



SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Источники и методология исторических исследований

<https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2026-25-3-625-642>

EDN: AWWUBE

Научная статья / Research article

Historical Component of the Course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood”: Methodology, Narrative, and Interpretations

Vardan E. Bagdasaryan ^{a, b} , Sergey I. Resnyansky 

^a Federal State University of Education, Moscow, Russia

^b State Academic University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia

^c RUDN University, Moscow, Russia

 vardanb@mail.ru

Abstract: The article examines the historical component of the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” in the context of the tasks of new worldview formation and youth education. The source base of the study includes four core textbooks, considered as the official corpus of the course, prepared within the logic of the “DNA of Russia” project and the introduction of the discipline into higher education. The methodology of the study is based on examining the textbooks on “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” through the correlation of key paradigms for explaining the historical process. The research methods include comparative analysis of educational texts, identification of interpretative differences, and quantitative content analysis. According to the findings, Russian history in the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” is presented within the logic of the civilizational approach, which interprets Russia as a special type of state-civilization. The study identifies common methodological features of the textbook corpus. It is shown that, while the textbooks share a common conceptual framework, there are differences in the interpretation of certain periods and phenomena of the Russian historical process. The article concludes that the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” creates a demand for a broader methodological renewal of teaching national history based on the civilizational approach, axiological analysis, and the presentation of Russia as an independent subject of the world historical process.

Keywords: historical process, civilizational approach, state-civilization, historical continuity, philosophy of history, traditional values, worldview, content analysis, textbooks

Conflicts of interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Authors' contributions: All authors contributed equally to the research and writing of the article, reviewed the final text and bear equal responsibility.

Funding: The study was carried out within the framework of the state assignment of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation (KFRF-2026-0021; registration No. 1025090200004-5-5-3.1), topic: “The Worldview and Methodological Potential of the Course Fundamentals of Russian Statehood in the Training of History and Social Studies Teachers.”

For citation: Bagdasaryan, V.E., Resnyansky, S.I. “Historical Component of the Course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood”: Methodology, Narrative, and Interpretations.” *RUDN Journal of Russian History* 25, no. 3 (August 2026): 625–642. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2026-25-3-625-642> EDN: AWWUBE

© Bagdasaryan V.E., Resnyansky S.I., 2026



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Историческая компонента курса «Основы российской государственности»: методология, нарратив, интерпретации

Вардан Эрнестович Багдасарян ^{a, b} , Сергей Иванович Реснянский ^c 

^a Государственный университета просвещения, Москва, Россия,

^b Государственный академический университет гуманитарных наук, Москва, Россия

^c Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Россия

 vardanb@mail.ru

Аннотация: Исследуется историческая компонента курса «Основы российской государственности» (далее – ОРГ) в контексте задач нового мировоззренческого строительства и воспитания молодежи. Источниковую базу исследования составили четыре базовых учебных издания, рассматриваемые как официальный корпус курса, подготовленный в логике проекта «ДНК России» и внедрения дисциплины в систему высшего образования страны. Методология исследования основана на рассмотрении учебников ОРГ в ракурсе соотнесения ключевых парадигм объяснения исторического процесса. В качестве методики исследования использован сравнительный анализ учебных текстов, выявление интерпретационных различий и количественный контент-анализ. Согласно полученным выводам, российская история в курсе ОРГ представлена в логике цивилизационного подхода осмысления России как особого типа государства-цивилизации. Выявлены общие методологические признаки корпуса учебников. Показано, что при единстве общей рамки учебники сохраняют различия в интерпретациях отдельных периодов и явлений российского исторического процесса. Сделан вывод о том, что ОРГ формирует запрос на более широкое методологическое обновление преподавания отечественной истории с опорой на цивилизационный подход, ценностно-смысловой анализ и представление России как самостоятельного субъекта мирового исторического процесса.

Ключевые слова: исторический процесс, цивилизационный подход, государство-цивилизация, историческая преемственность, историософия, традиционные ценности, мировоззрение, контент-анализ, учебники

Заявление о конфликте интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Вклад авторов: Авторы внесли равный вклад в исследование и написание статьи, ознакомились с окончательным текстом и несут равную ответственность.

Финансирование: Работа выполнена в рамках государственного задания Министерства просвещения Российской Федерации (KFRF-2026-0021), № 1025090200004-5-5-3.1. Название проекта: «Мировоззренческий и методологический потенциал курса Основы российской государственности в подготовке учителя истории и обществознания».

Для цитирования: Багдасарян В.Э., Реснянский С.И. Историческая компонента курса «Основы российской государственности»: методология, нарратив, интерпретации // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: История России. 2026. Т. 25. № 3. С. 625–642. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2026-25-3-625-642> EDN: AWWUBE

Introduction

Relevance. The current challenges of modern development on Russia, such as increasing geopolitical pressure, on the one hand, and a trend toward social atomization, on the other hand, have determined the demand for purposeful formation of young people's worldview. This necessity of shaping these views has been conceptualized at the highest state and social levels; Russian President Vladimir Putin has repeatedly spoken about the need for ideological education in the Russian Federation, linking the country's resilience with value definiteness, the preservation of historical memory, civic responsibility, and Russia's understanding of its own path. One of the institutional responses to this demand is

the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” (FRS) developed on the direct instructions of the President of the Russian Federation¹.

History has always played a special role in the formation of worldviews. It is history that shapes a person’s understanding of the origin of the state and society, the continuity of generations, the trials experienced by a population, the victories and heroes, and the tragic ruptures and restoration of historical integrity. Historical knowledge fosters the ability in students to relate their personal destiny to the fate of the country as an unfolding of a long historical process. Therefore, the historical component of the FRS requires special consideration in the focus of those ideological challenges that the course aims to address.

Source base. The discussion of the course approaches and content was conducted through the “DNA of Russia” platform with the direct support of the Ministry of Education and Science and other partners, such as the Russian Society “Knowledge” and under the supervision of the Presidential Administration. Following extensive expert discussions involving 562 universities, the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” was included in educational programs as a compulsory subject. By September 1, 2023, the start of the educational process, the preparation of three basic publications had been completed – the Educational-methodical complex, the textbook for engineering and technical and natural science fields of study, and the textbook for the humanities field of study.

By the beginning of the introduction of the new course, three basic educational publications had been prepared in such Russian universities as National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Yaroslavl Demidov State University (YSU), and Lomonosov Moscow State University (MSU). MEPhI was one of the first universities included in the “DNA of Russia” project, receiving the status of a methodical center to support the implementation of the FRS, and the research team of the Institute of Fundamental Problems of Social Sciences and Humanities of MEPhI published a manual for natural sciences and engineering and technical fields of study (headed by A.A. Larionov (hieromonk Rodion))². At YSU under the supervision of M.V. Marasanova, a team prepared an educational-methodical complex, which had the volume of 26.5 printed sheets; it effectively became a textbook³. A textbook aimed at students majoring in the humanities was created at Lomonosov Moscow State University (supervised by S.V. Perevezentsev)⁴. A year later, at the State Academic University of Humanities (GAUGN) A.D. Kharichev, A.V. Polosin, and A.V. Selezneva prepared a new integrated version of the course⁵.

¹ “Perechen’ poruchenii po itogam zasedaniia Gossoveta: utv. Prezidentom Rossiiskoi Federatsii 29.01.2023 № Pr-173GS. P. 11, podp. ‘a’ [List of instructions following the State Council meeting: approved by the President of the Russian Federation on January 29, 2023, No. Pr-173GS. Clause 11, subparagraph ‘a’],” Kremlin.RU, accessed June 12, 2026, <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/assignments/orders/70421>

² A.P. Shevryov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tehnicheskikh spetsial’nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023).

³ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel’nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023).

⁴ S.V. Perevezentsev, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiougumaniarnye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: A Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom Delo Publ., 2023).

⁵ A.D. Harichev, A.V. Polosin, A.V. Selezneva, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2024).

Later, other textbooks appeared; they were prepared at various other universities, typically have taken into account the specifics of the respective educational institution, region, or an author's vision⁶. This process was quite active. However, the first group of four publications can be singled out and defined as the official corpus of the FRS. Accordingly, it was the works included in this group that were selected for a focused analysis. The division of the publications under review by the four educational centers was conditional, as there was no strict institutional linking of experts to them. However, for the convenience of further analysis, the following designations are used: YSU textbook, MEPhI textbook, MSU textbook, and GAUGN textbook. The presented textbooks were created on a common, conventional methodological basis developed through discussions of the members of authors' groups, and therefore they cannot help but represent a unified platform. At the same time, the commonality of the initial framework did not eliminate differences of emphasis and in the interpretations of the historical material, and this is important to reflect on, bearing in mind the variability in approaches.

Discussion on the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood”: ideological and historiographical focus

The publication of the FRS textbooks and the implementation of the course which was perceived as a form of state-ideological building (enthusiastically by some, strongly opposed by others), which aroused widespread controversy. From the very beginning, the discussion of the textbooks turned out to be linked not so much to the quality of the learning materials, but rather to the question of the state's right to set the historical and ideological framework for higher education and the focus of the agenda that was set.

Five lines of reaction to the FRS can be identified. The first line is associated with direct support for its implementation and solidarity with the proposal. In this position, the course is perceived as a long-awaited ideological module for higher education. The significance of the FRS is seen in the change of the general logic of social and humanitarian education through it. In this formulation of the question, the course, is interpreted as the beginning of a broader shift towards the sovereignization of Russian social sciences as a whole⁷.

⁶ V.A. Kuznetsov, A.V. Bogomolova, S.Yu. Mitrofanova, M.V. Mikheikina, D.G. Slatov, T.L. Silant'eva, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook] (Samara: Izdatel'stvo Samarskogo universiteta Publ., 2024); G.A. Bykovskaya, R.V. Savenkov, D.A. Baranov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook] (Voronezh: VGUIT Publ., 2024); Ya.V. Valyaev, I.I. Gulyaev, A.V. Artyukh, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov po vsem napravleniiam podgotovki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students in All Fields of Study] (Belgorod: Belgorodskii gosudarstvennyi agrarnyi universitet imeni V.Ya. Gorina Publ., 2024).

⁷ V.E. Bagdasaryan, “Russia as Civilization-State: New Methodological Projections in Representing the Course in Russian History,” *RUDN Journal of Russian History* 25, no. 1 (2026): 138–154, <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2026-25-1-138-154>; Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, A.V. Popova, “The Importance of Traditional Values in Teaching the Course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood,” *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 1 (2024): 35–46, <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-1-35-46>; G.N. Lansko, S.I. Resnyansky, A.M. Khazanov, Review of *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatelnykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions], by V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, and S.A. Kudrina, *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 4 (2024): 138–148, <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-4-138-148>; A.A. Gulyaev, “The Significance of the New

There are also calls to go still further and to align other social sciences and humanities with the ideas of the FRS, and to reconsider the dependence of scientific language on Western theoretical schemes and form our own research frameworks for describing Russia and the world. Corresponding demands are also made with regard to history, in particular, the methodological shift in the teaching of historical disciplines to the platform of the civilizational approach and understanding Russia as a special type of state-civilization⁸. The position of the subsequent systemic decolonization of Russian sciences and education is presented by A.G. Dugin, who put forward a project to introduce a course in Western studies, which would explore the West as one of multiple civilizations, rather than a universal norm for human development⁹.

Of particular importance within this line is the support of practitioners teaching the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood.” The course teachers share their experience and point out its pedagogical effectiveness and potential. Suggestions are also put forward for methodological improvement and the introduction of additional substantive components. Judging by the viewpoints of practitioners, the course has truly become the focal point for a new ideological form in the realities of educational work at universities¹⁰.

One should note criticism of the FRS which is not related to any consistently stated methodological or ideological platform. This criticism was primarily based on the rejection of the initiative, since the course was introduced by the state, it was pre-determined to be ideological, unscientific, imposed, and a prime subject for debunking. The course was discredited by giving some concepts deliberately grotesque meanings, manipulations, or even inconsistencies with their content.

It is the concept of “pentabasis” which has become one of the main targets of this criticism. It was seen as group of artificially constructed “entities,” almost a quasi-metaphysical scheme imposed on students under the guise of scientific knowledge. Meanwhile, within the very logic of the course, the pentabasis asserted nothing more than the basic potential of statehood. Any statehood exists through a country as a geographic space, a society as a people, a state as a form of political organization, an individual as a subject of existence, and family as the primary microsocial entity. This scheme captured the constituent parts of state existence, without which no statehood is possible. Apart from

Discipline in Universities – ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’,” *Vlast* 31, no. 5 (2023): 100–103, <https://doi.org/10.31171/vlast.v31i5.9785>; V.A. Lukushin, A.N. Asafov, “Best Practices in Implementing the Course ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’ (Based on Materials from University Websites),” *Humanities and Social Sciences. Bulletin of the Financial University* 14, no. 6 (2024): 30–38, <https://doi.org/10.26794/2226-7867-2024-14-6-30-38>; L.V. Khokhlova, “The Philosophical Potential of the University Discipline ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’,” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 24, no. 1 (2024): 103–116, <https://doi.org/10.15372/PHE20240107>

⁸ V.I. Zhukov, “Civilization: From Hypotheses, Legends and Bylinas to Legal Certainty,” *RUDN Journal of Russian History* 24, no. 2 (2025): 249–263, <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2025-24-2-249-263>

⁹ A.G. Dugin, “Westernology: Towards a Sovereign Russian Science,” *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 3 (2024): 7–21, <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-3-7-21>

¹⁰ D.A. Sagal, “Analiz pervykh rezul’tatov vnedreniia kursa ‘Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti’ v 2023/2024 uchebnom godu i otsenka ego strategicheskogo vliianiia na patrioticheskoe vospitanie grazhdan Rossiiskoi Federatsii [Analysis of the First Results of Implementing the Course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” in the 2023/2024 Academic Year and Assessment of Its Strategic Impact on the Patriotic Education of Citizens of the Russian Federation],” in *Izuchenie rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti kak osnova patrioticheskogo vospitaniia molodezhi: materialy Vserossiiskoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii* (Moscow: Moskovskii finansovo-promyshlennyi universitet “Sinergiia” Publ., 2024), 120–122.

the concept of pentabasis, this structure for describing statehood was acceptable to social science thought as a whole, and even with adding or removing some components, was traditional¹¹. Criticism of the pentabasis revealed reluctance to examine the proposed construct rather than bringing substantive disagreement. The FRS proposed discussing statehood as a complex system, while opponents often shifted the conversation over toward the issue of public exposure and of the conceptualization of statehood.

As expected, it was the liberal ideological segment which reacted most harshly to the FRS. Its criticism centered around four main points. The first one was legal: critics saw the compulsory ideological discipline as the de facto introduction of a state ideology and, therefore, a contradiction to Article 13 of the Russian Constitution. The second point of criticism is related to the rejection of the civilizational approach. In liberal reception, the concept of “state-civilization” was viewed not as a methodological framework for describing Russia’s historical specificity, but to remove the country from universal legal and political criteria. It was the reference to the religious roots of Russian statehood that was particularly sensitive. The third critical component consisted of accusations of promoting a cult of the state, including a religious one. And this despite the fact that the state, as noted above, is considered in the course alongside an individual, society, and family – that is, clearly not from an etatist perspective.

The fourth point is the accusation of textbooks of nationalism. This reaction is particularly revealing as a liberal label for outright slander. In all the textbooks, both in terms of concept and actual implementation, the idea of the multi-nationality of Russian peoples, unity in diversity, was central to the structure of the entire course. The very concept of the state-civilization was presented from the perspective of viewing Russia as a system of multiple equal ethnic groups, a symphonic way of life.

The left-wing ideological segment of the criticism turned out to be less broad than the liberal one. The version of historical process continuity proposed in the FRS textbooks included the achievements of the Soviet era, and therefore, for some left-wing representatives, the course was probably more acceptable than previous discrete versions of history. However, there was also ideological criticism of the FRS textbooks from the orthodox left-wing segment.

The main criticism of this line was directed against the approach advocated within the FRS framework, which, in keeping with the tradition of historical materialism, was characterized as being idealistic. The civilizational approach, accordingly, was also classified as idealistic. The appeal to the axiological foundations of statehood provoked objections from the position that interests, not values, needed to be a primary focus. Instead of discussing the state-civilization, traditional values, cultural identity, and spiritual foundations of Russian history, they proposed to return to the historical-materialist explanation of social development. The desire to present Russian society as a historically a single whole was perceived by critics as a shift away from class contradictions.

The left-wing part agreed with liberal criticism in its rejection of appeals to God and religion. The religious component was perceived as a departure from scientific materialism and a return to pre-revolutionary forms of legitimizing power.

¹¹ A.V. Polosin, A.D. Kharichev, A.Yu. Shutov, E.N. Sokolova “Perception of basic values, factors and structures socio-historical development of Russia (based on research and testing materials),” *Journal of Political Research* 6, no. 3 (2022): 9–19, <https://10.12737/2587-6295-2022-6-3-9-19>

A separate point was the accusation of denying the progressive significance of revolutions. In the FRS textbooks, revolutions are often presented as a break in continuity, while left-wing criticism understands them as a mechanism for development. Correspondingly, attitudes toward the phenomenon of tradition also diverged, leading to particularly critical reactions to the description of the Muscovy model in the textbooks (primarily the MSU textbook)¹².

Paradoxically, considerable criticism of the FRS also came from conservative ideological positions. The paradox was that the course relied on thinkers traditionally considered to fall within the spectrum of conservatism ideology, yet critics failed to see in the textbooks either a corresponding focus on values or a corresponding methodology. There was criticism regarding the absence of theoretical and methodological sections, although the textbooks do contain such sections, and there is pronounced emphasis on the methodology of the civilizational approach. Conservative critics accuse the textbook authors of effectively “rolling back” from the official concept of the Russian state-civilization toward competition between various doctrines and approaches – Slavophilic, Westernist, pochvennichesky, and Eurasian. In fact, in the textbooks under review, the state-civilization concept is central, while references to other explanatory models were made in a comparative context. Another criticism was that the course allegedly denies the absence of a historically formed identity in modern Russian society, which must be created on the pentabasis. This did not correspond to the content, and as relying on the civilizational approach all the textbooks promoted the idea of deep origins and traditions of Russian values, the historical continuity of statehood, collective memory, and the existence of stable intergenerational images. Thus, this segment of the criticism was most likely the result of departmental competition rather than a part of a more substantive discussion¹³.

Russian historical process in the methodological framework of the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood”

The review of reactions to the FRS is of interest as a measurement of the state of public ideological understanding. It suggests, on the one hand, a high degree of ideological division in society, and, on the other hand, the presence of a dominant core ready to embrace the key value-based and semantic tenets of new Russian state-building.

The content of the FRS is meta-disciplinary. It includes philosophical, cultural, politological, legal, sociological, economic, geographical, and futurological components. All of them contribute to revealing Russian statehood as a complex phenomenon, understood through the concept of “civilization.” The historical component occupies a special place in this synthesis; it defines the axis of state genesis and links all of these elements. Consequently, a demand arises for a focused description of the historical narrative presented in the FRS.

¹² R.S. Osin, “Ideological and theoretical-methodological provisions of the course “fundamentals of Russian statehood”: critical analysis,” *Society: Philosophy, History, Culture*, no. 2 (2024): 74–79; M. Gatsko, “O kurse ‘Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti’ [On the course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood”],” *RUSO: Rossiiskie uchenye sotsialisticheskoi orientatsii*, accessed April 14, 2026, <https://csruso.ru/publicistika/mihail-gacko-o-kurse-osnovy-rossijskoj-gosudarstvennosti/>

¹³ S.G. Volobuev, “One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? On the Problems of Scientific-Methodological and Educational-Methodological Support for the Course ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’,” *The Heritage Institute Journal*, no. 2 (2024): 12–22.

The positioning of the FRS as a fundamental worldview course implies that the approaches developed within it should be further extrapolated to other related disciplines, including history. Hence, the emerging objective of the study is to analyze the concepts of the history of Russian statehood in its teleological and concrete historical perspectives which are developed in the FRS. Given the complexity of the basic sources of the discipline, a secondary objective arises: to identify commonalities and variations in the official course materials.

In all four FRS textbooks, the historical process is conceptualized within a single methodological framework. Differences in the authors' emphases and interpretations do not negate a single historical methodology of the course.

1. Civilizational approach.

The civilizational approach views the historical process as the development of large cultural and historical communities, each with its own logic of existence, value core, and mechanisms of self-reproduction. In all four textbooks, Russia is viewed as a state-civilization. The YSU textbook presents a detailed contrast between the state-civilization and the nation-state¹⁴. Despite the historical perspective dating back to the 19th century, the theory of civilizations underlying the FRS is challenged by universalistic assumptions. The GAUGN textbook states as follows:

The civilizational approach appears to be an integral element of modern social sciences, often ignored for political rather than academic reasons¹⁵.

2. Continuity of the Russian historical process.

The principle of continuity allows seeing history not as a sum of fragmented episodes, but as a process of intergenerational transfer of experience and identity, ensuring a connection between eras. Ancient Rus', the Tsardom of Russia, the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and modern Russia are viewed as different historical embodiments of a fundamentally unified community. The textbooks may offer different assessments of eras, some are more critical, some are more apologetic. Nevertheless, the general principle remains: Russia is historically reproduced. The MSU textbook places a more positive emphasis on pre-Peterine Russia, and on Orthodox, synodical, autocratic, and spiritual and state traditions. The MEPhI textbook and the MSU textbooks take a more critical approach to the Soviet period, particularly its revolutionary rupture. The YSU textbook and the GAUGN textbook offer a more integrative interpretation of the Soviet period in regard to previous eras. The YSU textbook's formula is revealing: the Soviet Union "was essentially reproduced as a state-civilization"¹⁶. According to this vision, the revolutionary

¹⁴ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel'nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Delo" RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 41.

¹⁵ A.D. Harichev, A.V. Polosin, A.V. Selezneva, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Delo" RANKhiGS Publ., 2024), 191.

¹⁶ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel'nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Delo" RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 46.

transformation led to the restoration of the Old Russian statehood system at a new level, with collectivist, synodical ideals and a messianic horizon. The MEPhI textbook presents the Soviet experience as a kind of lesson for the future. The authors of this textbook state as follows:

It turns out that the Soviet Union for modern Russia is simultaneously an example of flawed state building, and a positive development that should be preserved at all costs, and a kind of talisman that, with its tragic demise, teaches a proper lesson to the current Russian Federation and its authorities¹⁷.

3. Axiological approach.

The axiological approach reveals history through values, which define the goals of historical achievements and provide the internal direction for social development. The Russian historical process is explained through fundamental values and is not reduced to material determinants. This is particularly significant for the educational perspective of the course content. The YSU textbook contrasts values with anti-values, and civilizations with anti-civilization¹⁸. This contrast establishes a perspective on history as a dichotomy of good and evil, which is fundamentally important in terms of worldview as overcoming the tenets of relativization.

4. Civilizational reproduction with reliance on traditional spiritual and moral values.

The reliance in the textbooks on traditional spiritual and moral values presupposes viewing history as a revelation of the value ideals of humanity and individual civilizations. These values are presented as civilizational ones, through which the spiritual and moral constants of Russia are revealed. Departing from traditional values has historically resulted in crises (“times of troubles” in the Russian equivalent), disruptions, and threats to statehood.

At the same time, each textbook emphasizes the importance of development and the existence of a vision of the future. The GAUGN textbook points out that civilizations have historically striven to find an optimum between progress and tradition, and any imbalance can have the most critical consequences. They give examples of the devastating consequences of traditionalism for national security from the experience of the Opium Wars in China and the decline of the Ottoman Empire.

5. Religious foundation of Russia's historical genesis

The acknowledgment of the religious foundation of historical genesis within the logic of the classics of civilizational theory's understanding of the formation of civilizations establishes a position on the spiritual foundations of the historical process. The religious component is prominently featured in all textbooks as a factor in establishing the moral foundations of state-building. In the MEPhI textbook Orthodoxy is defined as the

¹⁷ A.P. Shevyryov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tekhnicheskikh spetsial'nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 220.

¹⁸ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel'nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 131, 159.

civilizational core of Russian history¹⁹. The MSU textbook views Orthodoxy as the foundation of the Russian idea. An emphasis is placed on the concept of “Holy Rus’.”²⁰

6. *Multiethnicity as a characteristic of the Russian state-civilization.*

All the textbooks highlight the contribution of various peoples to the single Russian civilizational history, with an emphasis on the Russian civilization-forming core. Multiethnicity is presented as a fundamental characteristic of Russian civilization. Examples are given of heroic service to Russia by representatives of various ethnic groups. All the textbooks contain references to the definition of the Russian people as the state-forming one, interpreted specifically from a historical perspective.

7. *“Challenge – response” as the logic of civilizational dynamics*

The explanatory “challenge-response” model developed by A. Toynbee reveals historical movement through the ability of civilizations to respond to external threats, internal crises, natural constraints, technological changes, and cultural gaps. In the FRS textbooks Russian history is revealed as a mobilization response to the relevant challenges of the time. Historical pressure from the West is seen as one of the recurring challenges. The theme of conflicts with the West and Russia’s putting forward an alternative to the Western path of development is given in all the FRS textbooks. At the same time, none of the textbooks contain any shift to Western-phobic positions. In the YSU textbook, the challenges of Western pressure, in accordance with the disclosure of the “challenge-response” concept, became a catalyst for Russian mobilization leading to Russia’s other historical breakthroughs²¹.

8. *Heroic narrative of history.*

The heroic narrative highlights historical figures and deeds that engender a distinct sense of pride in the homeland. Heroes of the Fatherland are presented in the textbooks in all periods of Russian history, which sets the appropriate framework for its presentation. In the YSU textbook and the MEPhI textbook, the theme is highlighted in a special section. It is proposed that during FRS seminars, there should be heroic illustrations and the images of statesmen, military leaders, naval commanders, heroes of the Great Patriotic War, philanthropists, researchers, scientists, cultural figures, sportsmen, contemporary heroes, including heroes of the special military operation. Each textbook offers its own unique series of heroes.

9. *Historiosophicality.*

Historiosophicality means seeking to see in history not only the sequence of facts, but also meaning, teleological direction, purpose, and the connection between the past and the future. The term “historiosophy” is not actively used in the textbooks, but in fact, the historiosophical perspective is constantly discussed – the meanings of history, the purpose

¹⁹ A.P. Shevryyov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tekhnikeskikh spetsial’nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 92.

²⁰ T.V. Evgen’eva, I.I. Kuznetsov, S.V. Perevezentsev, A.V. Selezneva, O.E. Sorokopudova, A.B. Strakhov, A.R. Boronin, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiugumanitarnye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 245–246.

²¹ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel’nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023).

of Russia, its mission, its historical destiny, and vision of the future. The textbooks are not limited to describing events; they seek the semantic foundation of Russia’s path. In the MSU textbook, the word “meaning” and its derivatives are used 182 times, defining the historiosophical nature of the theme raised.

Method of quantitative content analysis

To reflect the content of the educational materials, there was used the method of quantitative content analysis of references to personalities. Two calculations were employed: 1. The representation of various thinkers, which was intended to reflect the historical methodology employed; 2. The representation of statesmen and political leaders, which would allow for the reflection of the corresponding emphases in the presentation of the historical process. High-ranking government officials who acted as ideologists were included in the second calculation group (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Representatives of Russian and world social thought in the FRS textbooks
(based on the results of quantitative content analysis)

Personalities	MEPhI	MSU	GAUGN	YSU	Total
N. Ya. Danilevsky	7	24	18	13	62
K. N. Leontiev	1	22	17	10	50
F. M. Dostoevsky	9	20	3	12	44
N. A. Berdyaev	6	6	12	12	36
A.J. Toynbee	12	6	6	7	31
I. A. Ilyin	10	5	5	7	27
K. Marx	3	5	16	3	27
N. M. Karamzin	7	13	4	2	26
A. S. Pushkin	10	11	3	1	25
V. S. Solovyov	11	7	1	5	24
O. Spengler	7	4	9	4	24
Aristotle	13	6	0	0	19
M. A. Bakunin	0	18	1	0	19
V. O. Klyuchevsky	3	3	8	2	16
S. Huntington	6	2	2	6	16
L. A. Tikhomirov	2	10	0	3	15
L. N. Tolstoy	8	3	2	2	15
A. S. Khomyakov	1	6	3	5	15
F. Engels	4	3	5	3	15
A. S. Panarin	0	5	6	2	13
V.V. Rozanov	0	10	1	2	13
P. A. Sorokin	1	0	6	6	13
A.I. Herzen	2	6	3	0	11
L. N. Gumilyov	5	0	3	3	11

Source: The table was compiled by V.E. Bagdasaryan and S.I. Resnyansky based on independent calculations of the content of all ORG textbooks considered in this article.

Table 2

**Russian statesmen and political leaders in the FRS textbooks
(based on the results of quantitative content analysis)**

Personalities	MEPhI	MSU	GAUGN	YSU	Total
V.V. Putin	63	8	19	14	104
Peter I	22	29	14	3	68
B. N. Yeltsin	28	12	2	1	43
Ivan the Terrible	16	13	11	1	41
Ivan III	7	10	8	1	26
V.I. Lenin	5	8	6	1	20
J.V. Stalin	15	4	0	1	20
Alexei Mikhailovich	3	11	5	0	19
Alexander III	3	8	5	1	17
Catherine the Great	6	8	3	0	17
Alexander II	5	2	5	1	13
Alexander Nevsky	2	4	2	4	12
M. S. Gorbachev	10	1	0	1	12
Nicholas I	7	4	1	0	12
Alexander I	4	4	3	0	11
Vladimir Sviatoslavich / Baptist	1	9	0	1	11
K.Z. Minin	6	4	1	0	11
Mikhail Fedorovich / Mikhail Romanov	6	4	0	1	11
D. M. Pozharsky	7	2	2	0	11
Ye. M. Primakov	11	0	0	0	11
Dmitry Donskoy	2	1	5	2	10

Source: The table was compiled by V.E. Bagdasaryan and S.I. Resnyansky based on independent calculations of the content of all ORG textbooks considered in this article.

N.Ya. Danilevsky’s prominent position among all the thinkers in the four textbooks, to a significant margin over the others, is determined by the nature of the historical method employed. This position is natural, since in his doctrine on cultural-historical types, he developed one of the initial forms of the civilizational approach and in turn it formed one of the key influences of the FRS. Danilevsky is also a significant figure because he represents Russian social thought and multiple references to him indicate the Russian intellectual genealogy of civilizational theory. It can be noted with a certain conventionality that it is the thought of N. Ya. Danilevsky that occupies a significant position in the currently established methodology of the historical process. Through his work, the idea of the variable development of humanity was introduced, and simultaneously the formation of this idea in the Russian space of social science thought was revealed.

The second position is taken by F. M. Dostoevsky, who was the primary exponent of expressing the historiosophy of Russian statehood through the means of literature. His role is comparable to the one that during the Soviet era was effectively played by M. Gorky. Dostoevsky conceptualizes Russian history through the ideals of faith, spiritual commonality, and Russia’s messianic mission, which generally aligns with the agenda of the course. As a poet, A.S. Pushkin maintains a high position in this symbolic series as well.

K.N. Leontiev is also among the most frequently mentioned figures, as one of the most trenchant critics of the view of history based on the logic of the universality of progress. Through his thought, the concept of the cultural complexity of historical communities, the danger of unification, and the destructiveness of mechanically following the Western model of development was revealed. N.A. Berdyaev’s almost identical result

is also indicative. Berdyaev represents a circle of thinkers who viewed Russian history through the lens of the “Russian idea.” Of particular importance in the logic of the course is Berdyaev’s illustration of Russian pseudomorphoses – the value and semantic reproduction during the transition from the Moscow period to the Peter the Great period and from the imperial to the Soviet period.

Other developers of civilizational theory, A.J. Toynbee and O. Spengler, also occupy high positions in the conditional rating. Their presence demonstrates that the civilizational approach in the textbooks is revealed not only within the Russian historiosophical field but also within a global theoretical framework.

K. Marx, whose methodology determined the structure of historical description during the Soviet period, is sure to be among the first-tier thinkers. In the FRS textbooks, the Marxist framework is present as a significant part of intellectual history, but no longer as the sole explanatory model of the historical process.

I.A. Ilyin ranks highly, which reflects his position as a philosopher of Russian statehood. V.S. Solovyov is important as the founder of the discourse of the Russian Idea, with the search for historiosophical foundations of historical development. Among professional historians, the most frequently mentioned figures are N.M. Karamzin and V.O. Klyuchevsky.

Overall, the quantitative content analysis confirms that the FRS textbooks are constructed around the civilizational approach, and this includes the Russian religious and philosophical tradition, the historiosophy of Russian statehood, and a comparison of Russian thought with global theories of the historical process.

The FRS textbooks contain, with varying degrees of detail, virtually the entire substantive canvas of Russian history. This is reflected in the list of rulers and supreme statesmen: according to the adopted calculation method, 47 such figures are recorded in the main text of the four textbooks related to different periods – from the ancient Russian statehood to the modern Russian Federation.

Peter the Great is the most frequently mentioned historical ruler. His personality is naturally among the central ones, due to his association with one of the key state transformations. Ivan the Terrible is also frequently mentioned, as he is associated with the genesis of the Tsardom of Russia. In the FRS textbooks, the assessments of Ivan the Terrible, as well as those of Peter the Great differ, which does not negate the recognition of the special historical significance of these figures.

A distinctive feature of the course is the emphasis on Ivan III. All the textbooks highlight his role in Russia’s development. In the MEPhI textbook, he is presented as the architect of the Russian state-civilization²², whereas in the MSU textbook, he is presented as the founder of the continuous line of Russian state sovereignty²³.

The high frequency of references to B.N. Yeltsin is explained primarily by the inclusion of the MEPhI textbook, which particularly emphasizes the transition period to modern Russian statehood. V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin are presented rather widely, but their

²² A.P. Shevryyov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tekhnicheskikh spetsial’nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 88.

²³ T.V. Evgen’eva, I.I. Kuznetsov, S.V. Perevezentsev, A.V. Selezneva, O.E. Sorokopudova, A.B. Strakhov, A.R. Boronin, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiologicheskiiye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 26.

frequency is lower than might be expected given their place in public discourse. This proportion is explained by the overall logic of the presentation, which removes potentially divisive themes from the focus and shifts its emphasis to the themes that promote unity of community.

All the textbooks feature the figure of Sergius of Radonezh. Each of them refers to the historical experience of the Time of Troubles. All of them also analyze emergence from the Time of Troubles, and work within the logic of the course towards revealing the theme of unity and sovereignty.

Interpretation differences

Despite sharing a common methodological framework, the FRS textbooks have obvious interpretation differences. Recording these differences indicates the absence of a rigid ideological line in the course.

The interpretation specificity of the YSU textbook is linked to the presentation of Russian history through the successive shifts in state ideological concepts. The historical process is revealed through three models of statehood ideologies: “Moscow is the third Rome,” “Orthodox Empire,” and “Communism.” Furthermore, behind the change of political language, symbols and institutional forms, one can trace the paradigmatic continuity of each of the embodiments. All these ideologies were essentially a single ideology in correlation to the specificity of historical time²⁴. The interpretation of the Soviet ideological period is particularly indicative. The YSU textbook notes as follows: “The ideology of communism was developed throughout the entire preceding history of Russian socio-political thought. To a certain extent, communist ideology was a logical result of Russian civilizational discourse.”²⁵ In accordance with this view, the Soviet period received not only a revolutionary, but also a civilizational and successive explanation.

The MEPhI textbook is distinguished by a more critical approach to the precedents of the past, where state transformation was achieved through violence and suppression of opponents. It presents the oprichnina as a tragic experience of unlimited power. The conflict of Ivan the Terrible with Kurbsky reveals two models for understanding tsarist power and in this narrative, the oprichnina is described through its repressions, and there is also a discussion the Novgorod pogrom, the weakening of the country, the defeat of the oprichnina army by Devlet Girey, the devastation of the western lands, and the approaching crisis that became one of the preconditions for the Time of Troubles²⁶.

The same logic is evident in the interpretation of the revolutions of 1917. In the section “Russian Civilization under Threat. Revolution,” the February Revolution is depicted as the disorganization of the army and government, and the October Revolution as a demonstrative break with the Russian past. The execution of the imperial family, the persecution of the Church, the rejection of patriotism in favor of internationalism, and then

²⁴ V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, S.A. Kudrina, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatel'nykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 80–83.

²⁵ Ibid., 66.

²⁶ A.P. Shevryyov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tehnicheskikh spetsial'nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2023), 89–91.

the focus on world revolution and the subsequent Civil War, determine in their eyes that a revolutionary scenario was a threat to the foundations of Russian civilization²⁷.

The MEPhI textbook also criticizes certain aspects of Soviet modernization. Collectivization is described as a severe historical trauma: the confiscation of grain in excess of the permissible norm against the backdrop of the crop failure of 1932–1933 led to mass famine and millions of casualties. According to the surveys cited in the textbook, in family memories of the 1990s, collectivization was perceived as the second most traumatic experience after the Great Patriotic War²⁸.

On the contrary, the MEPhI textbook interprets the reforms of Alexander II positively, as a way out of Nicholas I's impasse following the defeat in the Crimean War. The need for reform is described as obvious, and the chapter is characteristically titled "Test of Reform," which allows seeing the reforms not as the destruction of statehood, but as an attempt to renew it through liberation, legal changes, local self-government, and the expansion of social energy. Overall, the textbook prioritizes the reformist course of Alexander II over that of Alexander III, which, in particular, distinguishes this textbook from the MSU textbook²⁹.

The MSU textbook offers a more traditionalist interpretation of Russian history. In the presentation of state genesis, it emphasizes the idea of the Slavic "melting pot" in which the political and cultural unity of future Russia was formed³⁰. Autocracy is interpreted as a form of sovereignty, as a historical means of maintaining the state's independence, rather than its accepted definition as autocracy³¹.

In contrast to the criticism of Ivan the Terrible's policy in the MEPhI textbook, the MSU textbook points out the ideological bias in the historiographical distortion of the Russian tsar's image. The authors refer to the nickname "Terrible" to later manifestations. They emphasize the inadmissibility of reducing the reign solely to negative stereotypes³².

Peter the Great's Europeanization, in turn, is critically interpreted in the MSU textbook as a breakdown of the traditional Russian way of life. It is viewed as a painful intrusion of Western forms into the Russian historical structure, with caused corresponding and consequences and crisis for Russian civilization³³.

Particularly revealing is the textbook's high assessment of Nicholas I, which diverges from the usual liberal paradigm. The authors of the textbook state as follows: "Nicholas I put an end to the unbridled admiration for everything Western and non-Russian that had become fashionable under Peter the Great. This characteristic feature of Nicholas I's reign was acutely captured by A.S. Pushkin, who called the actions of Emperor Nicholas I "a counterrevolution to the revolution of Peter the Great."³⁴

²⁷ A.P. Shevryyov, V.V. Lapin, S.V. Rogachev, A.V. Tutorskiy, P.Yu. Uvarov, A.A. Larionov, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlia studentov estestvenno-nauchnykh i inzhenerno-tehnicheskikh spetsial'nostei* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook for Students of Natural Science and Engineering Specialties] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Delo" RANKiGS Publ., 2023), 99–100.

²⁸ Ibid., 100–101.

²⁹ Ibid., 95–97.

³⁰ S.V. Perevezentsev, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiologicheskiiye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: A Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom Delo Publ., 2023).

³¹ Ibid., 198–199, 213–214.

³² Ibid., 49–50.

³³ Ibid., 219.

³⁴ S.V. Perevezentsev, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiologicheskiiye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: A Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom Delo Publ., 2023), 246.

In its assessment of the revolutionary movement, the MSU textbook also adheres to a traditionalist line of interpretation. The Bolsheviks were accused of being out of touch with their national soil, of failing to express the demands of the Russian people, and of severing the organic link between Russian statehood and its historical tradition³⁵. However, the challenge of 1941, a war of annihilation, prompted an ideological shift, and “the Soviet leadership began to rely on the traditional values of the Russian people.”³⁶

The GAUGN textbook generally seeks to smooth out the rough interpretation edges and present Russian history within a more integrated civilizational framework. Indicative in this regard is the attempt to smooth over the traditional opposition between Normanists and anti-Normanists. The Varangian narrative, per se permissible, is not focused on to provide evidence of the external origins of Russian statehood; it revealed in the text, Russian statehood was the result the long process of integration of Slavic, Finno-Ugric, and Baltic components into a single political space³⁷.

The textbook’s assessment of the revolutionary transformation is presented in stages: the first stage is a separation from civilizational foundations; the second stage is a civilizational reversal. In the first post-revolutionary years, the previous model of the Katechon’s state was replaced by a directly opposite orientation toward world revolution. However, by the mid-1930s, there was already evident a trend toward the restoration of state-civilization: radical revolutionary formulas disappeared from the public agenda, anti-religious pressure weakened, and the pantheon of national statehood was once again expanded by including figures from the pre-revolutionary past, such as Alexander Nevsky and Alexander Suvorov. This process culminated in the abolition of the Comintern in 1943, signaling a rejection of the previous universalist revolutionary model in favor of the historically consistent line of Soviet state-building³⁸.

Conclusion

The analysis of the FRS textbooks revealed a significant historical component. A systematic attempt was made to develop a holistic vision of Russian history, drawing on a civilizational approach and conceptualizing Russia as a state-civilization. Russian history is revealed as the reproduction of the state-civilization, passing through various historical forms – Ancient Rus’, the Tsardom of Russia, the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and the modern Russian Federation. Changes in political language, ideological formulas, and institutional models do not negate the internal continuity of the historical process within this logic.

The civilizational approach becomes the methodological axis of the course. It defines the understanding of Russia as an independent cultural and historical community, possessing its own value core, religious and cultural foundation, multiethnic composition, collective memory, and experience in responding to challenges. In this version of historical representation, it is N.Ya. Danilevsky occupies the key position in a variable understanding of history.

Along with the civilizational approach, the textbooks also highlight other consistent methodological features: the principle of historical continuity, an axiological reading of

³⁵ S.V. Perevezentsev, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov, izuchaiushchikh sotsiugumanitarnye nauki* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: A Textbook for Students Studying Social Sciences and Humanities] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom Delo Publ., 2023), 99.

³⁶ Ibid., 368.

³⁷ A.D. Harichev, A.V. Polosin, A.V. Selezneva, *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebnoe posobie* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Textbook] (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANKhiGS Publ., 2024), 59–61.

³⁸ Ibid., 77–79.

history, reliance on traditional spiritual and moral values, an acknowledgement of the religious foundation of Russian historical genesis, multiethnicity as the original characteristic of Russian civilization, the logic of “challenge – response,” a heroic narrative, and historiosophicality. These elements form a common framework for a new historical explanation.

While the textbooks share a single methodological platform, there are interpretation differences. The YSU textbook emphasizes the inclusion of the Soviet period in the single historical narrative. The authors of the MEPhI textbook are much more critical of the violent transformations of the past and more favorable to the practice of reform. The MSU textbook offers the most traditionalist interpretation of the past, with a critical attitude toward Peter the Great’s Europeanization and a positive rethinking of the conservative course of Nicholas I. The GAUGN textbook strives to integrate and smooth out rough interpretation edges, including an attempt to present the Soviet period through the movement from the revolutionary rupture to the restoration of state-civilization logic.

The existence of such differences is important. It demonstrates that the official corpus of the FRS is not reduced to a mechanical repetition of a single scheme. The common methodological base establishes a framework, but within it, there is space for the author’s interpretation. Consequently, this is not a matter of a closed ideological dogma, but of the formation of a new field of historical explanation.

The development of a new explanatory model for interpreting Russian history forms a demand for the use of the FRS experience directly in historical education. The adopted chronological scheme requires supplementing it with a civilizational, axiological, historiosophical, and state-semantic framework.

Such a revision does not mean abandoning the scientific complexity of history. On the contrary, the FRS brings back the issue of the meaning of the historical process and gives additional impetus to research the past.

Submitted: 4.02.2026

Approved after reviewing: 10.04.2026

Accepted for publication: 12.04.2026

References

- Bagdasaryan, V.E. “Russia as Civilization-State: New Methodological Projections in Representing the Course in Russian History.” *RUDN Journal of Russian History* 25, no. 1 (2026): 138–154 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2026-25-1-138-154>
- Dugin, A.G. “Westernology: Towards a Sovereign Russian Science.” *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 3 (2024): 7–21 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-3-7-21>
- Gulyaev, A.A. “The Significance of the New Discipline in Universities – ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’.” *Vlast’* 31, no. 5 (2023): 100–103 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.31171/vlast.v31i5.9785>
- Harichev, A.D., Shutov, A.Yu., Polosin, A.V., and Sokolova, E.N. “Perception of Basic Values, Factors and Structures of the Socio-Historical Development of Russia (Based on Research and Testing Materials).” *Journal of Political Research* 6, no. 3 (2022): 9–19 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.12737/2587-6295-2022-6-3-9-19>
- Ierusalimskiy, Yu.Yu., and Popova, A.V. “The Importance of Traditional Values in Teaching the Course ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’.” *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 1 (2024): 35–46 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-1-35-46>

- Khokhlova, L.V. “The Philosophical Potential of the University Discipline ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’.” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 24, no. 1 (2024): 103–116 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.15372/PHE20240107>
- Lanskoy, G.N., Resnyansky, S.I., and Khazanov, A.M. Review of *Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti: uchebno-metodicheskii kompleks po distsipline dlia obrazovatelnykh organizatsii vysshego obrazovaniia* [Fundamentals of Russian Statehood: Educational and Methodological Complex for Higher Education Institutions], by V.M. Marasanova, V.E. Bagdasaryan, Yu.Yu. Ierusalimskiy, L.G. Titova, and S.A. Kudrina. *Bulletin of the State University of Education. Series: History and Political Sciences*, no. 4 (2024): 138–148 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5164-2024-4-138-148>
- Lukushin, V.A., and Asafov, A.N. “Best Practices in Implementing the Course ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’ (Based on Materials from University Websites).” *Humanities and Social Sciences. Bulletin of the Financial University* 14, no. 6 (2024): 30–38 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.26794/2226-7867-2024-14-6-30-38>
- Osin, R.S. “Ideological and theoretical-methodological provisions of the course “fundamentals of Russian statehood”: critical analysis.” *Society: Philosophy, History, Culture*, no. 2 (2024): 74–79 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.24158/fik.2024.2.9>
- Sagal, D.A. “Analiz pervykh rezul’tatov vnedreniia kursa ‘Osnovy rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti’ v 2023/2024 uchebnom godu i otsenka ego strategicheskogo vliianiia na patrioticheskoe vospitanie grazhdan Rossiiskoi Federatsii [Analysis of the First Results of Implementing the Course “Fundamentals of Russian Statehood” in the 2023/2024 Academic Year and Assessment of Its Strategic Impact on the Patriotic Education of Citizens of the Russian Federation].” In *Izuchenie rossiiskoi gosudarstvennosti kak osnova patrioticheskogo vospitaniia molodezhi: materialy Vserossiiskoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*, 120–122. Moscow: Moskovskii finansovo-promyshlennyi universitet “Sinergiia” Publ., 2024 (in Russian).
- Volobuev, S.G. “One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? On the Problems of Scientific-Methodological and Educational-Methodological Support for the Course ‘Fundamentals of Russian Statehood’.” *The Heritage Institute Journal*, no. 2 (2024): 12–22 (in Russian).
- Zhukov, V.I. “Civilization: From Hypotheses, Legends and Bylinas to Legal Certainty.” *RUDN Journal of Russian History* 24, no. 2 (2025): 249–263 (in Russian), <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8674-2025-24-2-249-263>

Information about the authors / Информация об авторах

Vardan Ernestovich Baghdasaryan, Dr. Habil. Hist., Professor, Dean of the Faculty of History, Political Science and Law, State University of Education; 10A, Radio Str., Moscow, 105005, Russia; Leading Researcher of the Center for Fundamental and Applied Research Projects, State Academic University for the Humanities, bld. 6, 6, Miusskaya Square, Moscow, 125047, Russia; vardanb@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4895-5108>; SPIN-code: 5013-6853.

Вардан Эрнестович Багдасарян, доктор исторических наук, профессор, декан факультета истории, политологии и права, Государственный университет просвещения; 105005, Россия, Москва, ул. Радио, 10А; ведущий научный сотрудник Центра фундаментальных и прикладных научных проектов, Государственный академический университет гуманитарных наук, 125047, Россия, пл. Мюсская, д. 6, стр. 6; vardanb@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4895-5108>; SPIN-код: 5013-6853.

Sergey Ivanovich Resnyansky, Dr. Habil. Hist., Professor, Professor of the Department of History of Russia of the Middle Ages and Modern Times, Federal State University of Education; 10A, Radio Str., Moscow, 105005, Russia; Professor of the Department of Russian History, RUDN University; 6, Miklukho-Maklaya Str., Moscow, 117198, Russia; s-r44@yandex.ru; SPIN-code: 9798-0532.

Сергей Иванович Реснянский, доктор исторических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры истории России средних веков и нового времени, Государственный университет просвещения; 105005, Россия, Москва, ул. Радио, 10А; профессор кафедры истории России, Российский университет дружбы народов; 117198, Россия, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6; s-r44@yandex.ru; SPIN-код: 9798-0532.