

Introduction

Korine Amacher and Frithjof Benjamin Schenk

In 2017 the Russian government did not commemorate the revolutions of 1917 as it did, for example, the bicentenary of the Patriotic War against Napoleon in 2012 or the 400th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty in 2013. Today's Russian government felt obliged to position itself in relation to an event that represents everything it obviously despises: a breach of the stability, traditions, and authority of the state. In late December 2016 the head of the semiofficial Russian Historical Society, Sergei Naryshkin, declared in a public statement that the centenary of the Russian Revolution should not be "celebrated." Instead, the occasion should be used to reflect on the events that took place a hundred years ago. According to Naryshkin, the most important lesson to be learned was an understanding of "the value of unity and solidarity among citizens and the ability of a society to find compromises at the most difficult turning points in history." These, Naryshkin continued, were crucial prerequisites to avoid a radical divide in society that could lead to another civil war like the one that followed the 1917 Revolution.¹

¹ "Naryshkin schitaet stoletie revoliutsii 1917 goda povodom izvlech' uroki," *RIA Novosti*, 27 December 2016, <https://ria.ru/society/20161227/1484741774.html> (accessed 9 February 2021). On the commemoration of "1917" in Russia in 2017, see, inter alia, Boris Kolonitskii and Maria Matskevich, "Pamiat' o 'neizpol'zovannom' iubilee 100-letia revoliutsii v vospriatii zhitelii Rossii," *Revue des études slaves* 90, 1–2 (2019): 17–29; Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Celebrating (or Not) The Russian Revolution," *Journal of Contemporary History* 52, 4 (2017): 816–31; Korine Amacher, "Fête une révolution sans donner des idées," *Le Monde diplomatique*, March 2017, 18; Emilia Koustova, "Un malaise commémoratif: La Russie face au centenaire de sa révolution," in *Russie 2017: Regards de l'Observatoire franco-russe*, ed. Arnaud Dubien (Paris: Inventaire, 2017), 497–505; Sophie Coeuré and Sabine Dullin, "1917, un moment révolutionnaire," *Vingtième Siècle: Revue d'histoire*, no. 135 (2017/3): 2–17; Jan Plamper, "2017: Erinnerung und Verdrängung der Revolution in Russland—zwischen Märtyrologie, Konspiologie und starkem Staat," in *100 Jahre Roter Oktober: Zur Weltgeschichte der Russischen Revolution*, ed. Jan Claas Behrends, Nikolaus Katzer, and Thomas Lindenberger (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2017), 279–94; Julie Deschepper, Olga Bronnikova, and Maria Podzorova, "Célébrer,

Despite the Russian government's attempts to deny the positive legacy of the Russian Revolution, its centenary generated countless academic and scholarly events in 2017, both in and outside Russia.² Numerous scholarly conferences, lecture series, and temporary historical exhibitions were devoted to the history of this epochal event. Moreover, an impressive number of new books were published before and after the centenary. It is impossible to try at this point to give a comprehensive survey of the countless monographs, edited volumes, and special issues on the Russian Revolutions that were published around 2017.³ However, five interesting tendencies can be described that seem to shape the historiographic discourse on the Russian Revolution today.

First, historians, publishers, and the reading public alike both in Russia and abroad showed a reborn interest in 2017 in the history of the Russian Revolution. Whereas before 2017 one could get the impression that the history of the revolutionary movement in general and the story of "1917" in particular had lost its overwhelming attractiveness as topics of academic research (and of course the exception proves the rule), the centenary seems to have brought about a sudden rebirth of the subject in historiography.⁴ This was partly trig-

commémorer et oublier 1917 en Europe de l'Ouest," *Passés Futurs*, no. 5 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.26095/gfnq-b641>; Ekaterina Makhotina, "Verordnete Versöhnung: Geschichtspolitische und gesellschaftliche Perspektiven auf die Russische Revolution," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 65, 2 (2017): 295–305; Olga Malinova, "A Quiet Jubilee: Practices of the Political Commemoration of the Centenary of the 1917 Revolution(s) in Russia," in *Circles of the Russian Revolution: Internal and International Consequences of the Year 1917 in Russia*, ed. Łukasz Adamski and Bartłomiej Gajos (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 220–41; Marlene Laruelle, "Commemorating 1917 in Russia: Ambivalent State History Policy and the Church's Conquest of the History Market," *Europe-Asia Studies* 71, 2 (2019): 249–67.

² Indeed, a voluminous book of more than 1,000 pages attempts to "reconstruct" meticulously what this jubilee was, not only in its political dimensions, but also in its public, artistic, academic, and archival impact, in Russia and the world: Gennadii Bordiugov, ed., *Revoliutsiia-100: Rekonstruktsiia iubileia* (Moscow: AIRO-XXI, 2017). The events organized in 2017 are listed in the "Jubilee Chronology: Events and Reflections" (976–1076).

³ Stephen A. Smith, "The Historiography of the Russian Revolution 100 Years On," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 16, 4 (2015): 733–49; V. P. Grebeniuk, L. S. Kreshkina, and Rossiiskii fond fundamental'nykh issledovanii, eds., *Revoliutsiia 1917 goda v Rossii: Annotirovannyi katalog nauchnoi literatury* (Moscow: Rossiiskii fond fundamental'nykh issledovanii, 2017); V. V. Tikhonov and S. V. Zhuravlev, "Sto let izucheniia revoliutsii: Istoricheskie traditsii i sovremennost'," in *Rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917 goda: Vlast', obshchestvo, kul'tura: V dvukh tomakh*, ed. Iu. A. Petrov (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2017), 1: 26–65.

⁴ Just a short time before the 100th anniversary, leading historians Boris Kolonitskii, Stephen Smith, and Donald Raleigh observed a decline of scholarly interest in the

gered by publishing houses which decided to meet the jubilee-driven demand in the book market by republishing older scholarly works on the history of 1917, as well as offering well-known interpretations of “1917” and its consequences.⁵ In the meantime, a number of new comprehensive syntheses of the history of the Russian Revolution(s) appeared on the Russian, German, French, and Anglo-American book markets.⁶

Second, in historiography the conviction has undoubtedly gained wide acceptance that the history of the Russian Revolution should be detached from its teleological focus on “Red October,” and that more attention should be paid to the events of the February Revolution, which was almost taboo in Soviet historiography. The myth that the revolution of February was inevitably followed by the Bolshevik overthrow in October has long since been broken.⁷ Moreover, it is widely accepted in the field today that the revolutionary events of 1917 should be understood as a stage in a longer period of war and violence in Russia between 1914 and 1921, a temporal framework that historian Peter Holquist has called a “continuum of crisis,” and that has also defined the book series *Russia’s Great War and Revolution*, which includes this volume. Some

history of the Russian Revolution since the 1990s. See Smith, “The Historiography of the Russian Revolution 100 Years On”; Boris I. Kolonitskii and Joy Neumeyer, “On Studying the 1917 Revolution: Autobiographical Confessions and Historiographical Predictions,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 16, 4 (2015): 751–68; Donald J. Raleigh, “The Russian Revolution after All These 100 Years,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 16, 4 (2015): 792.

⁵ See for example Heiko Haumann, ed., *Die Russische Revolution 1917* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2016); Helmut Altrichter, *Rußland 1917: Ein Land auf der Suche nach sich selbst* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2016). Stéphane Courtois, ed., *1917, la révolution bolchevique* (Paris: Vendémiaire, 2017).

⁶ See, for example, Boris Kolonitskii, *#1917: Semnadsat’ ocherkov po istorii Rossiiskoi revoliutsii* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel’stvo Evropeiskogo universiteta, 2017); Boris Kolonitskii, *Revoliutsiia 1917 goda: Glavnoe, chto nuzhno znat’ o perelomnom momente Rossiiskoi istorii* (Moscow: Eksmo, 2018); Sean McMeekin, *The Russian Revolution: A New History* (New York: Basic Books, 2017); China Miéville, *October: The Story of the Russian Revolution* (London: Verso, 2017); Martin Aust, *Die russische Revolution: Vom Zarenreich zum Sowjetimperium* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2017); Mark D. Steinberg, *The Russian Revolution 1905–1921* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); Alexandre Sumpf, *1917, la Russie et les Russes en révolutions* (Paris: Perrin, 2017); Stephen A. Smith, *Russia in Revolution: An Empire in Crisis, 1890 to 1928* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

⁷ Tony Brenton, ed., *Was Revolution Inevitable? Turning Points of the Russian Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

scholars have argued that one should even challenge the idea of 1917 as a historical divide in Russian history.⁸

In addition to the temporal decentering of the Russian Revolution, the third tendency in recent historiography is a shift in spatial focus. While in the past the revolutionary capitals of Petrograd and Moscow were often at the center of attention, in recent years historians have been intensively researching the events of 1917 in the Russian provinces and at the empire's peripheries.⁹ Finally, much has also been written in recent years, and especially in 2017, about the revolution's impact on other parts of Europe and the world.¹⁰

When looking at the topics of scholarly conferences and new publications on the history of the Russian Revolution in the year 2017, the fourth striking

⁸ Smith, "The Historiography of the Russian Revolution 100 Years On," 734–35; Coeuré and Dullin, "1917," 3; Laura Engelstein, *Russia in Flames: War, Revolution, Civil War, 1914–1921* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); Matthias Neumann and Andy Willimott, eds., *Rethinking the Russian Revolution as Historical Divide* (London: Routledge, 2017).

⁹ Aust, *Die russische Revolution*; Jörn Happel, "Die Revolution an der Peripherie," in *Die Russische Revolution*, ed. Heiko Haumann (Cologne: Böhlau, 2016), 91–104; Dmitrii Chernyi and Aleksei Miller, eds., *Goroda imperii v gody Velikoi voiny i revoliutsii: Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Nestor-Istoriia, 2017); S. M. Iskhakov and Institut rossiiskoi istorii RAN, eds., *Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917 goda i musul' manskoe dvizhenie* (Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ, 2019). On this trend already before 2017, see Smith, "Historiography," 740–42; and Sarah Badcock, Liudmila G. Novikova, and Aaron B. Retish, eds., *Russia's Home Front in War And Revolution, 1914–22, Book 1: Russia's Revolution in Regional Perspective* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2015).

¹⁰ Tilman Mayer and Julia Reuschenbach, eds., *1917: 100 Jahre Oktoberrevolution und ihre Fernwirkungen auf Deutschland* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2017); Anatolii Vasil'evich Torkunov and Aleksandr Oganovich Chubarian, eds., *Rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917 goda i ee mesto v istorii XX veka: Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2018); Billie Melman et al., eds., "The October Revolution (1917): Global Implications," special issue, *Historyah*, no. 39–40 (December 2017); Jonathan Daly and Leonid Trofimov, eds., *The Russian Revolution and Its Global Impact* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2017); Stefan Rinke and Michael Wildt, eds., *Revolutions and Counter-Revolutions: 1917 and Its Aftermath from a Global Perspective* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2017); Iu. A. Petrov, "Razdel 8: Rossiiskaia revoliutsiia i mir," in *Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917: 100 let izucheniia. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Moskva, 9–11 oktiabria 2017 g.)*, ed. Petrov (Moscow: IRI RAN, 2017), 533–80; Łukasz Adamski and Bartłomiej Gajos, eds., *Circles of the Russian Revolution: Internal and International Consequences of the Year 1917 in Russia* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019); Jean-François Fayet, Valérie Gorin, and Stefanie Prezioso, eds., *Echoes of October: International Commemorations of the Bolshevik Revolution 1918–1990* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2017); Alexander Marshall, John W. Steinberg, and Steven Sabol, eds., *The Global Impacts of Russia's Great War and Revolution, Book 1: The Arc of Revolution, 1917–24*; and Choi Chatterjee et al., eds., *The Global Impacts of Russia's Great War and Revolution, Book 2: The Wider Arc of Revolution, parts 1 and 2* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2019).

feature is a pronounced interest in questions of remembrance, myth-making, and subsequent political uses and manipulations of the events of 1917.¹¹ After the delegitimization of the Soviet master narrative of the “Great Socialist October Revolution,” historical research has intensively dealt with the production of myths, commemorative rituals, historical narratives, and forms of staging of this official history. In this context, long suppressed counternarratives, for example of the White movement and the Russian emigration, have been explored systematically.¹² Scholars of Russian history both in Russia and the West have also intensified the analysis of their “own” historical narratives on the year 1917, partly in connection with interesting autobiographical reflections.¹³

Finally, closely connected with the deconstruction of traditional historical master narratives, there has arisen a growing interest in the individual voices, experiences, and memories of the revolutionary events of 1917. Historians have rediscovered individual actors who, for a long time, were often absent from the accounts of the Russian Revolutions. This broadening of focus certainly does not date back to the centenary of 1917. Rather it is linked to a relationship with sources that has evolved considerably in the historical field over many years.¹⁴ The increased interest in individuals’ personal experiences and perception is documented, for example, by numerous new publications of ego-documents, such as diaries from and memories of the Russian Revo-

¹¹ Gianni Haver et al., eds., *Le spectacle de la Révolution: La culture visuelle des commémorations d’Octobre* (Lausanne: Editions Antipodes, 2017); Inke Arns et al., eds., *Sturm auf den Winterpalast* (Zürich: Diaphanes, 2017); Jan Claas Behrends, Nikolaus Katzer, and Thomas Lindenberger, eds., *100 Jahre Roter Oktober: Zur Weltgeschichte der Russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 2017); Iu. A. Petrov, “Razdel 9: Revoliutsiia: Problemy istoriografii i istoricheskoi pamiati,” in Petrov, *Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917*, 583–690; Bordiugov, *Revoliutsiia-100*, 19–94.

¹² Marina Sorokina, ed., *1917 god v istorii i sud’be rossiiskogo zarubezh’ia: Mezhdunarodnaia nauchno-prosvetitel’skaia konferentsiia, 26–28 oktiabria 2017 goda* (Moscow: Vifsaida, Dom russkogo zarubezh’ia, 2017); Julia Hildt, *Der russische Adel im Exil: Selbstverständnis und Erinnerungsbilder nach der Revolution von 1917* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2018); Laura Sophie Ritter, *Schreiben für die Weisse Sache: Alexej von Lampe als Chronist der russischen Emigration, 1920–1967* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2019).

¹³ Ronald Grigor Suny, *Red Flag Unfurled: History, Historians, and the Russian Revolution* (London: Verso, 2017); Kolonitskii and Neumeyer, “On Studying the 1917 Revolution,” 751–68.

¹⁴ Smith, “Historiography,” 736.

lution,¹⁵ and of publications based on a thorough analysis of such sources.¹⁶ It is noteworthy that, in view of the dissonant chorus of memories of 1917, some scholars no longer even try to create a coherent “new” history of the Russian Revolution, while others selectively use self-testimonies to underpin their own new historical master narrative.¹⁷

In addition to the traditional book market, the Russian internet dramatically revealed the fragmentation and pluralization of the memory of 1917. The website <https://project1917.ru>, for example, offered a platform for what was probably the most innovative and interesting memorial project on the Russian Revolution in 2017.¹⁸ From the beginning of 2017 visitors to this website were able to follow on a daily basis a Facebook-like timeline of the course of events in 1917. On the basis of a large number of ego-documents (diaries, letters, memoirs) and newspaper clippings the team behind “project1917.ru” tried to reconstruct the multifaceted mosaic of events, personal experiences, and contemporaries’ perceptions and interpretations of the Russian Revolution. The result was a chaotic assemblage of pictures, impressions, observations, correspondence, and statements that represent in their variety and diversity a sharp contrast to the well-established monolithic master narratives of the Russian Revolution that have shaped historiography for decades. And even if this project has given rise to justified criticism that stresses, for example, that it mainly posted primary sources from the privileged classes and ignored

¹⁵ N. V. Surzhikova, ed., *Rossiiia 1917 goda v ego-dokumentakh: Vospominaniia* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2015), <http://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/51-rossiya-1917-goda-v-ego-dokumentakh-vospominaniya-moskva-2015> (accessed 9 February 2021); Surzhikova et al., eds., *Rossiiia 1917 goda v ego-dokumentakh: Dnevnik* (Moscow: Politicheskaia entsiklopediia, 2017), https://www.rfbr.ru/rffi/ru/books/o_2061382#1 (accessed 9 February 2021); S. V. Kulikov, ed., *Moia revoliutsiia: Sobytiia 1917 goda glazami russkogo ofitsera, khudozhnika, studentki, pisatel'ia, istorika, sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy, sluzhashchego parokhodstva, revoliutsionera. K 100-letiiu russkoi revoliutsii* (Moscow: Vstrecha, 2018).

¹⁶ Catherine Depretto, “Un nouveau Temps des troubles: Des historiens russes, témoins de l’année 1917,” *Vingtième Siècle: Revue d’histoire*, no. 3 (135) (2017): 131–44.

¹⁷ Mikhail Zygar', *Imperiia dolzhna umeret': Istoriia russkikh revoliutsii v litsakh, 1900–1917* (Moscow: Al'pina Publisher, 2017).

¹⁸ On this project, see Bordiugov, *Revoliutsiia-100*, 154–55; “Project 1917: Mikhail Zygar on Predetermination, Hindsight and the History of Everyday Minutiae,” *INRUSSIA* (interview conducted by Noah Sneider), <http://inrussia.com/project-1917> (accessed 9 February 2021); Neil MacFarquhar, “‘Revolution? What Revolution?’ Kremlin Asks 100 Years Later,” *The New York Times*, 11 March 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/10/world/europe/russian-revolution-100-years-putin.html> (accessed 9 February 2021); Kyril Drezov, “Project 1917 and RT: The Russian Revolution in the Age of Facebook and Twitter,” in “The Centenary of 1917—Year of Two Revolutions in Russia,” special issue, *Journal of Global Faultlines* 4, 2 (2018): 163–66.

“the voices of lower-class people who contributed, experienced, and were politically activated in the revolutionary process,”¹⁹ it undoubtedly helped us to question long-established interpretations of the Russian Revolution.²⁰

Biographical Itineraries and Autobiographical Reflections

This anthology links up with all five trends in recent historiography of the Russian Revolution briefly discussed above. Particularly evident is the reference to the recent research on biographies, ego-documents, and individual experiences of the revolution. However, the contributions collected here can also be related to other tendencies in the more recent historiography of the revolution. The essays of this volume investigate how the revolutionary events of 1917–21 shaped biographies both in Russia and in Western Europe and how individuals tried to make sense of the political developments during these years in self-testimonies like diaries and memoirs. In this context, the following questions feature prominently: What was the impact of individuals on the course of the revolution? What do we know about the personal experiences during 1917 of revolutionary activists, victims, and bystanders? Finally, how has the revolution been commemorated in autobiographies and other ego-documents?

This catalog of questions illustrates that we are interested here both in biographies and individual life paths, as well as the specifics of the autobiographical text and the handling of ego-documents from the time of the Russian Revolution. Although questions of biographical and autobiographical research are often closely linked, at the same time they may open up very different perspectives. For the following five reasons, the close examination of different biographies, life trajectories, and self-testimonies from the time of the Russian Revolution appears worthwhile and promising to us.

First of all, histories that focus on biographies, the agency of individuals, and ego-documents may scrutinize established historiographical narratives, based on a structural approach. Social clusters and major historical events may be analyzed from a microhistorical perspective to reveal individual experiences in their uniqueness and singularity. At first glance, a plethora

¹⁹ Sean Guillory, “Russian Intellectuals Make Bolshevik Revolution a Virtual Reality, Repeating 100-Year-Old Mistakes,” *Global Voices*, 13 December 2016; Anna Litvinenko and Andrei Zavadski, “Memories on Demand: Narratives about 1917 in Russia’s Online Publics,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 72, 10 (2020): 1657–77, DOI: 10.1080/09668136.2020.1791801.

²⁰ The website-based project www.prozhito.org seeks to gather in one digital library all personal diaries, both those published and those previously unknown to researchers. In November 2019 the Prozhito Foundation and the European University of St. Petersburg established the “Prozhito Ego-documents Research Centre.”

of individual perspectives may produce an overwhelming effect. But at the same time, individual perspectives may help us reassemble a historiographical puzzle whose pieces had been fixed in the same pattern for a long time. Thanks to (rediscovered) ego-documents and newly published sources, often extracted from the archives, a whole new history—and another memory—of 1917 appears: not a “great narrative,” but a “polyphonic novel,” a plurality of stories, perceptions, and interpretations, from men and women of very diverse backgrounds. Citing the Italian writer and philosopher Umberto Eco, one historian argues that “a diary-based history of Russia in 1917 continues to be an open book, in all its parameters fully compliant with the principles of an open artwork.”²¹

Second, most histories of revolutions tend to emphasize historical change and rupture, whereas narratives that focus on biographies and personal experiences put an emphasis on the continuity of one person’s life, his/her strategies of survival, adaptation, and interpretation of a changed world order. The lives of all the individuals whose biographies are examined in this volume bridge the historical caesura of 1917. In the meantime, authors of autobiographical texts positioned themselves not only in relation to events in the revolutionary past, but at the same time in their own (postrevolutionary) present.²² Therefore, the view of Russia’s history between 1914 and 1921 through the prism of biographies and autobiographical texts requires the extension of the analysis far beyond these temporal boundaries, along with examining the continuation of life trajectories “through” war and revolution, and also parsing strategies for constructing biographical coherence in autobiographical texts.

A third advantage of examining the revolution through individual biographies lies in what it reveals about the importance of place. Whereas many established historiographical narratives of the Russian Revolution focus on one (or a small number) of geographical places (most often the capital cities), biographies of historical actors whose personal lives were shaped by geographical (transborder) mobility may help us reflect on the importance of locality and the multiplicity of simultaneous historical developments in different geographical places. The lives of the protagonists in this book take us to very different places in Russia, both its center and periphery, and abroad. The diversity of these places determines the “stage” on which the drama of the Russian Revolution unfolded for the actors considered here. In such a per-

²¹ N. V. Surzhikova, “Rossia 1917 goda kak otkrytaia kniga (vmesto predisloviia),” in Surzhikova et al., *Rossia 1917 goda v ego-dokumentakh: Dnevnik*, 9.

²² N. V. Surzhikova, “Rossia 1917 goda kak rasskazannoe vremia (vmesto predisloviia),” in Surzhikova, *Rossia 1917 goda v ego-dokumentakh: Vospominaniia*, 8.

spective, the “classical” scenes of the Russian Revolution, such as the Tauride Palace or the Smol’nyi Institute in Petrograd, are joined by a multitude of other places, ranging from seemingly insignificant Russian villages and cities on the periphery of the empire to the various destinations of the “White” Russian emigration.

In a similar way, the biographical approach we suggest sheds light not only on the main important players on the political scene, but also on a large number of people from varied social origins, gender, and nationalities. As a result, we may learn a lot about such members of these groups as women, whose personal experiences have been neglected or overlooked by established historiographies. In the meantime, it is also worth asking why and when certain historical players entered the “pantheon of the Revolution” whereas others were actively forgotten or eradicated from collective memory.

Of course, earlier historians have used ego-documents such as diaries, letters, and autobiographical writings as primary sources for their work on the revolution. But quite often they exploited these sources mainly as “fact mines,” in other words as repositories of information about certain historical events and developments. More recent scholarship has argued that we should pay more attention to the contexts of production, the addressees, and the structure and narratives of ego-documents.²³ By applying such an approach to the diaries, memoirs, and other ego-documents of the Russian Revolution we may gain new insights into not only the formation of competing interpretations of this historical event, but also into the formation of conflicting communities of commemoration and their respective concepts of collective identity. In this context, we may describe the Russian Revolution as a powerful generator of competing historical interpretations and narratives. How did contemporaries perceive the revolutionary events in their environment?—one can ask with a view to autobiographical sources. Which events and experiences triggered the production of such ego-documents as diaries or memoirs? What terms did contemporaries use to describe revolutionary events? Which incidents do they describe as radical caesuras? What historical events are these compared to? What can be said about the authors’ self-images and the social self-positioning?

²³ Jochen Hellbeck, “Fashioning the Stalinist Soul: The Diary of Stepan Podlubnyi (1931–1939),” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, N.F., 44, 3 (1996): 344–73; Volker Depkat, “Autobiographie und die soziale Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 29, 3 (2003): 441–76; Irina Paperno, “What Can Be Done With Diaries?,” *The Russian Review* 63, 4 (2004): 561–73; Hellbeck, “The Diary between Literature and History: A Historian’s Critical Response,” *Slavic Review* 63, 4 (2004): 621–29; Julia Herzberg, “Onkel Vanjas Hütte: Erzählte Leibeigenschaft in der bäuerlichen Autobiografik des Zarenreichs,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, N.F., 58, 1 (2010): 24–51.

The literature on autobiographical texts as historical sources has convincingly shown that ego-documents such as diaries or memoirs are hardly suitable for drawing an “authentic” picture of historical facts. If, however, we are interested in the representations of this “reality” and, in our case, we are asking about Russia’s Great War and Revolution as experienced and imagined reality, then ego-documents have a source value that should not be underestimated. Therefore, the analysis of “experiences” cannot be so much about exposing “authentic” individual patterns of perception.²⁴ Rather, the prestructuring of individual perceptions through social discourses must always be taken into consideration. The text of remembrance itself—the diary, memoir, or letter—is regarded as an attempt retrospectively to attribute meaning to personal experiences or to lend meaning to them, and to inscribe the author in group-specific discourses of remembrance and identity of the time.

About the Structure of the Book

This volume comprises papers presented at an international academic conference, jointly convened by the universities of Basel and Geneva in September 2017, to which we have added a small number of commissioned contributions. The 15 chapters may be arranged in different ways. One possibility would be to consider methodologically similar texts together and to group them with a distinct biographical focus, for example, separately from those on autobiographical sources. It would also be conceivable to combine contributions on women and men into separate sections, or to separate contributions on persons from the “center” from those in the “periphery” of Russia or with distinct transnational biographies. When structuring the volume, we decided to ask about our “protagonists’” differing attitudes toward the revolutionary events of 1917 and to arrange the individual contributions into four corresponding sections. In the meantime, all the sections are still highly diverse, every chapter may be read separately, and all may be placed in relation to others in different ways than those we are suggesting.

The first section brings together chapters which focus on members of the “old elite” who personally experienced the Russian Revolution of 1917 and who, as “former people (*byvshie liudi*),”²⁵ were forced into exile after the Bolsheviks’ victory in the October Revolution and the Civil War. With one ex-

²⁴ On the notion of “experience” (Erfahrung), see Ute Daniel, “Erfahrung—(k)ein Thema der Geschichtstheorie?,” *L’Homme. Z.F.G.* 11, 1 (2000): 120–23; Kathleen Canning, “Problematische Dichotomien: Erfahrung zwischen Narrativität und Materialität,” *Historische Anthropologie* 10, 2 (2002): 163–82.

²⁵ Douglas Smith, *Former People: The Final Days of the Russian Aristocracy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012).

ception, all the chapters in this section feature biographies and/or ego-documents from female actors. Adele Lindenmeyr analyzes the fate of Sofia Panina (1871–1956) and Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams (1869–1962), two political activists in the Party of Popular Freedom (Kadets), who risked their lives in participating in anti-Bolshevik activities after October 1917. After the February Revolution, Panina was the first woman in world history to occupy a position in any government cabinet. Both female politicians promoted the feminist cause. However, neither of them reflected in her writings the extraordinary role they played as women in the male-dominated environment of Russian politics. In his chapter, F. Benjamin Schenk focuses on the autobiographical narratives of Ekaterina von Sayn-Wittgenstein (1895–1983) and Irina Skariatina (1888/98 (?)–1962), two young noble women whose families lost their property and personal rights after the Bolsheviks' takeover. The two young women held no influential position during the revolutionary period, but both attempted to "make sense" of the Russian Revolution by writing diaries, which were published much later in exile under different circumstances. Fabian Baumann's contribution deals with the Shul'gin family, who were leading conservatives and publishers in Kiev. He pays special attention to Ekaterina G. Shul'gina (1869–1934), the wife of Vasilii V. Shul'gin (1878–1976), editor-in-chief of the conservative newspaper *Kievlianin*. After the February Revolution, Shul'gina became an important political leader of the Russian nationalist milieu in Kiev who later, in exile, wrote memoirs about her life between 1904 and 1922. Baumann analyzes how former monarchists in one of Russia's most important provincial cities reoriented themselves politically after the abdication of Nicholas II and how, in the following months, they responded to the growing challenge of the Ukrainian national movement.

Christopher Read also analyzes a memoir written long after the revolution in his chapter. Its author, Zenaide Bashkireff (1908–96), was nine years old at the outbreak of the revolution in 1917. Much later, as an adult woman, she recorded her childhood memories. She recalls being an observer of the revolutionary events on her family's estate in the Nizhnii-Novgorod region. She takes note of the changing attitude of "their" peasants and domestic staff towards them, remembers surviving the 1921 famine in the Volga river basin, and, finally, recalls fleeing Russia in 1922. In her memoir, there is no nostalgia for a "lost past," Zenaide being too young at the time to appreciate the full scope of Russian life under the old regime. But the notion of nostalgia lies at the heart of Henning Lautenschläger's discussion of the Russian photographer Sergei Prokudin-Gorskii (1863–1944). Prokudin-Gorskii was the author of a collection of projectable color photographs of the Russian Empire, taken between 1905 and 1915 and showing Russia's natural landmarks, its peoples, and its many historical sights. He emigrated after the revolution, and initially

managed to continue his career as a photographer in Great Britain and France. Only in the 1930s, when Russian emigrants started to realize that a return to Russia and the prerevolutionary past was no longer possible, did Prokudin-Gorskii start engaging in the nostalgic discourse of the Russian diaspora and reframing his famous collection of color photographs in a nostalgic way.

Although all these "former people" may be viewed as victims of the revolution, their attitude towards the events of 1917 in Russia varied significantly. For Sergei Prokudin-Gorskii, it is not the revolution as such that was at the center of his autobiographical texts. It was rather a question of "positioning" himself in the struggle that took place in the émigré community during the interwar period over the interpretation of the years before 1917. By focusing on selected stories and anecdotes from the years 1907–16, he could portray himself "as an eyewitness of imperial celebrities and a faithful servant of the tsar." And finally, by presenting "his personal career from the perspective of a conservative refugee in imperial Russia, to an audience of Russians abroad," he created "the nostalgic narrative that until today predetermines the perception of his photographic collection as a 'window into the past,' showing 'Russia before the rupture.'" Unlike Prokudin-Gorskii, Zenaïde Bashkireff does not mention great political events of the years before and during the revolution in her account. Her stories depict the everyday life of a family of provincial nobility and its strategies of survival. Furthermore, compared to the high society of St. Petersburg and Moscow, Zenaïde's family was much closer to the "masses" and her portrayals of some peasants show a deep empathy for them.

By contrast, the protagonists of Adele Lindenmeyr's and F. Benjamin Schenk's chapters show a lack of empathy for the masses. Despite the fact that Tyrkova-Williams and Panina were opponents of the tsarist regime before the revolution, they did not try "to understand popular extremism in 1917 in the context of the social and economic inequalities of pre-revolutionary Russia." For Tyrkova-Williams, the masses "have simply lost their reason and sanity, led astray by Bolshevik lies and propaganda." In Sayn-Wittgenstein's and Skariatina's diaries, the Russian Revolution is described as a "story of destruction, disintegration and decay." In Sayn-Wittgenstein's words, the Revolution was "a frightening monster ... creeping through the black streets in the darkness and under the sound of shooting." The excitement that Skariatina initially felt for the revolution that she wanted to see "with [her] very own eyes" quickly gave way to disappointment, then to a deep disgust. The revolution destroyed "everything that we had been taught to look upon as immutable, unchangeable ... : Empire, Tsar, estates, homes, heirlooms—all were swept away."

Yet the revolution also offered opportunities for those who did not support it. A look at the biographies of Ekaterina and Vasilii Shul'gin makes it

clear that the two opponents of the revolution were not merely “passive victims of impersonal forces.” Indeed, both were able to develop a “high degree of agency” in Kiev after the fall of tsarism. Although Ekaterina Shul’gina had never advocated the promotion of political rights for women before 1917, after the February Revolution she rose to become a highly influential person in Kiev’s Russian nationalist milieu (though always hiding behind a male pseudonym in the press). Her husband Vasili, who, as a delegate of the Duma was given the memorable role of accepting Nicholas II’s abdication statement in March 1917, was involved in the formation of a Russian nationalist bloc in Kiev during the summer and autumn. Of course, the Shul’gins’ political room to maneuver shrank bit by bit after the October Revolution. Like all the other protagonists of this first section, the Reds’ victory in the Civil War ultimately drove them into exile.

The second section of this volume focusses on protagonists who actively supported the revolution. For some of them, the revolution offered not only a window of opportunity but also the promise of a bright future. Sophie Coeuré presents the “parallel lives” of two women: Aleksandra Kollontai (1872–1952), who was a veteran activist as early as 1917, and Suzanne Girault (1882–1973), who left her native France for Moscow at the age of 18 in 1900 and then for Odessa to work as a nanny. She embraced the revolutionary cause in 1917. While Kollontai continues to be recognized as the pioneer of left-wing feminism in Europe, Suzanne Girault is almost forgotten today, despite having been a high-level leader of the French Communist Party for several years. Sophie Coeuré sheds light on how these two women managed their role and image as political women in male-dominated environments as of 1917, and also their difficulties in reconciling the cause of women’s emancipation with the socialist struggle.

The next two contributions deal with the issue of personal political choices and their motivations. Korine Amacher analyzes the fate of Vladimir Socoline (1896–1984), a Russian born in Switzerland, who decided to serve in the tsarist army in 1915, embraced Bolshevism in 1918, and served the Bolshevik leader Lev Kamenev as his secretary during the Civil War. Between the two world wars he worked as a Soviet diplomat. In 1937 he was appointed Soviet undersecretary-general of the League of Nations in Geneva. In 1939, he ignored instructions from his superiors to return to the USSR out of a justifiable fear of arrest. Korine Amacher focuses on his motivation to join the Bolsheviks. She shows the transformation of a young man, born and raised in Geneva, into what he himself called an “aggressive and convinced” revolutionary. Finally, she emphasizes the impact of his adherence to Bolshevism on his life trajectory after 1918.

Anthony Heywood devotes his attention to Iurii Lomonosov (1876–1952), one of Russia’s most prominent railroad engineers at the beginning of the 20th century. In February 1917 Lomonosov chose to support the forces of revolution, and he then played a noteworthy role in the transport ministry. After the October Revolution, while on a government mission in North America, he decided to return to Soviet Russia. From 1919 onwards he worked for the Soviet government, but in 1927, while working in Berlin as the head of the Soviet Diesel Locomotive Bureau, he, like Socoline, refused orders to return to the USSR, largely out of fear of arrest. He therefore became, in his own words, “a free Soviet citizen abroad.” But he was never able to rebuild his career in Europe or in the United States. After 1934, he spent much of his time writing his memoirs.

The final chapter in this section by Marina Sorokina analyzes a little-known aspect of the life of the famous linguist Roman Jakobson (1896–1982)—the impact of the Russian Revolution on the young scholar, who was at the very beginning of his career in 1917. Although Jakobson’s parents emigrated to Germany in spring 1918, he decided to stay in Russia, where he began to work for the Soviet government in summer 1918. His collaboration with the People’s Commissariat of Foreign Affairs lasted for more than ten years. From 1920 he lived in Prague with the status of a Soviet employee abroad. Thus, although Jakobson left Soviet Russia, he did not slam the door behind him.

Choices, opportunities, but also loyalty to and sacrifice for the cause of the revolution are at the center of these four chapters. As Heywood stresses, “the revolution was supported by many different people for very different reasons.” Indeed, each subject’s path to political activism and acceptance of the revolution was very different. For Girault and Socoline, the vision of Russian reality, poverty, and injustice played a central role in their revolutionary adherence, whereas for Aleksandra Kollontai and Iurii Lomonosov, their politicization predated 1917. Some actors point in their writings to decisive choices they made at very specific moments that shaped the rest of their lives. For example, it was on the evening of 28 February 1917, after he received a telegram from Aleksandr A. Bublikov, a member of the Russian State Duma, that Iurii Lomonosov took the conscious decision to support the revolutionary forces actively. In addition, his public call for the United States to recognize Soviet power in June 1918 clearly represented the “Rubicon” of his life. Likewise, it was during the Left SRs’ uprising against the Bolsheviks in July 1918 that Socoline, while attending an improvised meeting in the street, found his “way to Damascus,” in his words—and became a Bolshevik. Even after his refusal to return to the USSR, Socoline never renounced his public loyalty to the October Revolution. This of course did not make his life easier in Switzerland.

The same goes for Kollontai and Girault, members of the first generation of revolutionaries who gained access to a high level of political and organizational power after the revolution. Given that they were more “Bolshevik activists serving the masses and the revolution” than “activist women advancing the cause of women and their political representation,” they accepted the “backsliding at the end of the 1920s and in the 1930s, and the elimination of dedicated women’s sections in the Party and Comintern” in fidelity to the October Revolution and the regime it birthed. As for Roman Jakobson, his choices were more ambiguous. As Marina Sorokina argues, “Jakobson’s involvement in the collective revolutionary creativity of that time and the Soviet experiment as a whole was motivated and driven by his own personal agenda and scholarly research program.” Indeed, by working for the Soviet regime, Jakobson could implement his scholarly program and develop Slavic studies “at the international level along structuralist lines,” while staying in contact with literary specialists and linguists in the USSR and helping them integrate their scholarly achievements into the discipline of Slavic studies abroad.

The two chapters in the third section deal with “ordinary people,” those who neither belonged to the old elite nor were politically committed. In short, they were “just” contemporaries and bystanders of the Russian Revolution and the civil war. These contributions also reflect the growing scholarly interest in experiences and personal recollections of the Russian Revolution as experienced by actors who belonged to the “silent majority,” which has been forgotten by historians for too long. Igor Narskii and Aleksandr Fokin focus on the diaries of Konstantin Teploukhov (1870–1942) and Nikolai Okunev (1868–?1924), two men who had reached a mature age by 1917. They did not accept the Soviet reality, but were not open enemies of the new regime. Indifferent to politics, they seemingly subjected themselves to the new order, making their own survival and that of their relatives their highest priority. Although they lived in different places—Cheliabinsk and Moscow—and did not know each other, their strategies were quite similar: they continued to keep their diaries after the revolution, an activity that provided “a means of immunizing and protecting themselves against the Soviet ambition to create ‘a New Man.’” The same reflection runs through Julia Herzberg’s chapter, which examines the significance of the political upheaval in 1917 in published and unpublished autobiographical texts by Russian peasants. After the revolution, the Bolsheviks invited workers and peasants to write about their lives and to send their stories to the editors of *Krest’ianskaia gazeta* (The Peasants’ Newspaper). These texts were all written according to the same standard and contributed to the creation of the founding myth of the USSR: 1917 as the “glorious beginning of a new era.” At the same time, in peasants’ unpublished writings the caesura of 1917 is secondary to another caesura, perceived as much more radical:

collectivization. Indeed, "in many cases collectivization smothered peasant autonomy and with it their narratives of their lives."

The self-testimonies of the protagonists in these two chapters not only make it possible to reconstruct as closely as possible the daily life of "ordinary people," but they also shed light on the strategies of survival employed by the population of revolutionary Russia. Keeping a diary, or writing memoirs, was for some a "strategy of survival in the extreme conditions of the Russian revolution and everyday Soviet life." According to Narsky and Fokin, keeping a diary for Teploukhov and Okunev was a way "to remain themselves and not become lost in a rapidly changing, unstable, opaque and often hostile reality." The questions of "resistance" and "submission" also stand at the heart of Herzberg's analysis. Although autobiographies were supposed to contribute to the creation of a "new man" in the early years of the Soviet regime, "this conception collided with earlier practices of autobiographical writing." By continuing to use the prerevolutionary Julian calendar after the Soviet calendar reform, for example, peasants resisted the Soviet injunction to become "new men." At the same time, they submitted outwardly, as resisting openly was, as one of them put it, a "senseless act." Hence, their strategy consisted in outward conformity and inner resistance, or, as one wrote in 1920: "inner emigration."

In the fourth and last section of this volume, the emphasis shifts to the construction of a revolutionary memory, analyzed through very different cases. In her paper on Lev Kamenev's revolutionary biography and Leo Trotskii's interpretation of it in his *Lessons of October*, Alexis Pogorelskin examines the relationship between Lenin and Kamenev before and during the revolution, the central political role of Kamenev after 1917, and the conflict between Kamenev and Trotskii after Lenin's death. As Pogorelskin emphasizes, the moderate attitude adopted by Kamenev in October 1917 must be understood in light of his intellectual evolution during emigration before the revolution. Indeed, this period was marked by his writing of a work on Alexander Herzen, a figure who had a decisive influence on Kamenev. The author then focuses on Trotskii's interpretation of Kamenev's "disloyalty" to Lenin and Bolshevism in 1917 in his *Lessons of October*.

Trotskii is the "hero" of Alexander V. Reznik's chapter, which addresses Trotskii's autobiographical engagement with the revolution in the broader context of his oeuvre. Reznik first analyzes the variety of Trotskii's autobiographical writings. Then he focuses on Trotskii's autobiography, *My Life*, considered until today as the most important memoir ever written by a Soviet leader. Reznik's aim is to "re-read this politicized autobiography" through a less political lens, in order to indicate the elements that were important to its

author, and to show that *My Life* was “a juncture point of Trotskii’s lifespan, both in terms of experiencing autobiography and experiencing life itself.”

Pierre Boutonnet’s chapter deals with the anarchist Volin (Vsevolod Mikhailovich Eikhenbaum, 1882–1945), who took part in the two Russian revolutions and spent most of his life—34 years—in exile, mainly in France. His book, *The Unknown Revolution*, published after his death in 1947, was rediscovered by a wider public during the 1960s, when the Stalinist myth of October lost its influence. According to Boutonnet, the autobiographical episodes included in the book were written “to show libertarians and citizens of the world in general the paths to follow or not follow to achieve social revolution.” They represented a “political act by a witness of the Russian revolution” who interpreted the defeat of the anarchist cause as the “promise of their future victory in the world.”

But this section does more than focus on well-known figures of the Russian Revolution. In his contribution Eric Aunoble presents a collective biography of Polish activists of the Russian revolution in Ukraine. Their personal files, kept in the Kyiv and Khar’kiv archives, make it possible to understand their individual involvement in the 1917 Revolution and the Civil War. For those who survived Stalinism, their fate until the 1960s underlines the upward social mobility induced by their participation in the revolution. The trace of these Polish activists was, however, long virtually invisible. Indeed, in the 1920s they put their political allegiance ahead of their national identity. But their Polishness became a dangerous characteristic during the Great Terror, imposing silence on their memory. Although the constitution of a “socialist” Poland allowed the rediscovery of a Polish component within the communist movement, it was not until de-Stalinization that the contribution of foreigners to the Russian Revolution was revealed in the USSR.

Three chapters in this last section deal with political actors—Trotskii, Kamenev, and Volin—whose legacy is still remembered. Indeed, even though Volin is less famous than Trotskii and Kamenev, he has not been forgotten by anarchists today; his book *The Unknown Revolution* has been republished several times. By contrast, the chapter devoted to Polish revolutionaries deals with actors who fell into oblivion after the revolution and whose traces must be sought in the archives in order to restore their visibility. Moreover, of all the protagonists studied in this section, only Trotskii has put his life into a narrative, and only Trotskii and Volin have presented their vision of a revolution that went astray. In their case, forced exile played a central role. It allowed them to defend their political position and to defend themselves against the attacks and accusations that were brought against them at different times by political opponents.

This is not the case of the very different protagonists who left no important memoirs: Lev Kamenev, executed in 1936, and the Polish activists caught up in the turmoil of Soviet life. Kamenev was the author of numerous texts on widely varied themes, but few were autobiographical in nature. As for the Polish activists, if they wrote autobiographies, they were written within the template dictated by the Communist Party. Talking about oneself to build a self-image is a political act. For Volin and Trotskii, it was a voluntary choice, whereas for the Polish activists it was institutionally imposed. But in the end, what connects the protagonists of these four contributions—Trotskii, Kamenev, Volin, and the Polish revolutionaries—is that they were all, at one time or another, for political and ideological reasons, either removed from official Soviet narrative or deemed to be “counter-heroes.”

Conclusion

It requires no special emphasis to point out that the case studies presented here deal only with a small number of “personal trajectories in Russia’s Great War and Revolution.” Furthermore, the selection of 15 individual experiences and autobiographical reflections may seem somehow arbitrary. Undoubtedly, underrepresented in our collection of essays are workers, who were once firmly established in “traditional” histories of the Russian Revolution. The various ethnic groups of the multiethnic empire are also poorly represented. Their biographies and voices would make the picture of the Russian Revolution even more complex. The same can be said for the numerous foreigners who, for various reasons, had settled in Russia before the First World War and whose lives abruptly took a new direction through war and revolution. Finally, the millions of Russian soldiers who were torn from their homeland by the Great War, many of whom in 1917 placed great hope in the revolutionary developments in their country, are also not to be heard in our volume. Consequently the overall picture makes no claim to completeness and cohesiveness.

Nevertheless, from our perspective, the small number of life stories and ego-documents analyzed in this book vividly illustrate the great potential of the heuristic approach we have chosen. The analysis of a small number of biographies and self-testimonies helps us to question established master narratives about what Russian official terminology nowadays calls the “Great Russian revolution,”²⁶ but also about the civil war that followed. It helps us

²⁶ In Russia, the revolution is increasingly described as the “Great Russian revolution” (*Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia*), a label that replaced the old term “Great Socialist October Revolution” in school history books. Iu. A. Petrov, ed., *Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917: 100 let izucheniiia. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Moskva, 9–11 oktiabria 2017 g.)* (Moscow: IRI RAN, 2017); Petrov, ed., *Rossiiskaia revoliutsiia 1917 goda:*

to contrast historical caesuras in politics and society with the continuity of individuals' lives, to look at geographical mobility and developments beyond the political centers, to give a voice to historically marginal actors and to juxtapose our concept of "history" (in the singular) with the many-voiced chorus of individual experiences and interpretations of the passage of time.

Indeed, the individuals whose biographies and/or ego-documents are analyzed in the following chapters had a life before and after the revolution. Some welcomed the long-awaited political change, actively participated in it, and even made a revolutionary career. Others observed the disintegration of the old order from a distance, withdrew into "inner exile" or took flight in the course of the civil war. Some of them took up the pen many years after the revolutionary upheaval to write down their memories and their own interpretation or history of 1917. Their view of the past was shaped by their own fate between the time of personal experience in the past and the time of their writing, as well as by the knowledge of which political forces had prevailed in revolution and civil war. Furthermore, while the case studies presented in this volume take the reader to the revolutionary capitals of Russia, others focus on small cities, provincial noble estates, or the Russian peasant village. Several chapters deal with highly mobile actors, members of the old tsarist elite on the run, or socialist activists who returned from exile to their Russian homeland in 1917. Finally, the following essays focus not only on well-known "heroes" of the Russian Revolution but also on social groups and individuals that are underrepresented in traditional histories of the revolution; among these, women can be mentioned in particular. Thus, despite the shortcomings mentioned above, including the absence of various social groups, this volume reminds us of the great diversity of the experience of 1917 and vividly illustrates the value of ego-documents as historical primary sources.

Vlast', obshchestvo, kul'tura: V dvukh tomakh (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2017). From the perspective of the Russian historian Aleksandr Shubin, the notion "Great Russian Revolution" "today no longer expresses admiration.... The word 'great' [rather] highlights the scale of the phenomenon and its impact on world development, which puts the Great Russian Revolution in a row with other greatest events in world history." Aleksandr V. Shubin, "The Main Stages of The Great Russian Revolution" (2017), 2, http://www.informacional.ru/articles/alexander_shubin_revolution_usa.php (accessed 9 February 2021); Shubin, *Velikaia rossiiskaia revoliutsiia: Ot Fevralia k Oktiabriu* (Moscow: Rodina-Media, 2014). Although official Russian politics of history removed the revolution's socialist mantle, students are apparently still required to be convinced of the "greatness" of this event in world history.