this is important, they were not named only as the rich, but as “Kulaky”, namely “Kurkuli”¹⁵. The researchers Iveta Silova and Garine Palandjian noted that such negative image was actively established during the second half of the 1920-s. At the beginning of the 1930-s when J. Stalin issued an order regarding elimination of the mentioned class, the issue was additionally urgent (Silova, Palandjian, 2018: 147-171). Therefore, the textbook contained an idea of struggle against them.

Nevertheless, the closer the events to the beginning of the 20th century, the more severe problem was to distinguish the Bolsheviks as the messengers of exclusively correct ideas among all socialistic forces. At the first time it occurred when the events of the Russian Revolution of 1905 were analyzed. While describing the Bolsheviks' activity, A. Schestakov stated that they were unique conscious fighters for the rights of the working class especially under the circumstances of revolutionary spirit of the Russians at the end of the 19th century. The idea emerged in a description of “Bloody Sunday”. According to the text the provocateur Gapon disturbed the people to send a letter to the tsar with a request for help¹⁶.

The Bolsheviks didn't criticize the priest because he had put the people at risk, but concerning his conviction regarding negotiating with a tsar. Marx, as it is obvious from the interpretation of the textbook's material, called for struggling against an enemy. When confrontation with the army began, the prominent role was attributed to V. Lenin and J. Stalin in the textbook. They were presented as those who had organized resistance to the current authorities. The Mensheviks were discredited against that background. A. Schestakov admitted that they didn't appear at the third congress of the RSDLP because they didn't believe in an opportunity of military confrontation with the imperial regime. Hence, the Mensheviks could be regarded as “the false socialists”¹⁷.

The same construct was applied to present and other socialistic forces during the First World War. “An external enemy” represented by the Entente Powers was dominated among various kinds of enemies. The common people were portrayed as the deceived victims by the bourgeoisie who had to defend their motherland due to the patriotic feelings. The Bolsheviks' promise to leave the war was supported by its defamation. Tactics and strategy of the military operations were heavily criticized. The Russian generals were characterized as untalented who sent hundreds of thousands of soldiers to certain death. According to the author they did it in a coalition with the Allies of World War I, and an ordinary soldier was cannon fodder for them¹⁸.

The Bolsheviks' activity was the only right in the textbook. The author wrote that only Lenin and adherents had deciphered a cunning plan of the Capitalists and tried to reverse the workers' arm against the exploiters, Mensheviks and Essers as they had betrayed interests of the proletariat¹⁹.

Such description of the events prepared a solid base for the further explanation and legitimization of the Bolshevik coup which was named “the real revolution” by A. Schestakov. The fall of Russian Empire was depicted in positive light, however the Provisional Government was considered as power of the abovementioned “betrayers” who continued to exploit the ordinary people. Therefore, all political forces except the Bolsheviks obtained a clear image of “internal enemy” – counter-revolutionary. All the opponents of “the great revolution” were considered to be them, the author himself insisted on that name²⁰.

The author was writing that the struggle deteriorated when the Essers and Mensheviks were supported by the capitalistic countries, it was the direct external intervention. The German army's invasion of the Ukrainian lands was illustrated in the same light. A. Schestakov considered that the forces that concluded “a special” agreement with Germany were bribed by that country. The Central Council was not directly noted, only some general counter-revolutionary forces that aimed at putting Ukraine under the capitalistic pressure were mentioned. The further attention was concentrated to the Allies of World War I – they were the embodiment of foreign interventionists. Even Poland's attack was presented as the work of the Entente Powers, as it provoked J. Pilsudski to perform military aggression against the Soviet state and seized power. S. Petliura was not mentioned at all²¹.

The textbook didn't contain any information about the Ukrainian revolution, the Ukrainians' desire for seeking autonomy. All confrontations were reduced to the collective “external enemy” embodied by the Entente Powers, and the “internal” enemy was presented via counter-revolutionaries, namely people who were struggling against the Bolsheviks or rejected to help them.

After the 1920-s, A. Schestakov concentrated on glorification of the Soviet power's achievements. The negative image of the rich peasants was severely deepened; they were called “kulaks”, namely “kurkuls”. They were accused of hiding, digging into the ground or destroying

¹⁴ Schestakov A. The Brief Course of History of the USSR. The textbook for the 3rd and 4th grades. Moscow. The State tutorially pedagogical publisher, 1937. P. 35-85.

¹⁵ Ibid. P. 94-95.

¹⁶ Ibid. P. 122-128.

¹⁷ Ibid. P. 129-132.

¹⁸ Ibid. P. 145-146.

¹⁹ Ibid. P. 145-150.

²⁰ Ibid. P. 150-155.

²¹ Ibid. P. 165-172.

bread during the tough times for the Soviet army. But it was predominantly about the new plants' building during the period of industrialization and happy life of free peasants on the collective farms and workers at the plants²².

The crucial subparagraph for our issue "Our Enemies and Friends Abroad" was presented at the end of the textbook, where the USSR is described as a unique country in which socialism had won, as a result the USSR called for peace in the world. Nevertheless, it was ready to meet all dangers. The fascist regimes in Italy and Germany contrasted with it. A. Schestakov particularly considered those regimes as a threat to the Soviet state. The Fascists are characterized by having a desire for war, hostile attitude towards the workers and revolutionaries. "The Fascists don't like our country most of all, the country of socialism, solid pillar of the world, of happiness for all humanity... Preparing the world war, the Fascists send their spies to all countries"²³.

It is important to mention that the textbook contained information regarding penetration of Fascists spies into the USSR. The adherents of Trotsky and Rykov were named by them. Also the Fascists who penetrated into the Soviet state were blamed for Kirov's assassination: "The enemies of our nation had a program, namely to renew oppression of the Capitalists, landowners and give Ukraine to the German, the Far East to the Japanese, they endeavored to prepare a military defeat of the USSR"²⁴. Consequently, the Fascists became a new image of enemy. Moreover, due to the author the enemy had surrounded the USSR and was waiting for a chance to invade it.

It was one of the key moments that had formed an enemy image. Enemies' cleansing of J. Stalin was exclusively explained by a necessity of struggle against "the Fascists" who penetrated into the USSR at the beginning and the end of the 1930-s. Thomas Ewing wrote that teachers drew children's attention to the "external" enemy during the 1930-s. They should understand why the newspapers contained information about elimination of various enemies in the country almost every day (Ewing, 2004: 92-118).

Conclusion

To conclude, the textbook of A. Schestakov "The Brief Course of History of the USSR" presented the Bolshevik's view on the past during the 1930-s. It contained the constructs used by the authorities for spreading the Soviet propaganda. One of the main elements of it was an issue of enemy image creation. The author has reached the aim via considering negative connotations regarding different categories of population in the textbook. We don't notice the obviously expressed "enemies" for a Soviet man at the beginning of the textbook, however the closer we are to the 20th century, the brighter are them. The modification from negative categories of "alien", "hostile" to the most dangerous "counter-revolutionary", "kurkul", as the expression of an internal enemy, occurred. A. Schestakov mentioned "the Fascists" only in the last

subparagraph. Impersonating an external enemy who "has been steadily dreaming about enslavement of the working class", they were considered beyond the geographical borders of the Soviet Union. The logic of material representation and existence of various categories of "enemies" had designed the feeling that children had lived in the dangerous time. As a result, the 20th century was rich for the vivid descriptions of dangerous activity of the internal and external enemies. Therefore, children who heard from the adults about elimination of "kurkuls", "counter-revolutionaries", "Fascists spies" should understand that it was done for good as not people were eliminated, but "enemies of the state".

REFERENCES

- Borysov, V. (2003). *Stanovlennia ta rozvytok zahalnoosvitnoi shkoly v Ukraini 1920-1933 rr.* [Dys. ... Candidat of historical sciences, Dnipropetrovsk National University]. Electronic library of dissertations: <http://www.disslib.org/stanovlennia-ta-rozvytok-zahalnoosvitnoyi-shkoly-v-ukrayini---rr.html> (In Ukrainian)
- Bukhalo, S. (2001). *Osvita na Radianskii Ukraini*. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Diatlova, O. (2008). *Intehratyvnyi pidkhdid do navchannia suspilstvoznavstva v zahalnoosvitnikh shkolakh Ukrainy (20-ti – 30-ti rr. XX stolittia)* [Dys. ... Candidat of pedagogical sciences, Taras Shevchenko National University of Luhansk]. Institute of pedagogy of APN of Ukraine: <http://dspace.hnpu.edu.ua/bitstream/...20.pdf> (In Ukrainian)
- Ewing, T. (2004). A Stalinist Celebrity Teacher: Gender, Professional, and Political Identities in Soviet Culture of the 1930s. *Journal of Women's History*, 16 (4), 92-118. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jowh/summary/v016/16.4ewing.html>
- Hryshchenko, M. (1948). *Rozvytok narodnoi osvity na Ukraini za roky radianskoi vlady*. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Lauglo, J. (2014). Soviet Education Policy 1917-1935: From Ideology to Bureaucratic Control. *Oxford Review of Education*, 14 (3) 285-299. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1050073>.
- Matthews, M. (2021). *Education in the Soviet Union: Policies and Institutions since Stalin*. London, New York.
- Nevinchana, I. (2006). Vplyv system y shkilyni osvity na protses natsiitvorennia v Ukraini u 1920-1930-kh rokakh. *Ukrayinoznavstvo*, 1: 107-111. <http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/12753/1/Nevynchana.pdf> (In Ukrainian)
- Pasternak, Y. (1979). *Ukraina pid bolshevykamy (1919-1939)*. Toronto. (In Ukrainian)
- Pauly, M. (2005). *Building socialism in the national classroom: education and language policy in Soviet Ukraine, 1923-30*. Indiana University.
- Polotskyi, O. (1930). Zahalne navchannia na novomu etapi. *Radianska osvita*. № 10. 12. (In Ukrainian)
- Pometun, E. (1995). *Shkolnoe istoricheskoe obrazovanie v Ukraine: puti razvitiya i problemy*. Lugansk. (In Russian).
- Silova, I., & Palandjian, G. (2018). Imperio soviético, infancia y educación. *Revista Española De Educación Comparada*, (31). 147-171. <https://doi.org/10.5944/reec.31.2018.21592>
- Siropolko, S. (2001). *Istoriia osvity v Ukraini*. Kyiv. (In Ukrainian)
- Schestakov A. (1937). *The Brief Course of History of the USSR*. The textbook for the 3rd and 4th grades. Moscow. The State tutorially pedagogical publisher (In Russian)
- Weinstein, H. (2014). «Language and Education in the Soviet Ukraine». *Slavonic Year-Book. American Series*, 1 (1941), 124-148. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020255>.
- Wojdon, J. (2021). *Communist Propaganda at School: The World of the Reading Primers from the Soviet Bloc, 1949-1989*. London, New York.

²² Schestakov A. *The Brief Course of History of the USSR*. The textbook for the 3rd and 4th grades. Moscow. The State tutorially pedagogical publisher, 1937. P. 190-200.

²³ Ibid. P. 206-207.

²⁴ Ibid. P. 207-208.

Богдан Безпалько,

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (м. Київ, Україна)

e-mail: b.bezpalko.asp@kubg.edu.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-6081-2428

**ОБРАЗ ВОРОГА В ПІДРУЧНИКАХ З ІСТОРІЇ СРСР 1930-х рр.:
НА ПРИКЛАДІ «КОРОТКОГО КУРСУ ІСТОРІЇ СРСР» А. ШЕСТАКОВА**

У статті досліджено особливості формування образу ворога в підручнику Андрія Шестакова «Короткий курс історії СРСР». Також, проаналізовано історіографію проблематики. Вона стосується як радянської доби так і сучасності. Незважаючи на скромну увагу до зазначеної теми з боку іноземних фахівців, виокремлені ті праці, які безпосередньо торкаються проблематики. Окреслено основні зміни в тодішній системі шкільної освіти, які привели до її уніфікації та сформували вимоги до уроку історії загалом та необхідності розробки підручника – зокрема. Розкрито роль Андрія Шестакова, який один з перших розробив «ідеальний» для радянської влади підручник з історії. Показано його кар'єрний ріст та роботу з марксистсько-ленінською ідеологією, що в результаті й допомогло досягти поставленої мети.

Прослідковано процес модифікації негативних конотацій стосовно тих сил, проти яких боролись більшовики. Так розглядаючи період Стародавньої історії, автор критикував багатьох людей. Поглиблювався негативний образ коли мова йшла про релігію в добу середньовіччя. Священики та монахи, порівняно із заможними, сприймалися не як щось «чуже» а більш негативно, як щось «вороже». Особливого забарвлення отримали багаті селяни, саме щодо них було вжито термін «куркуль». Чим ближче А. Шестаков у своєму викладі історичного матеріалу підходив до ХХ ст., тим чіткіше відбувалось формування образу ворога, не лише внутрішнього, а й зовнішнього. Так, першого уособлювали всі сили, проти яких боролись більшовики. Для окреслення таких «ворогів» використовували дефініцію – «контрреволюціонер». Другу категорію уособлювала «Антанта» і «фашисти», які прийшли до влади перш за все в Німеччині та Італії.

Ключові слова: образ ворога, підручник, історія, СРСР, більшовицька пропаганда, освіта.

© Bogdan Bezpalko

Надійшла до редакції: 28.10.2021

Прийнята до друку: 15.11.2021