

NOTAS HISTÓRICAS Y GEOGRÁFICAS

Artículos

**HISTORICAL MEMORY OF YOUNG GENERATIONS OF COUNTRIES
PARTICIPATED IN WAR (1939-1945)**

**MEMORIA HISTÓRICA DE LAS GENERACIONES JOVENES DE PAÍSES
PARTICIPANTES EN LA GUERRA (1939-1945)**

Galina Ivanovna Osadchaya

Institute of Socio-Political Research, Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPR FCTAS RAS), Moscow, Russia
osadchaya111@gmail.com

Igor Aleksandrovich Seleznev

Institute of Socio-Political Research, Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPR FCTAS RAS), Moscow, Russia
igdrake@yandex.ru

Irina Valeryevna Leskova

Russian State Social University (RSSU), Moscow, Russia
leskova.i@yandex.ru

Egor Yurevich Kireev

Institute of Socio-Political Research, Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPR FCTAS RAS), Moscow, Russia
Russian State Social University (RSSU), Moscow, Russia
yegorkireev@gmail.com

Marina Lvovna Vartanova

Institute of Socio-Political Research, Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPR FCTAS RAS), Moscow, Russia
11marina11@mail.ru

Anna Andreyevna Chernikova

Institute of Socio-Political Research, Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPR FCTAS RAS), Moscow, Russia
aanny@yandex.ru

Recibido el 10 de enero de 2020

Aceptado el 03 de junio de 2020

Abstract

The goal of the study is to identify the ideas about the Second World War present in the young generations of citizens of the states participating in the integration processes in post-soviet space, the common and the specific in the perception of the Victory of 1945 in the representatives of various post-soviet societies, the specific characteristics of the perception of social time, and the formation of historical memory in this group via the means of empirical analysis. The study methodology is based on the concepts of social time, communicative and cultural social memory, “postmemory” and “counter-memory”, commemoration, temporal stability of social memory. The study deploys a research method based on comparative qualitative analysis of the results of in-depth interviews of the young citizens of the EAEU and CSTO states and the countries being candidates for entering the EAEU. The semantic constructs of the past events may or may not coincide both within the young generations in each of the studied countries and across different countries.

Keywords: sociological research; social time; post-soviet states; Eurasian integration

Resumen

El objetivo del estudio es identificar las ideas sobre la Segunda Guerra Mundial presentes en las generaciones jóvenes de ciudadanos de los estados que participan en los procesos de integración en el espacio postsoviético, lo común y lo específico en la percepción de la Victoria de 1945 en los representantes de diversas sociedades postsoviéticas, las características específicas de la percepción del tiempo social y la formación de la memoria histórica en este grupo por medio del análisis empírico. La metodología de estudio se basa en los conceptos de tiempo social, memoria social comunicativa y cultural, “postmemoria” y “contramemoria”, conmemoración, estabilidad temporal de la memoria social. El estudio despliega un método de investigación basado en el análisis cualitativo comparativo de los resultados de entrevistas en profundidad a los jóvenes ciudadanos de los estados de la EAEU y de la OTSC y los países candidatos a ingresar en la EAEU.

Palabras Clave: investigación sociológica; tiempo social; estados postsoviéticos; Integración euroasiática

Para citar este artículo:

Osadchaya, Galina Ivanovna; Seleznev, Igor Aleksandrovich; Leskova, Irina Valeryevna; Kireev, Egor Yurevich; Vartanova, Marina Lvovna y Chernikova, Anna Andreyevna. Historical memory of young generations of countries participated in war (1939-1945). Revista Notas Históricas y Geográficas, número 25, Julio – Diciembre 2020. pp. 70-104.

1. INTRODUCTION

The life of a person involves not only the calendar-based dimension of time but also the social and historical dimensions as the parts of social time. Social time is defined as: 1) the pace and rhythm of the sequence of events characteristic of a certain period of the existence of an individual, a group, or a society as the most important form and measure of their existence; 2) a universal cultural concept embodying the essence of the understanding of time in a specific social group in a particular society¹.

Unlike calendar time, social time is subjective and can stretch and contract. There is a viewpoint suggesting that the aspect decisive for social time is the specific type of modeling of social events that are relatively independent of calendar periodicities. For example, Emile Durkheim's theory examines social time as a collective idea acting as a social category. Thus, in subjective experience, important historic events become the milestones of certain periods and entire eras that do not coincide with calendar periods. According to Pitirim Sorokin and Robert Merton², "social time is not continuous; it is disrupted by critically important dates". For instance, the 19th century as a social and historical era lasted from the beginning of the French Revolution (1789) to the start of the First World War (1914).

Similarly, the beginning of a new era in the 20th century was marked by the Second World War. The new system of international relations and law (Yalta-Potsdam system) served as a global result of the victory over fascism and the end of the war. This presents the point of origin of such global institutions generated by the Yalta-Potsdam system as the United Nations, the International Bill of Human Rights, etc.³.

¹ Otiutskii, G. P., *The sociological time*, vol.1, Sotsiologicheskaiia entsiklopediia (Moscow: Mysl, 2003), 179.

² Sorokin, P. A. and Merton, R. K., "Social time: the experience of methodological and functional analysis", *Sotsis* 6 (2004): 112–19.

³ Osipov, G. V., Osadchaia, G. I., Andreev, E. M., Yudina, T. N., Vartanova, M. L., Kireev, E. Yu., Drobot, Ye. V., Seleznev, I. A. and Vybornov, D. M., *The processes of Eurasian integration: the socio-political dimension* (Moscow: Biblio-Globus, 2018), 145-46.

However, the Second World War also resulted in worldwide changes in people's minds that acted as a reason for these institutions being demanded in real life. Such massive changes in people's consciousness led to the emergence of the discourse of Theodor Adorno who questioned the possibility of poetry after Auschwitz and formulated a new categorical imperative: how does one think and act in a way that would prevent Auschwitz from happening ever again⁴.

The victory in the Second World War cost such enormous efforts and massive sacrifices that it marked the reckoning of a new era. Time split into what was before the Victory and the war and everything that happened after. In 1945 the world changed and the feeling of self in people who knew victory could not remain the same as before the war. For the peoples of the Soviet Union, the Victory in World War II (or the Great Patriotic War) was not only a major milestone in the social and historical time but also the point of assembly of the national consciousness and collective will. Thus, social time became different in quality after the war compared to its previous state. Much like people in the 1940s, the heroes, victims, and witnesses split into those who had survived and those who had not. Those who knew the joy and triumph of the Victory on May the 9th, 1945, found themselves in a new era with the following generations remembering the Victory.

However, the social experience of historic time is often reflected in the collective perception of historic events. The pre-war year of 1935 and the victorious year of 1945 are a calendar decade apart but in the social and historical time categories, they are separated by an entire era. Subjectively 1935 ends up being closer to the events of the beginning of the 20th century and 1945 seems vivid and relevant to the present day, at the end of the second decade of the 21st century.

Social time is a key element in the formation of historical memory. It is interesting how the social time of historic events can be interpreted quite subjectively in a certain community. Despite the majority of historical sources including the "official" Russian ones associate the beginning of World War II of September 1, 1939, with the German attack on Poland and the formal declaration

⁴ Adorno, T., *Negative dialectics*. E.L. Petrenko transl (Moscow: Nauchnyi mir, 2003), 374.

of war by France and Great Britain, other interpretations exist as well. For instance, there is a known viewpoint of Chinese social scientists who associate the beginning of World War II with July of 1937. Indeed, the beginning of the Sino-Japanese War that opened the theater of operations of World War II in the Far East was marked by the incident on the Marco Polo Bridge. Meanwhile, the events that took place in Europe in the same period were the Munich agreement of 1938 which allowed Germany to first dismember and then occupy Czechoslovakia with the participation of Poland, the attempts of the Western countries to channel German aggression towards the USSR, and the Spanish civil war with international participation of military contingents of Italy and Germany on one side (Francoists) and Soviet military experts and inter-brigade volunteers from around the world on the other (republicans). According to the cultural historian and art critic M.S. Trofimenkov⁵, Spanish Civil War 1936-1939 “it was not just the first war against fascism, but the first anti-fascist war. <...> It was a world war in miniature. Not because the Soviet pilots blocked the skies of the cities from the Junkers, and the tank battalions destroyed the bersagliers. Their participation is invaluable from a military point of view; in the war of symbols, technology does not mean everything. Forty thousand volunteers from international brigades came to the defense of the republic, most often without military training. <...> All together they gave the war a unique character, a moral one. It was a war of culture against barbarism”. Everybody could feel the breath of the beginning world conflict. This context brings more clarity into the foreign policy of the USSR in 1939-1941.

However, following the topic of the subjective perception of historical time, we should provide a viewpoint heard in one European university as a curious example. According to their historiography, the Second World War began in December of 1941 when the USA entered the war. Following this US-centric position, the previously “local” events of the Sino-Japanese, the British-French-German, the German-Yugoslav, and the Soviet-German (Great Patriotic) wars reached worldwide scale only after Pearl Harbor.

⁵ Trofimenkov, M.S., *Hollywood Red Noir* (Saint-Peterburg: Seans, 2019), 746.

The paradoxical interpretations of this sort can often indicate both the subjectivity and political engagement of the various schools of historical science and a certain elasticity of historical time. In recent years, we have been observing a substantial informational confrontation on the topic of historical truth about the Second World War. It is illustrated by the “battle against monuments” and the attempts to erase the memory of the Soviet Union as a victorious state that ended up being one of the architects of the post-war world and to break the bond between generations. These attempts of falsification excused by “preserving historical memory for the future of Europe” can be heard both in the statements of individual European politicians and in the resolution of the European Parliament. The attempts of “convenient modification” of the historiography of war made in many countries join this range of examples. Many of the former Soviet republics are united in several integration initiatives: the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)⁶. The collective solidarity in preserving historical memory and the connection between generations can become an effective response in countering the falsifications of the history of World War II. A joint appeal to the peoples of the world that condemned any attempts of historical falsifications and misinterpretation of the results of the Second World War was made at the summit of the leaders of the CIS countries in Ashgabat (October of 2019)⁷. The CSTO and EAEU countries not only supported the Russian draft resolution against the glorification of Nazism in the UN but also became its co-authors⁸.

⁶ Osadchaya, G.I., Vartanova, M.L., Kireev, E.Yu., Seleznev, I.A. and Chernikova, A.A., “Assessing the Sustainable Growth Potential of The Eurasian Economic Union Member States’ Economies,” *Revista Turismo Estudios & Prácticas. Suplementar 03* (2020): 1-13; Seleznev, I. A., “A quarter-century guard of collective security (on the 25th anniversary of the collective security treaty and the 15th anniversary of the CSTO),” *Protivodeistvie terrorizmu. Problemy XXI veka – Counter-Terrorism 2* (2018): 16-23; Osipov, G. V., Osadchaia, G. I., Andreev, E. M., Yudina, T. N., Vartanova, M. L., Kireev, E. Yu., Drobot, Ye. V., Seleznev, I. A. and Vybornov, D. M., *The processes of Eurasian integration: the socio-political dimension*, 374.

⁷ Council of CIS Heads of State, “Appeal of the heads of states of the Commonwealth of Independent States to the peoples of the Commonwealth and the world community related to the 75th anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-194” (2019, October 11), <http://www.cis.minsk.by/news/12416/obrasenie-glav-gosudarstv--ucastnikov-sng-k-narodam-stran-sodruzestva-i-mirovoj-obsestvennosti-v-svazi-s-75-letiem-pobedy-sovetskogo-naroda-v-velikoj-otecestvennoj-vojne-1941-1945-godov> (as of September 10, 2020)

⁸ RIA Novosti, “Putin thanked the CSTO countries for supporting the resolution against Nazism” (2019, November 28), <https://ria.ru/20191128/1561700601.html> (as of September 10, 2020)

2. Literature review

Certain scientific works in Russian sociology explore the topics of the memory of the Second World War and the understanding of the Great Victory as a fundamental symbol of Russian history⁹, the effect of myths and fakes on the content of historical memory of the war¹⁰, the connection between the social memory of the Victory and “positive historical responsibility”¹¹, the role played by the government, the structures of civil society, and the church in the preservation of historical memory of the war¹², the analysis of the evolution of the mass consciousness of youth in relation to concepts like “heroism”, “self-sacrifice in the name of the Motherland”, and “preserving the memory of the exploits in the Great Patriotic War”, the nation’s moral values that have formed over the years¹³.

Considering the post-soviet countries, in 2019 the Belarus National Academy of Sciences hosted a scientific conference titled “The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor” that paid great attention to the historical memory of World War II¹⁴. Earlier, a monograph devoted to the studies of understanding of the history of Belarus of the 20th century in mass consciousness was published¹⁵. Among the studies of researchers from Kazakhstan there are of

⁹ Gudkov, L., “Victory in the war: towards the sociology of one national symbol”, *Monitoring* 5 (997): 12-9.

¹⁰ Tavokin, E. P., & Tabatadze, I. A., “On the question of historical memory of the Great Patriotic War,” *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 5 (2010): 62–6.

¹¹ Beliaeva, E. V., “Historical responsibility for the good” (1st International Scientific Conference “Istoricheskaiia otvetstvennost: ot mifov proshlogo k strategiiam budushchego”, Russia, Ekaterinburg, September 22-23, 2016).

¹² Buiukli, D. A., “Preservation of the historical memory of the contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church to the victory in the Great Patriotic War,” *Bulletin of the Tambov State University. Series: Gumanitarnye nauki* 24(180) (2019): 179-85.

¹³ Starikov, A. G., Bakushev, V. V., Perova, M. V. and Goriainov, S. V., “Who is the hero among youth?” *Gumanitarnye, sotsialno-ekonomicheskie i obshchestvennyye nauki* 1 (2010): 43-6.

¹⁴ Korshunov, G. P., Chief Editor, *The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor* (Minsk: “SUGART” LLC, 2019a), 360.

¹⁵ Sidortsov, V. N., Kandyba, I. A. and Ravchenko, M. M., *Belarus in the XX century: an unconventional image of history* (Moscow: MAKS Press, 2010), 272.

increased interest to us, for instance, those exploring the research on cultural memory and memorialization of World War II in post-Soviet states¹⁶ including the context of commemorative practices and gender aspect¹⁷, the studies covering the heroism of Kazakh warriors of the war fronts¹⁸ or the factors of behavioral motivation of the soldiers of Kazakh national military units in the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army during the war years¹⁹. However, following the analysis of scientific publications on the topic, we can conclude that there have not yet been any empirically-based studies on the historical memory of World War II in the young generation of the CIS countries. Approaching the beginning of the research, it is necessary to provide a clear differentiation of the concepts: “historical memory” is not identical to the “scientific historical knowledge”. The historical memory includes the entire totality of pre-scientific, scientific, quasi-scientific, and non-scientific knowledge and mass representations of society concerning a common past²⁰. While scientific knowledge has to be neutral and objective in its nature, memory has to be emotional, subjective, and mythologized, since it presents a complex of representations, opinions, and evaluations of the past of a society formed in it. The historical memory is dialectic: its content is determined by the past but the comprehension of the present is impossible without it; it changes depending on the social and historical context but affects the cultural environment of society as well. According to Johann Gottfried Herder, the development of a person takes place via the assimilation of the acquired experience that realizes the principle of continuity of the cultural time and the development of nations has the same trajectory. The development and upbringing of the entire humanity take place through transmitting the results of activities of the previous generations, traditions, as well as assimilating and applying the transferred²¹.

¹⁶ Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage,” *Mir Bolshogo Altaia* 1(2) (2015): 122-30.

¹⁷ Zharkynbaeva, R. S., “The Great Patriotic war: the sociocultural memory and commemorative practices in post-Soviet Kazakhstan (gender aspect),” *Zhenshchina v rossiiskom obshchestve* 1(82) (2017): 103-16.

¹⁸ Omarov, S. A., Omarova, G. E. and Iakhiiaev, I. A., “Heroism of Kazakhstanis on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War,” *Sibirskii torgovo-ekonomicheskii zhurnal* 1 (2015): 10-4.

¹⁹ Asanova, S. A., “On the main factors of behavioral motivation of the soldiers of Kazakh national military units during the war years (1941-1945),” *Mir Bolshogo Altaia* 5(2) (2019): 280-95.

²⁰ Repina, L. P. The concepts of social and cultural memory in modern historiography, In *Fenomen proshlogo*, ed. I. M. Savelieva, A. V. Poletaeva (Moscow: HSE Publishing House, 2005), 122-70.

²¹ Herder, I. G., *Ideas for the philosophy of the history of humanity* (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 770.

Here, it should be accentuated that historical memory is not limited to mere memories of the past and nostalgia. As indicated by Immanuel Kant²², it serves the connection of perceptions across time to associate that which is no longer there with that which is not there yet in related experience through what exists in the present.

Memory helps shape identity. This does not happen directly, because our relationship with the past only partially determines who we are in the present, but never directly, and never without unexpected or even undesirable consequences that connect us to those whom we consider different. Thus, our identity is formed both on the basis of personal memories and through interaction with the memories of other people²³.

Historical memory may become a factor of both the organization and the disorganization of the Eurasian space. It can contribute to both the reproduction of the Eurasian peoples' unity and separation of post-soviet countries. Since the Victory presents a crucial event in the history of the Soviet Union, we can suggest that in mass consciousness the historical memory of the war serves as a link for the integration processes. Therefore, the study of historical memory of descendants of the victors in World War II presents an interesting and scientifically relevant objective. Specialists propose that subjective time is researched via identifying the opinions about it present in various social groups²⁴. Philosophical schools like phenomenology, philosophy of life, and existentialism emphasize not the person's existence in time but rather the existence of time in a person as a subject of their own life²⁵. The paradigm of memory studies emerges largely as a project of analyzing the social background of designing and modeling history²⁶. What is the historical memory of the representatives of the younger generations of post-Soviet countries of the Victory of 1945?

²² Kant, I., *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*, vol. 7, Sochineniia (Moscow: Choro, 1994), 324.

²³ Rothberg, M., *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2009).

²⁴ Otiutskii, G. P., *The sociological time*, 179.

²⁵ Golovakha, E. B. and Kronik, A. A., *The psychological time of a person* (Moscow: Smysl, 2008), 272.

²⁶ Assman, J., *Cultural memory: writing, memory of the past, and political identity in the high cultures of the past* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kultury, 2004), 368.

To answer this question, the staff of the Center for the Study of the Processes of Eurasian Integration of the Institute of Socio-Political Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences conducted a sociological study of the social memory of the youth of countries participating in Eurasian integration by conducting a series of qualitative interviews with the representatives of the young generations of citizens of post-Soviet states (Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Moldova, and Tajikistan) living, studying, or working in Moscow.

3. Methods

The methodological base of the study is constructed by ideas and concepts of social memory studies by Maurice Halbwachs²⁷, Aleida Assman²⁸, Jan Assman²⁹, Marianna Hirsch³⁰, Yael Zerubavel³¹, Allan Megill³², Horst-Alfred Heinrich, and Pierre Nora³³, Bernard Guenee³⁴. “The social memory of the youth of the states participating in the Eurasian integration” was understood by the authors as relevant social information on the common past of the peoples formerly being the

²⁷ Halbwachs, M., *Sotsialnye ramki pamiati*. S.N. Zenkin transl. (Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo, 2007), 348.

²⁸ Assman, A., *A long shadow of the past: memorial culture and historical politics* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2014), 328; Assman, A., *The oblivion of history – obsession with history* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2019), 552; Assmann, A., *New dissatisfaction with the memorial culture* (Moscow: New Literary Observer, 2016).

²⁹ Assman, J., *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (München: C. H. Beck, 1992); Assman, J., *Cultural memory: writing, memory of the past, and political identity in the high cultures of the past*, 368.

³⁰ Hirsch, M., *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); Hirsch, M., “Memory and Counter-Memory for the Future” (Invited Lecture by U.S. State Department and Memorial, Moscow, Russia, June 2017).

³¹ Zerubavel, Y., *The dynamics of collective memory*, In *Imperii i natsiia v zerkale istoricheskoi pamiati* (Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo, 2011), 10-25.

³² Megill, A., *Historical epistemology* (Moscow: Kanon-Plius, 2007), 480.

³³ Nora, P., *Les lieux de memoire*, vol.1, *La Republique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984); Nora, P., *Problematics of the places of memory*. In *Frantsiia – pamiat*, ed. P. Nora, M. Ozuf, Z. de Piuimezh, and M. Vinok (Saint Petersburg: publishing house of Saint Petersburg State University, 1999), 17-50; Heinrich, H. -A., *Kollektive Erinnerungen der Deutschen. Theoretische Konzepte und empirische Befunde zum Sozialen Gedächtnis* (München: Juventa Verlag Weinheim und München, 2002), 288.

³⁴ Guenee, B., *History and Historical Culture of the Medieval West* (Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture, 2002), 494.

parts of a single state, as well as the complex of relevant practices that have developed under the influence of the current reality, the social and cultural context in the post-Soviet states, and the personal social life of young people who evaluate the past differently and have different attitudes towards the prospects of Eurasian integration.

Following the conception of Allan Megill, the commemoration is understood as the process in which “the preserved memories of past events can become something akin to the objects of religious veneration”. The emergence of commemoration takes place in the present out of the community’s desire to reaffirm their sense of unity and community strengthening ties within the community through the attitude towards the idea of past events shared by its members³⁵.

The specific characteristic of the present study is the use of a research method based on deploying comparative qualitative analysis of the results of in-depth interviews of the young citizens of the above-mentioned states being the members of the EAEU and CSTO and the candidates for entering the EAEU. 490 people were interviewed with the use of a non-random sampling method, each group included 70 informants recruited via the snowball method. The empirical object of research is presented by the youth representing the “millennial” and “post-millennial” generations (18-38 years old).

The social memory of World War two in the young generations of the states participating in the Eurasian integration is analyzed as postmemory since an average of 37-57 years has passed since the end of the war at the respondents’ time of the birth. Therefore, in constructing the image of the events that happened long before their birth they relied on stories told by people from the close circle of communication – grandparents, parents, and teachers, as well as historical and fictional literature, the forms of visual representation of the events, and their own imagination. We also derived from the fact that the empirical object of the youth of post-soviet countries is, like any other big group, heterogeneous, and multiple differentiating factors are present.

³⁵ Megill, A., Historical epistemology, 480.

The perception of the past is always conditioned by the common values and life experience, and the worldview that have formed, it changes along with the process of growing up and aging and is evaluated from the point of the present social reality and ideas about the future and constructs the changing semantic field of the social reality³⁶. Therefore, the semantic constructs of past events may or may not coincide both within the young generations in each of the studied countries and across different countries³⁷. The comparison of their perception of history will allow identifying the major tendencies in the similarities and differences of the social memory of the Second World War.

4. Results

According to the study results, the first place among the historical events mentioned by the informants was taken by the Victory of the USSR in World War II. This event was preserved in the memory of all the studied societies and was noted by two-thirds of the respondents. In the respondents' narratives, the Great Patriotic War was often woven into the context of family history; the role of the Soviet Union and the contribution of each republic of the USSR to the victory over fascism were highly appreciated. The heroism of all the defenders of the Motherland who contributed to the common victory was noted. The respondents mentioned their relatives who participated in the events in the rear and on the war fronts. The mentions of heroes native to a certain republic of the Soviet Union, the representatives of different cultures³⁸ by their contemporary young compatriots was an episode characteristic for the study.

³⁶ Leskova, I. V., Osadchaya, G. I. and Yudina, T. N. "Lifestyle of Moscow dwellers: system of values, behavioural patterns, and social practices". Web of science. WLC 2016: World lumen congress. logos universality mentality education novelty (lumen 15th anniversary edition), 2018. <https://doi.org/10.15405/EPBSBS.2018.02.89>. (as of September 10, 2020)

³⁷ Roberts, K., Osadchaya, G. I., Dsuzev, K. V., Gorodyanenko, V. G. and Tholen, J. "Who succeeds and who flounders? Young people in east Europe's new market economies," Sociological Research Online, 7(4) (2002). <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/4/roberts.html> (as of September 22, 2020).

³⁸ Leskova, I. V., "Social Mechanisms of Harmonization of the Relations between Muslim and Christian Culture", Bogoslovni Vestnik 79(4) (2019): 1053-61.

The mentions of the Great Patriotic War were also observed in answers to the question about the historic events that best describe Russia and the respondent's country of origin. A significant portion of the informants from various post-soviet countries accentuated the fact in the face of aggression the country demonstrated its resilience and power and the nation showed its fortitude and solidarity in achieving a common goal – the Victory.

The following presents the statements typical for the representatives of each of the studied countries:

“Back then, Russia and Armenia were a single country – the USSR. And I believe it is hard to distinguish who did more for the victory in this war. I believe that it was a single country and this country was the one victorious in the war” (Artur, 31 years old, Armenia).

“The Second World War united the peoples of the USSR against the common enemy which helped to achieve victory by joint efforts. This event is the most important thing that could happen to the Soviet Union since it united all of its nations” (Matvei, 20 years old, Belarus).

“Kazakhstan was a union country, so there is a direct relationship. The solidarity of people, everyone fought together for a single cause – to defeat the Nazis” (Marat, 26 years old, Kazakhstan).

“It is difficult to separate Kyrgyzstan from the USSR, everyone participated and fought and that is why fascism was defeated. Everyone had a single goal and rallied and fought for each other. It was a difficult time for every country that participated in the war. Of course, our country, too, suffered great losses, my family in particular. It is a common sorrow and a common victory” (Ismail, 31 years old, Kyrgyzstan).

“The USSR most definitely played a crucial role in the confrontation with fascist invaders. The Moldavian SSR was among the first ones that had entered the war but, unfortunately, was forced to retreat under the pressure of Hitler. However, after the liberation, it continued to provide major support to the Soviet troops supplying food and repairing equipment” (Zhanna, 25 years old, Moldova).

“...talking about the role of the USSR, it is obviously global. The Soviet Union won this war, did not let fascists take over the world” (Danila, 19 years old, Russia).

“During the war, Tajikistan was a part of the USSR, therefore, as soon as the Nazis attacked, a lot of our soldiers went to defend our country, more than a hundred people were present when the Brest Fortress was taken over” (Zarina, 20 years old, Tajikistan).

The social memory of post-soviet youth is supported on both the personal and the state levels by commemorative practices of common soviet holidays that secure, preserve, and transfer the memory of the past. Almost all informants from various post-soviet countries celebrated Victory Day which was the most often mentioned holiday.

“This event is a part of both my history and the history of the country” (David, 25 years old, Armenia).

“I celebrate May the 9th with my family. This date reminds me of the Victory, of the ancestors’ merit. This victory unites our countries to this day” (Azamat, 22 years old, Kazakhstan).

According to the interviews, in all studied societies, the family acts as the leading channel preserving the historical memory of the war and Victory and passing it on to the next generations.

“In my family, it was my grandfather who fought in the war. I have never seen him but my father told me what he heard from him. The attitude was absolutely positive. We defeated the enemy and after that everyone lived in happiness and prosperity. It was hard on the war but it was the unity that existed in the USSR” (Batyrykhan, 32 years old, Kazakhstan). “They won, kicked away the Nazis, protected the Motherland as well as they could, well done! Both grandfathers and grandmothers went to the war front, relatives were recruited in many families. I consider it a part of the history of my country, my family included” (Karina, 20 years old, Armenia).

Thus, the respondents who expressed negative connotations were in an overwhelming minority in all post-Soviet republics (1-4 out of 50 informants in each).

Country Specifics

We will now consider the specific characteristics of the respondents' countries by the country of their residence.

1. Armenia. The overwhelming majority of the answers provided by Armenian citizens reflects the decisive role of the USSR in the victory in the Second World War (39 out of 50 respondents). The Victory itself, according to the respondents, is one of the most significant events in the history of the 20th century.

“I believe that we as the youth, as the future generation of both Russia and Armenia must first of all be proud of the fact that we won the war, I believe that this quality of being united, the fact that at that moment people were not divided by their nationality and faith brought us together and played a key role in the outcome of the war, and I believe that these qualities should not be forgotten, we must continue to live in peace and harmony for the prosperity of both states” (Armen, 20 years old, Armenia).

Even the respondents who have perceived the war ambiguously (for one reason or another) view Victory as a major event. It is characteristic that many respondents sought to emphasize Armenia's contribution to the common victory:

“The attitude towards the Second World War is endlessly terrible. 40-50 millions of victims. Holocaust of the Jewish people. It is a tragedy. The role of the Soviet Union is massive. The Union defeated fascism, liberated entire Europe. The role of my country is huge since every third soviet general was Armenian.

The most famous [heroes] Bagramian and Babagzhanian – the two marshals who liberated the Baltic states and participated in the liberation of Belarus. There is also a huge number of heroes among pilots and foot soldiers” (Ashot, 22 years old, Armenia).

The republic has something to be proud of: 93 generals of the Great Patriotic War and 106 Heroes of the Soviet Union came from Armenia. The village of Chardakhlu is unique in that matter: two marshals and 11 generals came from it, 360 of its residents were awarded medals³⁹. The Armenian natives often mentioned by the respondents among the heroes of war are twice awarded Heroes of the Soviet Union marshal Ivanes (Ovanes) Bagramian and a pilot Nelson Stepanian, the Hero of the Soviet Union marshal Amazasp Babadzhanian, and the Hero of the Soviet Union admiral Ivan (Ovanes) Isakov.

2. Belarus. The swinging majority of Belarus citizens’ answers also reflects the decisive role of the USSR in the victory in the Second World War. Half of the respondents from Belarus admits that war years are among the hardest and most tragic milestones in the history of the USSR in general and their country in particular but are also highly significant and important since the state demonstrated its power and the nation showed its fortitude and solidarity in achieving a common goal.

“All people, the representatives of various nations, fought side by side and defended the united country of the USSR” (Denis, 24 years old, Belarus).

“If it were not for the USSR that composed 15 republics back then if we had not all gathered together in one single fist, it is unknown what would have happened to Europe” (Maksim, 25 years old, Belarus).

³⁹ Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage,” 122-30.

“In our country, it is called the Great Patriotic War because it affected everyone without exception. In almost every family in those distant years someone fought, someone died, someone went missing. For this reason in every city, there are stellas with the names of those who died” (Diana, 25 years old, Belarus).

“Belarus took one of the first battles of the Great Patriotic War, the attack of the Third Reich on the Brest Fortress” (Marina, 26 years old, Belarus).

The historic events mentioned by the respondents from Belarus separately, as especially significant, include the defense of the Brest Fortress, the deployment of the partisan movement against the invaders, and the “Bagration” operation of liberating the USSR territory from the invaders.

All the above-mentioned results correspond to the results of a republican study conducted in the Institute of Sociology of the Belarus National Academy of Sciences (IS NAS): the victory over Nazi Germany and the liberation of Belarus were mentioned by the majority of study participants (58.5%) as the main event in country’s history⁴⁰. Addressing more recent studies if the IS NAS of Belarus, according to the data acquired in 2008, most of the respondents attributed the victory in the Great Patriotic War to the historical events being the reasons for pride⁴¹.

In their response to the question on historical events that best describe Russia and the respondents’ country of origin more than half of the informants from Belarus noted the fact that the war became a test of the inviolability of the historical connection between Russia and Belarus, the friendship of the two peoples.

⁴⁰ Korshunov, G. P., “The problem of historical memory on the digital break of eras” (International Scientific and Practical Conference “The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor”, Minsk, Belarus, September 26-27, 2019b).

⁴¹ Sidortsov, V. N., Kandyba, I. A. and Ravchenko, M. M., Belarus in the XX century, 272.

A typical statement reads: *“Russia and Belarus are both long-suffering countries, we are connected by an almost 300-years-long history of being parts of a single state. Again, it seems to me that our peoples are forever bonded by this common memory of the Great Patriotic War and, of course, this memory cannot be torn away”* (Maksim, 24 years old, Belarus).

“The Great Patriotic War best describes the history of both Russia and Belarus. Two brotherly peoples rallied into one big and mighty power and marched “side by side” (Valerii, 29 years old, Belarus).

Over half of the surveyed young people from Belarus connect their ideas on the heroes and the heroic with the Great Patriotic War to some extent. Indeed, in the years of the Great Patriotic War, 448 Belarusians and Belarus natives were awarded the title of the Hero of the Soviet Union. A significant portion of the informants named the defenders of the Motherland as an example of heroes including the commanders who liberated the BSSR (Marshals Georgy Zhukov and Konstantin Rokossovsky), defenders of the Brest Fortress, members of the partisan movement but also the members of their families who fulfilled their duty and everyone who participated in the common victory.

When talking about the historical monuments most important for them, most of the respondents from Belarus mention the memorials devoted to the events of the Great Patriotic War. The most often mentioned monuments include the monument on Victory Square in Minsk (14 interviews), the Brest Fortress complex (13 interviews), the Khatyn and Dalva memorial complexes in the memory of residents of Belarusian villages burnt down by the invaders (13 interviews), the “Iama” memorial to the victims of Holocaust in Minsk. Among the Russian monuments, military-themed monuments also retain their primacy: “The Motherland Calls” sculpture on Mamaev Kurgan in Volgograd, the Victory Park on Poklonnaya Hill in Moscow.

Coming to the topic of holidays, it is especially indicative that the Independence Day of the Republic of Belarus celebrated on July 3 was established by a decision of a national referendum of 1996 and timed to the date of the liberation of Minsk from Nazi invaders (July 3, 1944). Therefore, the Republic of Belarus became the only former Soviet republic where Independence Day is not connected with the collapse of the USSR. Along with the Victory Day on May the 9th, this celebration was mentioned by the majority of the respondents.

3. Kazakhstan. The vast majority of the answers of Kazakhstan citizens (43 out of 50) signifies the decisive role of the USSR in the victory in World War II.

The typical statements read: *“In the years of the Great Patriotic War Kazakhstan was a part of the USSR as a union republic. Therefore, the Kazakh SSR entered the war from the moment the Nazi German army invaded the territory of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. Warriors from Kazakhstan contributed to the liberation mission of the Soviet Army. They stormed Berlin, participated in raising the Banner of Victory over the Reichstag. The Kazakhs actively participated in the partisan war as well. The agriculture of Kazakhstan provided the war front and rear with food and industry provided the necessary raw materials”* (Aidar, 35 years old, Kazakhstan).

“World War II took place in 1939-1945 and was a tragedy that touched the heart of every family. Fascist Germany was the main enemy. It was a cruel war that took millions of lives... left families without fathers... traumatized thousands of people... great deeds were accomplished, many of them posthumously... Yes, this event is undoubtedly one of the most significant in the history of the USSR and Kazakhstan. I believe this event cannot be perceived as something distant, it concerns everyone. I celebrate the Victory Day on March 9, go to parades, participate in concerts dedicated to this day, we visit veterans when possible. Of course, I agree that Kazakhstan is a country victorious in World War II” (Erzhan, 21 years old, Kazakhstan).

According to historians, there are 33 Heroes for every million of Kazakhs. Over 500 of Kazakhstan citizens were the Heroes of the Soviet Union, four of them awarded twice. Out of these 500 people, 97 were Kazakhs. Kazakhstan had the highest mobilization rate, every fifth citizen of Kazakhstan went to the war front, more than 350 thousand people did not return⁴².

Half of the informants from Kazakhstan relate their ideas about the heroes and the heroic to the defenders of the Motherland in the years of the Great Patriotic War. Among the heroes most often mentioned were Kazakhstan-originating soldiers of the Panfilov Guards Rifle Division (particularly Ivan Panfilov and Bauyrzhan Momyshuly), Manshuk Mametova (the first female Kazakh Hero of the Soviet Union), and Aliya Moldagulova. The Victory Day celebration was mentioned by most respondents.

4. Kyrgyzstan. Most answers to the question about the attitude towards World War II and the role of the USSR provided by Kyrgyzstan citizens were positive (22 out of 50). Neutral responses were provided by 13 out of 50 respondents who only noted the horrors of military life according to the older generation.

Negative connotations (15 out of 50 interviews) were related to the loss of population (including loved ones and family members), the economic decline, and devastation. There was even an answer that read: *“Hitler didn’t intend to touch the people of Kyrgyzstan but the political connection with Russia dragged the people into the war”*.

Half of the respondents noted the role of the USSR in the victory over fascism (24 answers). When answering the question about the role of Kyrgyzstan in the war, the respondents indicated that the country actively participated in hostilities, supplied food and essentials, and hosted the evacuated people.

⁴² Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage” 122-30.

Characteristic responses read: *“My great-grandfathers participated in that war. This event is a part of both the history of my country and my history” (Tariel, 22 years old, Kyrgyzstan).*

“They fought for a just cause, shoulder to shoulder with the Russians and other nationalities, that’s it. Won, as it should have been. Truth always wins. What else to say, thanks to grandfather for the victory” (Ilias, 26 years old, Kyrgyzstan).

“The war ended in 1945. There was a long and bloody battle. The USSR positively, as one might say, showed its power by uniting all countries, they demonstrated themselves as a unity, this shows that the world is one. All people have equal importance, whatever nation they might be. In my opinion, the victory united my country with Russia, this bond exists to this day, there is, of course, not as much brotherhood with Russia, but everything will work out” (Manas, 30 years old, Kyrgyzstan).

For most informants from Kyrgyzstan (37 interviews) the 9th of May was a crucial holiday they celebrated. (*“We celebrate May the 9th very solemnly, remember our grandfathers” (Ainura, 34 years old, Kyrgyzstan)*).

Every sixth resident of the Kyrgyz SSR was recruited to the army and went to war, 360 thousand Kyrgyz people took part in hostilities on the various fronts of World War II, 72 people were awarded the title of the Hero of the Soviet Union. Two former Soviet republics, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan consider the twice awarded Hero of the Soviet Union Talgat Begeldinov who participated in the famous Victory Parade of 1945 their pride since the hero was born and died in Kazakhstan but spent his childhood and youth in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan⁴³. In the course of the interviews, the participants from Kyrgyzstan personally mentioned marshals Georgy Zhukov and Konstantin Rokossovsky, the Heroes of the Soviet Union Victor Talalikhin, a pilot, and Zoia

⁴³ Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage,” 122-30.

Kosmodemianskaia, as well as the soldiers of the Panfilov Guards Rifle Division many of whom originated from Kyrgyzstan.

5. Moldova. The opinions of Moldovan citizens on the topic of the Second World War and the role of the USSR in it polarized. These events raised positive connotations in 21 out of 50 respondents, the same number of study participants were unsure of their position on them. Negative connotations in relation to the role of the USSR in the war were found in eight Moldovans. In the course of the Great Patriotic War, 23 Moldovan natives were awarded the title of the Hero of the Soviet Union. The respondents were aware of this fact, however, none of the heroes were mentioned personally during the interviews despite the majority of the informants connecting the concept of heroic with the defenders of the Motherland. It should especially be noted that World War II was often woven into the context of family history. Many informants had the representatives of the older generation of the family fight in the war which determined the fact that these respondents honored the memorable dates related to World War II and celebrated the Victory Day.

Characteristic responses read the following: *“Of course, the Republic of Moldova was affected by this war like every other republic. It was a terrible sorrow, there were many losses. Moldova took an active part in the hostilities. There is 21 hero of the Soviet Union in Moldova... I believe this is important for people, for every person who remembers these events, these circumstances. Every year we honor the memory of it. I believe this is a great indicator of how people united in this battle and a brutal reminder for us as the younger generations. What is happening in the country right now is unacceptable. I would not want the memory of what happened to be lost with the last veteran. It is still a tragedy for people, it's the loss of loved ones, many people still don't know where and how their relatives died. Yes, my great-grandfather fought in the war. My grandmother was a nurse. Thus, our family, like many others, was affected by this event. The Victory Day is a traditional holiday, the whole family celebrates it. Both grandfather and father put on the Saint George ribbons, we watch the parade every time. I remember that in my childhood there were parades we participated in”* (Natalia, 29 years old, Moldova).

Several individual respondents indicated that not every one of their compatriots joined the side of the USSR in the conflict. For example, a great-grandfather of one of the respondents who were also a Moldovan native served in the army of Romania, an ally of Nazi Germany, but joined the side of the anti-Hitler coalition close to the end of the war.

6. Russia. None of the informants from Russia provided a negative evaluation of the input of the USSR in World War II. The absolute majority of the informants began their answers by saying that the attitude towards war can only be negative since these are the difficult and tragic pages of our history. A positive estimation of the role of the USSR in World War II was provided by 34 out of 50 respondents. They mostly accentuated the heroism of Soviet soldiers and the fact that the victory in World War II demonstrated the power of the USSR to the entire world. Many informants also remembered their relatives who participated in hostilities.

Typical statements: *“The victory in the war was achieved by our grandfathers and great-grandfathers who fought to the end at the cost of their lives”* (Sofia, 19 years old, Russia).

“I believe, it was one of the most tragic historic events but also one of the most heroic ones”
(Elena, 19 years old, Russia)

“The role of our country is undeniable, fascism was defeated thanks to the USSR. Of course, other countries participated as well, but the prime role in the victory belongs to the Soviet Union”
(Sergei, 35 years old, Russia).

In the opinion of the informants, the Victory in the Great Patriotic War was among the historic events most often mentioned in positive connotations (32 out of 50 interviews). The informants also most often mentioned the Victory in the Great Patriotic War as a historic event that best describes Russia in positive connotations.

The following presents a typical statement: *“I believe that World War II was the most terrible event of the 20th century since a large number of civilians died in the abyss of hostilities. My great-grandfather participated in the war... This war is our history. The military knew they were going towards certain death but still continued to protect their relatives, children, loved ones, wives. It deserves great respect. To me, this war is not something distant. Yes, my family and I celebrate Victory Day on May the 9th. In the morning we attend the parade, then my mother usually bakes some kind of pie or a cake for us and our parents tell us what their parents, our grandparents, were usually telling them about these times. The fact of joint participation and the common victory in World War II unites Russia and the countries of the former USSR to this day – there is no doubt in that”* (Gleb, 21 years old, Russia).

The vast majority of the informants report celebrating the Victory Day (37 out of 50 interviews). Many answers to the question about the heroes and the heroic involved generalized mentions of the participants of the Great Patriotic War. Nevertheless, the most often listed personalities included commanders (for instance, Konstantin Rokossovsky).

7. Tajikistan. World War II is the most bloody of war crimes in the history of humanity⁴⁴. The answers to the question about the informants’ attitude towards World War II polarized into three groups. The positive role played by the USSR and Tajikistan, in particular, was noted by 18 informants who highlighted the unity of war front and rear. The victory of the USSR in the Second World War (17 interviews) is among the important positive events of the historical past mentioned.

Typical statements: *“It was obviously the USSR that won World War II. The USSR fought against fascism and nazism. In my family, the great-grandfathers and grandfathers both on mother’s and father’s side, all of them participated in the war. Make sure to celebrate the 9th of May, Victory Day. It’s a great celebration. The common victory unites my country with Russia but*

⁴⁴ Yudina, T. N., Bormotova, T. M., Leskova, I. V., Chernikova, A. A., & Zyazin, S. Y., “Migrant crime in the Moscow megalopolis: reality and public opinion”, Journal of social science research 3 (2018): 385-91.

not as much as it used to. But it can be said that now Tajikistan exists and survives thanks to Russia, with the help of Russia” (Farhat, 32 years old, Tajikistan).

“I am extremely proud that the USSR won this war. In my country, people fought for their Motherland on a par with other nationalities. Both of my grandfathers fought, one died, the other reached the Victory. I am proud of the USSR” (Farid, 29 years old, Tajikistan).

The same proportion of study participants (18 informants) did not decide on their position, negative connotations were observed in 17 informants. The aspects attributed to the negative side of the events of war mostly include the fact that many people did not return from the war front. However, the respondents still demonstrated pride in their country.

During the war years, 56 thousand front-line soldiers from Tajikistan were awarded military orders and medals for the courage and bravery in the fight against fascism demonstrated on the battlefields, 54 people were awarded the highest title of the Hero of the Soviet Union, 15 people became knights of the Order of Glory of three degrees⁴⁵. Therefore, in their representations of the heroic a significant portion of young Tajiks mentioned the participants of the Great Patriotic War (Georgy Zhukov and Joseph Stalin were personally mentioned).

Drawing a conclusion, it is important to note that the strategies of post-soviet countries are related to creating a strong and stable Eurasian integration association, hence it is important to strengthen the role of the cultural aspect of social memory creating the conditions for Eurasian integration in the market economy era⁴⁶. As demonstrated by the results of the study, the family now presents the main channel transmitting historical memory but the generations transmitting the information about the events are leaving.

⁴⁵ Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage,” 122-30

⁴⁶ Vozmitel, A. and Osadchaya G., “Way of life in Russia: changing dynamics”, Social Sciences 3 (2010): 117-29.

Thus, it is important to increase the social responsibility of the media, the education, and the creative intellectuals for the preservation and transfer of historical truth and maintaining a united historical and social code which creates a basis for Eurasian integration⁴⁷.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In Russian sociology, there are a number of publications devoted to the consideration of the memory of the Second World War and the understanding of the Great Victory as a supporting symbol of Russian history⁴⁸; the results of sociological studies of the historical memory of Russian citizens about the war⁴⁹; sociological studies of the historical memory of Russian youth about the war⁵⁰; the influence of myths and falsifications of the historical memory of the war⁵¹; continuity and transformation in the historical memory of Russians⁵²; the peculiarities of the sociological approach to the study of the historical memory of the war⁵³; historical, psychological, cultural and sociological aspects of the memory of the war⁵⁴; the perception of Victory in various social groups of Russians⁵⁵; the relation between the social memory of the Victory and “positive historical

⁴⁷ Ryazantsev, S., Osadchaya, G., Seleznev, I. and Pismennaya, E., “Workforce mobility in the EAEU: trends, barriers, prospects,” *Central Asia and the Caucasus* 19(2) (2018): 28-36.

⁴⁸ Gudkov, L., “Victory in the war: towards the sociology of one national symbol”, 12-9.

⁴⁹ Afanasyeva, A.I. and Merkushin, V.I., “The Great Patriotic War in the Historical Memory of Russians,” *Socis Sociological Research* 8 (2005): 11–22.

⁵⁰ Makarova, L.V., “The Great Patriotic War: What Remains in Personal Memory?”, *Sociological research* 11 (2015): 107-14.

⁵¹ Kumanev, G.A., *Feat and Forgery. Pages of the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945* (Moscow: Russkoye slovo, 2007), 344; Tavokin, E. P. and Tabatadze, I. A., “On the question of historical memory of the Great Patriotic War,” 62–6.

⁵² Egorov, V.K., Boykov, V.E., Pikhoya, R.G., Yablokova, E.A., Romanov, V.L., Merkushin, V.I., Toshchenko, Zh.T., Kudrina, T.A., Kapustin, V.S., Turchinov, A.I. and Afanasyeva, A.I., “Historical memory: continuity and transformations (“round table”)”, *Socis (Sociological research)* 8 (2002): 76–85.

⁵³ Prokazina, N.V., “Sociological approach to the study of the historical memory of the Great Patriotic War,” *Kazanskaya nauka* 7 (2016): 201–4.

⁵⁴ Rostovtsev, Y.A., Sosnitskiy, D.A., “Directions of research on historical memory in Russia,” *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* 2 (2014): 106–26.

⁵⁵ Emelyanova, T.P. and Misharina, A.V., “Commemoration of Victory in the Great Patriotic War in the perception of various social groups,” *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill* 4 (2014): 220–29.

responsibility”⁵⁶; the role that civil society structures play in preserving the historical memory of the war (science⁵⁷, church⁵⁸); analysis of the evolution of the mass consciousness of young people in relation to such concepts as “heroism”, “self-sacrifice in the name of the Motherland”, “preserving the memory of exploits in the Great Patriotic War”, formed over the years of the people's moral values⁵⁹. As for the post-Soviet states, for example, in 2019 the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus held a scientific conference “Historical memory of Belarus as a factor in the consolidation of society”, where considerable attention was paid to the historical memory of the Second World War⁶⁰. Earlier, a monograph devoted to the study of ideas of mass consciousness about the history of Belarus in the 20th century has been published⁶¹.

Among the articles published by Kazakhstani researchers, of interest are works devoted to the study of cultural memory and memorialization of the Second World War in post-Soviet states⁶², including studies on commemorative practices and the gender aspect⁶³; studies devoted to the heroism of Kazakhstanis at the war or factors of behavioral motivation of soldiers of Kazakh national military formations in the Red Army during the war⁶⁴. But, nevertheless, based on the analysis of publications on the topic, we can conclude that until now there have been no works based on empirical knowledge on the historical memory of the young generation of the CIS countries about World War II.

⁵⁶ Beliaeva, E. V., Historical responsibility for the good.

⁵⁷ Guskov, A.G., Drozdov, K.S., Zhuravlev, S.V., Kruglov, V.N., Lotareva, D.D. and Tikhonov, V.V., The contribution of historians to the preservation of the historical memory of the Great Patriotic War (based on the materials of the Commission on the History of the Great Patriotic War of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1941-1945) (Moscow: Center for Humanitarian Initiatives, 2015).

⁵⁸ Buiukli, D. A., “Preservation of the historical memory of the contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church to the victory in the Great Patriotic War,” 179-85.

⁵⁹ Starikov, A. G., Bakushev, V. V., Perova, M. V., & Goriainov, S. V., “Who is the hero among youth?”, 43-6.

⁶⁰ Korshunov, G. P., Chief Editor, The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor, 360.

⁶¹ Sidortsov, V. N., Kandyba, I. A. and Ravchenko, M. M., Belarus in the XX century, 272.

⁶² Zhanbosinova, A. S., “The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage,” 122-30.

⁶³ Zharkynbaeva, R. S., “The Great Patriotic war: the sociocultural memory and commemorative practices in post-Soviet Kazakhstan (gender aspect),” 103-16.

⁶⁴ Asanova, S. A., “On the main factors of behavioral motivation of the soldiers of Kazakh national military units during the war years (1941-1945),” 280-95.

Until now, there have been no works that would give a holistic picture of the state of historical memory of the war among the youth of the participating states of Eurasian integration. Therefore, the findings obtained as a result of this study have scientific novelty and originality.

6. Limitations And Study Forward

The ideas about the World War II present in the young generations of citizens of States participating in integration processes in the post-Soviet area, the common and specific perception of the Great Victory among representatives of various post-Soviet societies, the specific characteristics of the perception of historical time and the formation of historical memory in this group. The historical memory of the Great Victory is largely related to the modern ideas about the Eurasian integration of the new independent states. Although the content of social memory of youth seems to not affect the process of Eurasian integration, as a potential force it may spontaneously appear in the social life or be included in the social and political discourse under certain conditions and with the presence of an organized force. The success of the integration processes will depend on the way the authorities of the new independent Eurasian states will interact with each other, international organizations, the leading states of the world, and the new subjects of socio-political transformations in the formation of historical memory.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was carried out with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research as a part of the scientific project N^o 20-011-00899 “The social memory of youth of the countries participating in the Eurasian integration: structure, current state, and the mechanisms of formation. article was financially supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation under the program to increase competitiveness of the Peoples’ Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) among the world’s leading research and educational centres for 2016-2020.

8. **REFERENCES**

Adorno, T. 2003. Negative dialectics. E.L. Petrenko transl. Moscow: Nauchnyi mir.

Afanasyeva, A.I. and Merkushev, V.I. 2005. The Great Patriotic War in the Historical Memory of Russians. *Sociological Research* 8:v11–22.

Appeal of the heads of states of the Commonwealth of Independent States to the peoples of the Commonwealth and the world community related to the 75th anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Council of CIS Heads of State. 2019, October 11. <http://www.cis.minsk.by/news/12416/obrasenie-glav-gosudarstv--uchastnikov-sng-k-narodam-stran-sodruzestva-i-mirovoj-obsestvennosti-v-svazi-s-75-letiem-pobedy-sovetskogo-naroda-v-velikoj-otecestvennoj-vojne-1941-1945-godov> (as of September 10, 2020)

Asanova, S. A. 2019. On the main factors of behavioral motivation of the soldiers of Kazakh national military units during the war years (1941-1945). *Mir Bolshogo Altaia* 5(2): 280-295.

Assman, A. 2014. A long shadow of the past: memorial culture and historical politics. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie.

_____. 2016. New dissatisfaction with the memorial culture. Moscow : New Literary Observer.

_____. 2019. The oblivion of history – obsession with history. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

- Assman, J. 1992. Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen. München: C. H. Beck.
- _____. 2004. Cultural memory: writing, memory of the past, and political identity in the high cultures of the past. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kultury.
- Beliaeva, E. V. 2016. Historical responsibility for the good. 1st International Scientific Conference “Istoricheskaja otvetstvennost: ot mifov proshlogo k strategiiam budushchego”, September 22-23, 2016, in Ekaterinburg, Russia.
- Buiukli, D. A. 2019. Preservation of the historical memory of the contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church to the victory in the Great Patriotic War. Bulletin of the Tambov State University. Series: Gumanitarnye nauki 24(180): 179-185.
- Egorov, V.K., Boykov, V.E., Pikhoya, R.G., Yablokova, E.A., Romanov, V.L., Merkushev, V.I., Toshchenko, Zh.T., Kudrina, T.A., Kapustin, V.S., Turchinov, A.I. and Afanasyeva, A.I. 2002. Historical memory: continuity and transformations (“round table”). Socis (Sociological research) 8: 76–85.
- Emelyanova, T.P. and Misharina, A.V. 2014. Commemoration of Victory in the Great Patriotic War in the perception of various social groups. Knowledge. Understanding. Skill 4: 220–229.
- Golovakha, E. B. and Kronik, A. A. 2008. The psychological time of a person. Moscow: Smysl.

- Gudkov, L. 1997. Victory in the war: towards the sociology of one national symbol. *Monitoring* 5: 12-19.
- Guenee, B. 2002 *History and Historical Culture of the Medieval West*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture.
- Guskov, A.G., Drozdov, K.S., Zhuravlev, S.V., Kruglov, V.N., Lotareva, D.D. and Tikhonov, V.V. 2015. The contribution of historians to the preservation of the historical memory of the Great Patriotic War (based on the materials of the Commission on the History of the Great Patriotic War of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1941-1945). Moscow: Center for Humanitarian Initiatives.
- Halbwachs, M. 2007. *Sotsialnye ramki pamiati*. S.N. Zenkin, Trans. Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo, p. 348.
- Heinrich, H. -A. 2002. *Kollektive Erinnerungen der Deutschen. Theoretische Konzepte und empirische Befunde zum Sozialen Gedächtnis*. München: Juventa Verlag Weinheim und München, p. 288.
- Herder, I. G. 1977. *Ideas for the philosophy of the history of hukanity*. Moscow: Nauka, p. 770.
- Hirsch, M. 2012. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 2017. Memory and Counter-Memory for the Future. Invited Lecture by U.S. State Department and Memorial, June 2017, in Moscow, Russia.

Kant, I. 1994. Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view. vol. 7, Sochineniia. Moscow: Choro.

Korshunov, G. P. 2019b. The problem of historical memory on the digital break of eras. International Scientific and Practical Conference “The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor”, September 26-27, 2019, in Minsk, Belarus.

_____, Chief Editor. 2019a. The historical memory of Belarus as a society consolidation factor. Minsk: “SUGART” LLC, p. 360. Minsk: “SUGART” LLC.

Kumanev, G.A. 2007. Feat and Forgery. Pages of the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945. Moscow: Russkoye slovo.

Leskova, I. V. 2019. Social Mechanisms of Harmonization of the Relations between Muslim and Christian Culture. Bogoslovni Vestnik 79(4): 1053-1061.

Leskova, I. V., Osadchaya, G. I. and Yudina, T. N. 2018. Lifestyle of Moscow dwellers: system of values, behavioural patterns, and social practices. Web of science. WLC 2016: World lumen congress. logos universality mentality education novelty (lumen 15th anniversary edition). <https://doi.org/10.15405/EPsBS.2018.02.89>. (as of September 10, 2020)

- Makarova, L.V. 2015. The Great Patriotic War: What Remains in Personal Memory? Sociological research 11: 107-114.
- Megill, A. 2007. Historical epistemology. Moscow: Kanon-Plius.
- Norra, P. 1984. Les lieux de memoire, vol.1: La Republique. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 1999. Problematics of the places of memory. In Frantsiia – pamiat, Ed. P. Norra, M. Ozuf, Z. de Piuimezh and M. Vinok, 17-50. Saint Petersburg: publishing house of Saint Petersburg State University.
- Omarov, S. A., Omarova, G. E. and Iakhiiiev, I. A. 2015. Heroism of Kazakhstanis on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War. Sibirskii torgovo-ekonomicheskii zhurnal 1: 10-14.
- Osadchaya, G.I., Vartanova, M.L., Kireev, E.Yu., Seleznev, I.A. and Chernikova, A.A. 2020. Assessing the Sustainable Growth Potential of The Eurasian Economic Union Member States' Economies. Revista Turismo Estudios & Prácticas. Suplementar 03: 1-13.
- Osipov, G. V., Osadchaia, G. I., Andreev, E. M., Yudina, T. N., Vartanova, M. L., Kireev, E. Yu., Drobot, Ye. V., Seleznev, I. A. and Vybornov, D. M. 2018. The processes of Eurasian integration: the socio-political dimension. Moscow: Biblio-Globus.
- Otiutskii, G. P. 2003. The sociological time. vol.1. Sotsiologicheskaiia entsiklopediia. Moscow: Mysl.

- Prokazina, N.V. 2016. Sociological approach to the study of the historical memory of the Great Patriotic War. *Kazanskaya nauka* 7: 201–204.
- Putin thanked the CSTO countries for supporting the resolution against Nazism. RIA Novosti. 2019, November 28. <https://ria.ru/20191128/1561700601.html> (as of September 10, 2020)
- Repina, L. P. 2005. The concepts of social and cultural memory in modern historiography. In *Fenomen proshlogo*, Ed. I. M. Savelieva, A. V. Poletaeva, 122-170. Moscow: HSE Publishing House.
- Roberts, K., Osadchaya, G. I., Dsuzev, K. V., Gorodyanenko, V. G. and Tholen, J. 2002. Who succeeds and who flounders? Young people in east Europe's new market economies. *Sociological Research Online*, 7(4), <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/4/roberts.html> (as of September 22, 2020).
- Rostovtsev, Y.A. and Sosnitskiy, D.A. 2014. Directions of research on historical memory in Russia. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* 2: 106–126.
- Rothberg, M. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Ryazantsev, S., Osadchaya, G., Seleznev, I. and Pismennaya, E. 2018. Workforce mobility in the EAEU: trends, barriers, prospects. *Central Asia and the Caucasus* 19(2): 28-36.

- Seleznov, I. A. 2018. A quarter-century guard of collective security (on the 25th anniversary of the collective security treaty and the 15th anniversary of the CSTO). Protivodeistvie terrorizmu. Problemy XXI veka – Counter-Terrorism 2: 16-23.
- Sidortsov, V. N., Kandyba, I. A. and Ravchenko, M. M. 2010. Belarus in the XX century: an unconventional image of history. Moscow: MAKS Press.
- Sorokin, P. A., & Merton, R. K. (2004). Social time: the experience of methodological and functional analysis. Sotsis (Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia) 6: 112–119.
- Starikov, A. G., Bakushev, V. V., Perova, M. V. and Goriainov, S. V. 2020. Who is the hero among youth?. Gumanitarnye, sotsialno-ekonomicheskie i obshchestvennye nauki 1: 43-46.
- Tavokin, E. P. and Tabatadze, I. A. 2010. On the question of historical memory of the Great Patriotic War. Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia 5: 62–66.
- Trofimenkov, M.S. 2019. Hollywood Red Noir. Saint-Peterburg: Seans.
- Vozmitel, A. and Osadchaya G. 2010. Way of life in Russia: changing dynamics. Social Sciences 3: 117-129.
- Yudina, T. N., Bormotova, T. M., Leskova, I. V., Chernikova, A. A. and Zyazin, S. Y. 2018. Migrant crime in the Moscow megalopolis: reality and public opinion. Journal of social science research, Special issue 3: 385-391.

Zerubavel, Y. 2011. The dynamics of collective memory. In *Imperiia i natsiia v zerkale istoricheskoi pamiati*, 10-25. Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo.

Zhanbosinova, A. S. 2015. The cultural memory and memorialization of the Great Patriotic War at the present stage. *Mir Bolshogo Altaia*, 1(2), 122-130.

Zharkynbaeva, R. S. 2017. The Great Patriotic war: the sociocultural memory and commemorative practices in post-Soviet Kazakhstan (gender aspect).