

The National Union Of Political Scientists

---

POLITICAL **ISSUE 1(25-26), 2017**  
SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

MOSCOW, 2017

# POLITICAL SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

**Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,**

Chairman of the Editorial Board, Doctor of Political Sciences,  
Professor of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship  
University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

## Editorial Board:

BOZHANOV Vladimir A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of World and National Literature, Belorussia National Technical University (Belorussia, Minsk)
DONAJ Lukasz	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Faculty of Political Science And Journalism, Department of International Relations (Poland, Poznań)
IRKHIN Yuri V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor, Chair of Politology and Political Administration, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
KARAGZE Tatiana V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Politology and Sociology of the Moscow State Pedagogical University (Russia, Moscow)
KOVALENKO Valery I.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Russian Politics of the Moscow State Lomonosov University (Russia, Moscow)
KOSIKOV Igor G.	Doctor of History Sciences, Chief Researcher, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia, Moscow)
KRIVOKAPIC Boris	Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Business and Law Faculty, University "Union – Nikola Tesla" (Serbia, Belgrade)
MIKHAILOV Vyacheslav A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Head of the Chair of National and Federative Relations of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
NASIMOVA Gulnara O.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology, School of Philosophy and Politology, Kazakh National University named after El-Farabi (Kazakhstan, Almaty)
NISNEVICH Yuli A.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, National Research University – Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow)
PAKHRUTDINOV Shukritdin I.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Department "National interests and the stability of society" of the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
PLYAYS Yakov A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology of the Finance University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia, Moscow)
PRYAKHIN Vladimir F.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Chair of World Politics and Foreign Relations, Russian State Humanitarian University (Russia, Moscow)
PUSKO Vitaliy S.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor of the Chair of Politology, Moscow State Technical University named after N.E. Bauman (Russia, Moscow)
SALKIEWICZ- MUNNERLYN Ewa	Ph.D., MFA, Academy Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (Poland, Krakow)
Olivier VEDRINE	Chief Editor of the Russian Edition of the French Review "Revue Défense Nationale", Speaker of the European Commission, Editor of the Franco-German Magazine on Foreign Politics "European Union Foreign Affairs Journal" and Rector of the Continental University in Kiev (France, Paris)

**Editor-in Chief of the Review – Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,**  
Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Humanities  
and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia  
(RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

## ESTABLISHED BY LLC "PUBLISHING HOUSE "SCIENCE TODAY"

The Journal is published with  
the participation of the Institute  
of modern policy of the Peoples'  
Friendship University (RUDN)

The Journal is registered  
by the Federal Service  
for Supervision of Mass Media,  
Communications and Protection  
of Cultural Heritage

Reg. Number PI No.FS77–46176  
of August 12, 2011  
The Journal is published quarterly

The journal is included  
in the database of the Russian  
Science Citation Index

The Five-year Journal's  
impact factor is 0,808

The Journal is included  
in Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Academic papers published  
in the journal undergo obligatory  
editorial checking.

The authors' opinion not always  
coincides with the opinion  
of the Editorial Board.

At reprint of the article or a part  
of it the reference to the Journal  
is obligatory.

Address of the editorial office:  
10, Zagoryevskaya street, building 4,  
office 4, Moscow, Russia, 115598  
Tel: (910) 463-53-42  
[www.voprospolitolog.ru](http://www.voprospolitolog.ru),  
[www.souzpolitolog.ru](http://www.souzpolitolog.ru)  
E-mail: [voprospolitolog@yandex.ru](mailto:voprospolitolog@yandex.ru),  
[souzpolitolog@yandex.ru](mailto:souzpolitolog@yandex.ru)

Executive Secretary  
*Shkurina S.S.*

Computer-aided makeup by  
*Antsiferova A.S.*

Translated by  
*Chernyshova E.V.*

Signed for printing on 25.06.2017  
Format 60x84/16. Offset paper.  
Offset print.  
Number of printed sheets  
Circulation 500 copies.  
Order 000.

Printed at the LLC "Bely Véter"  
Str. Shchipok, 28,  
Moscow, Russia, 115054  
Tel.: (495) 651-84-56

# CONTENTS

---

## POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES

**Slizovsky D.E., Medvedev N.P., Shulenina N.V., Kashin M.V.**

Research Project: Attitude of the Youth Towards the Revolution of 1917  
and its Influence on the Presidential Elections of 2018 ..... 4

**Zalysin I. Yu.** Problem of Violence in Studies  
of Modern Russian Political Scientists ..... 16

## POST-SOVIET COOPERATION AND CONFLICTS

**Kurbonova Z.M.** Enclaves in Central Asia: Myths and Realities..... 22

**Krut'ko A.A.** Russia and Kyrgyzstan Aim to Deepen Eurasian Integration ..... 27

## POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

**Mikhailenko A.N.** Evolution of the Pattern of International Relations  
with a Dominant Element ..... 37

## REVIEWS

**Gaiduk V.V.** Political crises and conflicts: theory and practice  
(Review of the monograph by Medvedev N. P.  
"Political crises and conflicts: theory and practice". – Moscow:  
Publishing house of the journal Political science, 2017. – p. 161) ..... 51

**Slizovsky D.E.** Review of the article by R. A. Suleymanov  
"On the Formula of the Russian Nation in Political Agenda» ..... 54

OUR AUTHORS..... 57

**D. E. SLIZOVSKY**

*Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor,  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,  
Moscow, Russia*

**N. P. MEDVEDEV**

*Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor,  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,  
Moscow, Russia*

**N. V. SHULENINA**

*PhD in philosophy, Assistant Professor,  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,  
Moscow, Russia*

**M. V. KASHIN**

*Student of politology,  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,  
Moscow, Russia*

## RESEARCH PROJECT: ATTITUDE OF THE YOUTH TOWARDS THE REVOLUTION OF 1917 AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS OF 2018

*The article announces a research project for the next two years (2017-2018) initiated by the students and supported by a group of professors, it also announces the results of a trial study. The purpose of the project is to understand the dynamics of young people's ideas about the most relevant historic and political events: the 100th anniversary of the 1917 revolution in Russia and the 2018 presidential elections and on that basis to show the degree of connections and intersections between history and politics, between the age consciousness and political matter. It is planned to conduct a series of surveys (questionnaires and interviews) with a group of youth respondents, mainly university students, obtaining results in the form of facts, forms and styles of representation of historical memory in modern politics. In the theoretical aspect, a historical event, the revolution of 1917, is actualized and its nature, role, values, technologies, entities, achievements and failures are described in modern terms, just as the idea of incorporating a historical dimension into the political practice. In the applied and experimental aspects, the authors attempt to reconstruct visions, values, ideological and political perceptions of the past and modern youth, and the pragmatics of handling them.*

**Key words:** *the revolution of 1917 in Russia, the February revolution of 1917 in Russia, the October revolution of 1917 in Russia, the centenary of the revolution in Russia, the 1917 revolution in the consciousness and politics, the youth about the revolution of 1917, the 1917 revolution and presidential elections of 2018.*

The revolution of 1917 in Russia is a major historical phenomenon, which marked the beginning of the creation of a society with a fundamentally different organization than that of all previous types of society. This opinion is shared by 84.4% of the 65 students, specializing in humanities, interviewed in December 2016 in the process of the pilot, trial and local measurement of opinions and ideas about the revolution on the eve of 2017, the year of the centenary of the largest historical event of the last century. At the same time, 15.6% believe that the revolution was a banal coup, the seizure of power by some characters from the other.

A particular case of perception of this event and attitude to it in the consciousness of a certain age group of young people should not be considered as a universal assessment and reassessment of the event, worthy of a critical attitude and additional verification. But, nevertheless, the approach and methodology, and the results of the survey, in our opinion, stimulate heuristic intentions in the dissemination of the cognitive experience obtained in this survey and other researches<sup>1</sup>, the results of measurements of the mood and attitude to the major historical and political events relevant in the next two years (the centenary of the Revolution and the presidential elections in 2018). It is fundamentally important to note that the idea of continuing this kind of research is actively supported by the students acting both as researchers and as an object of research. The research project, as is now clear for all its participants, stimulates academic and practical interest to extend such measurements, to compare the received data with others and other areas of study on a broader time and subject-to-subject basis using theoretical approaches and methods of data analysis of historical, political and sociological sciences.

Actually, we are talking in this case about the implementation of a two-year research project (2017-2018), induced and provoked by the events of 2017, the central content of which, we believe, will be the centenary of the revolution of 1917 in Russia, and the natural transition of this campaign to the presidential election campaign of 2018. At the highest political level, the Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly has already set a roll of value and semantic assessments and a revision of the ideas and methods of the 1917 revolution. It already forms a certain view point on the historic event and its consequences and its own truth: "The coming year 2017 is the year of centenary of the February and October revolutions. It is a good reason to turn once again to the causes and nature of the revolutions in Russia. Not only historians or scientists but also the Russian soci-

---

<sup>1</sup> See: Slizovsky D. E., Shulenina N. V. Electoral preferences of the young people of 18 to 20 years of age before the elections of 2016: between political apathy, anti-politics and activism // Issues of politology. – 2016. – No. 3. – Pp. 7-19; Slizovsky D. E. Social and electoral preferences and orientations of the young people of 18 to 20 years of age // Sociology. Vestnik RUDN. – 2016. – No. 3. – Pp. 576-585; Slizovsky D. E., Amiantov A. A. Socio-political preferences of young people of 18 to 20 years of age: the contrast between statements and reality // Locus. – 2016. – No. 4. – Pp. 93-110; Slizovsky D. E. The paradox of youth attitudes and relations to the election – 2016 // Communicology. V. 4. – 2016. – № 5. – Pp. 84-97.

ety needs an objective, honest and in-depth analysis of these events”<sup>1</sup>. The revolutionary event which took place a hundred years ago was of such scale that even today it turns either one or the other side towards not only the Russian state and civil daily life, but also to the contradictory international situation, causing certain reactions. Thus, the President of Ukraine Petr Poroshenko announced the year 2017 the year of the revolution, but the year of Ukrainian revolution of 1917-21. One of the priorities for the authorities for the years 2017 to 2021 is defined as commemoration of the events and prominent participants of the 1917-1921 revolution. And the Ukrainian historian Georgy Kasyanov believes that addressing the historic events of the 1917 revolution and its modern reinterpretation means nothing less than “interpretation of history as a component of information war”<sup>2</sup>.

It is therefore understandable (today it is even difficult to imagine) what passions will rage in Russian society as these events approach. Probably, there will be no interested person left among Russian or world centers of intellectual knowledge or influence, no historian or politician who will not express his or her attitude to these events. Attitude to the events of 1917 and its reflection in 2017 sometimes spurs unhealthy imagination, it is especially true if you accept the fact that a number of analysts believe that the year 2017 will be a turning point for Russia. Most Russian political scientists and economists have said that the Russian state tends to repeat some “historical mistakes” with enviable frequency and for some reason they confidently say it again and again. If we analyze some historic events that have occurred one hundred years ago and compare them with today’s events, we can come to the conclusion about predictability of the same revolution in 2017<sup>3</sup>.

In 2015, the Ministry of culture of the Russian Federation offered a new understanding of the 1917 revolution. The Minister of culture Vladimir Medinsky has declared his readiness to a balanced assessment of the controversial historical events and formulated five theses of the platform of national reconciliation timed to the anniversary of the events of February and October 1917<sup>4</sup>. P. Rodkin, member of Zinoviev club MIA «Russia today,» considered it necessary to declare the revolution of 1917 an anniversary with a living meaning<sup>5</sup>. His colleague A. Pankin developed this idea deeper and wider calling this process and its participants by their proper names: “We will comprehend and rethink not only the series of events that took place between February and October of 1917, but also the entire further course of the Soviet and post-Soviet history of Russia. The anniversary will be also celebrated worldwide. You can imagine how today in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly on December 1, 2016. – URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53379> (date: 15.12.2016).

<sup>2</sup> See – URL: <http://rian.com.ua/interview/20170108/1020312974.html> (date: 09.01.2017).

<sup>3</sup> See – URL: <http://russinfo.net/predictions/predskazaniya-o-revoljucii-v-rossii-2017.html> (date: 10.01.2017).

<sup>4</sup> See. – URL: [https://www.gazeta.ru/science/2015/05/20\\_a\\_6695345.shtml](https://www.gazeta.ru/science/2015/05/20_a_6695345.shtml) (date: 09.12.2016).

<sup>5</sup> See – URL: <http://zinoviev.info/wps/archives/2652> (date: 09.12.2016).

Western intelligence services, brain trust and headquarters of fugitive oligarchs they distribute main topics of propaganda campaigns, compile lists of PR agencies, media, NGOs and public politicians through which they will penetrate the international discourse”<sup>1</sup>.

In 2017, on the eve of the centenary of the Great Russian revolution, the perception of the above event and the attitude towards it acquires the widest significance: theoretical, ideological and propagandistic. Many people in our country, contrary to the pessimistic predictions, are comforted by the idea that 2017 will be a better year than the year 2016. It is difficult not to be strengthened in such a consolation when the head of state offers it during the Christmas holidays at a meeting with Novgorod fishermen. “I am sure that this year will be better than the one that has passed”<sup>2</sup>, the President assured his audience, noting that without the popular support, no progress could be even discussed. It is difficult not to believe in the holiness of the assurances given during the Christmas time. It is almost a biblical story, one can’t resist the idea that it is a well-directed political action, a media performance, an appeal to the historical past and, at the same time, to the eternity and today in the expectation of the future. In the actions and representations one can guess a sincere willingness to be a part of the past and the present and the future. Therefore, it does not matter whether it is done consciously or not but praise is given to the past, to the present and to the eternal.

Involuntarily, diverse and multi-vector chronologic associations arise. The first of them says that there are signs of inner spiritual efforts of empathy of the historical, albeit mythological, but real past, and attempts to understand and accept the meanings of “how wise it is that Christ began from below and not from above! How wise it is that He began the building of His Kingdom not from the kings but from fishermen! ...Not only in the darkness of simple Galilean fishermen the Lord buried the seeds of the Tree of Life but in the darkness until Adam and afterwards He went away”<sup>3</sup>.

If we correctly interpret the hidden and explicit meanings, then there are not one, but several, albeit smaller, but also important lines of development of political behavior and semantic analogies and psychological reactions to the historical past and the present. The first of them is based on the development and use of the idea of addressing simple fishermen. There is a search for building political life, filling it with strong support and protection on the part of ordinary citizens. In case of such perception, the past, though religious in content, becomes no longer a past, but a real and political present. Those who think this way are ca-

---

<sup>1</sup> See – URL: <http://zinoviev.info/wps/archives/2680> (date: 09.12.2016).

<sup>2</sup> See – URL: <https://news.yandex.ru/yandsearch?cl4url=ria.ru/society/20170107/1485220848> (date: 09.12.2016).

<sup>3</sup> The Sunday gospel: why Jesus started with fishermen, not kings. See. – URL: <http://www.nsad.ru/articles/voskresnoe-evangelie-pochemu-hristos-nachal-s-rybakov-a-ne-carej> (date: 09.12.2016).



pable of pursuing a policy in the spirit of historical traditions of the chosen path, albeit justified only by religion. However, in the past as today, political actors are engaged in altering traditions, adjusting them to the needs of their policies. Along the second line, such impulse is crowned with another idea, important and relevant for the present, the idea of withdrawal. For large-scale politicians the issue of withdrawal from their posts has always been and remains burning and non-trivial. There is no sense in reminding how important the issue of withdrawal or transition to another state or status for the head of state of our country is in the context of the presidential elections of 2018. And if we emphasize this subject, there is no natural withdrawal from the political Olympus for such a figure as the incumbent President of the Russian Federation. We agree with those specialists and experts who believe that the personality of the head of state in the country like Russia is a key point. If we are unlucky with the head of state, the country may face the most severe trials. Therefore, neither the first nor the second outcome can be tolerated.

That is why the idea that the Kingdom of God is eternal should be in public consciousness. Earthly kingdoms, created in haste by the power and genius of humans, are worthy of the deathbed and humans, even kings, are only transitory political types. We would like to believe and know that enlightenment and understanding have already come and the earthy kings not devoid of wisdom and a deep sense of realism are not as susceptible to demagoguery as their counterparts. Others, with a lesser sense of realism, are more inclined to understand realities as a conscious game with imaginary values in politics. There are those who do not shun false promises, who console themselves and the others with non-existent rewards. The destiny of such characters and the fate of their states recur, they face repetition of their fate and start from the beginning over and over again.

The second association is connected with the events of a century ago, the great revolution in Russia in 1917 and the fact that such event passes to us in 2017, and further on. The fate of the state and the nation created as a result of the 1917 Revolution in Russia is the evidence of it. The historical past associated with that great revolution is the best evidence of the differences between the earthy life and the life and death understood through religion and the Church. Such associations and links are unusual for political consciousness and behavior only superficially, at the level of primitive suspended consciousness and thinking. In the past, such relationships can be clearly seen in the revolutionary battles and discussions regarding political battles between all the participants of the revolution for the priority in leadership and management and for privileges accompanying such positions. However, it can be seen in a specific way, mostly like an opposition between those who demonstrated the highest examples of loyalty and truthfulness and those who regarded revolution as a means of ruthless exposure of the contradictions of the society, its hypocrisy and even perverted demagoguery.



No matter how far and wide are the links between politics and religion, the state and the church, they are worthy of attention and understanding and cannot be ignored not only on the personal or human level. This idea could not and was not accepted by the revolutionaries of the 1917 era in Russia. And this fact testifies to their total exposure as people ignorant in politics. Was it not a political short-sightedness when one of the most famous revolutionary leaders L. D. Trotsky, reveling in his intelligence, wrote in 1931: “Isn’t the Church the main institution of demagoguery as it promises eternal bliss for a wax candle?” It is possible to treat without contempt the sound and apt thought of his opponent noticed by Trotsky: “Meanwhile the Church, as Lloyd George correctly and accurately said, is the central power station feeding all parties of order”. But the purely political programs of capitalist parties are imbued with the spirit of conscious deception. The people of order consider the destruction of their traditional lies as demagoguery. The revolution, which is the most merciless exposure of the contradictions of society and its falseness, is considered by the people of order as an eruption of demagoguery”<sup>1</sup>. But it’s a fact and a tragedy that the revolutionaries of the early twentieth century in Russia have completely followed the enlighteners of the 18th century and the European revolutionaries of the 19th century and praised political parties as the parties of true order and not of new lies, falsehood, hypocrisy, and demagoguery.

Already one hundred years have passed since that revolution, but we still cannot understand to whom the revolution was a feast and to whom it was grief and suffering. Either all were winners or all were total historical losers. It is obvious that not only revolution, but also post-revolutionary process develop unevenly, two steps forward are followed by a step, two or three backward. Historical reality as a tromp on the spot, or something like it, but it raises to life new social strata that consolidate their rule and do not want to part with it becoming the same hated liars and demagogues against whom the revolution was directed.

How to treat such event and how to evaluate it in the new realities of today? Contradictions of economic development in our country and the world situation, just as it was before, make it necessary to revise revolutionary ideas and methods. At the same time, we all want to look even briefly into the future. Christmastime at the beginning of 2017 was the starting historical landscape, the historical canvas on which it was considered necessary to embroider patterns of social and political future. Blindly following such tradition, one can fall into the next newfangled prostration of dogmatic and bureaucratic thinking. Well-versed people remember another tradition that was no less strong, the Orthodox government of the Russian Empire adopted laws prohibiting “on the Christmas eve and during the Christmastime a behavior in accordance with the ancient idolatrous legends when people

---

<sup>1</sup> Trotsky, L. Stalinist school of falsification. Amendments and additions to the literature of the epigones. – Berlin: Granite publishing house, 1932. – P. 6.

play games, dress up in idol robes, dance in the streets and sing seductive songs.” Times are changing and we are changing with them. In the past, it was forbidden ... “to sing seductive songs.” Today, it would be worth to prohibit oneself from pronouncing seductive speeches realizing from the past experience that axioms of one era are unsolved problems of the following. What is the year 2017 for Russian citizens? A better year against the previous one or it is a year of that distant era – the era of 1917 when everything collapsed and something new was born. Our bold moves along our history, from 2017 to the era of a century ago, are fully justified. “The past is never dead. It’s not even past,” said American writer William Faulkner. The following facts and evidences describe the present from the past.

The following data speak about the event under consideration and its reflection in the everyday perception (*See Table 1*).

*Table 1*

<b>Key phrase/word query</b>	<b>Search results (in million units)</b>	<b>Displays per month (units)</b>
Revolution	93	1 mln
October revolution of 1917 in Russia	133	700
February revolution of 1917 in Russia	129	1 157
Velvet revolutions in Central and South-Eastern Europe in 1989-1991	86	-
Color revolutions in the post-Soviet space	29	170
Coup d'état	34	9 289
Counterrevolution	11	7 822
Evolution	75	688 000
Modernization	79	280 000
Democracy	73	179 000

At the beginning of 2017, there were 93 million search results and 1 million displays per month in Yandex Search. Next to the word “revolution” Internet users were looking for: “velvet revolution”, “color revolution”, “reform”, “modernization”, “evolution”, “progress”, “coup” and “reformation”. It is an impressive evidence and it testifies to the popularity of not only the revolutionary theme but also of such topics in the public perception as the October and February revolutions of 1917 in Russia.

We are not sure how fully this simplified statistics reflects the content of the current life and current events, but we have already witnessed how the preparatory work in connection with the approaching events unfolds on a wide front.

The first sketches of the upcoming intellectual battles were voiced and demonstrated by the public organizations of scientists of different profiles, such as Free Historical Society and Military Historical Society. The paradox is that, according to the Semyon Ekshtut, Doctor of philosophy, no scientist was brave enough to write the latest biography of the leader of the 1917 revolution Vladimir Lenin<sup>1</sup>. It is also true that TV channel One announced the beginning of production of "Lenin," a mini-series (12-episode) documentary. According to the announcement, it will depict a new image of the leader of the revolution unlike those shown before<sup>2</sup>. There is a probing into convenient ideological and methodological positions from which each group of scientists and not only scientists but also journalists, ideologists, propagandists who are carrying on a cognitive offensive in the name of achieving, as they all claim, scientific truth and who try to separate the myths bearers and those who seek truth about the 1917 revolution and its meaning. Something is happening with both, those who study such events and those who adapt to them, getting benefits for themselves, it has happened more than once in history with those who want to fool everyone and those who find themselves fooled in their search for the truth. Most often it means emasculation of the content of the subject. Such treatment of views and ideas about the 1917 revolution now converge guardians of the counter-memory about the revolution, eager to witness numerous propaganda surprises, those who without a tremor in their hands allow themselves to write about the main historical and political event spreading from 1917 to 2017. As a rule, such group of seekers of historical truth is described not without sarcasm: "Their talks about the truth ... are one-sided and dull... They repeat the same thing for the hundredth time. The conclusion is simple: the authors of such passages are losing their appeal." Indeed, they highlight and praise what is acceptable or seems acceptable for the speculative balancing act, deftly wrapping their bold views in rounded idioms. In order to describe the existing situation in more detail, it is enough to cite the considerations of Andrei Kolesnikov: "The hands of those who carry truth and not myths about history no longer tremble. The officials can hardly cope with the counter-memory. And this is good news on the eve of 2017, the year of centenary of the October coup/revolution, the year that will most probably bring many propaganda surprises"<sup>3</sup>.

It is a fresh example in which the idea of a conflict is clearly expressed in different manifestations, for example, as historic truth and as a historical myth. The idea of contrasting the official position and the position of the counter-memory carriers is expressed less clearly. If the official position of the state power,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ekshtut, Semyon. Why science is afraid of Lenin Электронный ресурс. – URL: <https://rg.ru/2016/11/01/rodina-nauka-lenin.html> (date: 03.01.2017).

<sup>2</sup> See. – URL: <https://rg.ru/2016/10/13/pervyj-kanal-pristupil-k-proizvodstvu-dokumentalnogo-filma-lenin.html> (date: 03.01.2017).

<sup>3</sup> Kolesnikov, Andrey. About the main war of 2016. March of the crusaders. See. – URL: <https://www.gazeta.ru/comments/column/kolesnikov/10451189.shtml> (date: 03.01.2017).

its institutions and subjects can be found behind the official position, then who the bearers of the counter-memory are. It's not quite clear or rather it's not clear at all who they are. On the other hand, countless articles by those who cover modern political realities are thoroughly imbued with philistine theories, exposing everything, reproaching, sowing doubts and denying the historical memory. According to them, only counter-memory is true and only those who preach and support it are right. In this situation, are there bearers of the counter-memory among the part of the young people who were interviewed on the issue? And how many of them are there? The question was asked in the following interpretation:

Is the 1917 Revolution a living historical memory for the modern Russian society? Or does it already belong to a certain national historical archive and is the year of its centenary just a nice round number?

*Table 2*

Living historical memory	78.1%
Historical archive	17.1%
Just a nice round number	4.8%

The responses in **Table 2** theoretically do not deny either the fact that today in the public consciousness the 1917 revolution belongs to a historical archive (17.1%) or that the year of its centenary is just a nice round number (4.8%). But we must admit that for the younger generation it is a living historical memory (78.1%). The weight of each position is definitely in favor of "living historical memory." But is there enough space in the minds of the young people for those who adhere to the logic of counter-memory? In the formalized boundaries, their percentage (21.9%) is less than a quarter of those who adhere to the idea of living historical memory.

We assume that all those involved in the celebration of the anniversary and the subsequent events will be divided into a set of entities, phenomena and actions. We dare to say that two approaches would be strong and clear: interpretation and reinterpretation of both revolution and the presidential election campaign. On the one hand, there will be those who will stress the immorality of the 1917 revolution, its inspirers and organizers. They will contrast that revolution against the high patterns of loyalty to the modern revolutions, as instruments for breaking social lies, as revolutions of truth and dignity. On the other hand, there will be those who would equally strongly declare themselves defenders of the revolution as a historical phenomenon full of contradictions, as a process that was neither complete, nor harmonic, and even socially harmful and politically destructive. But all of them not being able to pursue a policy in the spirit of enlightened traditions and responsibility to the history and the future will engage in the reworking of traditions according to the needs of their everyday interests and desires. There will also be groups of those who would link the problem and the event under discussion with their own policies, who will use them in their

struggle for power instead of using them in the name of universal good and not their narrow interests.

In this regard, all statements about the study of the historical past without varnishing and embellishing it, in the search of the true historical knowledge of the past and the future may become a matter of personal intrigues or group squabbles. Previously, in the past, politically and ideologically biased historians usually avoided portraying the search for the historical truth as a matter of personal interests and personal intrigues, although that was the case. But today, in the era of hybrid existence, it is not as obvious as it used to be how strong the influence of personal squabbles and intrigues is and how powerfully they oppose the interests of the common good. Live meaning of the 1917 revolution is in its understanding as a deep political and historical process with its own social reasoning, background and roots. Understanding grows when we listen to the historical events, facts, moods, feelings and actions. But, as it was in the past, so, unfortunately, it is today, no one listens to the history in detail, although it tries hard and therefore is forced to recur. However, history does not only recur two or three times, but it is also rewritten and it is rewritten much more often.

Periods, when the history of the 1917 revolution was rewritten to a greater or lesser degree, as well as evaluation of the consequences of its influence on the fate of the country and the world often went hand in hand with political and ideological reaction and behavior, with social and economic upheavals. The revolution of 1917 brought to life new broad strata of society in Russia and then in the Soviet Union and created new ruling class. The logic of the process is that the ruling elite at any time seeks to consolidate its privileged position. The ruling elite today, as the ruling elite at that time, tend to see themselves not as a temporary historic instrument of revolution and evolution but as a climax and final point. For this purpose, historic and political participants of these processes create their own picture of the world of revolution and evolution. But economic contradictions and the world situation prevent Russian ruling bureaucracy from a reckless and fearless rest on the laurels of modern ideas about the history of the 1917 revolution, its traditions and values, ideas about themselves and objects controlled in similar historic situations. Changes in the official policies pursued by the ruling group prevent the development of both a new theory and new traditions of the state's life, just as they prevent the nation from saving itself. To identify this pattern of vision is the meaning of the work planned by the joint group of researchers.

Application for the study: topics, aims, tasks, methodology and methods; conditions and prospects.

*Research topic:* "Main political and historical events for Russia in 1917 and 2018 in the minds and views of the young people."

*Aim:* Identification of the multi-dimensional vision of how the younger generation analyzes, understands, perceives and regards the 1917 revolution, the centenary of this event and the presidential elections of 2018 in order to justify new

academic approaches to the study of historic and political processes, behavioral and mental reactions in this social stratum to the large scale historic events.

*Tasks:*

- to identify, describe and analyze reactions, ideas and attitudes of the youth (students) to the 1917 revolution and events connected with its anniversary;
- to collect, classify and evaluate the main facts, events and documents dedicated to the centenary of the 1917 revolution and the upcoming presidential elections of 2018.

*By methodology* in our research we mean a system of principles of scientific research, which determines to what extent the collected data and facts can serve, on the one hand, a reliable basis of a positive knowledge, and on the other hand, of the knowledge based on conscious game with imaginary values in politics and history, on the replication of false promises and consolations. The methodology is not directly related in our research to the essence of knowledge about the real world of young people's ideas about the 1917 revolution or its centenary. Rather, and only rather, it deals with the technologies and techniques by which knowledge is constructed. The term methodology we interpret not only as a set of research procedures, techniques and methods, including methods of data collection and processing. We understand this term as a set of procedures, techniques and methods that are used to form an incomplete or distorted, even falsified representation of the historical phenomenon, which is a function and reflection of the differentiated structure of the society. Methodology in such case proceeds from the fact that falsification, distortion of events and facts often results from the system of false ideas aimed to maintain the foundation of the dominant paradigm, created in the world of knowledge by the domineering, format group of the existing social order and political regime. Falsification and misinterpretation of the events and facts by researchers of informal status is a weakness of the defenders. The methodology of our study does not seek to interpret the year 1917 as an era of one or two revolutions. These are all events of the same social order, having different stages and levels of tension and resolution of existing contradictions. However, our research does not come from the need to see the October of 1917 either as a revolution or a coup. However, we insist on recognizing these events as revolutionary that have mercilessly exposed contradictions of the then Russian society. Some researchers perceive them as a stream of violence, demagoguery, lies, oppression and spiritual enslavement, another group considers them as a giant mechanism of redrawing the basics of life, as the first attempt in history to put into life the idea of justice on the basis of public ownership, as an attempt to create a new state, economy and human being. Methodologically, we distinguish between the polemic arguments and ideas about the 1917 revolution, its anniversary events and actions in the mood of young people, their perception of the historical role and importance of this revolution in the history of the country.

The research team includes high-level professionals in the field of history, political sciences and philosophy, as well as young scientists (postgraduate stu-



dents), students seeking Master's and Bachelor's degrees at the RUDN University. The research project is designed for the next two years: 2017 and 2018.

Heads of the project are a) Dmitry E. Slizovsky, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor; b) Nikolay P. Medvedev, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor; c) Nadezhda V. Shulenina, PhD in philosophy, Assistant Professor; d) students: Mikhail Kashin, Matvey Klyushin, Olga Fateeva.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

1. *Ankersmit F. R.* Political representation / Translated from English by A. Glukhov. NAT Research University "Higher School of Economics". – M.: Publishing House of the Higher School of Economics, 2002.
2. *Besançon A.* The Intellectual origins of Leninism / Translated from French by M. Rozanova, N. Rudnitskaya and A. Rutkevich. – M.: Publishing house "MIK", 1998.
3. *Goldstone Jack A.* Revolutions. A Very Short Introduction. / Translated from English by A. Yakovleva. – M.: Publishing house of the Gaidar Institute, 2015.
4. *Lenin V. I.* State and revolution. Complete collection of works, v. 33. – M., 1981.
5. *Medvedev N. P.* Political Russia: from centralization to bureaucratization. – M., 2010.
6. *Medvedev N. P.* History of state and law. To the 25th anniversary of the Federal Treaty // Eurasian Union: issues of international relations. – 2016 – No. 4.
7. *Medvedev N. P.* Inter-party conflicts as a source of socio-political development // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2016. – No. 4.
8. *Medvedev N. P.* Contemporary history of modern Russia: essays from political memoirs // Eurasian Union: issues of international relations. – 2013. – No. 3-4.
9. *Medvedev N. P.* "New people" at the Old Square: Kremlin and provincial stories. – M., 1997.
10. *Medvedev N. P.* Gorbachev. Yeltsin. Putin. Three models of political development. In the book «Political regionalistics and ethnopolitics / ed. N. P. Medvedev and V. K. Medvedeva. Issue 6. – M., 2009.
11. *Slavoj Zizek.* 13 experiences about Lenin. – Yekaterinburg, 2001.
12. *Slizovsky D. E., Shulenina N. V.* Political science. 2nd ed. – M.: Yurayt Publishing House, 2016.
13. *Slizovsky D. E., Shulenina N. V.* Electoral preferences of the young people of 18 to 20 years of age before the elections of 2016: between political apathy, anti-politics and activism // Political science. – 2016. – No. 3.
14. *Slizovsky D. E.* Social and electoral preferences and orientations of the young people of 18 to 20 years of age // Sociology. Vestnik RUDN. – 2016. – No. 3.
15. *Slizovsky D. E., Amiantov A. A.* Socio-political preferences of young people of 18 to 20 years of age: the contrast between statements and reality // Locust. – 2016. – No. 4.
16. *Slizovsky D. E.* The paradox of youth attitudes and relations to the 2016 elections // Communicology. – v. 4. – 2016. – No. 5.