

University of Tartu
Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics
Department of Semiotics

Comparative Discourse-Semiotic Analysis of the Historiography in the History Textbooks of the
Soviet Union and the Soviet Republic of Estonia

Marko Karilaid
Master's Thesis

Supervisor:
Andreas Ventsel, PhD

Tartu
2022

I have written the Master's Thesis myself, independently. All the other authors' texts, main viewpoints and all data from other resources have been referred to.

Author:Marko Karilaid.....

(name)

.....

(signature)

.....18.08.2022.....

(date)

I permit the thesis to be defended.

Supervisor:Andreas Ventsel.....

(name)

.....

(signature)

.....

(date)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	5
Part I Theory	8
1.1. Ideology	8
1.2. Definition of Historiography.....	11
1.2.1. Approaches to Soviet Historiography	14
1.2.2. Historiography of Soviet Textbooks.....	17
1.3. Semiotics of History	19
1.4. Methodology	23
1.4.1. Discourse Analysis.....	23
1.4.2. Myth Analysis.....	26
Part II Analysis	28
2.1. Prehistory	29
2.1.1. Šestakov (Stalinism) - Our Fatherland in the Distant Past	30
2.1.2. Netškina & Leibengrub (Stagnation) - Prehistoric and Slave Order	33
2.1.3. Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre (Soviet Estonian) - Prehistoric Order on Estonian Territory	37
2.1.4. Conclusions from Prehistory.....	39
2.2. Era of Interventions and Civil War	42
2.2.1. Šestakov (Stalinism) - Military Intervention. Civil War	42
2.2.2. Berhin (Stagnation) - Soviet Russia During the Period of Imperialistic Interventions and Civil War	46
2.2.3. Lõhmus & Siilivask (Soviet Estonian) - Estonia During the Years of Intervention and Civil War.....	49
2.2.4. Conclusions from the Era of Interventions and Civil War	51
2.3. The Era of Russian Expansion and the Livonian War	54

2.3.1. Pankratova (Stalinism) - The Expansion of Russia and its Development into a Multi-ethnic Nation	55
2.3.2. Netškina & Leibengrub (Stagnation) The Emergence of a Centralised Russia and its Development	58
2.3.3. Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre (Soviet Estonian) - The Livonian War. Estonia Divided Between Multiple States	60
2.3.4. Conclusions from the Livonian War.....	62
2.4. Discussion	63
2.4.1. Discourse Analysis.....	64
2.4.2. Myth Analysis.....	65
Conclusion	67
References	71
Resümee	75
License	79

Introduction

History defines societies from without and within. It informs societies of where they have been and what they are. On the contrary, a lot can be learned from studying how any society places itself in history. The study of Soviet historiography is critical to understanding Soviet society and the cultural relationships that existed within the Union itself. By studying how the Union and the constituent Soviet republics placed themselves in history, the understanding of the actions, choices and events surrounding the Union can be better understood. Another important aspect through which a society can be understood is by looking at what it teaches its children. It is through the educational system that any society builds its future and expresses sincerely what it hopes to become through the creation of desirable citizens.

Understanding the Soviet Union is important because it was one of the most important nation-states of modern history. For half a century it directly or indirectly dominated half of the world and engaged the other half of the world in war. It had at one point the world's largest military and the second largest economy. Furthermore, the Soviet state was not a clear nor easily understandable nation. It used multiple tools, such as the iron curtain or secret police institutions, to disguise its actions and true nature. The common conception views the Soviet Union as a monolith, a union in name only where the state seems to be a seamless nation with one hierarchy, image and ideology. However, the constituent republics within the Union, like Soviet Estonia, Soviet Latvia, Soviet Ukraine and so on, had their own identity and structures and might have had their own version of Soviet ideology, altered by their own cultural background.

Soviet Estonia was an occupied territory which was organised into a Soviet republic within the union. It had its own political hierarchy, with its own Estonian leaders like Nikolai Karotamm, Johannes Käbin, Karl Vaino and others. It had its own cultural institutions and its own language as a state language. Because of the previous independence, the Union put a lot of emphasis on propaganda and ideological education in order to convert the population into a loyal and pliant citizenry. The chief tool for conversion was education, especially children's education

because children are more manipulatable, they do not have either knowledge or strong personality to resist manipulation as strongly as adults. Therefore, textbooks are one of the clearest manifestations of ideology. Moreover, because history is a tool for self-determination, the most important textbooks in the case of ideology were history textbooks.

Studying Soviet history textbooks is crucial to understanding both the immediate past of Estonia and Russia and understanding the present-day paradigms present in both societies because of the generations who were taught by the Soviet education system. History is more than just an accounting of past events. It is the impairment of a worldview where children position themselves in human history. It is also a stage where the state can manipulate the children to pursue tangible political goals, like the mobilisation of the masses for various projects.

This leads to the main question of this paper, which is whether there is a difference in ideology between Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors. In this case, Soviet Russian means the textbooks produced and authorised by the central powers in Moscow, which were always written originally in Russian and then translated into Estonian. Soviet Estonian textbooks refer to textbooks written by Estonian authors, and usually produced either in Tallinn or Tartu and authorised by the Soviet Estonian Ministry of Education. To answer the main question a few subsidiary questions, must be answered first:

1. What is the ideology present in the Soviet Russian textbooks?
2. What is the ideology present in the Soviet Estonian textbooks?
3. During what era was the text written, and how does that shape it?

The material for the comparative analysis is old Soviet history textbooks because they are direct ideological tools and because they depict history, which allows the analysis to see deeper into the social psychology of Soviet ideology. Narrowing it down further, the textbooks will be aimed at 7-11 grades, and have either been translated into or written in Estonian. The reason is that between these grades, the textbooks are complex enough to be interesting from an ideological perspective but not too complex because they are still meant to be consumed by children.

The paper will cover two eras of the Soviet Union. The era of Stalinism and the era of Stagnation. The era of Lenin will not be covered as it predated the occupation of Estonia, and the

era of Gorbachev will not be covered as there are very few history textbooks from this era. Focusing on two eras will include the changes in the ideology through time into the analysis and reduce any false positives – where differences in ideology are the result of changing times and not cultural or political lines. This way the analysis will cover the era of the Thaw insofar as to explain the Stagnation. Doing this will focus the paper on two eras which are as chronologically far apart as possible. During the Stalinist era the education system was instituted to convert as many people as possible to re-educate them. The era of Stagnation, whilst a return to some Stalinism, was not a full return and it was a system which sought to maintain established ideologies which makes it probably lighter in its approach.

The paper itself will have two halves, the theory part, and the analysis part. In the theory part, the paper will define ideology so that it can be identified in the analysis. It will define historiography so that the structure of the Soviet historians can be analysed. It will define the semiotic approach of the paper so that elements of the semiotics of history can be applied to the analysis. Lastly, it will define methodology, where it will lay out how discourse analysis will be used for close reading of the text and myth analysis, will be used to identify the ideologically foundational ideas in the text.

The analysis will be divided by topics. The comparative analysis will be done by comparing textbooks from the same topic against each other because that way the texts will have similar elements within them and the differences between them can be analysed by seeing how the authors approach the same topic. Each topic will contain three chapters. An early Soviet Russian textbook chapter, from the era of Stalinism, to give an overview of early Soviet ideology. A late Soviet chapter, from either the end of the Thaw or from the Stagnation, to give an example of late Soviet textbooks, and analyse the evolution of Soviet ideology. Finally, a Soviet Estonian textbook chapter to compare against the Soviet Russian authors.

This way, the paper will answer the question of whether there is a noticeable difference between the ideology of Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors within the history textbooks of the Soviet Estonian educational system.

Part I Theory

1.1. Ideology

The term ideology refers to a conglomeration of ideas that are united together into a coherent and functional system. Van Dijk writes that ideology is a system that prescribes to the people in it political and social values to live by (van Dijk 2005: 7-14). Therborn adds that ideology is a system that shapes the world in such a way as to make it understandable and manageable to the people it influences (Therborn 1980: 2). However, in the end, as Eagleton writes, there can be no one unified definition of ideology. It is because ideology as a term and a tool holds too many meanings and functions, all of which are not compatible with each other (Eagleton 1991: 1). For the purposes of this paper, ideology will be defined as a group of ideas existing together in a hierarchical system, which prescribes to individuals' values, a worldview and simplifies the world through those actions.

Some characteristics of ideologies. They consist of multiple ideas, which are linked by internal structures. They attempt to maintain their internal structure by reducing inconsistencies within. They exist within an environment where they compete and are influenced by other ideologies, as Therborn writes, ideologies exist in time and affect each other not only through space but also through history (Therborn 1980: 32). They are, as van Dijk writes, abstract and therefore they exist by their own paradigms and cannot be proven objectively right or wrong, only challenged by their own rules (van Dijk 1995: 4-5). It may not be possible to prove them wrong from the outside, but since they are inherently structural, they have their own rules and can be combated by using their own internal logic.

As previously stated, the ideas that make up an ideology are connected by a structure. That structure is inherently hierarchical. That hierarchical nature becomes visible when an ideology needs to change. It is under that pressure when ideas gain different values, and either are more susceptible to change or less. There are ideas that are easily changed and priorities that

are easily shifted. Most of the time such ideas constitute less important branches of an ideology and are merely means to an end. For example, the hard-line stance of Stalinism against religion changed in the Second World War, when the state allowed for worship again because of the pressure put on it by the Wehrmacht (Costelle & Clarke, 2015: 0:07:15). In this example, an ideology gives up an idea and the surrender itself indicates differentiation between values.

Conversely, there are core ideas more important than the rest, because they underpin an ideology. They are the most resistant to change and for good reason. Core ideas are what give an ideology its shape and form. They are the lenses through which an adherent sees and defines the world. When those core ideas can no longer provide concurrent solutions to new problems, the entire ideology is usually abandoned or radically transformed. A good example of this is the radical transformations of Marxism which all have their own core ideas, like Leninism, Stalinism and Maoism. Ideologies must constantly serve as solutions to problems for their adherents because, as Therborn writes, ideologies exist as matrixes that provide sanctions and prohibitions through which they maintain their own structure (Therborn 1980: 33).

The relationship between ideology and power is crucial. Firstly, an ideology uses power in order to pursue the goals prescribed to it by its core principles. Secondly, it uses power to maintain its own structure and maintain the loyalty of its adherents. Fairclough writes that ideology is inevitably linked to power and so the nature of ideology reveals the nature of the power that upholds it (Fairclough 2001:2). The relationship between an ideology and its adherence is a delicate game of balance. On the one hand, power is used to maintain the structure, by not allowing ideas or structures to alter too much. On the other hand, the adherence to an ideology does not allow the ideology to change too much in its pursuit of power. Nescolarde-Selva and others write that ideologies have to maintain their own structure to ensure the continued loyalty of their adherents (Nescolarde-Selva, Usó-Doménech, Gash 2017: 12).

Ideologies exist within individuals as abstract concepts. Within individuals, an ideology shares the same category with concepts such as “society” and “collectives”. The relationship between an individual and society is as van Dijk writes, complicated (van Dijk 2005: 26). It is because every individual, as van Dijk writes, holds their own version of ideology and has varying competence in that ideology (van Dijk 2005: 30). In short, no ideology can maintain the exact form and shape across all of its adherence, every individual is different and every

environment unique, shaping any idea. This has to be considered in analysing any product of ideology.

Since ideologies are abstract constructs, they do not manifest themselves directly. They are manifested through the products and actions of their adherents. It is for this reason that Fairclough points out that language is the material form of ideology (Fairclough 1995: 73). In short, language is the most direct form of communication. Because of that ideology reveals itself through text, through which it usually most successfully spreads. It is for this reason text is the most reliable product through which to analyse ideology. Yuri Lotman's definition of text is that it is culturally active, not only the author but the community itself influences it. The function of text is defined by the society and the text serves the demands of the community (Lotman & Piatigorsky 1978: 1). The basis of this analysis is formed by texts that were put out into society and influenced it, but also texts which were influenced by society and ideology.

An ideology can use many methods to maintain itself. In the end, all of those methods boil down to some form of power. To pivot to Althusser, he created a theory to explain how ideologies work within western countries. The nation-state uses a set of tools to maintain order within a nation-state. They can be roughly divided into two categories. The first is the ideological state apparatus, it is the category of tools that cultivate a pliant and obedient population by using for example schools or the entertainment industry to indoctrinate its population. The second category is the repressive state apparatus, which uses force and violence to punish anyone who strays from the actions that are accepted by the state. It is the form of enforcement that is done for example by the police (Althusser 1971: 145). I would argue that such patterns of actions can be analysed as functions inherent to all ideologies, not just the ones found within Western European countries. One of the tools Western countries use as ideological apparatuses are schools, with most of them existing as nationalised institutions. The Soviet Union was completely nationalised, so the paradigm translates well because conceptually both are state-run institutions. Therefore, through the analysis of Soviet history textbooks, the manifestations of the ideological apparatus can be seen.

One example of how Soviet ideology attempted to simplify the world was the Soviet attempt to create a Ukrainian monoculture. As Yilmaz writes, Ukrainian history is diverse because it was inhabited by multiple cultural groups lived in and influenced the area. Before the rise of the Soviet Union, Ukrainian identity reflected that, even though it had not entirely

emerged. In 1935 the Soviets started creating a singular Ukrainian monoculture, which either melded or erased other cultures from Ukrainian history and tied Ukrainians closely with the Russians. In order to accomplish this, the Soviets created a singular state-sanctioned history (Yilmaz 2015: 49-51).

Ideology is a group of ideas in a hierarchical relationship. They exist alongside other ideologies which they influence and are influenced by. The structure of an ideology is important to all of its adherents and there is a complex interplay between the need to change and the need to maintain the same structure. Fundamentally ideologies are abstract and that is why they can be analysed only through the products of their adherents. One of the best products through which analysis is possible is text and that is why this paper will focus on the text-based products of the Soviet republics in its analysis of ideology.

1.2. Definition of Historiography

Breisach writes that the task of historiography is to analyse the way history has been written through time and how its contents have changed (Breisach 1989: 3). Goldstein writes that historiography is about what historians write as historians. It does not care about what they do nor what they say about history (Goldstein 1996: 256). Tucker writes that historiography is composed of the representations of the past. Most of the time they are in the form of text. However, movies or sound recordings can just as well represent the past (Tucker 2004: 1). When investigating the writings of historians, historiography has to be oriented by something and, as Tucker writes, historiographic interpretations are composed of both scientific historiography and value judgements, in the form of ethical, aesthetic, political and other judgements. Tucker continues by elaborating, that one of the jobs of historiography is to decide what is important enough to be considered scientific historiography and so imparted into textbooks. Alongside the decision, historiography also decides what value judgements should be made on those elements (Tucker 2004: 2).

There is a difference between history and historiography. Tucker illustrates the difference by making a comparison to the relationship between the philosophy of science and science itself. Science studies nature, whereas the philosophy of science studies how science operates in its

relationship with nature. If the philosophy of science studied nature directly, there would be no difference between the two. The same holds true for the relationship between historiography and history. Historiography, therefore, studies the relationship between the events of the past and the writings that have been made about the past (Tucker 2004:2). McPartland makes another distinction which is that historiography is the structure of knowing and history is the structure of the known (McPartland 2010: 18).

Historiography has an important function in the science of history and that is to provide a critical lens to the writing of history. McPartland writes that historiography rises by necessity as a critical tool that intervenes in the writing of history. The goal is to put historical writings under criticism, ensure accurate interpretations, judgements, and evaluations about the past (McPartland 2010:15). History is in a constant state of revision, that revision is guided by the continued emergence of new evidence. Historiography, as McPartland points out, allows, and invites revisals of counterpoints and the continued development of positions (McPartland 2010: 15), by doing this it facilitates a more accurate revision which is done in good faith. What is more, there is a branch of historiography that specifically deals with revisionism. Goldstein points out that revisionist historiography attempts to reassess the known facts. Not only does history get revised by adding new information to it but by reassessing old facts. All facts are not created equal, and some facts may have in the time of their assessment been underappreciated (Goldstein 1976: 83).

The structure of historiography can be divided into two, a superstructure and an infrastructure. Goldstein writes that the superstructure of historiography seeks to generate narratives for non-historians to consume. This can be in the form of popular books, but also in the form of textbooks. It is the final form of a historian's work. Infrastructure on the other hand remains invisible to non-historians. It is the critical form of historiography where historical narratives are generated by thinking about the evidence and conceptualising the past (Goldstein 1976: 140-141). However, as Tucker points out, stylised products of the superstructure, like textbooks, should not be placed at the centre of historiography because they constitute only a small element of the larger and more complex process of historiography and provide sanitized narratives. For example, they do not reflect the complex relationship between historiography and evidence (Tucker 2004:7).

It is important to point out that historiography is a large field and not all of its elements can be studied within the scope of this paper. Therefore, this paper will focus on the superstructure of historiography in the form of history textbooks. The reason for this is that the analysis is based on ideology and the materials for that analysis have to be active texts which influence people in a society. Textbooks offer a good insight into government ideology because they were sanctioned by political powers and were used to teach the masses. Although historiography is an iceberg with most of its processes remaining behind the curtains, in order to study ideology, the subject has to be in front of the curtains and visible. The text has to be active and texts that were never presented to the population have limited value because they merely reveal the nature of the individual author rather than societal preclusions.

Within historiography, there has to be made a distinct separation between the philosophy of scientific historiography and the philosophy of historiographic interpretation. As Tucker writes scientific historiography is a branch of epistemology and so is concerned with what is true, applying a critical lens to the evidence. Historiographic interpretation on the other hand is a branch of value theory and is concerned with value judgements (Tucker 2004: 11).

There are no concrete narratives in history. It is for this reason that, as Tucker writes, historiography makes no observations of historical events, but only provides descriptions that are based on the available evidence. Historians simply cannot create an objective narrative because there is no historical evidence upon which to create an objective narrative (Tucker 2004: 17). This is also the reason why Tucker writes that the primary subject matter for historiography is evidence and not events. Moreover, he adds that the philosophy of historiography should examine how historians separate the essential from the non-essential. As well as extracting information nested within their texts (Tucker 2004: 18).

History is presented to consumers in the form of narratives. History mainly manifests itself in narratives not because it is a narrative but because it is far easier to consume it as a narrative. Because the telling of history depends on narratives, it rightly belongs to the broad category of the humanities. The humanities mainly study and create narratives in disciplines like philology, philosophy and folkloristics. Since history studies a form of narratives i.e. the events of the past and produces multiple kinds of narratives in the form of history books, overviews of events and textbooks, there has to be something that separates it from the other disciplines. The separation comes from the claim that the narratives produced, and the narratives studied

objectively occurred in the past and historiography is the tool which aims at protecting that claim. Historiography, as McPartland writes, maintains that guarantee by bringing into the study of history essential critical aspects which allow history to make true universal statements rather than short-sighted biased claims (McPartland 2010: 29).

In conclusion, historiography has many layers. One of them is its superstructure and infrastructure. This paper will analyse the products of the superstructure of Soviet historiography but also employ historiography to the analysis. Historiography is also the study of what historians write and has within itself the critical lens to divide true events from false. Ideology simplifies history for its own goals and critical analysis can identify the places within which history does not, for whatever reason, correlate with actual events.

1.2.1. Approaches to Soviet Historiography

In Enteen's words, there are two large schools of thought when studying Soviet historiography. The first sees the Soviet system as totalitarian, wherein all or most historiographies were dictated downwards from the height of the Soviet hierarchy. They are essentially making the claim that the regime was strong, that the state ruled everything from the top down. The second approach claims that Soviet historiography was led by individuals with their own integrity and understanding. This is the claim that the regime was weak, that although the state had power, the individuals that made up the state also had some or significant power themselves. Enteen ultimately end favours neither approach and believes that the truth lies somewhere in between. (Enteen 2002: 363)

Soviet historiography was rigid. As Enteen points out, it was influenced both by Marxist-Leninist ideology and political power. Marxist-Leninist ideology constrained historiography by allowing it to only centre itself around very specific concepts, like analysing the role of labour in society (Enteen 2002: 360). Jaak Undsuk also writes that Soviet history books always contained the same ideas and analysed the same processes. The morale of all historiography was always oddly the same (Undsuk 2003: 3). Enteen also points out that Soviet leadership influenced historiography and it started with Stalin's consolidation of power and his dictations to historians (Enteen 2002: 360).

This paper is concerned with three time periods of the Soviet Union. The periods of Stalinism, the Thaw and the Stagnation. The reason for this narrowing is that the Soviet Union occupied Estonia only in 1940 and the most recent texts that the paper analyses are from the early 1980-s.

Stalinism began in 1927 and lasted until 1953. In 1927, as Plamper writes, Stalin consolidated his power and started taking control of institutions such as the *Pravda* (Plamper 2012: 54). Prompting hard-line rule Stalinism then lasted until Stalin's death in 1953. McClauy has gathered multiple definitions of Stalinism together and the common denominators are that Stalinism was monolithic, strongly rigid and hierarchical – where the state regulated society and economy through rigid administrative planning and all economic, cultural and political life was subordinate to the state. Moreover, the Union worked in a centralised system where all the smaller constituent nations were denied self-determination. Another key idea was the cult of personality where not only Stalin was worshipped but so were the ranks within the state hierarchy. The last throughline was strong nationalism, where the state took great pride in Russian history at the foundation of the Union. (McClauy 2019: 169-171; see also Marković 1977: 300; Cohoen 1999: 12-13; Medvedev 1975: 553; Gill 1990: 57-58).

In regard to Estonia under Stalinism, Olesk writes that in the domain of literature one could not precisely speak of Estonian literature, so much as Soviet literature written in Estonian (Olesk 2003: 465). The collectivisation and nationalisation of Estonia were not immediately total, as Martelsmann writes, during the first occupation, 1940-41, private industry survived, especially in agriculture, in a small but significant form. However, at the beginning of the second occupation, 1944-91, the regime again started to slowly crack down little by little on all the spheres of life which ended with Estonia as a model Soviet republic by the 1950-s (Martelsmann 2007: 7-9). In conclusion, Soviet control over Estonia through the occupations during Stalinism was significant, but at least in the first years, not total.

The reign of Nikita Krushchev from 1953 to 1964 is known as the Soviet Thaw. Taubman writes that the name originated from Ilya Ehrenburgs book and meant the relaxation of state control and the alleviation of repression with the goal of making Soviet society more functional and less rigid (Taubman 2005: 306-307). As Thompson writes by quoting Krushchev, the inner party was afraid of the changes. They were afraid that the Thaw would melt everything, and the water would flood and drown all of them (Thompson 1997: 114). This shows that

although the state no longer practised full control, it still maintained high control over the social, cultural and economic domains. The duality of the undertaking is evidenced by two occurrences. The liberating nature of the Thaw is proved by the fact that Krushchev allowed the publication of state critical texts such as Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (Thompson 1997: 245). The constrained nature of the system is evidenced by the fact that Krushchev used state power in his later career to attack avant-garde and abstract art and artists (Thompson 1997: 258).

In regard to Estonia during the Thaw, Peirumaa writes that the Thaw lagged in Estonia, the local government played by the old rulebook, and the new possibilities for increased autonomy were either missed or ignored (Peirumaa 2004: 30). However, there was a measurable reduction in tension, specifically in journalism, even if it was late (Peirumaa 2004: 102). Peirumaa hypothesises that the tardiness was created from a hesitance to place trust in Moscow and from a desire to keep their heads down (Peirumaa 2004: 102-103).

The reign of Brezhnev from 1965 to 1982 is known as the Era of Stagnation. As Bacon writes, the name was given by Gorbachev, who saw Brezhnev's rule as neo-Stalinism, where the state did not evolve with the times and where the rigidity of the Soviet Union was strengthened (Bacon 2003: 1-2). Brezhnev re-established some Stalinist policies and attempted to protect some of Stalin's cult of personality by banning public discussion of Stalin (Sandle 2003: 143). The era of Stagnation is not a return to Stalinism, but partial freezing of the Thaw, where some policies were restated but not anywhere near to the extent as under Stalinism.

Under Brezhnev, Estonia felt the effects of stagnation. The key features of Estonian life at the time were, as Nutt writes, a reinvigorated russification process under Vaino, increased immigration into Estonia of workers from throughout the Union, and a deflated belief in ever achieving independence again (Nutt 2016).

There are multiple factors to consider as the background of the textbook. The first is the author's question, as Enteen pointed out the power dynamics of the Soviet Union are somewhere in the middle between strong and weak power. This means that the hierarchy of the state had an influence on the texts produced, which means that there is some value in knowing which era the text is from, and the individual author had an influence when writing the text, which means that they could have partially acted independent of the era they were writing in.

As evidenced by their title pages the textbooks are produced, in the case of Russian authors, by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. Each Russian author is a Russian academic in pedagogy. The Russian texts have then been translated into Estonian by a local publishing institution, approved by the Soviet Estonian Ministry of Education and published by a publisher who is different depending on the time of publication. Over the course of the occupation, the publishing institution changed three times. The first institution was the Pedagogical Literature (1940-49), the second was the Estonian State Publishing House (1949-64) and the third was the publishing house *Valgus* (1965-). In the case of the Estonian authors, it is the publishing houses that have produced the text and those texts have been approved by the Soviet Estonian Ministry of Education

The producers of the textbooks were academics, but it was up to state institutions such as the State Committee for Publishing, abbreviated to *Goskomizdat*, to maintain and enforce ideological unity throughout the state. As Beck writes, it controlled the Soviet publishing and printing industry, being in charge of literary censorship and the entire economy surrounding books (Pristed 2017: 63). As Becker writes, Soviet state publishers had to present an annual plan to the *Goskomizdat* and the approval of the institution was predicated on the five-year plans of the Union, any change had to be approved from above (Becker 2003: 99).

1.2.2. Historiography of Soviet Textbooks

Raudsepp researched in her doctoral thesis the organisation of history teaching in Estonian-speaking schools in Soviet Estonia in the years 1944-85. She analyses the changes and peculiarities of the Estonian educational field throughout three eras of Soviet rule.

With the beginning of the post-war occupation, the educational system was not standardised. Throughout the era of Stalinism, adjustments had to be made, even so, there were differences in focus and structure in Soviet Estonia compared to Soviet Russia, such as a greater focus on the humanities and an 11-grade primary and secondary school system. Since the system was not standardised for most of the era students used textbooks from a wide range of origins, but in 1952/53 all textbooks in education were replaced with Estonian translations of Russian textbooks. (Raudsepp 2005: 21)

The teaching of history differed between Soviet Estonia and Soviet Russia in the first three post-war years. Whilst Soviet Russia taught history linearly, in chronological order, Soviet Estonia taught history bi-concentrically, where general history was taught alongside the history of the Soviet Union. Another difference was that in this period Estonian national history was taught and was not entirely replaced with the history of the Russian nation, which is a unique condition of Soviet Estonia that no other Soviet republic shared. (Raudsepp 2005: 58-60)

Vilumets also studied the era of Stalinism and focused on the period of transition. She notes that the main goal of the post-war reforms of education was to create patriotism for the Soviet Union and the textbooks were filled with propaganda. One of the key focuses of the textbooks were the constitutions of both Soviet Estonia and the Soviet Union. Also noting that the reforms were undertaken for three reasons, to rehabilitate the society, make the people pliable to mobilisation for state aims and establish the regime's validity in the eyes of the population. Vilumets also reaffirms the differences of early Soviet Estonia, with 11 grade school system and adds the element that the age of compulsory school attendance was higher in Estonia and that the methods of teaching differed as well. (Vilumets 2017: 45-48)

The Thaw brought with it liberalisation. The educational system was more decentralised. The Soviet republics were allowed and encouraged to create their own textbooks. There was less ideological pressure, teachers did not push as much and student membership in communist youth organisations lessened. There was also a change of focus, from the humanities to practical classes like math or biology and an introduction of profession-based courses, like baking and car mechanics in the high schools. (Raudsepp 2005: 31-38)

With liberalisation, the Estonian education changed quicker than in any other republic. Estonian national history was brought back into the curriculum and even made compulsory in 1957/58, compared with other national histories being made compulsory in 1959/60. The purpose of allowing national histories to be taught was to justify Russian and Soviet occupation and increase authority over the concurrent establishment. Soviet history textbooks were over-ideological, and the authors say in them was insignificant. However, there was more freedom in the auxiliary material to the main textbooks because of the lax conditions set by the curriculum. (Raudsepp 2005: 180-181)

Stagnation reversed all the liberal reforms. The system was strictly centralised under the control of the Soviet Ministry of Education and the Institute of History of the Academy of

Sciences of the Soviet Union. Textbooks were written centrally, and the educational system was standardised and made linear. The state apparatus cracked down on ideological education and increased the school's emphasis on the humanities. Profession based courses were eliminated as well. Stagnation also introduced russification into the educational system. (Raudsepp 2005: 41-46)

1.3. Semiotics of History

Semiotics of history is, as Tamm writes, the merging of the two disciplines of history and semiotics with the goal of creating a typology of historiographic narrative structures (Tamm 2017: 213). Moreover, Tamm writes that history and semiotics are deeply linked because on the one hand historical past is the outcome of semiosis through mediation and transmission, but that understanding history is also crucial to understanding how and why sign systems change (Tamm 2017: 214). Williams also writes that history is always being rewritten because that is the semiotic role it plays in culture (Williams 1985: 321). In short, both disciplines are dependent on each other and tying them closer together can as Williams writes, enhance both disciplines and expand our understanding of the avenues that could exist between the two (Williams 1988: 821).

However, as Tamm writes, there is a resistance against the full realisation of the sub-discipline, for example, one reason is that historians do not want to fall into the murky activities of theorising on the writing of history and would rather focus on writing history itself. To this day the semiotics of history has not been fully realised and whenever evoked it is done so in a longing mood. (Tamm 2007: 215-216)

Tamm writes that there are two core semiotic traditions. The atomistic and holistic. The atomistic tradition views signs in isolation, where the researcher focuses on the relationship of the sign to meaning, to addressee etc. The holistic view on the other hand focuses on a language or a system that contains a set of elementary signs used for communication. (Tamm 2017: 216-217)

Mihhail Lotman identifies the holistic tradition as the Sassurian and the atomistic as the Piercian, adding that there is functionality for both, but it depends on the subject of study. With the atomic tradition it is hard to analyse systems of meaning, because, specifically with language,

most systems have meanings beyond the sum of their parts and therefore cannot be analysed through only their fundamental elements. The holistic tradition has its own limitations, which come from the placement of language as a superior system above other systems of meaning. (M. Lotman 2002: 10-13)

Tamm compares the traditions by analysing the products of both. He identifies that most American universities favour the atomistic approach when engaging in semiotics of history, which makes sense because Pierce was a leading American academic. Both Tamm and Mihhail Lotman identify that the Tartu-Moscow school favoured the holistic or Sassurian approach, placing primacy on the language as the object of analysis (M. Lotman 2002: 13). Tamm concludes that in approaching the semiotics of history the American universities produced lacklustre products whilst the Tartu-Moscow school saw major success. (Tamm 2017: 216-217)

From this it is a safe assumption that in approaching the semiotics of history, viewing the narratives and their effects through language or another major system of meaning, is a superior method to the atomistic one, where signs are analysed in isolation. This could be because history is a set of narratives and that its function and effect is more than the sum of its parts. It is not only important what historic figures existed, but what they did, how they reacted and how they are perceived by contemporary society.

Lotman and Uspenskij write that by viewing history through the semiotic perspective history appears as a system of communications between social groups and the reality surrounding them as well as the communication between the historical individual and the social group (Lotman & Uspenskij 1984: 10-11). For Lotman the beginning of the semiotic movement was spurred on by a denial of historical studies, but that denial served semiotics well because through it semiotics evolved on its own and then later returned to history, enhancing them both (Lotman 1993: 41).

The historian, as Lotman writes, is consigned to working primarily with texts. The reason for this is that when studying history, the historian has to approach the objective event in the past through texts constructed by people in the form of memoirs, accountings, descriptions, etc. Hence the objective event is always translated into some sort of code i.e. language. Therefore, to the historian the objective historic event is always distorted by the human condition, limiting the description through perspective, ability and so on. This condition is inevitable in history studies, and it creates differentiations and sometimes conflicting texts. This also means that the historian

has to decode the text, not only study the event. The action of decoding has dangers as well, as most historians are unaware of their biases, and they write those biases into their translations. (Lotman 1991: 165-166)

For Lotman historians are semioticians not only because they have to decode texts but also because they make the choice of what constitutes an event and what does not through decoding text (Lotman 1991: 166). Moreover, the historian also organises history by making the chaotic set of events into an illusory linear history (Lotman 2009: 17).

Uspenskij rejects the idea that the same mechanisms operate in various fields of culture and from that premise he develops his approach. For him, communication is at the core of the semiotics of history, where history is a cultural process of communication. New information in the form of text, is interpreted by the addressee in the form of society. The act of ascribing meaning to the text generates a new text through the society's reaction within a specific historical-cultural context. The whole system is also predicated on a certain code. He concludes that what primarily matters in regard to historic events is how they are read and perceived rather than how they objectively occurred. (Uspenskij 1996: 10)

In regard to history Vladimir Tropov formulated three provisions that constitute historical writing. The first provision was that history is a weave of multiple texts, where the historical text is created by weaving together several texts that are either primary, secondary or tertiary sources. The second provision is that the same elements described in history can have different meanings and, opposed to this, different elements can have the same meaning. The third provision is that it is important to differentiate synchronic and asynchronous descriptions. (Boyko 2015: 271)

Roland Barthes has his own approach to the writing of history. Akin to Lotman he questions the ability of the historian to create objective history, but he also adds into the analysis the varying ways the historian can further manipulate history through multiple means either consciously or unconsciously.

For Barthes one of the ways historians manipulate history is through the speech act. Historians distort history by organising it, but the organisation takes the form of inauguration framing and acceleration. Essentially the historian inaugurates a time in history as of greater importance, frames history by narrowing the vision of the readership and focusing it on something very specific and lastly by accelerating time when telling history (Barthes 1989: 128-133). All of these are forms of distortion, but they can never be completely removed. However,

the historian can use all of the methods to consciously bend history without the readership noticing fully.

A crucial dynamic Barthes discusses is the role of the historian as an author. As an author, the historian can take one of two approaches. The first approach is to include themselves in the text as either a narrator and/or a participant (Barthes 1989: 132-133). William L. Shirer's *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* is a good example of a historian including themselves in the historic narrative. In this approach, the author speaks in the first person and speaks directly with the audience. In this way, the historian is more direct with their position, perspective and bias, and the audience can more easily take it into account because they see the author as an active participant.

The second approach is for the historian to take themselves out of the narrative. In this way, the historian becomes an objective storyteller, telling what really happened without being an active participant for the audience (Barthes 1989: 132-133). The claim is potentially more distorting to history because the bias, perspective and position of the author become hidden. Therefore, the audience is not as prepared for the ideologically driven storytelling and the claim of absolute truth is made by the speech act. A good example of this kind of historic writing is history textbooks wherein the authors always take themselves out and where the texts are always taught as the objective truth of what really happened.

Barthes also attempts to boil the historic statement down. He manages to break it down into two components. The existent and the occurrent. The existent is something that existed like a castle, a prince or a country. The occurrent is an action that was undertaken by the existent, like to reign, to fight or to make alliances. Both components exist within systems which have within their own rules for substitution and transformation. (Barthes 1989: 133-134)

In conclusion, both semiotics and history are intertwined and dependent on each other. They are however different disciplines and so separated from each other. The semiotics of history is the attempt to mix the two disciplines in order to enhance both. Semiotics sees history as communication, both through time and through the activity of historians. Objective history can never be written because the text serves as the only link between society and objective history and the text itself is never a perfect translation of real history. Therefore, historians are always engaged in decoding and to that extent are engaged in a semiotic activity.

Historiography and the semiotics of history are similar in function. Both approach the products of historians, analyse them, and attempt to alleviate the biases written into the narratives of history. Where the two disciplines differ is focus and approach. Historiography presupposes an objective truth and corrects towards that truth, approaching the narratives of history through the intention of aligning them with the objective event. It also focuses solely on the products of historians and does not move out of that sphere. The semiotics of history on the other hand does not presuppose the objective truth because it has been inevitably lost in the encoding and decoding processes. Semiotics of history attempts to reduce the biases found in the text but also studies the effects the biases have on society. As Uspenskij pointed out, what matters is not the objective event but that which a society holds to be true (Uspenskij 1996: 10). Therefore, the semiotics of history approaches history from a wider angle taking into account all the elements of the creative process of writing history. Also, it focuses on the society's reaction to narratives, rather than narratives alone.

1.4. Methodology

Firstly, the research question of this paper is whether there is a difference in ideology in the texts of Soviet history textbooks between Soviet Russian authors and Soviet Estonian authors. To answer the question this paper will employ two methods with which to analyse the texts. The first method is discourse analysis, and the second method is myth analysis. Both methods will be used to analyse specific elements of the texts and the paper will focus on the ideological elements found in the texts. The results of each respective method will be compared with each other and through that, the differences in the texts can be uncovered. These methods used in conjunction should give a wide overview of the ideologies involved.

1.4.1. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is firstly a general term – an umbrella term, containing within itself all the approaches used to understand discourse in relation to social interaction. Discourse analysis can

manifest itself in multiple approaches such as critical discourse analysis, applied linguistics, speech act theory etc. Through the generality of discourse analysis, the researcher can mould the approach to each subject uniquely. (Ho & Limpaecher 2021)

Hansun Zhang Waring has composed a book which serves as a comprehensive introduction to discourse analysis, focusing on the method's interdisciplinary capabilities. Discourse, as Waring writes is the actual use of language as used in the world actively rather than in an abstract form, such as linguistic theory. Discourse analysis is the study of the actual use of language, with the focus of uncovering meanings that have not been directly stated but still influence the reader by the way of inference, hidden premises, judgements of value and assumptions. In order to accomplish its goal, discourse analysis employs close reading of the actual use of language to disassemble the text and devise hidden meanings behind the signs. (Waring 2017: 6-10)

The goal of this paper is to study ideology. Discourse analysis will be applied to analyse how the text uses indirect meanings to convey ideological judgements and assumptions. Added to that, discourse analysis will also be used to analyse the structure and theme of the text to uncover the meanings the text conveys.

This paper will apply discourse analysis in four categories. The first category is vocabulary, the second category is structure, the third category is connections, and the fourth category is bias. Vocabulary will take into account the choice of words, as Waring writes that vocabulary can be used to highlight both the negatives or the positives of a concept or to hide some negative effects of a concept, by focusing the attention elsewhere (Waring 2017: 205-206). Word choice can have hidden meanings due to the connotation and denotation of many words. For example, using the word "creation" instead of "emergence". Creation has a manufactured/synthetic connotation whilst emergence has a natural connotation. Another example can be the use of adjectives which distort or simplify a historical event. Adding savage, brutal or beautiful to a noun can be a distorting value judgement. And finally choosing to use an uncommon name for a location can reveal the ideological position of the author, such as calling Constantinople Tsargrad.

In structure, the analysis will look into the way a text is constructed and presented. It will analyse the chosen style of the text and the effects different narrative styles within the text have on the reader. Waring writes that structure takes into account how a particular text is framed i. e.

what meaning the elements outside the text give to the text, and how do the different subunits within the text relate to each other and in that create meaning (Waring 2017: 44). The themes of the text can range from informal and emotionally charged texts that make a great number of value judgements, to texts that are very formal and emotionally cold, making very few value judgements and eliciting few emotions. The theme of the text can uncover the author's approach, showing where the text wants to convince its readers and where a text wants to remain neutral and avoid conflict. Additionally, this approach can uncover the position the author wants to place themselves relative to the reader. For example, if one text attacks religion directly and openly and then a parallel text has a neutral attitude towards a specific religion described, that neutrality signals a desire to avoid conflict with people who hold that specific religion dear.

In connections, the analysis will focus on the placement of concepts in relation to each other. One of the roles of discourse analysis is to uncover connections that are not obvious but emerge as a result of the features of the text (Waring 2017: 213). Ideology is a system of ideas and in placing concepts next to each other or into systems of logic the author can make unstated statements of meaning due to the proximity and the logical connections of different concepts. In doing this the text can infer connections between concepts and add additional meanings. For example, by tying the discovery of iron with the emergence of family and then tying both ideas to the emergence of private property and then stating that private property is the cause of inequality, the author has tied the discovery of iron to inequality and as a result, given a negative connotation to the discovery of innovations.

In bias, the analysis will focus on the group preferences displayed within the text. The main focus will be on how groups are presented, how group membership is assigned and why some groups are preferred to others. Bias presents itself in two forms. First, in directly stated bias which manifests in the use of determiners such as "ours". Second, in indirectly stated bias where the text is building up certain groups and heaping praises on them, whilst criticising other groups. The goal of the analysis is to identify the in-groups that the text supports and the out-groups that the text attacks, with the overall objective of analysing the reason the lines between groups are drawn.

1.4.2. Myth Analysis

Myth analysis is, as Barthes defines it, the analysis of a semiotic system that exists in a secondary relationship with a major semiotic system, such as natural language (Barthes 1972: 110). Myth is a system of concepts that are stated as fact and their real historical and social origins are neglected (Ganes 2001: 2). In that, myth is a distortion of reality and history, directly affecting the reader (Barthes 1972: 121). As well as Ganes writes, myth is the construction of a shared reality where elements of reality are socially agreed upon or enforced by authority and is not a reality built from logic or cause and effect. For example, myth stands on a natural language system and emerges as a result of the context of the signs involved, being that the signs appear and behave because the myth is presented as true, and their behaviour validates the myth. Therefore, myth cannot stand on its own but because it is in a deep causal relationship with the signs involved, it cannot be questioned and the very activity itself justifies the existence of the myth (Ganes 2001: 14). As Barthes writes, the main goal of myth is to naturalise beliefs and conclusions and therefore myth cannot be hidden but has to be plainly presented, the distorting effects come from the myth's naturalisation and normalisation, where readers believe that the myth is undoubtedly true (Barthes 1972: 130). As Barthes defines it, myth is depoliticised speech because politicised speech is a form of speech that emerges as a result of compromise, myth on the other hand is stated as fact and is not debated (Barthes 1972: 142-145).

Myth analysis will be employed to understand the Soviet myth within the texts of old Soviet history textbooks. The Soviet Union constructed its own reality and its own narrative based on Marxist, Leninist and Stalinist ideologies. Moreover, it stated that its ideology was fact and not debatable. Myth analysis will be used to point out the existence and then explain the reason behind various manifestations of the Soviet myth in the texts. In short, the analysis will explain the reason unfounded conclusions appear in the text and the meanings that are generated in the interplay of various historical concepts and events from the perspectives of both the author and the reader i. e. why did the author write the text and how would a reader understand the text. Moreover, the analysis will also hypothesise the root and cause of the various manifestations of the Soviet myth.

The Soviet myth is the part of the ideology of the Soviet Union that is directly visible and is seen by the citizenry as the truth. In extracting it from the texts and understanding the causes for its manifestation the differences between the texts can be revealed and to some extent explained. In this paper discourse analysis will be applied in four categories to analyse the unstated elements of ideology in the text. The unstated meanings can then be extracted, explained and compared. Myth analysis on the other hand will be used to analyse the directly stated manifestations of ideology. The directly stated meanings can also be explained and compared. In the comparison of both stated and unstated meanings, the differences in ideology can be revealed and explained and therefore the research question can be answered.

Part II Analysis

The overarching research question is whether there is a difference in ideology in the textbooks of Soviet history textbooks between Soviet Russian authors and Soviet Estonian authors. In its fifty years of occupation, the Soviet regime produced a vast number of textbooks and so the amount of textbooks produced far exceeds the ability of this paper to analyse in full. In order to solve the problem and analyse the differences in ideology, the paper will compare chapters found in the textbooks and compare these specific chapters of the same topic. In comparing chapters which are on the same topic from different authors and eras, the differences in ideology can be identified. In the Soviet Estonian educational system, the number of Soviet Russian authors outweighed the Soviet Estonian authors heavily, with most of the textbooks being translations from original Russian textbooks. Soviet Estonian textbooks are later texts and usually secondary textbooks created to support the main textbooks.

The structure of the analytical part will be divided by topics. Each topic will contain within itself three textbooks. The first textbook will be an early Soviet Russian textbook from the 1940s-1960s, and the idea is to analyse the early and hypothetically ideologically heavy textbooks. The second textbook will be a middle or later Soviet period text from the 1970s-1980s, and the idea is to analyse how the ideology changed and to identify the kind of changes that occurred. The third textbook will be a Soviet Estonian textbook and it will be compared against both, seeing how it fits into the larger Soviet system and how it differs from it. To each textbook will be applied discourse analysis and myth analysis. The three textbooks will be analysed through the categories of analysis laid out in the methodology.

The first topic is prehistory. Prehistory is the time before written records and refers to the time when civilisation developed. Since there are few records, it is a time that history does not know much about (McCall 1973: 734). The topic was chosen for three reasons. The first reason is that prehistory is universal to textbooks because history must start somewhere, and therefore prehistory is represented in every series of history textbooks. The second reason is that through

studying the beginning, the origin and foundation of ideological elements can be identified. It is a part of history where the first processes took place, and it is where all the roots of every ideology lie. The third reason is that due to the lack of knowledge among historians, prehistory is a relatively free environment. That lack of knowledge lends well to ideologies which fill any blank spaces with their own conclusions, meaning that the text is a clearer example of ideology.

The second topic is the era of interventions and civil war from 1918 to 1920. The era was chosen because it is an important period of transition for Soviet ideology, where it struggled and where it both won and lost. The activity within and the importance of the time period give it a potentially heavy ideological content. From the period it can also be analysed how the ideology responded to both victories and losses. It is also one of the latest time periods and so quite fresh when written. Compared to prehistory it is closer to the more important time periods for the Soviet Union. As Raudsepp stated, ideology becomes more intense in the textbooks as the events move closer to the founding of the Soviet Union.

The third topic is the expansion of Russia and the Livonian war. It is the era from the 1350s to the 1550s. The era was chosen because it is an important period in history, both for Russia and Estonia. The Livonian war is an event through which the histories of both countries are deeply intertwined. The event takes place in the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance, and therefore within the historic narrative, it is set between prehistory and the age of interventions.

2.1. Prehistory

The first chapter of the topic is the first chapter from A. V. Šestakov's history textbook, printed in 1941. Written during the first occupation of Estonia it is one of the earliest textbooks in Estonian. It is a translated textbook from Russian and the reason it is chosen is to analyse the earliest structure and shape of Soviet ideology. Moreover, it is a good example of Stalinist ideology.

The second chapter is the first chapter of M. Netškina & P. Leibengrub's textbook of Soviet history, printed in 1975. It was written during the second half of the Soviet period and is an example of a textbook written when the ideological state apparatus had solidified and been

streamlined. It is a translated text from Russian and it was chosen to exemplify the ideology of the Stagnation.

The third chapter is the first chapter from J. Kahk, H. Palamets and S. Vahtre's textbook on the history of Soviet Estonia, printed in 1974. It is written in conjunction to the second textbook – serving as extra material for the second textbook. It is written by Soviet Estonians and is not a translated chapter. It was chosen for its proximity to the second textbook and as an example of a history textbook written by Soviet Estonians.

2.1.1. Šestakov (Stalinism) - Our Fatherland in the Distant Past

2.1.1.1. *Discourse Analysis*

Analysing the vocabulary in Šestakov's chapter where he uses adjectives to give the chapter an emotional undertone. The use of adjectives simplifies the history the author is attempting to convey. The adjectives used in the chapter are for example that “their lives were very hard” (Šestakov, 1941: 5), “The wars of the Georgian kings were very savage” (Šestakov, 1941: 8), “Bulgarians were awesome and manly Slavs” (Šestakov, 1941: 10). In doing this the author is binding a very specific and emotionally charged message with historical events and characters. With this, the author wants to convey a very specific image, that the lives of prehistoric peoples were simply very hard, that all the wars fought by early Georgian kings were only savage and unreasonable and that Bulgarians were great people because they were Slavs. The author does not provide evidence to support such conclusions.

Furthermore, such conclusions leave the reader with a very specific view of events, simplifying history. History is a complicated set of events; the lives of people vary through time and not all wars have been unethical and unnecessary. In these examples, we see statements and conclusions made without giving a substantive overview or any source for those conclusions. As stated in the theory section, history is at the heart of the debate and in order to showcase conclusions, especially emotionally charged conclusions, the author should justify their reasoning. The problem of justification and validation may be the reason the author choose a

familiar narrative format within which to convey history so that there would be more room to bury the premises. The question of authority and validity is solved outside the chapter. The textbook is printed by and for the state and there the authority lies.

Analysing the structure, the chapter starts with a short four-paragraph story which is meant to frame the rest of the chapter. This story manages to create relatability with its readers, establish a power dynamic and add the authority of the state. All of these three methods are introduced to manipulate the readers.

The first four paragraphs contain a story about children. These children are digging up bones and stones from the earth. Given the expected readership of the textbook, it is safe to assume that Šestakov intends to create relatability with children through this story and the children are engaged in an activity, digging up things from the earth, which is not un-common for children. This is the first mark of manipulation where Šestakov reels the readers in by attempting to relate to them. (Šestakov, 1941: 5)

After relatability, Šestakov visualises a familiar power dynamic and connects it seamlessly to the structure of the rest of the chapter. The children bring those bones and stones to the teacher and the teacher begins telling the children about history. This immediately invokes the power dynamic between teachers and children, where children are conditioned to trust and learn from teachers as inherent authority figures. Moreover, the teacher also connects this power dynamic with the larger Soviet Union by connecting the story with events going on in the larger collective of the Union by saying “academics from across the USSR are undertaking excavations.” (Šestakov, 1941: 5) Following this Šestakov connects the teacher's dialogue with the rest of the chapter. The first sentence that the teacher says is indirect speech and is intended directly for the children in the story. The second sentence the teacher speaks is in reported speech and is intended to connect to the larger societal group by naming the USSR. After the second sentence Šestakov directly takes over and continues in a familiar narrative style. With this, the author has managed to take the authority of the teacher as their own. With this narrative and societal authority, it is easier for Šestakov to convey conclusions to the readers as the readers will be inherently more trusting. (Šestakov, 1941: 5)

Analysing the connections within the chapter the most prominent connection is that of family and inequality. The chapter states that at the beginning of history humanity was equal and democratic, but when the family started forming then this created inequality. Through that

inequality slavery and oppression were created (Šestakov, 1941: 6-8). By creating this chain of ideas Šestakov has tied the concept of family to oppression and slavery and therefore given a negative connotation to family as a concept.

Analysing the bias in the chapter, the author favours certain groups over others. As Breisach writes, during Stalinism there was a goal to create pride in Russian history and to further the cultural identity of the Russian people through patriotic pride (Breisach 2007: 354-355). That dynamic plays itself out in the chapter where Šestakov favours the Bulgarians over the Byzantines. Šestakov extols all the virtues of the Byzantine empire and attempts to show them in the best light possible. It is after that he says that even with all the virtues and military aptitude of the Byzantines, the Bulgarians still won many battles against them, and the main reason was that “the Bulgarians were awesome and manly Slavs” (Šestakov, 1941: 10). In building up the Byzantines Šestakov is actually building up the Bulgarians once he demonstrates their victory. Šestakov is playing with extremes in order to create a simple picture and in truth the empire was not as capable as Šestakov claims and the Bulgarians were not so much mightier in defeating the empire.

Another in-group preference that is shown in the chapter is an ideological divide. Šestakov writes how the Greeks colonised the northern coast of the Black Sea and then started exploiting the local Scythians and then claims that the Greeks did not work at all and all of the work was done by the oppressed Scythians (Šestakov, 1941: 9). This shows more of an ideological division into the in-group of the Scythians and the out-group of Greeks because it does not rely on patriotic reasoning but economic reasoning. Šestakov is making an absolute claim about the Greeks and is attempting to paint the entire culture as oppressors.

2.1.1.2. Myth Analysis

Analysing the myth in the chapter, Šestakov makes multiple claims that rise from the Soviet myth that is buried as the premise for the chapter itself. That myth manifests itself in multiple conclusions throughout the chapter. The first manifestation is brought out in connections that family is connected to oppression. The idea that family and then private property were the first ills of humanity was most famously propagated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who claimed that

cohabitation of males and females was the first ill of humanity and private property was the second (Rousseau 1755: 44-46). As a collectivist society, the USSR viewed the time before family as a utopia and it was the state of the world that they wanted to return to as evidenced by the positive language used towards tribal life.

Another manifestation of the myth comes from the simplified view of history the chapter has. Šestakov claims that nations were created to protect the wealthy and maintain the structures of slavery (Šestakov, 1941: 7-8). This is a simplification of history where Šestakov views history from one perspective and excludes most other considerations. In the Soviet myth history is only a story of the wealthy exploiting the non-wealthy and so every major development in history is a subordinate to that narrative. There were in fact multiple factors that led to the rise of nations. Security and stability were perhaps the most important. A peasant is willing to pay a tithe in order to keep his land from being burned by raiders. Adding to this Šestakov also greatly simplifies the creation of titles and the feudal system. He claims that titles like duke, czar and khan were just created and every one of them was a simple exploiter (Šestakov, 1941: 7). However, each of those titles carries a great and meaningful weight behind them. They are not just titles of political power, but they also have significant cultural meaning.

2.1.2. Netškina & Leibengrub (Stagnation) - Prehistoric and Slave Order

2.1.2.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The vocabulary of Netškina's chapter conveys hidden meanings through emotional language and broad unidimensional descriptors. Netškina simplifies history by boiling the descriptions of historic events down to single and unilateral descriptions. By making an absolute statement through modern concepts Netškina is distorting history. Two good examples of this are the claims that the lives of prehistoric people were full of sacrifice and wretchedness (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 18) and that the Slavs were a tall, strong and beautiful people (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 22).

For the first example, Netškina romanticises the lives and conditions of prehistoric peoples who lived in tribes. Another example of romanticisation is the claim that tribal societies were collective, with communal households where they did all activities together and property was owned by all (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 10). A third example of this is the claim that once metal was discovered the tribal order started to fall apart and as did equality and communal property (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 15). The word choice of falling apart indicates that what was being lost was of value and that which was replacing it was of inferior quality.

All in all, within the chapter the author uses words which attempt to convey to the reader that the prehistoric time of human history was a mythical good time where the ideals of the Soviet Union flourished. The romanticisation ties in directly with the Soviet myth.

The second example uses emotional language and strongly descriptive language to make the reader empathise with certain in-groups, the most prominent of them being the Slavic peoples. Netškina is using the words tall, strong and beautiful but all three are very subjective terms. All terms strongly rely on comparisons with contemporary peoples, meaning that a person could only be tall compared to other people of the time. Moreover, the author is not using virtues to describe the Slavs but raw physical traits. The author is attempting to frame the Slavic people through his own contemporary standards and in so doing attempting to manipulate the reader into admiring and looking up to the Slavic people.

In the structure of the chapter, the author attempts to display himself as an objective storyteller. As Barthes wrote, by taking oneself out of the historic narrative the historian makes the claim that the history presented is objective by the very structure of the approach. In the chapter, there is no mention of the author. He has removed himself completely. The only place where the author directly speaks to the audience is in the introduction, but the chapter itself is conveyed as the history of objective events that occurred. The authority for the chapter is gained from the social structure that the chapter is a part of. The author does not have to work to convince the reader because it is a state produced textbook and so the authority of the state backs up the claims entirely.

In the chapter, there are three connections of note. The first is the chain of events that led up to inequality, the second is the logical system of religion, and the third is gender roles. The first chain of events starts with tribes. Netškina makes the claim that once the discovery of iron and the development of families occurred, the tribal system fell apart and was replaced with a

family system wherein inequality began to flourish (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 15). In the chain, Netškina attaches inequality to both family and the discovery of iron. The chapter clearly specifies that innovation and its effects were the cause of inequality, by making the gathering of resources easier and allowing for individual families to survive (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 15). Netškina not only blames family but condemns innovation itself, not just the discovery of iron, condemning the core effects of innovation, such as the improvement of living quality.

The second is the system of ideas that Netškina has constructed around religion. The first claim is that religion has no natural foundation. Netškina claims that scientists have found no proof that prehistoric people had religion. Another claim is that religion was only created to explain parts of nature that prehistoric people did not understand. The last claim is that religion always misleads and cannot give correct explanations for human life or nature. (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 11)

In these claims, Netškina attempts to invalidate religion by claiming it misleads, that its only mechanism is as an explanation for the unknown and finally by stating that it has no deep foundation in human nature or psyche. The author wants to completely discredit religion by showing a one-sided picture and connecting it to only three negative ideas.

The third is the description of gender roles in prehistory. The author creates a dynamic wherein the beginning prehistoric people lived in matriarchies (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 13). With the discovery of iron prehistoric societies switched to patriarchies (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 15). In this dynamic, because of the romanticisation of tribal society, the author is making matriarchies positive by attributing to them the original *good* state of society. The author then identifies patriarchies as the results of the change that families and the discovery of iron brought. In this way, the author is identifying patriarchies as an attribute of *bad* societies.

The bias of the chapter is directed mainly toward three groups in the form of pro-Slavic, pro-Scythian and anti-Greek bias. The presence of the pro-Slavic bias is unsurprising because of the cultural background of the authors, but what is surprising is the degree of bias present in the chapter. The first example is the description of the Slavs in very favourable terms. Moreover, Netškina depicts history from the point of view of the Slavs. The author frames Slavic history through the separation of the community and the invader, setting up the invader as a constant danger, the author also emphasises the virtues of the Slavic communities writing that once the tribes united their differences melted away (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 24). The opposition to

the invader and the identity claimed from that is a key feature of Russian culture and it echoes through the Soviet textbook.

Pro-Scythian bias is present in the textbook, and it seems that it has manifested for two reasons. The first is that the Scythians inhabited modern-day Slavic territories and also because the chapter portrays the Scythians as underdogs in comparison to the Greeks against whom the author has a negative bias. Netškina writes that the Scythians lived on the northern coast of the Black Sea and in the Crimean steppes (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 18). Geographically they lived in modern-day Ukraine and Russia, which explains the bias. The bias itself manifests in the claims that their art was comparable to Greek art, they built awesome structures (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 19), and it was the slaves, often peoples such as Scythians that built everything in the Greek world (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 20). In short, the author is attempting for several reasons to build up the Scythians as important and powerful peoples whilst comparing them to the Greeks and undermining the Greeks in the process.

The anti-Greek bias in the chapter is severe. It seems the author has divided history into two kinds of cultures the oppressors, and the oppressed. It is a similar division to class conflict, but whereas class conflict divides human society into two classes, it does so regardless of the culture and ethnic nature of the participants of the conflict, as Marx and Engels wrote, “Working men of all countries unite!” (Marx & Engels 1970: 77). It seems that Netškina sees in history another kind of collective struggle, that between cultures. It is evidenced by the fact that he makes total statements about culture, that all Greeks did or did not do something.

2.1.2.2. Myth Analysis

There are several myths in the chapter. The romanticisation of prehistoric tribes, matriarchal societies and the nature of religion are the three most important ones. The romanticisation of prehistoric tribes emerges through the vocabulary the author uses. One reason for that romanticisation might be the idea that the human being is fundamentally good and was better off in nature before civilisation. There are two ideas which were disseminated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau which could lead to such a conclusion. The first one is the idea that private property was the beginning of all man’s ills (Rousseau 2006: 40). The other one, also promulgated by

other philosophers, such as Locke and Hobbes, was the idea that man before civilization was greater, purer and less constrained (Rousseau 2006: 21). To reinforce this the chapter states that prehistoric tribes lived communally, socially and without private property.

Another myth that in the chapter is not uniquely a Soviet myth but also a matriarchal myth. Netškina writes that agriculture was originally part of the domain of women and that in clans humans lived in matriarchal societies (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 13). As Eller writes, the idea that agriculture was originally invented by women and that all of human society was under a matriarchal societal system is part of the matriarchal myth propagated by Will Durant (Eller 2000: 36). This shows how Soviet ideology did not exist in a vacuum and also that the ideology was susceptible to subversion by other closely aligned ideologies. Adding to this, the chapter then specifies that male importance in society only grew with the discovery of new technologies, namely the invention of iron tools (Netškina & Leibengrub 1975: 15). There is no clear logical reason why the importance of men grew only with the discovery and use of iron tools and in that, a logical inconsistency is seen.

Religion is opium for the masses, as famously declared by Karl Marx. The main contention Marx seems to have to religion is the illusionary veil that religion creates, by fabricating answers and deceiving the people (Marx 1992: 244). It is also echoed in the chapter where the author states that the only thing religion creates is lies. Religion also impedes the idea of totalitarianism and the dictatorship of the proletariat by creating dual power hierarchies, one to the state and another one to God. The Soviet Union embraced the idea of, as Froese calls it, *Scientific Atheism* (Froese 2004 3-4).

2.1.3. Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre (Soviet Estonian) - Prehistoric Order on Estonian Territory

2.1.3.1. Discourse Analysis

The vocabulary is predominantly descriptive. The use of embellishing or emotional adjectives is limited. The chapter is rather cold and does not attempt to raise the emotions of its readers. The

choices of words are also non-combative because the author does not make statements attacking any social or cultural concept in the chapter.

The structure of Kahk's, Palamets's & Vahtre's chapter suggests objectivity as well, because the authors have taken themselves out of the text and are presenting history as fact. The authors approach to religion is noteworthy. Their chapter is very neutral and descriptive. The authors give an overview of the ancient Estonian religion but do not say that it was neither good nor bad. Running counter to the near-total antagonism that the Soviet Union showed to religion, it could be explained by the idea that the Union did not want to antagonise the Estonians too much and choose their battles.

There are several connections within Kahk's, Palamets's & Vahtre's chapter. The authors also display a system of logical steps which created inequality. For the authors the downfall of tribal societies came with the discovery of iron, the plentiful resources iron provided by making it easier to work the land allowed families to emerge. Because husbandry and agriculture rose in prominence and because both were predominantly male fields of activity, iron led to the rise of patriarchy. Both patriarchy and family then splintered society and created inequality. For the authors innovation is the root cause of inequality, which is also connected with the family. (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 6-7)

There is comparatively little bias in the chapter. The main bias that is displayed is the division between the peasantry and the emerging wealthy people. However, in regard to other people, the chapter is descriptive, not making value judgements.

2.1.3.2. Myth Analysis

There are three myths in the chapter. The first is inequality is the source of suffering. The second is that families are part of the main cause of inequality. The third relates to gender in prehistory. The first myth is that the greatest evil in human history is inequality. Predicated on the Marxist myth that every division of wealth in society is predicated on oppression and stealing. Inequality seems to simply be a facet of human societies with very complex reasons for its existence. In the chapter inequality also destroys prehistoric communal societies that the authors also romanticise

as they write “replacing previous tribal societies, where all members were equal” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 7).

The second myth is that families were a part of the reason inequality was created. Technology created a surplus of resources, on the back of which families could become independent of the tribe. Families then developed private property as property that belonged to the family, not to the tribe (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 7). This feeds into the greater Soviet antagonism against the family.

The third myth is the gender peculiarities of the transition from prehistory into feudalism. Not only was there a transition from collective tribal living into family-based unequal feudal societies with private property, but there was a transition from matriarchy to patriarchy, where the authors ascribe to matriarchy the qualities of communal equal tribal living and to the patriarchy private, unequal private lifestyle (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 4-7). This adds an extra dynamic to the core precepts of Soviet ideology and makes the ideology at least in the chapter, more favourable towards a matriarchal system. Ironically, the Soviet system was very patriarchal in its political sphere.

2.1.4. Conclusions from Prehistory

In comparing the vocabularies of the three chapters the biggest divide is are between the third chapter and the two preceding chapters. For both the Russian authors the vocabulary was very emotionally charged. The word choice and the adjectives used attempted to colour the existents and occurrents that the chapter described. Not only were the authors describing what happened but were also making value and aesthetic judgements with the descriptions.

The Estonian authors on the other hand were more neutral in their approach. The chapter was centred on Finno-Uralic tribes but events such as the emergence of inequality and the emergence of religion took place in the chapter. The authors described the existents and the occurrents and did not add adjectives which coloured the reader's perception. The authors were not making short value or aesthetic judgements through vocabulary.

The vocabulary used when describing religion shows up in stark contrast to the second chapter. The third chapter describes religion in very neutral ways, being only descriptive. It

contrasts with the negative approach taken by the parent chapter which both describes and attacks religion, pulling no punches. There are two possible explanations. The first is that the authors and the Union are choosing their battles and not wanting to fight over every little detail, hoping to maintain some stability in doing so. The other reason might be that the Soviets saw no danger in the ancient Estonian religion because it was a dead and pagan religion so the chances of it taking root were slim to none. This might be an example of an ideology twisting itself for greater goals and plans.

In comparing structure, the three chapters are similar. The first chapter differentiates itself more because unlike the two other chapters it does not firmly adhere to the objective storyteller approach. Rather it ties in a direct and biased narrative approach in order to reel in the readers. Such an approach is not repeated in the later chapters and can perhaps be seen as either an earlier approach to ideological influencing that was later refined out of the Soviet educational system through standardisation or a symptom of Stalinism.

In comparing the connections there are a few differences between the chapters. Transitioning from the first chapter to the second chapter, the system for the emergence of inequality gained an element, which was innovation. The third chapter shares the extension and so it is likely to be an evolution of Soviet thinking.

Another moving part that was added in with the evolution was the addition of gendered hierarchies. Not only was there a transition from communal to private property as in the first chapter, the second chapter ties in the transition from matriarchy to patriarchy. The most interesting point of comparison is that the third chapter claims that agriculture was a male domain and became more important as iron was discovered, it does not claim that agriculture was invented by women. This is a slight contradiction to the second chapter as it only implies that agriculture was only a male domain, by only writing about it in the context of the patriarchy. However, seeing how many elements the second and the third chapter share in common, the exclusion that agriculture was invented by women is noteworthy, especially as the second chapter serves as its parent chapter.

In comparing bias, the first two chapters are very similar. Both authors exhibit strong pro-Slavic bias, medium pro-Scythian bias and strong anti-Greek bias. The reasons for the bias are simple and self-evident. The Slavic bias comes from the authors own ethnic backgrounds and the Scythian and Greek biases come from ideological sources.

There is however a strong difference between the first two chapters and the third chapter. Even though the authors of the third chapter had an Estonian ethnic background, there is no clear or direct evidence of in-group bias in the favour of any ethnic group within the chapter. The authors describe multiple peoples throughout the chapter such as the Russians, the Finns and Estonians. The only form of bias emerges from class differences described with the emergence of inequality. This is evidence of a lighter ideological chapter just because of the lessened amount of in-group bias shown.

In comparing myths all three chapters agree that private property is the main source of human suffering. Moreover, all three chapters agree that the emergence of family is directly tied to inequality and private property. The second and third chapters add in innovation as a coequal to family in creating private property and that can simply be seen as an evolution of ideology.

All chapters see divisions between oppressors and oppressed within cultures. For example, through the existence of families of differing affluence, which emerged from the same tribe. But also, in the division of cultures where some cultures are oppressors, and some are oppressed. The third chapter however does not identify entire culture groups as oppressors or oppressed and it is an example of how the third chapter is lighter in ideology than the first two.

In short, there are several differences between the Estonian authors and the Russian authors. The first is the use of vocabulary which shows the difference between the amounts of ideology present in the chapters and the Estonian chapter was lighter, especially when it comes to manipulating the reader. The Estonian authors are descriptive and rarely prescriptive. The second is the difference in approaching religion. The neutrality of the Estonian authors in comparison to the hostility of the Russian authors shows a stark difference between the weight of ideology between the chapters. The third difference is between the Estonian author's approach to gender hierarchies where the Estonian textbook lightly contradicts the parent textbook, and it shows that the chapter has fewer ideological elements.

In the comparison of the three chapters, the Estonian chapter has less ideology within itself. So much so that the ideological presence in the chapter is markedly less than the comparing chapters.

2.2. Era of Interventions and Civil War

The first chapter of the topic is the twelfth chapter of A. V. Šestakov's history textbook, printed in 1940. The chapter is from the first occupation of Estonia and as such is one of the earliest Soviet history textbooks in Estonian. It is a translated chapter from Russian and the reason it was chosen was to give an example of early Soviet ideology and a good example of chapter from the era of Stalinism.

The second chapter of the topic is the third chapter of I. Berhin's history textbook, printed in 1980. The chapter is from the height of the Stagnation and serves as an example of late Soviet ideology. It is a chapter translated from Russian and the reason it was chosen was because it has an Estonian auxiliary textbook, and it is a good example of a chapter in a standardised and streamlined system.

The third chapter of the topic is the third chapter of M. Lõhmus's and K. Siilivask's history textbook, printed in 1973. The chapter is from the period of Stagnation and is an example of later Soviet ideology. The chapter was chosen because it is a chapter written by Soviet Estonians and because it is an auxiliary textbook to I. Berhin's textbook.

2.2.1. Šestakov (Stalinism) - Military Intervention. Civil War

2.2.1.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The vocabulary of Šestakov's chapter is emotional. He uses both word choice and adjectives to convey short, emotional messages and conclusions to the reader. Examples of this are "the Traitor Trotsky and his minion Buhharin" (Šestakov 1940: 113), "Bourgeoisie bought the services of bandits to assassinate the leaders of the revolution" (Šestakov 1940: 117), "Soviets were beginning to organise in Germany, but they were infiltrated by large quantities of traitors to the revolution" (Šestakov 1940: 119), "Awesome battles started" (Šestakov 1940: 129). In every

example, the author uses singular words to convey complex conclusions to the reader as if they were true, for example, that Trotsky was a traitor and always worked against Soviet Russia. The use of such vocabulary creates a black and white world, where only a specific narrow group of people are in the right, that being the leaders of the Soviet Union. Everyone else is in the wrong, no matter how insignificant the ideological differences. From such a world view the dichotomy of friend and foe develops, where anyone even slightly against the dominant power structure is treated as a foe and everyone who is a friend is part of an ordained mythological struggle but also stuck to a narrow and confined set of beliefs.

The author manages to create a powerful image for the reader by stating several complex and one-sided conclusions as simple facts. This way, the author can distort history but also make it believable through both authority and the simplicity of the chapter. The simplicity of the chapter leaves no room for misinterpretation or debate.

In the structure of the chapter, the author places himself as an objective storyteller because Šestakov takes himself out of the chapter. As Barthes wrote, such a position makes it easier for the author to manipulate with the audience (Barthes 1989: 132-133). The audience cannot directly see the author and so they have a harder time keeping in mind the bias of the storyteller when they are reading the textbook. What adds to the manipulation is the authority of the state behind the chapter. Therefore, through structure it is not so much the author who is speaking but the state, even more so because the state is also the material and distributor of the textbook.

Another crucial element in the chapter is the way Šestakov uses names and imagery. Multiple times he includes individuals alongside historic events, but in the chapter, there is no historical reason to include the names or the actions of these individuals, examples of this include “Vassili Ivanoviš Tšapajev” (Šestakov 1940: 122-123), “Aleksandr Jakovleviš Parhomenko” (Šestakov 1940: 127) and “Valerian Vladimiroviš Kuibōšev” (Šestakov 1940: 129). In all the examples the individuals are included in the chapter as additions and do not further the historic narrative. It seems that the author is using names to make the historic chapter more relatable, rather than having masses of red army soldiers and officers, the author gives them names and attempts to portray them as heroes. Through this, he is also creating role models for the readers, and exemplars for children.

Another element of structure is the use of visual elements. The author has mixed the chapter with portraits. Every portrait represents a significant individual from the chapter on the side of the Communists. Even though names of the enemies are shown in the chapter multiple times like “General Wranger” (Šestakov 1940: 126-130), “General Denikin” (Šestakov 1940: 123-126) and “General Judenitš” (Šestakov 1940: 123-126), they are never visualised. It is probably a dehumanising tactic because the names of allies are written out in full, but the names of enemies only in surnames, and they have no face next to the chapter.

There is one notable connection within the textbook. The chapter admits that during the civil war, there were shortages and famines, but they were not the fault of the Soviet regime. The chapter makes the connection that the disasters were created from the envy of factory owners and industrialists who broke their own machinery and abandoned their factories. The capitalists are then also connected to the Kulaks, who further exasperated the situation by destroying their own products for profit and then selling what was left at high prices (Šestakov 1940: 116). This implies that the famine was not the fault of the war nor the policies of the government, but rather self-interested greed. It also makes the Soviet government look like the saviour and cure; the author attempts to show the government has the only true solution to these problems.

There are several biases within the chapter. The most powerful is the pro-Soviet and pro-communist bias. Another bias is a softer pro-Slavic bias. The pro-Soviet bias manifests itself in several claims. The first claim is that the Soviet state is the saviour of workers and farmers by alleviating famine and shortages (Šestakov 1940: 116). The second claim is that Soviet Russia is a liberator who frees all peoples from the oppression of capitalists, czarist generals and foreign conquerors (Šestakov 1940: 126). The third claim was that every kind of opposition to the Soviet Union was invalid, done either by corrupt czarist generals, imperialist powers or internal traitors (Šestakov 1940: 126-130). Through the bias the author is reinforcing the black and white world of Soviet ideology. For the textbook the friends are the state and every individual involved in furthering the state. Opposing that is the enemy distinction, where everyone who opposes the Soviet experiment is a foolish or malicious enemy, who is an existential threat and must be viciously eliminated. This creates a very sharp distinction between two sides and frames it as a struggle of obliteration.

There is also a pro-Slavic bias. The chapter describes the Polish-Soviet war and in its conclusion, the author states that “Soviet Russia could not remain neutral before the subjugation

of brethren peoples of the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians, who were subjugated and stripped of their rights under Polish dominion” (Šestakov 1940: 128). This shows the pro-Slavic bias of the chapter but creates an interesting dynamic by stating that the Polish culture is not Slavic or worthy of protection, probably because the Soviets saw them as ungrateful (Šestakov 1940: 126).

2.2.1.2. Myth Analysis

There are two major myths contained within the textbook. The myth of the traitor Trotsky and the conspiracy myth. The myth of treasonous Trotsky is a deeply Stalinist myth. Trotsky was a rival of Stalin and having won this rivalry Stalin rewrote the history of the Union with Trotsky as the main internal enemy, whereas in truth Trotsky was one of the most loyal followers of Lenin. The myth is seen in the chapter in two places, the first regarding early peace negotiations that Trotsky allegedly sabotaged to cripple the Soviet Union (Šestakov 1940: 112). The second example is by stating that Trotsky and his minion Bukharin attempted to sabotage the Brest peace negotiations (Šestakov 1940: 113). For Stalinist ideology, the internal enemy was as important as the external enemy. The terror government relied on the idea that there was always an internal enemy who was engaged in counterrevolutionary activities. Solzhenitsyn wrote that the terror system was not concerned with capturing criminals, it was concerned with maintaining terror among the population (Solzhenitsyn 2002: 5-18).

The second myth is that every failure of Soviet history is because of the actions of the bourgeoisie, industrialists or counterrevolutionaries. The first example of this is the reason given for the failure of the November revolution in Germany “Soviets were being organised in Germany but into them flowed a great many traitors to the revolution, German Mensheviks and social democrats” (Šestakov 1940: 119). The second example is that the industrialists and kulaks were behind the famines and shortages in Soviet Russia (Šestakov 1940: 116). The third example is that the intervening states of England, France and Japan started the civil war against Soviet Russia (Šestakov 1940: 116). In all the examples Šestakov paints a picture where Soviet Russia did nothing wrong and bad things occurred because of the machinations of malignant people in and around Soviet Russia. Here the Soviet state simply did everything right in the difficult situations it was thrust into.

2.2.2. Berhin (Stagnation) - Soviet Russia During the Period of Imperialistic Interventions and Civil War

2.2.2.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The use of the vocabulary in the textbook conveys indirect meanings, through the underlying conclusions behind word choice and descriptions. There are two prominent statements that Berhin makes. The first is that the Bolshevik movement boils down to a single axis, a selfless service to the working class and that through such service the movement has mystical power over the actions of the working class. That emerges from the author's description of the Bolshevik movement, saying "The liberating class war for the workers and peasants of Russia" and "the only worker and peasant socialist nation in the world" (Berhin 1977: 77). The theme is iterated on later by describing how the Soviet state resolved conflicts with peasants simply by talking to them (Berhin 1977: 91). And the fact that merely with his words Lenin was able to turn back the tide of war in the Urals and achieve victory in the mountains (Berhin 1997: 98).

The second prominent statement is that the Bolsheviks are in an unjust war, in which they are the victims. Moreover, the enemies of the Bolsheviks are united in a large international coalition, which strikes as one giant movement. Berhin states that "Imperialism organised an international intervention which started the war" (Berhin 1997: 77) and that "all counter-revolutionary forces joined the interventionist forces" (Berhin 1997: 78). Essentially the author is implying that there was a great international conspiracy against the Bolsheviks and that every action of the enemy was coordinated to weaken both the working class and Russia as a whole.

The most prominent detail of structure is the treatment of Lenin. Lenin is treated as the source of truth in the chapter. Multiple times mixed into the narrative of history there are statements of Lenin, such as "everybody knows, wrote Lenin, 'we were assaulted by the White Guard in the west, south and east only by the help of the Andante.'" (Berhin 1977: 78) or "'We have reached from a completely defenceless situation to a mighty Red Army,' said Lenin" (Berhin 1977: 88). Lenin's quotes reinforce the authority of the textbook. Regarding structure

they seem to be statements of pure truth. They also carve into the reader's mind the idea that all authority and righteousness originate with Lenin. Lenin is no longer a human being but a pure manifestation of ideology and a mythical hero.

There is one important web of connections which is created in the textbook which comes together to create a grand conspiracy against the Bolsheviks. Namely, the major enemy of the Bolsheviks are not the White guard, but the imperialist states of France and Britain (Berhin 1977: 77). French and British intervention in Russia convinced the enemies of socialism to rise and join the imperialist forces in their opposition to the Bolsheviks (Berhin 1977: 77-78). Following that Romania invaded Bessarabia and the Americans began their own expeditions (Berhin 1977: 78). Japan soon also attacked (Berhin 1977: 59) and the Czechoslovaks rebelled against socialism and, siding with the imperialists, invaded Russia (Berhin 1977: 80). And finally German imperialists invaded the Baltics (Berhin 1977: 80). As Lenin states ‘we were assaulted by the White Guard in the west, south and east only by the help of the Andante.’” (Berhin 1977: 78).

The connection implies that all the invasions were coordinated, unified and served both the same masters and the same goals. The author is both building up a monolithic enemy but also framing the civil war as a near hopeless struggle where the Bolsheviks were innocent victims.

The bias within the textbook manifests itself as a stark division between a good side and a bad side. Everything the Bolsheviks attempt or do is good and everything that the opposition does is evil, that evil is exaggerated. For example, Berhin writes that the American occupations were extremely cruel and ended with the imprisonment of forty thousand people and the execution of four thousand innocent victims (Berhin 1977: 78-79). Also, that the White Guard forcibly drafted people into the army, forcing them to fight against their will (Berhin 1977: 96). The first example simply dehumanises the enemy, making the reader sympathetic towards any action taken against the enemy. The second example is very hypocritical, shaming the opposition for tactics that the proposition employed.

2.2.2.2. Myth Analysis

There are two noteworthy myths within the textbook. The first is the myth of an international conspiracy and the second is the power of language. The myth of an international conspiracy

serves the Bolsheviks in multiple ways. First, it creates a major enemy, making the Bolsheviks look small and hopeless, presenting them as the underdog and making them endearing. Secondly, it gives the Bolsheviks more prestige when they achieve victory in the end. The bigger the foe defeated the more impressive it is and if the Bolsheviks defeated a unified international coalition, then they must be a powerful force to do so. Thirdly it makes the Bolsheviks look like the victims. Framed in such a way that the Bolsheviks were doing their own things and pursuing virtues self-evident to all when they were viciously declared war on. This ignores the reality that the civil war began with Bolshevik a coup d'état.

The international conspiracy is a myth because the counterrevolutionary forces were never united, as Kenez writes, it was one of the major reasons why they lost the war (Kenez 1977: 50). Competing interests and multiple figureheads were unable to give the army a unified and decisive goal. The expeditions on the other hand were small military excursions where neither France, Britain nor the US declared war. Whilst there were many enemies surrounding the Bolsheviks, they were disunited, spontaneous or working at cross purposes. The international conspiracy creates a more mythological and inspiring story and feeds into the narrative of an ever-present enemy at the gates but finding relatively little basis in reality.

The second major myth is the power of language. There are multiple times within the textbook that the Bolsheviks, either in the form of the state or in the figure of Lenin move and alter the course of events through language. Through the use of speeches, the myth shows the reader that the Bolsheviks are right and capable of achieving everything necessary, at least within their internal structures. This is a reinforcement of authority, stating that the state is right when it speaks and therefore the reader should not question the state. It also gives the state mythological power to control the course of events, making their own soldiers and peasantry merely extensions of the state through direct and effective control. This makes the statement that people did not build the Soviet Union, but that ideology and the mythical hero Lenin did.

2.2.3. Lõhmus & Siilivask (Soviet Estonian) - Estonia During the Years of Intervention and Civil War

2.2.3.1. Discourse Analysis

The vocabulary within the textbook implies that the Estonian war for independence was a civil war where the Estonian bourgeoisie fought against the Estonian workers and peasants. The first argument by the authors is that in the face of German occupation Estonian military units were created in Soviet Russia (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 63). Then in the November of 1918 Estonian workers and peasants declared a massively popular Estonian workers commune in Narva and set out to liberate Estonia on behalf of Soviet Russia (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 63). The authors also claim that the Estonian government, at least in the beginning, lacked any popular support and the only way they could get people in the army was by mobilising them under the pain of death (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 68).

One notable element of structure which reoccurs in multiple forms throughout the textbook is the way names are recorded in the narrative. Namely within the historic narrative names of Soviet heroes have been inserted which somewhat disrupts the tempo of the narrative itself and does not add any significant meaning to the narrative itself. The most egregious example is “amongst them E. Tiitsen, H. Telliskivi and the machine-gunner Alice Tisler” (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 63). Such disruptive insertions are manifestations of ideology, where the narrative is of less value than the ideological goal of creating and maintaining heroes and role models.

The most important string of connections in the text is embodied in the international conspiracy. The authors frame the Estonian war for independence as one theatre of the struggle between the international bourgeoisie and the working class. Whilst the Estonian government is not portrayed as synonymous with the bourgeoisie and imperialism, they are portrayed as traitors and sell-outs to imperialism. The first claim is that the Estonian bourgeoisie prostrated themselves before the Andante and the Germans so the German armies would occupy Estonia

quicker and save Estonia from the Soviets (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 63). The second claim is that with the fall of Germany, Britain and France intervened in the independence war at the request of the Estonian government and that this angered the working class of Estonia, inspiring them to help restore Soviet order (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 67). The third claim is the Estonian government begged for occupation from France and Britain but because of the anti-war sentiment within the population it was impossible, but that well paid and trained volunteers were sent to fight for imperialism (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 72).

The bias present in the textbook emerges only in the political sphere. There is the good side and there is the bad side. Everything that independent Estonia does is negative, regardless of the context of the actions. The authors also contradict themselves, showing hypocrisy in order to depict the Estonian government in a bad light. For example, the authors chide the Estonian government for employing forced mobilisation (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 68) whilst a few pages later lamenting that they themselves did not employ mobilisation (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 71). Also, when Estonia is unified under the Estonian government the authors claim that White terror is initiated with hundreds of communists executed by the government (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 72).

This bias is also shown where the authors state that during the first elections the Estonian government promised four things. They promised to end the White terror, secure independence, end the war, and divide up the estate land to the people. The authors claim that the government fulfilled almost none of these promises (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 73). This is blatantly false because, with victory, independence was secured, the war was ended, estate lands were reorganised, and the White terror never got out of control.

2.2.3.2. Myth Analysis

A major myth in the text is that the independent Estonian government was illegitimate and had no popular support. The authors write that the only reason the Estonian government survived the end of the First World war, and the fall of Germany, was because of the military support of German soldiers (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 63). Furthermore, the authors claim that the Estonians did not lead the independence war, but that the English admiral Sinclair was the real

military leader of the entire war (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 72). This myth would later justify actions against the Estonian government and through this, the communists never saw the government as a legitimate equal.

The myth of mistakes. The authors lay out multiple mistakes that the Estonian communists made, losing them the war. Every mistake was inspired by ideology and the authors are making a cynical argument toward pragmatism and subversion. They are saying that power is all that matters and in order to achieve victory the goals of ideology should be secondary to victory. They are also making themselves subversive, by claiming that the Communists should lie and manipulate in order to get what they want and once they have the power, they can initiate unpopular policies without restriction. There are two mistakes that the authors highlight. The first is the decision to turn estates into communal property. The people desired private property and communality made the Communists unpopular (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 71). The second mistake was the fact that the Communists did not mobilise the working class into the Red Army and therefore had less manpower (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 71).

The myth of Lenin as a mythical father figure emerges in the text. Lenin is used by the authors to alleviate the defeat of the Soviets in the independence war. For example, Lenin congratulates the Estonian Communists for their courage and spark, especially in facing England on the international stage (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 76). Lenin compares the Tartu peace treaty to the action of carving a window to the West with an axe, therefore opening new possibilities in the future (Lõhmus & Siilivask 1973: 77).

2.2.4. Conclusions from the Era of Interventions and Civil War

In comparing the vocabulary of the three textbooks there is a stark difference between the first chapter and the other two. Šestakov uses emotional and flowery language to convey complex conclusions easily to the reader. In comparison, both the later Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian chapters are far milder with the use of language. They preferred neutral word choicing and adjectives. Seeing that both later texts use mild vocabulary, the difference between the texts can be attributed to a gradual shift in the style of propaganda through the decades. Moreover, the Soviet Russian authors created sharp divisions between friend and foe, where it was framed as an

existential battle to the death. Soviet Estonian authors, whilst creating a distinction did not make those distinctions as sharp. The Soviet Estonian authors framed the enemy more as misguided and weak. Therefore, attempting to rather save the other Estonians as opposed to destroying them.

In comparing the structure of the three chapters there is very little difference. All chapters use names and pictures in a similar way. That being by sprinkling into the narrative different names which slightly disrupt the narrative and using textbooks as lists of Soviet heroes. Furthermore, the pictures used next to the text of the chapter are all only of pro-Soviet people or Soviet locations. In every chapter, the authors avoid the use of enemy names, with the Estonian independence movement always being referred to as simply the bourgeoisie and nothing else. If there is a need to name enemies the authors only use titles and surnames.

In comparing the connections found in the three textbooks there is only a difference between the early Stalinist textbook and the later textbooks. On one side there is the blamelessness of the USSR with Stalinism and on the other side, there is the international conspiracy with the Stagnation.

In comparing the biases found in the three textbooks there are two. The pro-Soviet bias and the anti-Polish bias. The pro-Soviet bias maintains that the Soviet state did everything correctly, that the faults and ills that plagued the people, such as famine and unrest, were problems that the Soviet state was not responsible for and tried effectively and tirelessly to solve. The third chapter however takes a different stand. In the third chapter Communist mistakes are laid out and analysed. But there is a buffer, the text does not criticise the Soviet state, but the puppet Estonian commune, making the criticism less direct. All in all, the third text does diverge from the rest, by setting out to criticise and analyse.

The anti-Polish position is expressed by only the Soviet Russian authors and not the Soviet Estonian authors. Probably because in the Estonian conflict the Polish war has little bearing. Even so between the Soviet Russian textbooks, there is evolution, where the first is an existential enemy in the first chapter and in the second chapter, they become just another tool of the international conspiracy.

The myth of the international conspiracy manifests itself in all three chapters. In the first chapter Šestakov attempts to create an image of an innocent Soviet Russia that everyone wanted to destroy just because it existed. In the second chapter Berhin attempts to construct and show a

large, complex and competent international conspiracy headed by France and Britain. In the third chapter, the authors paint the Estonian War for Independence as just another battlefield in the struggle against the international conspiracy.

Even though the conspiracy exists in all three texts, it does so with a different level of strength and depth in each. Sestakov's chapter blames France, Britain and Japan for the Civil war but he does not create a large and cohesive structure of command and cooperation. One reason for this is that for Stalinism there was one great enemy at the time, which was the German Reich. Meaning that the policies under Stalinism probably did not want to ostracise any potential allies that the Soviets could use and manipulate. Therefore, there was no need to ferment any anger against France, Britain or the US.

The second chapter is far more pronounced. Berhin clearly states multiple times that there is an international conspiracy and that every belligerent against Soviet Russia is a member of that conspiracy. In Berhin's text the enemies are not singular states nor organisations, but a single immense enemy that is cooperation on multiple fronts. The singular enemy under the Stagnation makes sense because the Soviets needed an enemy against whom to focus their population.

The third chapter contains the international conspiracy, but it is not as pronounced as in the second chapter. Namely, Estonia is a battleground for the imperialists and workers, but multiple times in the text the Estonian government is shown to be an independent entity which is not synonymous with the other imperialist powers. This is shown when the Estonian government goes to beg for help and therefore help is not self-evident. This means that the Estonian government is more than just a puppet of the conspiracy.

The second myth that permeates in the chapters is the myth of the leadership. In the first chapter, it takes the form of Stalin's myth of Trotsky as the internal enemy. This is a deeply Stalinist myth where there is one face to the internal enemy and the internal enemy is of grave importance. Both issues would weaken in later decades. The myth of the internal enemy would weaken, and it would become just another facet of the international conspiracy. Because of that, the internal enemy became the external enemy and the face of the enemy shifted to that of the West as a whole. This is also probably the reason why this myth is not present in the later texts and has seemingly been replaced with the international conspiracy.

In the second chapter, the myth of leadership manifests itself in the form of Lenin as the mythical hero and a source of truth. In the chapter, Lenin is constantly quoted to support the

authority of the narrative, presenting him as a source of truth. Moreover, Lenin has mystical powers which directly influence the course of events. Added to that the presence of Stalin is significantly reduced in comparison to the Stalinist textbook. He is no longer a central figure, but a side character in Lenin's great epic. This signifies the shift that occurred in the Union after the Thaw, where Stalin became the villain. And it also signifies a quality of the Stagnation era where rather than saving or condemning Stalin, the Soviets were just silent about him.

The third chapter does not include Lenin in the same manner. Lenin is not structured as the source of truth and the narrative stands alone. In the third chapter, Lenin has a different function. Lenin is used to twist the Communist defeat in the Estonian Independence War into a victory, soothing issues and pointing out how the Estonian communists were victorious and brave. In the chapter, Lenin is treated as a patriarchal authority figure, but he is not directly assigned a mythical or divine status.

In short there are several differences between the Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors. The main differences being in the myths told through the textbooks. In the Soviet Estonian chapter, the influence and importance of Lenin is reduced compared to the other chapters. The influence of the international conspiracy is also not as important. Also, there is a difference between the biases present in the chapters. Soviet Estonian authors do not present as much bias in comparison to the other chapters. Pro-soviet bias is weaker, and the pro-Slavic or anti-Polish bias is completely missing. There is also a difference between how the Soviet Estonian authors approach the friend and foe dichotomy, where they did not make the distinctions as sharp as the Soviet Russian authors did.

2.3. The Era of Russian Expansion and the Livonian War

The first text of the topic is the thirteenth chapter of A. M Pankratova's textbook of Soviet history, printed in 1941. The text is from the first occupation of Estonia and as such is among the earliest Soviet history textbooks in Estonian. It is a translated text from Russian and the reason it was chosen was to give an example of an early text of Soviet/Stalinist ideology but from another author at the time.

The second text of the topic is the fourth chapter of M. Netškina's & P. Leibengrub's textbook of Soviet history, printed in 1975. This is a recurring textbook, and it was chosen because the analysis of another chapter from the same textbook can give a deeper understanding of the structures and styles employed by the authors and unlock the textbook more than a single chapter can. As such it is a Stagnation era textbook and comparing it with another Stalinist era author can expose more of the changes that took place between periods.

The third text on the topic is the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters of J. Kahk's, H. Palamets's & S. Vahtre's textbook on Soviet Estonia, printed in 1974. It is also a recurring textbook and was chosen because of its link to the second textbook. As such it is the Soviet Estonian textbook. The choice was also made because the three chapters from this textbook correlate to the chapters found in the Soviet Russian textbooks.

2.3.1. Pankratova (Stalinism) - The Expansion of Russia and its Development into a Multi-ethnic Nation

2.3.1.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The use of vocabulary in the chapter is highly emotional. The author attempts to convince the reader of the validity of the chapter by embellishing the events and infusing the events with an unreasonable amount of importance and weight. For example, the author writes that "The manly defence of the city enabled peace talks" (Pankratova 1941: 196), "An uncountable number of prisoners were taken out of Moscow" (Pankratova 1941:192) and "In family life, raw emotion and cruelty ruled" (Pankratova 1941: 203). In all the examples the author is attempting to manipulate the reader by first framing the historic narrative so that certain events seem worse or better in the context of the textbook. Moreover, the author is also priming the reader by offering the conclusion before the argument, colouring the entire text that follows the conclusion in either a favourable or negative light.

Within the structure of the chapter, there is one notable peculiarity. It is the appeal for authority. The author quotes Lenin as an authority figure. The author writes that "'Nation,' says

Lenin ‘Was divided into singular lands, some into duchies, which had maintained elements of their previous autonomy within their governance, and in some cases also armies’” (Pankratova 1941: 190). In Soviet historiography, quotations from Lenin and Marx were mandatory whatever the subject. Such an approach created a unified and seamless ideology which flowed without contradictions through all aspects of Soviet life. Moreover, the quotations not only unified the ideology, but also gave authority to all the different manifestations of ideology like textbooks or academic papers. However, such quotations also note heavy ideological sections in the textbooks because they either highlight the importance of some events or empower the effects of less notable or important events, all because of authority.

There is one major string of connections within the text. That connection is Russia as the victim of circumstances within the Livonian war. The ideas which are connected are Russia’s geographic position, The antagonism of the neighbouring states and Russia’s internal instability. In the chapter, there are two reasons for the beginning of the Livonian war. Even though the authors admit that the Livonian war is caused by Russian aggression, they attempt to justify it with two arguments. The first is Russia’s geographic location where the dominion over the Baltic coast is Russia’s right because of the landlocked nature of the state (Pankratova 1941: 188). The second reason was that Russia’s neighbours were interested in cutting Russia off from Europe (Pankratova 1941: 188).

Since the Livonian war ended with a defeat for Russia, the authors write two reasons for that defeat. The first reason is the involvement of antagonistic neighbouring states in the Livonian territories, the states being the Swedes, Danes and Poles (Pankratova 1941:193). The second reason was the instability of the state caused by the infighting of the feudal lords at the time (Pankratova 1941: 196-197). In all the examples the Russian state declared war and lost that war because of reasons beyond their own control and responsibility. This way the Russian state can seem both the victim of circumstances and maintain its virtue in the eyes of the reader.

There is some pro-Russian bias in the chapter. A few examples include “The fast victory of the Russians over the politically disunited Siberian khans can be explained by Russian technological superiority” (Pankratova 1941: 200) and “The manly defence of Pskov” (Pankratova 1941: 196). However, they are not major forms of bias, merely short conclusions which prefer the Russian side and do not delve deeper into the complicated history.

2.3.1.2. *Myth Analysis*

In the chapter, there are several myths. The first is Ivan IV as a cultural icon, the second is the class war, the third is the nobility as the source of all evil and the final myth is the family as a heavily patriarchal structure.

In the chapter, Ivan IV is treated as a cultural icon. Of all the ills and wrongs he committed during his reign the authors either do not cover them, attribute them to someone else or claim that some acts were just for the greater good. In the chapter the author claims that Ivan IV was talented, smart, well educated, well read and in love with writing. Moreover, he had a sharp and quick mind (Pankratova 1941: 196). The author does cover the czar's cruelty but partially attributes that to the actions of the noble class at the time (Pankratova 1941: 197). That attribution alleviates some of Ivan IV's responsibility for his own actions and through the glowing praise, the czar comes across to the reader as a righteous ruler.

The class war is a major myth that permeates the text. The main motif of the class war is played out in the tensions between the nobility of Russia and the peasantry of Russia. Examples of that tension include "the nobles raked the peasantry" (Pankratova 1941: 180), "in the wars between nobles, the peasantry suffered first and foremost" (Pankratova 1941: 192) and "merchants fleeced the Siberian locals by getting them drunk and buying furs off of them for nothing" (Pankratova 1941: 200). In the chapter the author is making the claim that all of history is a clear and distinct struggle between multiple classes, like the merchants, nobility, and peasantry. However, the reality is not as simple, the distinctions not as clear and the distortion can manipulate the worldview of the reader significantly.

The last significant myth in the chapter is the myth of the strongly patriarchal family unit. The author claims that "In family life, raw emotion and cruelty ruled. The father had full dominion over slaves, over women and over children. He was also ready to use violence over the slightest provocation." (Pankratova 1941: 203). Such a framing depicts a very stark, and dire family life for everyone in Russia at the time. This also continues the trend where the Soviet Union had serious issues with patriarchy on paper but practised it liberally in its own political system.

2.3.2. Netškina & Leibengrub (Stagnation) The Emergence of a Centralised Russia and its Development

2.3.2.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The use of vocabulary in the chapter is tinted with emotion. The authors use emotionally charged words to convey complex meanings and create simple conclusions. This both supports the validity of the text by engaging the reader, but it also condenses the text down into a more concise narrative which is easier to tell. Examples of this include “An awesome battle began” (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 88), “Devastating feudal wars began” (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 98) and “Violence was used either considerately, painfully, plentifully or manfully” (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 114). In doing so the authors can easily manipulate the readers by using few but powerful words.

In regard to the structure of the chapter, there is only one element of note. That element is the reinforcement of the text through referencing. For instance, the authors reference Karl Marx in the text. The authors write that Karl Marx gave the battle of Kulikovo high praise (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 88). Again, it is the example of the mandatory quotations from Marx and Lenin. They are clear manifestations of the totalitarian and unified Soviet ideology. Every time the quotation appears it brings a strong ideological authority to the narrative, under which historic events can more easily be simplified, strengthened, or downplayed. It is a tactic of political rhetoric, where both the author is strengthened by the appeal and the party is strengthened, because the action paints both to be unquestionably in the right.

There is one major string of connections within the text. It is the idea of Russia as a victim in the Livonian war. The authors claim that Russia had the right to fight its way to the Baltic coast just because it was landlocked and that the coastal territories had belonged to the Russian states since ancient times (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 107). Moreover, neighbouring states such as the Livonian Order, Sweden and Poland blocked travel between western Europe and wanted Russia to slow in its development (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 107-108).

The defeat of Russia was also caused by influences out of its control. The nobility, for its own greed, betrayed Russia during the Livonian war and weakened it significantly (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 109). Also, Russia found itself on two fronts, the Western against the Swedes Poles and the Danes, but also in the East against Crimean Tatars (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980:109). Through this, the authors are trying to make the claim that both the war declared was justified and the defeat in that war was beyond Russia's control. In this, the authors are attempting to save the grace and virtue of the Russian state by showing it in the best light and perspective possible.

In the chapter, there is light pro-Russian bias. Examples of this include "The Polish-Lithuanian nobles pushed the Great Horde to attack Russia" (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 94), "Russian technology was superior" (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 105), "Russia was more advanced than Kazan" (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 107) and "The Livonian Order always threatened Russia" (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 107-108). This is the way the authors position Russia, framing it as more advanced and efficient than its eastern enemies, therefore giving it a right to conquer. Also being constantly threatened on its western side, where therefore it had the moral right to fight defensive wars.

2.3.2.2. Myth Analysis

There are two main myths in the chapter. The first is the class war and the second is the heavily patriarchal family structure. One of the subheadings of the chapter is titled class war and in it the authors argue that as the nobility engaged more in the economy, they raised taxes and made the lives of the peasantry harder, even forcing the peasants to flee across the Urals (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 99). Another claim is that as the state solidified, slavery was strengthened through the will of the nobility because there was more stability in the political system (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 103). The class war extended out of Russia as well "Local Estonian and Latvian forces aided the Russians because they hated the German nobility ruling over them" (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 108). Through this the authors convey to the reader a world view wherein across the world there were sharp and belligerent divisions between classes of people. This is a simplification of history through a single axis and so heavily distorting.

The second myth is the heavily patriarchal structure. The authors claim that the head of the family was the man, women and children had to obey him. Along with that was the liberal use of physical violence (Netškina & Leibengrub 1980: 114). The authors are framing the past as deeply patriarchal and also along with that making the claim that their concurrent time was not only better, but the opposite of the ideals presented in the chapter.

2.3.3. Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre (Soviet Estonian) - The Livonian War. Estonia Divided Between Multiple States

2.3.3.1. *Discourse Analysis*

The vocabulary used in this chapter is slightly emotional and has only a small number of conclusions hidden within itself. The construction of short conclusions to long and complicated events makes the narrative more concise and easier to consume but distorts history and manipulates the reader. Examples of this include “Estonians and Latvians felt blazing joy over the defeat of the Livonian Order” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 38), “Tartu strongly declined” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 46) and “The Swedes did not give the starving people any food in amounts worth mentioning” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 45).

Within the chapter in regard to structure, there is very little of note. The chapter is structured as a historic narrative, telling the story of the Livonian war, the Swedish time and the way of life in the 16th and 17th centuries.

In the chapter, there is one string of connections which are of note. That is the idea that Russia was the victim in the Livonian war. The authors justify Russia’s declaration by both arguing that Russia needed access to the sea and by claiming that the Livonian Order was too weak to survive. Moreover, the authors claim that the neighbouring states were conspiring to stop Russia’s communication with Western Europe, attempting to hold it down (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 37). Through this the authors are claiming that Russian aggression was justified and that in seeking to survive and expand any state has an integral right to declare wars of aggression and conquest. The reasons for Russia’s defeat are not explained in the chapter at any

length. The authors simply show the Russians being outnumbered by the Swedes, Danes and Poles (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 39).

In the chapter, there is a lot of anti-Swedish bias. Examples of bias include “Because of military overextension Sweden was always in financial difficulty” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 42), “The Swedish legally endorsed the slavery of Estonians” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 44), “The Swedish administration did not give Estonians food in amounts worth mentioning to alleviate the famine, whereas they did have the means to do so” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 45). Through the bias the authors are creating an undesirable overlord in order to frame any other power that ruled over Estonia as evil. Through the frame, the occupation of Russian forces can more easily be argued as benevolent later by the authors.

2.3.3.2. Myth Analysis

There are two myths in the chapter. The first is the class war and the second is Estonians as perpetual victims. The class war is presented in the chapter on multiple occasions “The peasants promised to kill all the nobility” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 38), “In the oppression of the peasantry the Swedish and German nobility found a common language” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 43) and “The class war strengthened after the return of property to the nobles and the famine” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 46). The authors are boiling history down to a single axis, that being a struggle between classes, where classes have distinct divisions and where they are engaged in constant warfare. This is both a dangerous simplification and a falsification of history that can distort the reader's perspective on history.

The second myth is Estonians as perpetual victims. The authors make many claims “Estonian food was uniform and boring” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 48), “There were few joyful events in a peasant's life” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 48), “No Estonian students attended Tartu university as of current knowledge” (Kahk, Palamets & Vahtre 1974: 52). Essentially the authors are claiming that under Swedish rule the Estonians were unhappy, unfulfilled, and remained uneducated. The authors are probably attempting to downplay the importance of the Swedish age in Estonia in order to strengthen the Russian age and through that strengthen the legitimacy of the Russian occupation.

2.3.4. Conclusions from the Livonian War

In comparing the vocabulary of the three chapters there is a difference between all of them. The first chapter is highly emotional and manipulative. The second chapter does not present as high of an emotional charge as the first, but a significant charge is still there. The third chapter on the other hand only has a slight emotional charge in it. These differences show that there is an evolution in Soviet Russian authors as through time the manipulating nature of their textbooks lessens. It also shows that Soviet Estonian authors do not engage with emotional language as much as Soviet Russian authors do.

In comparing the structure of the three chapters there is a difference between Soviet Estonian and Soviet Russian authors. Namely, Soviet Russian authors make appeals to authority in the textbooks to Lenin, whereas the Soviet Estonian authors do not, at least in their three specific chapters. This shows that Soviet Estonian authors are less likely to rely on appeals to authority and therefore have less ideology in their textbooks because they are using a certain manipulative tactic less. This does not mean that Soviet Estonian authors do not quote Lenin or Marx, they do because it was a mandatory element of the academia at the time. It simply means they do it less often.

In comparing the connections found in the three chapters there is little difference. All three chapters took the same stance in regard to Russia and its actions during the Livonian war.

In comparing the bias found in the three chapters there was a difference between Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors. The Soviet Russian authors were pro-Russia in the textbook, which should be expected. The Soviet Estonian authors showed strong anti-Swedish and anti-nobility sentiment in the textbook, but they did not show much positive group bias in their textbook.

In comparing the myths found in the three chapters there are both similarities and differences between chapters. When it comes to the similarity the class war is present in all three chapters and its manifestations do not significantly change between them. This is probably because it is one of the core principles of Soviet ideology and therefore one of the most common characteristics of the ideology.

The treatment of the peasantry does differ between the Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian chapters. In both, the Soviet Russian chapters the family unit is depicted as patriarchal and even though the suffering of the peasants is shown, there are few specific details about it. In the Estonian chapter on the other hand there is no mention of a patriarchal family structure. Moreover, the Estonian family unit is detailed rather expansively, going into yearly practices and cuisine. Even though the Estonian peasantry are treated as complete victims in their own land, no negative attributes are assigned to them.

2.4. Discussion

The analysis of all the textbooks chosen has shown that there are differences in the ideology present when comparing Soviet Russian authors to Soviet Estonian authors. The intensity of the ideology present varies between the two groups of textbooks. There is a difference of the scale of ideology present within the Soviet Estonian textbooks, where the nature of ideology remains similar but its manifestations in the textbooks are less present and manipulate less.

To reach this conclusion the paper created a methodological approach where the analysis was divided into five. First, there were four divisions of discourse analysis, analysing the unstated but meaningful elements within the textbooks. Within discourse analysis, the first category was vocabulary, which analysed the word choice and sentence structure of the different chapters. The second category was structure, which analysed how the chapters were framed and how the composition and overall delivery of the narrative contained meanings. The third category was connections, which analysed the webs of ideas connected with each other in the chapters, focusing on how those connections gave meanings to each element of the web. The fourth category was bias, which analysed how group preferences manifested themselves in the chapters and analysed the distinctions that the authors were making in the chapters.

The fifth category was myth analysis. Drawing from Barthes's theory, myth analysis sought to analyse the directly stated meanings in the textbooks, essentially analysing the meanings that the authors held as self-evident truths. Myth analysis focused on specific myths found in each chapter and compared either the same myths found in different textbooks or noted the absence of certain myths in textbooks which shared a topic.

2.4.1. Discourse Analysis

In comparing the vocabulary Soviet Russian authors used emotionally charged words and diluted complex historic events with simplified and biased word choices. They made sweeping value and aesthetic judgements. Moreover, the Soviet Russian authors created sharp friend and foe distinctions and attempted to create a black and white world, where everything that was part of the ideological world was declared to be good and everything that was even slightly against it was decried as evil. Compared to that, Soviet Estonian authors were far milder, being more descriptive and not as prescriptive, even when covering ideologically negative topics such as the ancient Estonian religion where they refrained from value judgements. However, they were prescriptive at times, especially when it came to covering the Swedish age in Estonia. This shows that the Soviet Estonian authors were engaged in ideological manipulation, but simply at a smaller scale.

In comparing the structure there is only one difference of note between Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors. There is a difference in the frequency of how many times the authors appeal to authority in the textbooks. Whilst Soviet Estonian authors do appeal to the authority of Lenin and Marx at times, like alleviating the defeat of Estonian communists after the Estonian independence war, they do not engage in the practice as often as Soviet Russian authors do. This means that they are engaging in manipulatory tactics less often and therefore have less ideology in their textbooks.

In comparing the connections within the textbooks there is very little difference between the authors. At times some singular ideas from the web change, but the overall meaning and structure of ideas within the chapters remain so similar that there is no significant ideological difference between them.

In comparing the bias within the textbooks there are stark differences between Soviet Russian authors and Soviet Estonian authors. Namely, every Soviet Russian author was heavily pro-Slavic or Pro-Russian. They attributed very positive value and aesthetic judgments to both the Slavic people and Russia. The Soviet Estonian authors on the other hand mostly were neutral in ethnic bias, however, they did exhibit examples of it, such as in the description of the Livonian

war. On the other hand, all chapters were uniformly pro-peasantry and anti-nobility. In the ethnic bias, Soviet Estonian authors showed less favouritism. But in the class war, they exhibited the same amount. So, in total, Soviet Estonian authors exhibited slightly less ideology.

In comparing the two different discourses of history there are differences of approach, style and tone. There could be a few explanations for this. When it comes to vocabulary for example the differences could be attributed to culture, because Estonians are not as emotionally expressive in language as Russians are. That difference becomes more evident through comparing the larger pool of Estonian literature to Russian literature. In structure too the reasons for the difference may be that Soviet Estonians did not innately view Lenin or Marx as great leaders, because both figures were far more profound cultural icons in Soviet Russian society and not in Soviet Estonian society. Therefore, Soviet Estonian authors would not and could not rely on their authority as much as their Soviet Russian compatriots.

2.4.2. Myth Analysis

In comparing myths there were a few standouts. In the first set of chapters, the Soviet Estonian authors were not as tribalistic in regard to other cultural groups as the Soviet Russian authors were. Soviet Estonian authors did not divide history into oppressive cultures and oppressed cultures, whilst that is how Soviet Russian authors divided history.

In the second set of chapters, the international conspiracy is a myth that permeates all three textbooks. However, in the Soviet Estonian textbook, the myth is not as pronounced, and the enemies of the Soviets are not framed as uniform monoliths. The Soviet Russian authors paint their civil war as a struggle between two forces, but in the Estonian independence war there are multiple participants, and the Estonian government is granted a modicum of independence within the narrative. Another myth in the second set of chapters is the myth of mythological leadership. For the Soviet Russian authors, Lenin is a god-like source of all truth and authority. For the Soviet Estonian authors, Lenin is a fatherly figure but in no way capable of moving warring fronts with his words alone.

In the third set of chapters, the most important myth was that of the patriarchal family unit. Soviet Russian authors depict their own family structure as deeply dysfunctional and commit

hypocrisy as well when condemning its patriarchal nature. The Soviet Estonian authors depict Estonian lives as miserable but do not depict the structure of their lives as innately dysfunctional. Functionally both family units were similar in structure when bearing in mind the time period and therefore there was room for such criticism. The authors simply did not take the opportunity.

There might be a few reasons for the differences found in the myths present. One of the major reasons is probably that Soviet Estonian authors did not want to antagonise the Estonians as much and so were far more lenient when describing Estonian history. In every example Soviet Estonian authors were less divisive than their contemporary Soviet Russian counterparts. Another reason for the differences might be that Soviet Estonia was not totally converted into the Soviet ideology and there was innate resistance even among Soviet Estonian academics. The reason for this might be that Soviet ideology did not originate in Estonia and therefore was fundamentally alien to Estonian society until the end, even though a large number of people played their part in it.

Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to create a comparative study, comparing the ideology in the historiography of Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors. The study focused on old high-school and middle-school textbooks as sources. The reason for this was that education is one of the most important parts of any state's ideological apparatus. It is the mechanism within which ideology is most apparent and most present. Furthermore, children in middle school and high school are most vulnerable to manipulation because on one side they have developed enough to understand complex ideas but have yet to develop a full worldview which would protect them against manipulation.

It became apparent that in the Soviet Estonian education system there were two kinds of textbooks. One kind was textbooks written by Soviet Russian academics and translated into Estonian. The other kind was textbooks written by Soviet Estonian academics. This gave an opportunity to compare different authors, cultures and eras to each other within the confines of the same language, topic and allegedly same ideology.

Using this opportunity, the paper first set out to define ideology as a group of ideas in a hierarchical system maintained by power and used to simplify the world for its adherents. Then it defined historiography as both a critical lens in examining the work of historians and as a producer of easily consumable narratives for the public. Following that the paper covered Soviet historiography by showing its changes through time and its structural peculiarities such as the *Goskomizdat*, which headed the massive writing and publication system in the Union. After that, the paper also covered some of the work already done on the subject, like the work of Raudsepp and Vilumets. This was done to place this paper in the larger academic field.

Another step was defining the semiotics of history for use in the analysis. In the chapter Juri Lotman, Boris Uspenskij and Vladimir Tropov were covered in order to give a quick overview of how the Tartu-Moscow school saw history and the work of historians from a theoretic perspective. Moreover, the atomistic and holistic approaches to semiotic analysis were

covered and it was shown that it might be preferable for history studies to use the holistic method. Lastly, Roland Barthes was covered because he had his own unique theories about the processes of history writing, especially when it came to structural manipulation.

Continuing, the analysis is broadly divided into two halves, discourse analysis and myth analysis. Through discourse analysis, the vocabulary, structure, connections between ideas and biases were compared and analysed across the textbooks. Myth analysis on the other hand dissected the foundational ideas and the truths that the authors presented as self-evident. Essentially the first half analysed the directly unstated meanings within the textbooks, looking at how the framing and structure of the textbooks added meanings. The second half, composed of myth analysis, analysed the stated meanings in the textbooks and highlighted how certain beliefs echoed through the various textbooks.

In the analysis, three topics were chosen. They were prehistory, the Russian Civil war and the Livonian war. In each topic, the histories of Russia and Estonia were deeply intertwined for both nations went through those events and therefore they were perfect for analysis because the events and individuals in the narrative coincided. Each topic contained within itself three chapters from three different textbooks. The first textbook was from the Stalinist era, the second was from the Stagnation era and the third was a Soviet Estonian textbook, also from the Stagnation era, because Soviet Estonian textbooks were most common in the Stagnation era.

To answer the question of whether there was a difference between the ideology of Soviet Russian and Soviet Estonian authors the paper compared the textbooks through discourse analysis and myth analysis.

In discourse analysis, it was found that Soviet Estonian authors were far milder in their word choice and preferred to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. Soviet Estonian authors made distinctions between ethnic and socio-economic groups, but those distinctions were not as sharp and combative as the distinctions of their Soviet Russian counterparts. Moreover, Soviet Estonian authors did not appeal to the authority of Lenin and Marx as often. Lastly, even though Soviet Estonian authors exhibited in-group bias, in the confines of the class war, they did not exhibit significant ethnic nor cultural bias in their textbooks, whereas Soviet Russian authors were either deeply pro-Slavic or pro-Russian.

Through myth analysis, it became apparent that there were several myths that were shared by all textbooks. In the comparison then it was revealed that the Soviet Estonian authors included

some of those myths in their textbooks in a milder form, which was not as manipulative or ideologically charged. For example, Soviet Estonian authors were not as tribalistic, they did not view the history of the world in most cases as a narrative of oppressed cultures and oppressor cultures. As well in regard to the international conspiracy, Soviet Estonian authors did not frame the conspiracy as a monolith which was perfectly unified against their cause. In it, they viewed the Estonian government, not as a link in the international conspiracy, but rather as a semi-autonomous entity which had lost its way. Lastly, Soviet Estonian authors did not criticise their own historical Estonian family unit as much as their Soviet Russian counterparts criticised the historical Russian family unit.

In the end, this paper has found that at least when it came to the chapters and topics analysed there were differences between the ideologies of Soviet Estonian and Soviet Russian authors. The textbooks of Soviet Estonian authors contained less ideology within them than their counterparts. There can be multiple causes and explanations for this. One explanation for this can be cultural, where Estonians are simply not as emotionally expressive as their counterparts. Another may be political, where the Soviet Union did not want to antagonise its constituent republics, so allowed for the construction of less divisive textbooks.

By analysing the discourse this paper was able to reveal the ideological differences between two social groups within the Soviet Union. Discourse analysis and myth analysis can be used to identify and examine the manifestations of different ideas, ideologies and cultures, but their limitation is that they can't fully explain the reasons for their existence. That is where the limit of this approach lies. In order to start explaining why there are differences a deeper study into both the participant cultures has to be undertaken. For that approach, the theories and methodologies of cultural semiotics would be much more appropriate.

This paper covered a tiny selection of the Soviet Estonian educational system. That system was enormous and had its unique peculiarities when compared to the Soviet Russian system. There are several approaches that can be taken in order to further unlock that educational system, both to understand how it operated, what it produced and how it fit into the larger Soviet system. One approach could be increasing the quantity of material and with that answer larger questions regarding the reasons for the differences in the first place. Another approach could be to add layers of complexity, analyse the textbooks in the context of the events surrounding them, adding more historic analysis to the comparison. Yet another approach could be to shift the focus to

university education, where the ideology would probably be more complex and written out. All in all, there are a few approaches, should anyone want to research this topic further.

In the end, the most important question is the reason why this topic should be researched at all. Not only was the educational system a major part of the Soviet System, but its influence can be felt to this day in all the old Soviet Socialist Republics. The children educated in that system, whose worldview was affected by Soviet ideology, influence society to this day. The generations that dictate our present-day politics, culture and economy were mostly educated in the Soviet system. The influence of that education varies, but it is there. Estonia, the country that recovered fastest from the ruin that the Soviet Union brought, probably owes much to the fact that communist ideology was not that accepted and widespread during the occupation. However other ex-Soviet countries have recovered at a different rate, and it is an interesting question how different the ideologies of the other Soviet Socialist Republics were compared to Soviet Russia and how much does that difference correlate to the recovery after the Soviet collapse.

In the post-Soviet world, Russia is one of the most affected by the ruin that Soviet ideology brought to it. In no other country was Soviet ideology more widespread than in Soviet Russia. That influence is seen to this day where most of the members of Russia's government are ex-Soviet officials. Moreover, Soviet ideology survives in the narratives generated by Russia and around the ex-Soviet republics. One of the major topics is the validity and value of old Soviet memorials. Another example manifests in Russian attempts to validate itself through the Soviet Union, by claiming that the fall of the Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century. And in the end, such narratives are not benevolent but can fuel truly devastating actions, such as the Russo-Ukrainian war. Part of the reason for the war was to force Ukraine back into the status of a satellite state and buffer state. Such a status has part of its roots in Soviet ideology and a part of its roots in Russian imperial ideology. All in all, ideas are the most important things in the world because they motivate action and action directly changes the world, therefore ideologies should never be taken lightly.

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Monthly Review Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1972. *Mythologies*. The Noonday Press.
- 1989. *The Rustle of Language*. Hill and Wang.
- Becker, Petra. 2003. “Prozess der Entstaatlichung des zentralistischen Buchverlagswesens.”
Verlagspolitik und Buchmarkt in Russland, 1985 - 2002. Harrassowitz.
- Berhin I. 1980. *NSV Liidu Ajalugu Õpik X Klassile*. Valgus.
- Boyko, Taras. (2015). Describing the past: Tartu-Moscow School ideas on history, historiography, and the historian’s craft. *Sign System Studies*, 43(2/3), 269-280.
University of Tartu Press.
- Breisach, Ernst. 1989. *Historiography Ancient, Medieval & Modern*. The University of Chicago Press.
- (2007). *Historiography*. Third Edition, The University of Chicago Press.
- Coselle, Daniel; Clarke, Isabelle. 2015. Episode 2. *Apocalypse: Stalin*. CC&C, ECPAD.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology an Introduction*. Verso.
- Eller, Cynthia. 2000. *The Myth of Matriarchal Prehistory: Why An Invented Past Will Not Give Women a Future*. Beacon Press.
- Enteen, George R. 2002. Recent Writings about Soviet Historiography. *Slavic Review*, 61(2), 357–363. Cambridge University Press.
- Froese, Paul. 2004. *Forced Secularization in Soviet Russia: Why an Atheistic Monopoly Failed*. Baylor University.
- Ganes, Elliot. 2001. Semiotic Analysis of Myth: A Proposal for an Applied Methodology.
The American Journal of Semiotics, 17(2), 311-327. Philosophy Documentation Center.
- Goldstein, Leon J. 1976. *Historical Knowing*. University of Texas Press.
- 1996. The What and the Why of History. *Philosophical Essays*. E. J. Brill.
- Kahk, Juhan; Palamets, Hillar; Vahtre, Sulev. 1982. *Eesti NSV ajaloo*. Valgus.
- Kenes, Peter. 1977. *Civil War in South Russia, 1919-1920*. University of California Press.

- Ho, LaiYee; Limpaecher, Alex. 2021. *What is Discourse Analysis?*. Essential Guide to Coding Qualitative Data, accessed 12 June 2022, <https://delvetool.com/blog/discourseanalysis>.
- Lotman, Juri; Piatigorsky A. M. 1978. New Literary History. *Soviet Semiotics and Criticism: An Anthology*, 9(2), 233-244. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lotman, Juri. & Uspenskij Boris A. 1984. *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*. University of Michigan.
- Lotman, Juri. 1991. Semiotics and the historical sciences. *Dialogue and Technology: Art and Knowledge*, 165-180. Springer.
- 1993. Zimnie zametki o letnih shkolah. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 3, 40-42.
- 2009. *Culture and Explosion*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lotman, Mihhail. 2002. Atomistic versus holistic semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies*, 30(2), 513–527. University of Tartu Press.
- Lõhmus, M; Siilivask, K. 1973. *Eesti NSV Ajaloost Keskoolile*. Valgus.
- Marx, Karl; Engels, Friedrich. 1970. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Foreign Languages Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1992. *Early Writings*. Penguin Books.
- McCall, Daniel. F. 1973. Prehistory as a Kind of History. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 3(4), 733-739. The MIT Press.
- McClauey, Martin. 2019. *Stalin and Stalinism*. Routledge.
- McParlan, Thomas. J. 2010. *Lonergan and Historiography: The Epistemological Philosophy of History*. University of Missouri Press.
- Mertelsmann, Olaf. 2007. The Private Sphere in Estonia during Stlainism. *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры*, 18, 58–81. Magnitogorsk House Printing.
- Nescolarde-Selva, Josue A; Usó-Doménech, Jose-Luis; Gash, Hugo. 2017. *What are Ideological Systems?* MDPI.
- Netškina, Militsa. & Leibengrub, Pavel. 1980. *NSV liidu ajalugu õpik VII klassile*. Valgus.
- Nutt, Mart. 2016. What Made the Restoration of Estonian Independence Possible?. *The International Centre for Defence and Security*, accessed 07. June 2022, <https://icds.ee/en/what-made-the-restoration-of-estonian-independence-possible/>.
- Olesk, Sirje. 2003. Laine põhi. *Võim ja kultuur*, 465-480. EKM teaduskirjastus.
- Pankratova Anna. M. 1941. *NSVL Ajalugu I osa*. RK Pedagoogiline Kirjandus.

- Peirumaa, R. 2004. *Hruštšovi aja "Sula" ning muudatused ENSV kunstipoliitikas ja -elus 1950. aastate teisel poolel*. Tartu University.
- Plamper, Jan. 2012. *The Stalin Cult a Study in the Alchemy of Power*. Yale University Press.
- Priested Birgitte. B. (2017). *The New Russian Book A Graphic Cultural History*. Springer International Publishing AG.
- Raudsepp, Anu. 2005. *Ajaloo õpetamise korraldus Eesti NSV Eesti õppekeeltega üldhariduskoolides 1944-1985*. Tartu ülikooli kirjastus.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 2006. *Discourse on Inequality*. Digireads.
- Sandle, Mark. (2003). "A Triumph of Ideological Hairdressing? Intellectual Life in the Brezhnev Era Reconsidered." *Brezhnev Reconsidered*, 135-164. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, Kevin. B. 2003. The Ideology of Education. *The Commonwealth, the Market, and America's Schools*. State University of New York Press.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr. I. 2002. *The Gulag Archipelago 1918-1956 An Experiment in Literary Investigation*. HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Šestakov, Andrei. V. 1941. *Nõukogude Sotsialistlike Vabariikide Liidu Ajalugu I*. Pedagoogiline Kirjandus.
- 1940. *Nõukogude Sotsialistlike Vabariikide Liidu Ajalugu II*. Pedagoogiline Kirjandus.
- Tamm, Marek. 2017. Introduction: Semiotics and history revisited. *Sign System Studies*, 45(3/4), 211-229. University of Tartu Press.
- Taubman, William. 2005. *Khrushchev the Man his Era*. A Viacom Company.
- Therborn, Göran. 1980. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. Verso.
- Thompson, William J. 1997. *Khrushchev a Political Life*. Macmillan Pres Ltd.
- Tucker, Aviezer. 2004. Our Knowledge of the Past. *A Philosophy of Historiography*. Cambridge University Press.
- Undusk, Jaan. 2003. Retooriline suund Eesti Nõukogude ajalookirjutistes. *Võim ja kultuur*, 41-68. EKM teaduskirjastus.
- Uspenskij, Boris. A. 1996. Istoriya i semiotika. *Izbrannye trudy*, 1. 9-70. Гнозис.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. 1995. Discourse Semantics and Ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 243-289. Sage Publishing.
- (2005). *Ideoloogia multidistsiplinaarne käsitus*. Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Vilumets, Maarja. (2017). *Haridussüsteemi ümberkorraldamine Eesti NSV-s 1940-1953*. Tartu

ülikool.

Waring, Hansun Z. 2017. *Discourse Analysis: The Questions Discourse Analysts Ask and How They Answer Them*. Routledge.

Williams, Brooke. 1988. Opening dialogue between the discipline of history and semiotics. *The Semiotic Web 1987*, 821-834. Mouton de Gruyter.

Yilmaz, H. (2015). "National Identities in Soviet Historiography." *The Rise of Nations Under Stalin*. Routledge.

Resüme

Antud töö põhieesmärgiks on analüüsida erinevusi nõukogude ajaloo kirjutustes eksisteerivate ideoloogiate vahel, võrreldes Nõukogude Vene ja Nõukogude Eesti ajalooõpikuid. Töö materjaliks on nii põhi- kui keskkooli ajalooõpikud. Selline valik on tehtud esiteks sellepärast, et haridussüsteem on iga riigi ideoloogilise aparraadi tähtsaim osa. Teiseks ka sellepärast, et põhi- ja keskkooli lapsed on kõige kergemini mõjutatavad ideoloogia poolt, sest nad on küllalt vanad, et aru saada keerulistest ideedest, aga nende maailmapilt ei ole veel küllalt välja kujunenud, et kaitsta neid piisavalt manipulatsiooni eest. Seetõttu on nendes õpikutes kõige lihtsam leida ja võrrelda ideoloogia ilminguid.

Nõukogude Eesti haridussüsteemis eksisteeris kahte tüüpi õpikuid. Esimene tüüp oli pärit stalinismi ajast, mil terve Nõukogude Eesti hariduskirjandus vahetati välja Nõukogude Vene akadeemikute tõlkekirjanduse vastu. Teine tüüp õpikuid tulid sula ajal, kui liiduvabariikidel lubati kirjutada ja õpetada omaenda ajalugu paralleelselt nõukogude ajalooa. Sellest ajast pärinevad Nõukogude Eesti akadeemikute poolt kirjutatud õpikud. Kaht õpikutüüpi kõrvutades saab võrrelda ajastuid, kultuuri ja autoreid keskkonnas, kus tekstid jagavad keelt, teemat ja väidetavalt sama ideoloogiat.

Töö alguses on defineeritud ideoloogia kui ideede süsteem, kus ideed on üksteisega hierarhilises suhtes ning võim aitab struktuuril ennast koos hoida. Samas on ideoloogia ka tööriist, mille abil selle järgijad lihtsustavad oma maailma. Järgmiseks on defineeritud historiograafia, mis töötab kriitilise tööriistana, hoides ajaloolaste tööd kindlal standardil. Samas toodab see ka lihtsamaid narratiive, mida tavalisel inimesel oleks kerge lugeda. Sellele järgneb nõukogude historiograafia ülevaade, kus tuuakse välja, kuidas Nõukogude Liit muutus läbi aja ja millised olid selle iseärasused. Järgneb põgus ülevaade sellest, milliseid akadeemilisi töid samas teemavaldkonnas on juba varem tehtud, et oleks kergem käesolevat magistratööd akadeemilisele maastikule sobitada.

Järgmine tähtis teema on ajaloo-semiootika. Selles peatükis on esitatud lõike Juri Lotmani, Boris Uspenskij ja Vladimir Tropovi teooriatest, et anda kiire ülevaade Tartu-Moskva kooli vaadetest ajaloolaste ja ajaloo kirjutamise kohta. Lisaks sellele tuuakse välja kaks semiootilist lähenemist analüüsile, milleks on atomistlik ja terviklik lähenemine. Võrreldes lähenemisi võib järeldada, et terviklik lähenemine on parem selleks, et analüüsida ajalugu ja ajaloolisi narratiive. Viimaks antakse ülevaade Roland Barthes'i tööst, kel on ka teooriad ajaloo kirjutamisest ja eriti sellest, kuidas ajaloo kirjutamisega manipuleeritakse.

Järgneb analüüs kahes osas. Esimene osa on diskursusanalüüs ja teine osa on müüdi analüüs. Diskursusanalüüsi abil võrreldakse tekstide sõnakasutust, struktuuri, ideede vahel olevaid ühendusi ja kalduvusi. Müüdi analüüsi abil on võimalik aga uurida ideoloogilisi „enesest mõistetavusi” ehk fundamentaalseid baasväiteid, millelt õpikutes on ajaloo narratiiv üles ehitatud. Põhimõtteliselt tegeleb esimene analüüsiviis välja ütlemata tähendustega, mis ilmnevad narratiivide struktuuri ja raamimise kaudu. Teine pool aga tegeleb välja öeldud tähendustega ning vaatleb, kuidas sarnased ideed korduvad mitmes õpikus.

Analüüsiks on valitud kolm teemat, mille põhjal kolme õpiku peatükki võrrelda. Esimeseks teemaks oli eelajalugu, teiseks Vene kodusõda ja kolmandaks Liivi sõda. Iga teemaga seoses võrreldi kolme peatükki kolmest erinevast õpikust. Esimene ja teine õpik olid kirjutatud Nõukogude Vene autorite poolt, esimene Stalini ajast ja teine stagnatsiooniajast. Kolmas õpik oli alati Nõukogude Eesti autorite õpik, mis oli pärit stagnatsiooni ajast.

Diskursusanalüüsis tuli välja, et Nõukogude Eesti autorite tekstid sisaldasid endas vähem ideoloogiat ja manipuleerisid lugejaga vähem. Nõukogude Eesti autorid eristasid kultuurilisi ja ühiskondlike gruppe, aga need eristused ei olnud nii teravad kui Nõukogude Vene autorite õpikutes. Lisaks sellele ei viidanud Nõukogude Eesti autorid nii tihti ei Leninile ega Marxile ega toetunud oma õpikutes niipalju ideoloogilisele autoriteedile. Viimaks ei ilmnenu Nõukogude Eesti autorite õpikus suurt kallutatust kindlate kultuuriliste gruppide poole, samas kui Nõukogude Vene autorid olid kaldu slaavi hõimude või Venemaa poole.

Müüdi analüüs tõi välja, et oli mitu müüti, mis eksisteerisid kõigis õpikutes. Nõukogude Eesti autorid aga ilmutasid neid müüte nõrgemas vormis kui Nõukogude Vene autorid ning nad ei olnud ideoloogiliselt nii tugevad ja manipuleerivad. Näiteks ei vaadelnud Nõukogude Eesti autorid ajalugu kui võitlust pealesurutud kultuuride ja pealesurujate kultuuride vahel. Lisaks ei näinud Nõukogude Eesti autorid ajaloos üht suurt vandenõud, näiteks vaadeldes Eesti valitsust

kui osati teovõimelist ja iseseisvat vastast, kes oli lihtsalt kaotanud õige tee. Viimaks ei kritiseerinud Nõukogude Eesti autorid nii rängalt ajaloolist eesti perekonna struktuuri, samas kui Nõukogude Vene autorid kritiseerisid rängalt ajaloolist vene perekonna struktuuri.

Lõpuks tuli analüüsist välja, et vahe Nõukogude Vene ja Nõukogude Eesti ajaloõpikute ideoloogia vahel on täiesti olemas. Nõukogude Eesti õpikud sisaldavad endas vähem ideoloogiat ja manipuleerivad lugejaga vähem. Sellele võib olla mitu selgitust. Üks võib olla lihtsalt kultuurilised erinevused, kus eestlased ei väljenda ennast nii emotsionaalselt kui venelased. Teiseks põhjuseks võib olla, et Nõukogude Liit ei tahtnud tekitada ebavajalikku pinget oma liikmesriikide vahel ning ei rünnanud nende kultuuri nii palju.

Diskursusanalüüsimine aitas tuua välja erinevused kahe Nõukogude Liidu sees eksisteeriva sotsiaalse grupi vahel. Diskursusanalüüsi ja müüdianalüüsi saab kasutada selleks, et välja tuua ja aru saada erinevustest ideede, ideoloogiate ja kultuuride vahel, kuid neid ei saa kasutada selleks, et selgitada ja uurida erinevuste põhjusi. Selleks, et selgitada erinevuste põhjusi, oleks tõenäoliselt kohasem kasutada kultuurisemiootika tööriistu ja suuremas mastaabis kultuurteooriat.

See töö uuris ainult väikest osa suurest Nõukogude Eesti haridussüsteemist. Nõukogude haridussüsteem oli hiiglaslik, töötades läbi viie kümnendi oli ta tootikus totalitaarse korra sunnil kõrgem ja tihedam kui võrrelda tänapäeva haridussüsteemidega. Nõukogude süsteemi saab edasi uurida, fokuseerides sellele kuidas ta toimis, mida ta tootis ja kuidas ta sobitus suuremasse Nõukogude süsteemi. Üks lähenemine võiks olla materjali hulga suurendamine, sihiga vastata põhjalikumalt küsimusele miks erinevused eksisteerisid kahe haridussüsteemi vahel. Teine lähenemine võiks lisada analüüsitavaid kihte, lisades materjalile ka ajaloolise konteksti. Samas ka võib teemale läheneda sellega, et fookus läheb ülikooli õpematerjali analüüsimisele. Selles õpematerjalis on tõenäoliselt ideoloogia juba keerulisem ja rohkem välja seletatud. Ühe sõnaga on selle teema edasiseks uurimiseks mitu lähenemist.

Kõige tähtsam on aga küsimus miks seda teemat üldse uurida. Haridussüsteem oli üks kõige tähtsamaid Nõukogude valitsuse tööriistu aga ta mõjud on tunda meie tänapäeva maailmaski. Lapsed keda õpetati Nõukogude haridussüsteemis mõjutavad kõrgel tasemel meie ühiskonda tänapäevani. See sama generatsioon dikteerib iseseisvunud vabariikides poliitikat, kultuuri ja majandust. Nõukogude hariduse mõjud aga varieeruvad ühiskondade vahel. Eesti, riik mis taastus kõike kiiremini kommunismi laastavast mõjust, võlgneb palju faktile, et Nõukogude

ideoloogia ei olnud väga vastuvõetav eestlastele ja ei levinud läbi meie rahva südamete takistusega. Aga iseseisvunud vabariigid on taastunud Nõukogude Liidu kokku kukkumisest erineval kiirusel. Sellest tuleb aga huvitav küsimus milleks on see, et kas on side selle vahel kui palju oli Nõukogude ideoloogia liiduvabariikides levinud ja kui kiiresti nad taastusid pärast kokku kukkumist.

Maailmas pärast Nõukogude liitu on Venemaa riik, mis on mõjutatud kõige rohkem sellest hävingust mida Nõukogude ideoloogia talle tõi. Ei olnud ühtki riiki kus seesama ideoloogia oleks nii levinud ja vastu võetud. Selle ilmingud on ilmselged. Enamus Vene riigitegelasi on kunagised Nõukogude ametnikud või ohvitserid. Venemaa õhutab tänapäevani Nõukogude ideoloogiast sündinud narratiive. Nõukogude monumentide tähtsus, hoidmine ja säilimine on üks tähtsamaid rahvusvahelisi konfliktipunkte Venemaa ja vanade liiduvabariikide vahel. Vene valitsus samas ka hoiab seisukohta, et kõige suurem geopoliitiline katastroof oli Nõukogude Liidu häving. Sellised narratiivid ei ole kahjutud. Nad võivad tuua maailma ette kujutamata suurt kahju ja kannatust. Kõige viimasem väide sellest on Vene-Ukraina sõda, mis algas osati soovist tuua Ukraina Vene sfääri tagasi vasalli ja satelliidina. Selline lähenemine ideoloogilisel tasandil leiab oma juured nii Nõukogude ideoloogiast ja Tsaari Venemaa ideoloogiast. Lõppsõnaks on ideed kõige tähtsamad asjad maailmas, sest nad motiveerivad käitumist ja teod muudavad maailma. Sellepärast ei tohiks suhtuda kergekäeliselt ajalooõpikutes ilmnevasse ideoloogilistesse konfliktidesse.

License

Non-exclusive licence to reproduce thesis and make thesis public

I, Marko Karilaid

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to reproduce, for the purpose of preservation, including for adding to the DSpace digital archives until the expiry of the term of copyright, “ Comparative Discourse-Semiotic Analysis of the Historiography in the History Textbooks of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Republic of Estonia ”supervised by Andreas Ventsel.

2. I grant the University of Tartu a permit to make the work specified in p. 1 available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives, under the Creative Commons licence CC BY NC ND 3.0, which allows, by giving appropriate credit to the author, to reproduce, distribute the work and communicate it to the public, and prohibits the creation of derivative works and any commercial use of the work until the expiry of the term of copyright.

3. I am aware of the fact that the author retains the rights specified in p. 1 and 2.

4. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe other persons' intellectual property rights or rights arising from the personal data protection legislation.

Marko Karilaid

18.08.2022