

The vision of regional history in the Soviet textbooks of the socio-humanitarian block in 1920-1930

Bohdan Bezpalko (ORCID 0000-0002-6081-2428)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

Denys Khokhlov (ORCID 0000-0001-8820-3985)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

ABSTRACT

The article examines the peculiarities of forming the vision of regional history, which was presented in the textbooks of the socio-humanitarian block of the 1920s-1930s. The historiography of the issue is analyzed. Examining the vision of regional history in Soviet textbooks, the author touched on the problem of the Soviet school system functioning in general and the history lesson in particular. The main textbooks of the specified period, which are representative of the presented issues were also analyzed, because they concern secondary general schools, that is, those children who were the basis of the school education system. The article reveals the spatial vision presented in the work of M. Yavorsky "A Brief History of Ukraine" – the main textbook of that period. Among the regions distinguished by the Soviet information policy were: Ukraine as part of the USSR; Naddniproshchyna with the main city Kyiv, Galicia, Volyn and Zakarpattia (Transcarpathia). Also, the peculiarity of the vision of regional history, which was formed at the beginning of the next decade, is revealed. It consisted in shifting the vector from the west to the eastern spaces – Russian lands. Kyiv as a regional center receded into the background, giving way to St. Petersburg and Moscow. The specified vision deepened even more at the end of the 1930s. Textbooks of that period almost did not describe Ukrainian lands, dividing them into two artificial regions, "Eastern and Western" Ukraine. Instead, the regional vision spread to Central Asia, Kazakhstan and the Caucasus.

KEYWORDS

regional history, Soviet propaganda, school textbooks, Soviet school education, Soviet Union.

Introduction

When considering the problems of Soviet propaganda, scientists mostly concentrate on political, cultural and religious aspects. Indeed, it is precisely in these areas that the Bolsheviks' information policy manifests itself in the best possible way. The desire to create a single Soviet society forced them to blur the identities of entire nations. At the same time, it was necessary to construct common loyalty, that is, things that would be perceived equally positively or negatively. Hence the praise of the Communist Party, the creation of a pantheon of Soviet heroes, the rewriting of history, the struggle against the church, and the like. However, the aspect of the vision of regional history remains understudied. Although it is not so clearly manifested in the general maelstrom of means and methods of propaganda, however, its importance does not diminish because of this.

Love for one's homeland is an integral element of any society. Without this component, the existence of any state is impossible. As the Bolsheviks sought to revive the empire but in a different form, they needed to convince the population they controlled that the Soviet Union was the "real homeland". The success of the mentioned process guaranteed the existence of the USSR. That is why

the vision of regional history was so important for the Soviet authorities. To form it, the Bolsheviks actively used the school education system. Pupils, studying the subjects of the social and humanitarian block, had to learn the view of regional history necessary for the authorities. Having studied the proposed problem, we will be able to better understand the peculiarities of Soviet propaganda, which aimed to legitimize the very existence of the USSR. Our attention will be focused on the 1920s and 1930s, because it was during that period that the basis for the vision was formed of the Soviet regional history, which underwent evolution in accordance with the general political situation.

The issue of Soviet propaganda and its impact on society became relevant after Ukraine regained its independence. Researchers tried to understand which means and methods were the most effective in informational influence on the then population of the USSR in general, and the Ukrainian SSR in particular. A Ukrainian scientist, doctor of historical sciences, Stanislav Kulchytskyi made a significant contribution to the mentioned issues. Analyzing the process of establishing Bolshevik power, he repeatedly referred to the importance of Soviet propaganda (Kulchytskyi, 2013: 504). The impact of propaganda on



the formation of Soviet society was revealed by Yuriy Kaganov in his monograph "Homo Sovieticus Identity Construction (1953–1991): Case of Ukraine". Despite the fact that the author considered a later period, his work is still valuable for us, because it reveals the main approaches in the process of using the Soviet information policy (Kahanov, 2019: 68–90). Closer to our topic is the work by L. Nahorna "Historical consciousness in the regional dimension: Ukrainian realities". In it, the researcher briefly touches the issue of the vision on regional history and emphasizes its importance in the Soviet information policy (Nahorna, 2011: 67–70). Among foreign researchers, the topic of the Soviet Union is widely popular, especially when it comes to its information policy. However, the vision of regional history in the educational process is not the main leitmotif of their research. We would like to single out the work "Soviet empire, Childhood, and Education" among the important works that touch our issues. Its authors, Iveta Silova and Garine Palandjian, focused on the study of Soviet propaganda in the field of education (2018). John Lauglo's study Soviet Education Policy 1917–1935: From Ideology to Bureaucratic Control (2014) should also be singled out. Even closer to our problem is the study of the famous American historian James Mace "Communism and dilemmas of national liberation. National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918–1933". The author, investigating the issue of nationalism, emphasizes the efforts of the USSR to level local national identities in favor of a single Soviet one (Mace, 2018: 29–75).

Thus, we can state that the topic of Soviet propaganda in the field of education is in the field of interest of Ukrainian and foreign researchers. However, the process of creating a vision of regional history is understudied, especially when it comes to the analysis of school textbooks, which provide an opportunity to consider the proposed issue more broadly.

Accordingly, **the purpose of the work** is to reveal the features of the process of forming a vision of regional history in the Soviet textbooks of the social and humanitarian block of 1920–1930. In this context, important tasks are: to reflect the evolution of the historical vision from "republican" to "all-Union"; trace the political changes that influenced the mentioned process and its reflection in the textbooks of the humanitarian block of the secondary school; to identify the main regions that received attention and how they fit into the overall Soviet narrative.

Research methods

To achieve the purpose, the analysis method was used, which is end-to-end in our work. Applying it, we divided the text of the textbooks into constituent parts according to the problem-chronological principle and singled out in each of them the structural components in which the authors formed the vision of the regional history by the Soviet authorities. In addition to the analysis, a comparative approach was used to compare the content of various textbooks of the social and humanitarian bloc of the Soviet era. The use of the above-mentioned methods and such general scientific principles as scientificity, objectivity and systematicity permitted to follow the transformation of the views of the Soviet authorities on history, in which the events of the past of individual national republics were leveled; to determine the regions that, according to the Bolsheviks, were most in line with their ideology. Thus, we managed to reveal the nature of the reflection of regional history in the Soviet textbooks of the socio-humanitarian block of 1920–1930.

Results and Discussion

The First World War led to the destruction of the Russian Empire. The peoples who inhabited it got a chance to build their own national states. Ukrainians were no exception, they created their own governing bodies and relatively quickly moved from the idea of autonomy as part of federal Russia to their own independence. However, their plans were not destined to come true. The Russians rejected the possibility of creating a national state in favor of other projects: the White Guards fought for the restoration of the empire, and their competitors, the Bolsheviks, sought to create a union of Soviet states (Kulchytskyi, 2012: 155–186).

As a result of revolutionary events and armed struggle during 1917–1921, the Bolsheviks won. By force of arms and propaganda, they conquered the neighboring peoples, including the Ukrainians, who at that time already had their own national state. Therefore, on January 6, 1919, the formation of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic was proclaimed in the territory of Ukrainian lands. Declaratively, it was considered independent, however, in reality, the Soviet government began to completely absorb it (Kulchytskyi, 2013, 444–486).

During the 1920s, the power of the Bolsheviks in the USSR was not yet absolute. In order to facilitate the incorporation of captured territories into the USSR, they used propaganda rather than brute force. In the Ukrainian SSR, this was manifested due to the policy of Ukrainization, when, on the one hand, the use of the Ukrainian language was allowed, and on the other hand, it turned into a tool for the delivery of Soviet propaganda (Danylenko et al., 1991: 250–269).

The school system of this period was unstable. The Bolsheviks wanted to get rid of everything imperial, including the school education system. The government paid special attention to the subject of history, and this is not surprising, because it is conceptual in the aspect of state formation (Borysov, 2003: 190). Imperial textbooks were banned, but there were not yet any of their own. Given the situation, the Bolsheviks allowed to use the Short History of Ukraine, the author of which was Matviy Ivanovych Yavorskyi. His work was characterized by a class approach to the historical process and Marxist ideology, but here the emphasis on events related primarily to Ukrainian lands was preserved, thanks to which it is possible to trace the beginning of the formation of a vision of regional history¹.

The very title of the textbook "A Brief History of Ukraine" gives the reader the understanding that the work is devoted to a specific region, the history of which appears separately from the entire Soviet Union. Given the political situation at the time, this state of affairs is not surprising. After all, the textbook was written in 1923 and was reprinted almost unchanged for several years. As of 1926, when there was already the fifth edition, the Ukrainization policy continued in the Ukrainian SSR. It permitted to highlight the history and culture of Ukrainians as a separate people, but only in the Soviet sense. "Thanks to the new, Marxist coverage of the facts and events of the history of the Ukrainian people, the reader can see that the history of Ukraine is not an exception to the general historical laws..." - noted in the introduction the head of the Ukrainian SSR at the time, Khrystyan

¹ Yavorskyi, M. Short history of Ukraine. Electronic library "Culture of Ukraine" [Korotka istoriya Ukrainy. Elektronna biblioteka "Kultura Ukrainy"] <https://elib.nlu.org.ua/view.html?id=8079>

Rakovsky². Thus, from the very beginning, pupils were formed to understand that Ukrainian lands are a separate region that is part of the Soviet cultural space. The territorial difference remained, in contrast to the mental one, which began to blur.

The center of the vision of regional history was the city of Kyiv. It comes to the fore from the first chapters of the textbook. The author considers it as the center of the state-building processes of the Eastern Slavs. The importance of the mentioned territory is indicated by the name of the second subdivision: "Kyiv Rus". Due to the fact that the most important political and economic processes were concentrated around Kyiv, the Dnieper region, where the city is located, also gained special importance: "book writing also appears in the Dnieper... a special book language also appears, which church books are written."³

In fact, during the examination of the Middle Ages epoch in the "Short History of Ukraine", Kyiv land stood out qualitatively compared to other regions, which the author almost did not mention. Only when it came to the 12th century. M. Yavorsky noted the decline of Russia and the rise of three other regions in contrast to Kyiv: the Novgorod land, the Suzdal principality, and the Galician kingdom⁴. Despite the fact that these lands were characterized as equal heirs of Russia, the history of Novgorod and Suzdal was not described in the textbook. The emphasis shifted to the Galician kingdom with its political center in the city of Halych.

At first glance, this situation is strange. However, if we take a closer look, we will see that for the author the Galician kingdom had one very important advantage over other regions – because during the reign of Roman Mstyslavovych, it took control of the Dnieper region territory. Thus, the city of Kyiv was under the rule of the Galician princes, and its importance legitimized the leading role of the Galicia-Volyn kingdom⁵. Thus, although the vision of regional history shifted to the west of Ukraine, it still weighed heavily and was connected to the land of Kyiv. This logic of the historical regional vision characterized the Lithuanian period as well, and was strengthened when the textbook described the events of the 16th century. The Dnieper region, as a regional center, once again assumes a leading position, because, according to the author, it was in this region that the Cossacks were born. The activities of one of the most prominent Ukrainian hetmans, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, are connected with it. Evaluating his activity, M. Yavorsky shifts the emphasis even more to Kyiv. This city, preserving its historical importance, became one of the centers of the revolutionary events of 1948-1957. Even after the Cossack state split, it was the lands of the Dnieper region that became the main arena of hostilities⁶. The only region that is still mentioned in the whirlwind of events of the 17th and 18th centuries. these were Galicia and Zakarpattia. They came into the author's field of interest thanks to the fact that there were opryshka detachments that fought against the lords⁷.

The specified regions continued to appear in part alongside the Kyiv lands, but there was no special em-

phasis on them from the author's side. Speaking about Galicia, Transcarpathia, and rarely Volyn, M. Yavorsky did not reveal the history of these regions, there was no information about the development of cities and towns. They were considered only in the general context of the political polls of that time. The beginning of the emphasis shift from the West to the East occurred when the textbook revealed the material related to the beginning of the 20th century. This became especially noticeable when the Bolsheviks entered the political arena.

The textbook describes in detail and emotionally the events of 1917-1921, namely the confrontation of the first with the Ukrainian national forces. From the point of view of the regional vision, Slobozhanshchyna with its center in the city of Kharkiv is becoming important. The mentioned region was used by the Bolsheviks as a springboard for an attack on Ukrainian lands, therefore it appears more often than others in the textbook material. However, it is worth noting that the Kharkiv leitmotif did not prevail over the Kyiv one. The main hostilities were still fought around the capital of the Ukrainian People's Republic, which was still perceived as the main factor in the legitimacy of the government. The South of Ukraine, from the point of view of the regional history vision, appears more active compared to the previous material, this was connected with the battles against the White Guards and their defeat⁸. In general, "A Brief History of Ukraine" legitimized Soviet power in the territory of Ukraine, which was a separate region in the historical vision of the Bolsheviks. In the second half of the 1920s, the political situation in the Soviet Union in general and the Ukrainian SSR in particular began to change radically. Having strengthened their power, the Bolsheviks began to shift the emphasis from national identities to the general Soviet one. Such actions could not bypass the school system, including the vision of regional history. As early as the beginning of 1920s, the Soviet authorities abandoned individual school subjects of the humanitarian block in favor of a single integrated course called "Social Science".

We have already noted that there was a problem with textbooks for teaching a new subject, so the use of "A Brief History of Ukraine" was allowed. However, in the second half of the decade textbooks appeared that satisfied the authorities of the time and were approved for use in schools. They received a name similar to the school subject whose information was contained in them. One of the most popular textbooks of this type was "Social Science" for primary and secondary schools, the authors of which M. Ovsyannikova, B. Levitan, A. Aleksandrov and S. Ushakov republished their work until 1933. This testifies to the representativeness of the mentioned work.

Thus, in the mentioned textbook, there was no longer such a definition as the history of Ukraine. In the introduction, the idea of a Soviet community without clearly defined regional features is imposed on students. "In our country, the power belongs to the workers and peasants. Under the leadership of the working class and its communist party, the workers of our country are rebuilding life in a new way" – these are the words of the authors' address M. Ovsyannikova, B. Levitan and others to pupils⁹. Without giving a clear territorial definition, the Soviet authorities tried to blur the loyalty of pupils to their own na-

² Rakovsky, H. (1926). Preview In: *Yavorskyi, M. Short history of Ukraine*. Ed. 5. Kharkiv. State Publishing House of Ukraine. P. 5-6.

³ Ibid. P. 20–23.

⁴ Ibid. P. 28.

⁵ Ibid. P. 29.

⁶ Ibid. P. 46–64.

⁷ Ibid. P. 66.

⁸ Ibid. P. 122–140.

⁹ Ovsyannikova, O., Levitan, B., Aleksandrov, A., Ushakov, S. (1933). *Sociology. Textbook for primary and secondary school* [Pidruchnyk dlya pochatkovoyi ta seredn'oyi shkoly]. Part I. Kyiv. *Soviet education*. P. 3.

tional republics in favor of the USSR. This was the next stage on the way to formation of a unified Soviet society.

The first paragraph of the textbook, which begins with the words: "Until 1861, serfdom existed in Russia", immediately makes it clear that the events of the past will be presented through the prism of Russian history¹⁰. The class struggle, the confrontation between the rich and the poor, no longer concerned the Ukrainian space. The past, which was described in social science, brought to the fore the Russian landowners and peasants.

The word Ukraine first appears only at page 15, when it was about the Cossacks. Information about the formation of the specified state, the uprising of B. Khmelnytskyi and M. Zaliznyak occupied only two and a half pages, and then the history of the Russian peasant uprisings led by Stepan Razin, Yemelyan Pugachev and others was presented. When talking about the Cossacks, the authors of the textbook did not specify any region in Ukrainian lands. Moreover, Ukraine itself fit into the Russian regional vision¹¹.

In the future, the attention of the textbook material is concentrated on St. Petersburg, as the capital of the Russian Empire and only considering the beginning of the 20th century. At page 51, information about Ukrainian lands appears again: "In mid-October 1905, a rally took place at the Kharkiv Steam Locomotive Plant"¹². Several paragraphs were devoted to this event, after which the main focus again shifted to the Russian regions. Only the events of 1917-1921 forced to shift more attention to Kyiv, because it was for Kyiv that the main hostilities took place between the Bolsheviks and the Ukrainian national forces. However, if M. Yavorsky took ¼ of his textbook to describe these events, then in social science it took up to ten pages, and information about events in Ukrainian lands was often mixed with events that took place in Russian regions¹³.

The leveling of Ukrainian history in favor of the common Soviet history in the 1930s only deepened. It was then that J. Stalin finally took over the leadership of the Communist Party. It, unlike the previous decade, received absolute power in each of the republics of the USSR. The new paradigm of the Bolsheviks was aimed at building a unified Soviet society (*Kulchytskyi, 2017: 237-245*). If, in the 1920s, the authorities allowed conducting experiments in the field of school education, changing the content of education, using different materials in lessons, then in the next decade, processes aimed at the unification of the above-mentioned elements took place. The new political vision led to the restoration of history as a separate lesson, which necessitated the development of new textbooks (*Kalakura, 2016: 179-188*). Their content absorbed the most important cliché that the Bolsheviks tried to instill in children to create their socialist consciousness, including the understanding of the historical regional vision that continued its genesis.

The turning point in this context was 1934. It was then that the resolution of the Central Committee of the AUCP (b) "On teaching civic history in schools of the USSR" was issued. The document stated that the form of studying history that exists in the schools of the USSR is unsatisfactory. The schematic nature of teaching the subject and the same when compiling textbooks were noted. As a result of such actions, the level of pupils' knowledge was

unsatisfactory¹⁴. After the publication of the specified order, the process of preparing textbooks began. Special attention was paid to issues related to the history of the USSR. At the beginning of August, the first developments of the future concept of history teaching had already appeared.

The reaction to the first abstracts of Y. Stalin, A. Zhdanov and S. Kirov testifies to the level of attention to the mentioned issues. In their address "Remarks on the compendium of the USSR history textbook" (August 8, 1934), they criticized the new concept of history, which, in their opinion, was influenced by the imperial paradigm. Stalin criticized the authors for developing the history of Russia instead of the Soviet Union¹⁵.

In this way, the process of working on new textbooks, which were intended to replace "Social Science", continued. This is how "History of the USSR" appeared, the authors of which were K. Bazylevych, S. Bakhrushin, G. Pankratova and L. Focht. Since the manual was used during 1941, it can be stated that it met the requirements of the authorities at that time and is representative of the second half of the 1930s, when new views on history were actually being formed.

In "History of the USSR" the material begins with the 17th century. But, interestingly, the main actors through whom history is represented were the rulers of the Russian Empire. Thus, when students opened a textbook called "History of the USSR", they realized that the past of the Russian people is located in its foundation. Accordingly, geographically, the emphasis shifted to the east, to St. Petersburg and Moscow¹⁶. As we can see, although J. Stalin spoke about the need to create a general history of the USSR, the events of the Russian past remained in its foundation.

Ukraine as a region appears at page 19 and only in the context of Peter I struggle against the Swedes. In this version of history, there were no longer Cossacks and Hetmanate. Such personalities as B. Khmelnytskyi, S. Paliy and other famous figures of the Cossack epoch did not meet. Accordingly, there was no Ukrainian vision of regional history. The Dnieper region completely loses the meaning of the main region of Ukrainian lands, because the city of Kyiv itself almost did not appear as one of the political centers. Instead, information about such a region as Central Asia appears for the first time. The textbook informs that the Bukhara and Khiva Khanates are an integral part of the history of the USSR¹⁷.

Among the Ukrainian regions, the authors of "History of the USSR" highlight only one - Eastern Ukraine. That is the name of one of the paragraphs of the textbook. In general, the view on the understanding of the historical regions of Ukrainian lands is changing. The Soviet authorities tried to convince students that there are two main parts - Eastern and Western Ukraine: "Before the partition of Poland, Ukraine was divided into the eastern (with Kiev), which was part of Russia, and the western, or right-bank, which remained under the rule of Poland"¹⁸.

¹⁰ Ibid. P. 5.

¹¹ Ibid. P. 15-18.

¹² Ibid. P. 51.

¹³ Ibid. P. 83-96.

¹⁴ On the teaching of civil history in the schools of the USSR. Historical materials: <http://istmat.info/node/40824>.

¹⁵ Stalin, I., Zhdanov, A., Kirov, S. (1997). Remarks on the synopsis of a textbook on the history of the USSR. Works. Vol. 14. Moscow, Publishing house "Writer". P. 40.

¹⁶ Bazilevich, K., Bakhrushin, S. Pankratova, G., Focht, L. (1941). History of the USSR. Textbook for the 10th grade of secondary school. Kyiv. Soviet education. 1941. P. 3-14.

¹⁷ Ibid. P. 46-47.

¹⁸ Ibid. P. 66.

In this way, the names of historical regionalism specific to Ukrainian lands are disappearing. And those presented in the textbook are presented as an integral part of the Soviet space. After a short information about the history of Ukraine, the emphasis immediately shifts to that of Russia.

In general, the vision of regional history presented in the mentioned textbook is concentrated around St. Petersburg and Moscow. Compared to social science, "History of the USSR" expands the eastern expanses of the Soviet state. Pupils are invited to learn about the peoples of the Caucasus, the population of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Compared to previous versions of history textbooks, the general concept of the past of the USSR is still presented here, although it was based primarily on the Russian people. Accordingly, this reflects the government's desire to create a single Soviet society with a common history; therefore local regional narratives were leveled.

Conclusions

Thus, in the process of formation of Soviet power, information policy played an important role, the key aspect of which was propaganda in the field of school education. It was the Bolsheviks who used it to influence the young, growing generation, which was supposed to become true citizens of the USSR. For this purpose, textbooks were actively used, especially those of the social and humanitarian direction, thanks to which the worldview processes of children were mostly formed. One of the most important tasks of Soviet propaganda was the creation of a common history, which was supposed to legitimize the existence of the Soviet Union. It was this that led to an increasing disregard for the past of those peoples who were part of the USSR.

The specified process began immediately after the Bolsheviks came to power in the early 1920s. Students of those years, studying history textbooks, formed a vision of Ukrainian lands as a separate historical region that was part of the Soviet space. The most important role in it was played by the Dnieper region, the center of which was the city of Kyiv. It was the political and cultural center around which state-building processes took place. Also, the regions of western Ukraine, such as Galicia, Volyn, and Zakarpattia, often appeared. The eastern vector was rather weak, it manifested itself only in Slobozhanshchyna with its center in the city of Kharkiv.

However, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, the situation began to change radically. The vision of regional history is increasingly shifting to the eastern expanses of Russian lands. The Soviet government sought to make them the center of state-building processes and thus legitimize the messianic role of Russians in the USSR. Ukrainian children, reading textbooks on social science, no longer found a clear outline of their own state. It was called socialist, workers, but without specific geographical and regional definitions. Petersburg and Moscow are beginning to play an increasingly important role, but Kyiv, like the entire Dnieper region, was included in the context of the historical processes of the Russian lands.

In the mid-1930s, the Soviet government completed the vision of a common Soviet history. Although it was based on the foundation of Russian lands, it still represented the general concept of the past of the USSR. In it, Ukrainian lands were represented by two new regions: Eastern and Western Ukraine. Moreover, the first of them, according to the authors, had a more important role, since

it included the city of Kyiv, which was part of the Russian Empire and then the USSR. Therefore, the regional vision shifted more and more to the east. Pupils were offered to get acquainted with the spaces of the distant Caucasus, Kazakhstan and Central Asia, on a par with Ukrainian regions. Thus, the Soviet authorities, creating a vision of regional history, made the pupils aware that their homeland is not only the national republic but the entire Soviet Union. Spatial vision constantly moved from Kyiv to Moscow and further east.

Summarizing, it is worth noting that, in general, regional history was presented rather weakly in the textbooks of the social and humanitarian bloc. The significance of only a few of the largest regions was revealed, but without detail. There was no information that would reveal the role of towns and districts. Villages did not appear at all in the regional concept. This approach was not accidental. The Soviet authorities tried to blur local national identities, forming a vision of the USSR as a common homeland for Soviet citizens, among whom Russians were "more equal to others".

REFERENCES

- Borysov, V. (2003). Stanovlennia ta rozvytok zahalnoosvitnoi shkoly v Ukraini 1920–1933 rr.. Thes. of Kandidat of Historical Sciences: 07.00.01. Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian)
- Danylenko, V., Kasianov, H., Kulchytskyi, S. (1991). *Stalinizm na Ukraini: 20-30-ti roky*. Kyiv, Lybid. (In Ukrainian)
- Kahanov, Yu. (2019). *Konstruiuvannia «radianskoj liudyny» (1953–1991): ukrainska versia*. Zaporizhzhia, Inter-M. (In Ukrainian)
- Kalakura, Ya. (2016). Konstruiuvannia obrazu voroha yak tekhnolohiiia manipulatsii rosiiskoi istoriohrafii ta propahandy. *Ukraina–levropa–Svit. Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Seriia: Istoriiia, mizhnarodni vidnosyny*, (18). Ternopil, Vydavnytstvo TNPU im. V. Hnatiuka, 179–188. (In Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, S. (2012). Natsionalna polityka Kremlia shchodo USRR (1919–1922), in: *Natsionalne pyttannia v Ukraini XX – pochatku XXI st.: istorychni narysy*. Kyiv, Nika-Tsentr, 155–186. (In Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, S. (2013). *Chervonyi vyklyk. Istoriiia komunizmu v Ukraini vid yoho narodzhennia do zahybeli*. Book 1. Kyiv, Tempora. (In Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, S. (2017). *Chervonyi vyklyk. Istoriiia komunizmu v Ukraini vid yoho narodzhennia do zahybeli*. Book 2. Kyiv, Tempora. (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>.
- Meis, D. (2018). *Komunizm ta dylemy natsionalnoho vyzvolennia. Natsionalnyi komunizm u radianskii Ukraini, 1918–1933*. Kyiv, Komora. (In Ukrainian)
- Nahorna, L. (2011). Istorychna svydomyi u rehionalnomu vymiri: ukrayinski realiyi. *Rehionalna istoriya Ukrayiny*, 5, 61–74 (In Ukrainian).
- Silova, I., & Palandjian, G. (2018). Imperio soviético, infancia y educación. *Revista Española De Educación Comparad*, 31, 147–171. <https://doi.org/10.5944/reec.31.2018.21592>

Візія регіональної історії у радянських підручниках суспільно-гуманітарного блоку 1920-1930 рр.

Богдан Безпалько (ORCID 0000-0002-6081-2428)
Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Денис Хохлов (ORCID 0000-0001-8820-3985)
Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

У статті досліджено особливості формування візії регіональної історії, яка була представлена у підручниках суспільно-гуманітарного блоку 1920-1930-х рр. Проаналізовано історіографію проблематики. Розглядаючи візію регіональної історії у радянських підручниках, автори торкнулися проблеми функціонування радянської шкільної системи загалом та уроку історії зокрема. Також були проаналізовані основні підручники зазначеного періоду, які є репрезентативними для представленої проблематики, адже стосуються середньої загальної школи, тобто тих дітей, які були основою шкільної системи освіти. Стаття розкриває просторову візію, представлену в роботі М. Яворського «Коротка історія України» – основному підручнику того періоду. Серед регіонів, що виділялись радянською інформаційною політикою, були: Україна як частина СРСР; Наддніпрянщина з головним містом Києвом, Галичина, Волинь та Закарпаття. Також, розкрито особливість візії регіональної історії, яка формувалась на початку наступного десятиліття. Полягала вона у зміщенні вектору із заходу на східні простори – російські землі. Київ як регіональний центр відходив на другий план, поступаючись Петербургу та Москві. Ще більше зазначена візія поглибилась наприкінці 1930-х рр. Підручники того періоду майже не описували українські землі, виділяючи їх у два штучних регіони «Східну та Західну» Україну. Натомість регіональна візія поширилась на простори Середньої Азії, Казахстану та Кавказу.

Ключові слова: регіональна історія, радянська пропаганда, шкільні підручники, радянська шкільна освіта, Радянський Союз.

Received (Надійшла до редакції): 14.04.2023,

Accepted (Прийнята до друку): 11.05.2023

Available online (Опубліковано онлайн) 30.06.2023