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Introduction

Educational content produced in conflict-affected areas must be free from inaccurate, biased, or discriminatory depictions of different groups in society. Students must be taught the values of peace; responsible citizenship; equality; and tolerance in all circumstances. This is especially pertinent in conflict zones, because it promotes respect for others, which aids peacebuilding and conflict resolution. Nonetheless, it is inevitable that conflicts will arise when schools are used as tools for indoctrinating children, and inciting hatred.¹

This IMPACT-se report examines aspects of the Russian and Ukrainian history curricula as per IMPACT-se methodology standards, which are based on UNESCO and UN guidelines on education for peace and tolerance.² The report evaluates 12 history textbooks from the Russian and Ukrainian national curricula, published between 2015 and 2021. The findings are divided into two sections: the first is an analysis of state-approved Russian history textbooks, with an emphasis on how Ukraine and the Ukrainian people are portrayed. The second focuses on depictions of Russia from the perspective of Ukraine, using a selection of examples from Ukrainian history textbooks approved by Ukraine’s Ministry of Education.

Russian History Textbook Covers

Russian History XX Century – Early XXI Century, Grade 9

History of Russia, Grade 10, Part 1

Russian History, Beginning of 20th Century – Beginning of 21st Century

² https://www.impact-se.org/methodology-2/
Main Findings

Overall, the textbooks show skewed historical narratives and dismissal of the “Other,” with little impetus for peace-making as a strategy to resolve conflicts. The curricula do not offer balanced perspectives on historical events, which reduces students’ ability to question such narratives, and to move beyond them toward conflict resolution.

The Russian textbooks focus on the conflict in Crimea, Donetsk, and Lugansk, as well as the period from the 1920s famine until today. Few examples encourage empathy toward the individual, and toward the collective experience of the Ukrainian “Other.” The textbooks are full of unsubstantiated, one-sided statements about the Ukrainian people and their government, which lack the necessary context to educate students on the historical complexities of the relationship between Russia and Ukrainian nationalism. The depiction of events occurring in 2014 (the Euromaidan Revolution and the annexation of Crimea) are viewed solely through the lens of the Russian government, with no neutrality, or acknowledgment of the Ukrainian perspective. President Vladimir Putin and Russia are portrayed as saviors of the Ukrainian people. A separate Ukrainian identity pre-WWII is acknowledged, but only depicted in a positive light when operating as an extension of the Soviet Union. In other instances, Ukrainian nationalism is depicted as being inextricably linked to Nazism. The textbooks emphasize that the Ukrainians developed strong nationalistic ambitions after WWII, and how, with the assistance of the West, they attained power in the post-Soviet era.

Ukraine and the Ukrainian people are portrayed favorably in Russian history textbooks, but only when part of the Soviet Union, or when acting in the best interests of Soviet ideals. Throughout various textbooks, the Ukrainian government is depicted as politically irresponsible and
illegitimate. Students are taught that the Ukrainian government is an elite, nationalist entity that has neglected its own people, particularly Crimean citizens, to advance corrupt interests. Ukrainian nationalism is never portrayed as a legitimate national interest, or as a sovereign right of the Ukrainian people. Instead, it is viewed as an extension of Western interests, with the sole intent of interfering in Russian affairs. Students receive implicit messaging that legitimizes Russia’s control over Crimea, by referring to Putin and Russia as the saviors of the Ukrainian people. The famine of the 1920s and 1930s is discussed. However, no mention is made of the fact that the Ukrainian government and many other countries regard it as a genocide perpetrated by Russians against Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian textbooks frequently portray Russia as an aggressor that has sought to oppress Ukraine and the Ukrainian people throughout its history. The findings in this report focus primarily on events over the last 20 years, but include historical examples that impact today, dating as far back as a century. There is little evidence that the textbooks promote peace or understanding of the Russian “Other.” However, Ukrainian textbooks aim to provide students with the context to understand the origins of today’s conflict. The textbooks instill patriotism and nationalistic pride in Ukrainian students, while objectively portraying contentious events between Russia and Ukraine. Students learn about the famine of the 1920s and 1930s, considered by Ukraine, along with many countries, as a genocide at the hands of the Soviet Union. There is little acknowledgment of Ukrainian crimes committed in collaboration with the Nazi regime. Instead, collaboration with the Nazi regime is explained as a choice intended only to achieve the goal of restoring an independent and sovereign Ukraine. Russia is portrayed as a country that has always impeded Ukrainian independence and sovereignty.

Russian textbooks teach students about Ukrainian involvement in the Holocaust, particularly the Babi Yar massacre. However, this example, instead of being presented as an event essential to students’ understanding of the atrocities of the past, is used to inextricably link Ukrainian nationalism with Nazism. In contrast, Ukrainian involvement in the Holocaust is acknowledged in its textbooks, but Ukrainian collaboration with the Nazi regime is shown as being driven by national interests. There is no mention of the widespread atrocities committed during Ukrainian collaboration with the Nazis. Stephan Bandera, a notorious Nazi collaborator, is portrayed as an essential figure in mobilizing Ukraine’s nationalist movement. When acknowledging failures or atrocities of the past, the Russian curriculum goes to great lengths to separate modern-day Russia from the Soviet Union, while the Ukrainian curriculum makes no distinction between the Soviet Union and today’s Russia.

---

3 Russian History XX century - Early century XXI, Grade 9, 2015, p.373-374
4 The History of Russia. Grade 9. Part 1, 2021, P.92, P.121
5 The History of Russia. Grade 10. Part 1, 2021, P. 237
6 History of Ukraine (Strukevich), Grade 11, 2018, p. 188.
Selected Examples from Russian History Textbooks


In this chapter, students learn about the famine in the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s. The text does not mention that the Ukrainian government considers this famine a genocide against its people, or that the Russian government denies these claims as ahistorical. The textbooks acknowledge that the United States and France assisted Russia in this crisis, which is noteworthy given that the Russian curriculum is traditionally devoid of all praise for the West.

[......] Up to 5 million people died in the Volga region, Ukraine and other areas. Various non-governmental organizations of the USA, France and other countries provided assistance to the hungry in Russia

Regarding the extent of the famine “caused by forced collectivization,” there is an official assessment prepared by the State Duma of the Russian Federation in the official statement “In Memory of the victims of the Famine of the 30s on the territory of the USSR” issued on April 2, 2008. According to the conclusion of the commission under the State Duma of the Russian Federation, around 7 million people died in the territory of the Volga region, the Central Chernozem region, the North Caucasus, the Urals, Crimea, parts of Western Siberia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Belarus “from hunger and diseases associated with malnutrition,” the reason for which was “repressive measures to ensure grain procurement,” where “the severe consequences of the crop failure of 1932 were significantly aggravated.”

The passage teaches that Ukraine was Nazi-occupied territory during WWII. Despite the Nazi regime’s prohibition of communism, pro-Soviet and communist activity remained prevalent in Ukraine. According to this textbook, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (“Центральный комитет коммунистической партии”, or abbreviated as “Цк кп” in the Russian language) was still in operation, with over 90 active centers across the country. This example indicates Ukrainian allegiance to the Soviet Union and its values.

During various periods of the war in the occupied territory, there were illegal Central Committees of the Communist Party of Ukraine and Belarus, 90 regional committees and inter-district party centers.


A ninth-grade history textbook lists the number of soldiers from the various countries of the Soviet Union that were recognized for their “courage and heroism” while serving in the Red Army during WWII, and were awarded the honor of “Hero of the USSR” (“Герой советского союза” in the Russian language). The textbook lists the different regions and nationalities that joined the army, showing that Ukrainian and Belarusian nationals received the most “Hero of the USSR” awards. As demonstrated in this example, whenever textbooks portray Ukrainians in a positive light, it is always as an extension of their loyalty to the Soviet Union.

For courage and heroism on the fronts of the war, the title of Hero of the Soviet Union was awarded to 8160 Russians, 2069 Ukrainians, 309 Belarusians, 161 Tatars, 108 Jews, 96 Kazakhs.
Representatives of all the peoples of the USSR fought in the ranks of the Red Army. Dozens of national divisions and brigades were created, along with the Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians fought soldiers from the Volga region of the northern Caucasus of the far north and from Siberia, Transcaucasia and Central Asia, the Baltic states and from the far East.

4. Russian History XX Century- Early XXI Century. Grade 9. 2015, p. 227

In the same textbook as the above examples, from page 227 onward, Ukrainians are portrayed in a contradictory manner. Before, textbooks depicted Ukrainians as holding true to the principles and ideology of the Soviet Union, and as being honored for their courage and bravery despite Nazi occupation. Whereas from this point on in the textbooks, Ukrainians are portrayed as nationalists operating against the interests of the Red Army. The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) is described as fighting solely for self-interest and national independence, and not for any party except their own. The below example explains to Russian students that the closer the Germans got to Ukraine, the more active the OUN became in fighting against the Red Army. The text also claims that the OUN formed the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, with the sole purpose of fighting against the Soviets.

Organizations were also created with the goal of achieving national independence. The largest of them was the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN).

With the outbreak of war, especially as the German troops approached, the activities of these organizations intensified. The formation of armed detachments began to fight against Red Army. In Ukraine, the OUN created its own Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).
The passage below states that during the 2004 election in Ukraine, NATO and the United States funded their own mass-marketing campaign, declaring the election a fraud. Students are taught that election results were overturned due to the direct intervention of the US and NATO, which led to the appointment of a pro-Western candidate showing significant interest in joining NATO, instead of the pro-Russian candidate who won the election. Furthermore, the textbook describes the Ukrainian government’s decision to ban the Russian language and culture from Ukrainian books, movies, and the curriculum as a great disappointment and a betrayal to Ukrainian citizens. The textbook attempts to legitimize all actions of the Russian government as a necessary intervention to protect citizens of Ukraine from corrupt, nationalist elites.

In 2004, a campaign of non-recognition of the results of the presidential elections was provoked upon Ukraine. With the direct participation of the United States, the European Union and NATO, the election results were, in fact, canceled. As a result, V. A. Yushchenko, who aspired to Ukraine's accession to NATO, was brought to power instead of Viktor Yanukovych, who won by a slight margin, who advocated strengthening relations with Russia. These events were called the "Orange Revolution". Attempts by the new leadership of Ukraine to conduct military exercises on its territory with the participation of NATO troops caused mass protests of the population.

The government of Ukraine refused to switch to payments for Russian gas at market prices, as a result of which there were repeated interruptions in the supply of European countries with energy from Russia.

The Ukrainian authorities, ignoring the interests of millions of their own citizens, ousted the Russian language from the mass media, film distribution, and the education system. Cultural contacts with Russia have been curtailed from year to year.
Despite orders for Soviet soldiers to “take the life and property of the population of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus under their protection,” the arrival of the Soviet army in the aforementioned areas is portrayed as the arrival of saviors. It is explained that, bar a few minor incidents, the Soviet army made its way to Poland without much resistance.

The Soviet troops were ordered to “take the life and property of the population of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus under their protection,” and on September 17, 1939, they crossed the Polish-Soviet border. For the Polish leadership, the intervention of the USSR turned out to be completely unexpected, the reaction of the country’s population was not unambiguous. Many Poles perceived the Soviet offensive as a stab in the back of their troops. However, residents of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus, with rare exceptions, greeted Soviet soldiers as liberators. The campaign of the Red Army lasted 12 days. In general, the Soviet troops were advancing steadily.
The History of Russia. Grade 10. Part 1, 2021, p. 231

The paragraph below from a tenth-grade history textbook teaches students about the Ukrainian nationalists' involvement in the Holocaust, specifically in the Babi Yar massacre, where Ukrainian nationalists were involved in the mass murder of hundreds of thousands of Jews and prisoners of war.

In Kiev on September 29-30, 1941, about 33,000 Jews (men, women and children) were taken to Babi Yar ravine. Here, fascists and Ukrainian nationalists shot them in batches of 100 people. In the future, a deadly conveyor was made—executions were carried out on Tuesdays and Saturdays, and so on for two years. During the years of occupation of Kiev, from 100 thousand to 200 thousand people of all nationalities were killed. Half of them were Jews. In addition to civilians, prisoners of war were executed there. Mass executions of prisoners and Soviet prisoners of war were also carried out in extermination camps: Salaspils, Auschwitz, Majda-nek, Treblinka, Dachau, Buchenwald and many others.


The following chapter explains to students how the Ukrainian nationalists collaborated with the Nazi regime to fight against the Soviets. The paragraph teaches students that from 1941, when the Soviets entered the war, Ukrainians joined the Nazis to fight against the Red Army and committed pogroms against its Jewish population. The textbook includes the declaration of Stephan Bandera, a Ukrainian nationalist leader, politician, and theorist of the militant wing who served as head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN-B). OUN-B was responsible for the ethnic cleansing of Jews, and was also implicated in collaboration with Nazi Germany. The text quotes Bandera’s declaration, in which he promises that Ukraine and Hitler will work together very closely. It goes on to explain that despite the OUN-B’s desire for a Nazi alliance, Hitler wanted to arrest members of this group.
From the very beginning of the war, the allies of the Germans were Ukrainian nationalists. On their initiative, in the spring of 1941, two Ukrainian battalions were created under the Wehrmacht — “Nachtigal” and “Roland.” After the capture of Lviv by the Germans, some Nachtigal fighters took part in Jewish pogroms. Soon the battalion was disbanded, and the police battalion created on its basis regularly served the Germans, performing punitive functions.

On June 30, 1941, in Lviv, the leaders of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), natives of Western Ukraine S.A. Bandera and Ya.S. Stetsko, proclaimed the creation of an independent Ukrainian state. In the “Act of Proclamation of Ukrainian Statehood” under paragraph 3, it was declared: “The newly-formed Ukrainian state will closely cooperate with the National Socialist Great Germany which, under the leadership of its Leader Adolf Hitler, will create a new order in Europe and in the world.”

The OUN considered Poles and Russians to be its main enemies. However, to the chagrin of Bandera, Hitler did not recognize the proclamation of an independent Ukraine. Arrests of
members of the OUN began — a total of 1.5 thousand people were arrested. Some of them died. Bandera himself was in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp until the autumn of 1944, where high-ranking prisoners from all over Europe were kept in special conditions similar to "honorable isolation".

The OUN was closely connected with the German military intelligence service, the Abwehr, and actively interacted with the German army. In fact, the Banderites were accomplices of the Nazis. No serious clashes were recorded between the UPA (The Ukrainian Insurgent Army) and German troops. Many Ukrainian nationalists voluntarily joined the SS division "Galicia", which was destroyed by Soviet troops in July 1944.


The passage below teaches students about N.I. Kuznetsov, a Soviet spy who became a USSR hero after preventing the assassination of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill when they met in Tehran. The text concludes with the students learning that Kuznetsov was later killed in an organized attack by Ukrainian nationalists.

[......] In the spring of 1943, Kuznetsov received valuable information about the preparation by the Germans of an offensive operation in the Kursk region using the new Tiger and Panther tanks, and reported on the preparation by the German special services of an assassination attempt on Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill in Tehran. N.I. Kuznetsov died in 1944, falling into an ambush arranged by Ukrainian nationalists.
The following text in a tenth-grade history textbook explains how Crimea was given to the Ukrainians by the Soviet Union. The text mentions that when the Soviet government handed over Crimea to Ukraine in the 1950s, they had no idea that one of the Soviet republics would secede from the Soviet Union.

[…..] In 1954, Crimea was transferred from the RSFSR to Ukraine, where Crimean Tatars were forbidden to enter. The leadership of the USSR, not allowing the thought of a real possibility of any republic secession from the USSR, when deciding on territorial changes, took into account only momentary economic and political interests.

Students are taught in the following passage about Mikhail Gorbachev, a former president of the Soviet Union, who stated that seizing control of Crimea would be historically and politically accurate. In this example, Gorbachev, a historically well-respected politician, is used to justify Russia’s breach of Ukrainian sovereignty on political and historical grounds.

In this connection, in 1987 at meetings of the Politburo there was a conversation about the situation in the Crimea. All participants in the meeting recognized the fallacy of the 1954 resolution on the transfer of Crimea to the Ukrainian SSR. The words of M.S. Gorbachev that
"from a historical and political point of view, it would be right to return the Crimea to Russia." At the same time, they believed that no decisions should be made in the current concrete situation. M.S. Gorbachev noted that there is a proposal, having withdrawn Crimea from Ukraine, to form a "federal district" and declare it an "all-Union health resort." Ultimately the issue was shelved.


This passage teaches students about Russia’s relations with other countries that were once part of the Soviet Union. According to the text, Russia recognized Ukraine as a sovereign state with borders that include Crimea. However, the text goes on to explain that the Ukrainian government neglected most of Crimea and had a minimal role in its development. It is also mentioned that the Crimean people were heavily influenced by, and remain connected to, Russian culture.

The character and fate of the CIS were largely determined by Russian-Ukrainian relations. After difficult negotiations, on May 31, 1997, Russia and Ukraine signed the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership. Russia recognized Ukraine within the borders of 1954 with the peninsula of Crimea as part of the republic. The Black Sea Fleet was divided, and the Russian fleet was based in Sevastopol on a leasehold basis. However, relations between Kyiv and Crimea remained tense; gaining autonomy within the framework of Ukraine, the majority of the inhabitants of the peninsula in cultural, linguistic and mental terms remained in the space of Russia. The Ukrainian government was not actually involved in the development of the Crimea. In general, by the end of the 1990s. Russia’s foreign policy has acquired a clearer outline, taking into account the national interests and priorities of the country.
The passage below teaches students about the Russia–Ukraine gas disputes over natural gas supplies, prices, and debts, and about how these issues transformed from simple business disputes into transnational political issues. Students are taught that this dispute led to strained relations between the Russian and Ukrainian governments.

Relations with Ukraine were aggravated by the “gas wars” of 2006 and 2009, when Gazprom stopped gas supplies to Ukraine because of Kyiv’s unwillingness to pay for gas at European prices. According to independent analysts, Russia annually subsidized the Ukrainian economy in the amount of $5 billion due to low energy prices.

In this passage, students are taught about demonstrations in Kyiv in 2013 over the Ukrainian government’s decision not to join the European Union. Students also learn that these demonstrations turned into violent riots, and led to the deaths of dozens of Ukrainians.

At the end of November 2013, thousands of protests began in the center of Kyiv because of the refusal of the Ukrainian government to sign an association agreement with the European Union. In addition, the protesters opposed the arbitrariness of power, corruption. In January, the confrontation escalated into riots, clashes between radical demonstrators and police units. Blood was shed, dozens of people died.
February 21, 2014, President of Ukraine V.F. Yanukovych made concessions and, through the mediation of representatives of the European Union, signed an agreement with the opposition to resolve the crisis in the country. The agreement provided for holding early presidential elections by the end of 2014 and the formation of a "government of national confidence." It also provided for the withdrawal of law enforcement forces from the center of Kyiv, the cessation of violence and the surrender of weapons by the opposition. However, the leaders of the extremist wing of the opposition (the organization "Right Sector", banned in the Russian Federation) rejected the agreement. On the night of February 21-22, the seizure of administrative buildings in Kyiv began. Yanukovych left Kyiv, and soon Ukraine. Nationalist-minded forces carried out a coup d'état and seized power. On February 23, 2014, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine repealed the law that allowed recognizing the official status of the Russian language.
In this passage, students learn about the process of annexing Crimea. The text claims that the people of Crimea asked Putin for assistance.

In Sevastopol, the protesters adopted a resolution: the results of the coup d’êtat and the decisions of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine were not recognized. Self-defense units began to form throughout the peninsula. On March 1, the Crimean leadership appealed to the President of Russia V.V. Putin with a request “to assist in ensuring peace and tranquility in the territory” of Crimea. On March 16, a referendum was held in Crimea, in which more than 82% of voters took part (in Sevastopol - 89.5%).

As a result, almost 97% of Crimean residents voted for reunification with Russia. In Russia itself, according to public opinion polls, 91% of Russians supported this choice. At the same time, 86% of the survey participants said that Crimea is already part of Russia. March 17, 2014, President of Russia V.V. Putin signed the Decree "On the recognition of the Republic of Crimea." The Republic of Crimea, in which the city of Sevastopol has a special status, was recognized as a sovereign and independent state. On March 18, in the Georgievsky Hall of the Kremlin, an interstate agreement was signed on the admission of the Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation as new subjects.
The following text describes what has occurred in Ukraine since the annexation of Crimea which has, in essence, become a civil war. The text pits the anti-Russian Ukrainian government against pro-Russian citizens from southeast Ukraine. The text portrays the Ukrainian government as being to blame for the war in Donetsk and Lugansk, and consequently for the deaths of thousands of civilians, including children. Furthermore, the Ukrainian government is accused of spreading rumors and anti-Russian propaganda to avoid a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

解决

Возвращение Крыма обострило российско-украинские отношения. Против антироссийских настроений украинского руководства восстал Юго-Восток Украины. По сути, в этой стране началась гражданская война, так как власти решили силой оружия подавить самопровозглашённые Донецкую Народную Республику и Лугансскую Народную Республику. Погибли тысячи мирных жителей, в том числе дети.

В феврале 2015 г. руководители России, Германии, Франции и Украины согласовали в Минске документ с целью прекращения вооружённого конфликта и политического урегулирования кризиса на Украине. Однако с тех пор киевская власть саботирует взятые на себя обязательства, раздувает антироссийскую истерию, называя Россию агрессором, и с помощью блокады республик ДНР и ЛНР, провокаций препятствует мирному разрешению кровавого конфликта.

The return of Crimea has aggravated Russian-Ukrainian relations. The South-East of Ukraine rebelled against the anti-Russian Ukrainian leadership. In fact, a civil war began in this country, as the authorities decided to suppress the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic and the Lugansk People's Republic by force of arms. Thousands of civilians were killed, including children. In February 2015, the leaders of Russia, Germany, France and Ukraine agreed in Minsk on a document with the aim of ending the armed conflict and politically resolving the crisis in Ukraine. However, since then, the Kyiv authorities have been sabotaging their obligations, fanning anti-Russian hysteria, calling Russia an aggressor, and using the blockade of the republics of the DPR and LPR, provocations, preventing the peaceful resolution of the bloody conflict.
The passage describes Putin’s statement to international media agencies, where he condemns the actions of the US and NATO in Ukraine, and justifies his actions in Crimea.

V.V. Putin, May 24, 2014, at a meeting with the heads of international news agencies, "I believe that our partners from both the United States and European countries acted in Ukraine with rude, illegal methods, pushed the anti-state coup and created, in our understanding, a threat to the fundamental interests of the Russian Federation, and not only in the sphere of economy, but also in the sphere of security. Because this anti-constitutional coup (and we heard about it well) was followed by proposals to deprive national minorities of the rights to use their own language, to join NATO, which means the possible deployment of both NATO troops and strike missile systems, and missile defense systems. This would actually create a completely new situation for us and prompt us to take certain actions, including actions related to supporting the aspirations of the people of Crimea to join the Russian Federation. We believe that they tried to talk to us with the help of force and that we, acting in this logic, gave an adequate answer. I hope that this will never, under any circumstances, be repeated anywhere else."
The text describes the 2004 Orange Revolution in Ukraine, which was triggered by the opposition’s declaration that the national elections were falsified.

At the end of November 2004 in Ukraine, the so-called “Orange Revolution” began (the orange color became a symbol of the protest movement). In the center of Kyiv on the Maidan (square) opponents of V.F.Yanukovych, the winner in the second round of the presidential elections, gathered and started a series of protests. The Party of Regions headed by him was accused of falsifying elections in the eastern regions.
20. *The History of Russia. Grade 10.* 2020, p. 342

The text explains that former Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovych, under the influence of the West, along with the protesters of the Orange Revolution, agreed to another round of elections, which he lost. The West is portrayed as interfering with Ukraine’s democratic process.

Under strong pressure from the protesting opposition activists who settled in tents on the Maidan and the representatives of the West supporting them, VF Yanukovych agreed to re-elections. According to the results of the third round of the presidential elections, V. A. Yushchenko became the President of Ukraine.[…]


The passage below teaches students that the Orange Revolution led to Ukraine’s nationalist aspirations, and anti-Russian politics. The change is shown to have stemmed from Ukrainian elites, with Ukrainian citizens remaining pro-Russia.

The “Orange Revolution” essentially changed nothing in the country, except for the transfer of power into the hands of another group of the political elite. During the presidency of V.A. Yushchenko, the degree of nationalism in domestic politics increased, and dependence on the European Union and the United States strengthened, aimed at a complete break with the CIS. In relations with Russia, conflict situations arose every now and then related to the prices of Russian gas and the presence of the Russian Black Sea Fleet in Sevastopol. Yushchenko stepped up political and ideological pressure on the Russian-speaking population. Ukrainian youth were brought up with a nationalist spirit.
In this chapter, the textbook describes the events that led to Russia’s annexation of Crimea. However, it is not portrayed as an annexation; rather, as the circumstances that led to Crimea and Russia’s reunification. According to the students, Yanukovych's refusal to sign an agreement with the EU was the main reason that the Ukrainian opposition initiated riots at Maidan, and why the Ukrainian government was unable to control the situation.

In the autumn of 2013 Yanukovych, who all the time maneuvered between the West and Russia, was supposed to sign an association agreement with the European Union, which he, however, did not sign, since the agreement infringed upon the economic interests of Ukraine. This was used by the opposition forces as a pretext for mass mobilization of all dissatisfied people to fight against Yanukovych. At the end of November 2013, on the anniversary of the previous Maidan, the opposition managed to bring thousands of protesters to Independence Square, which marked the beginning of the second Maidan. Attempts by the authorities to disperse the protesters did not lead to fading, but to the growth of the opposition movement. At the beginning of 2014 reports that tires are burning in the center of Kyiv, bottles with a “Molotov cocktail” are flying into the forces of order, and administrative buildings are being seized became a usual sight. The authorities were forced to make concession after concession.
23. *The History of Russia. Grade 10*. 2020, p. 343

The text describes the circumstances in which Yanukovych fled from Ukraine to Russia, and claims that the new government of Ukraine is illegitimate due to a violation of the Constitutional Court.

February 21, 2014, a peace agreement was signed between President Yanukovych and the opposition in the presence of action and with the participation of representatives of Germany, France, Poland and Russia (the Russian representative did not sign the document). But Yanukovych, in the face of a threat to his life, left Kyiv and was soon forced to take refuge in Russia. A new government was illegally formed in Kyiv. The creation of a new government was accompanied by a violation of constitutional procedures and even the dissolution of the Constitutional Court, which, according to a combination of violations made the executive power illegitimate. In fact, it was a coup d’état.
In this passage, students are taught that in 1954, on the initiative of N.S. Khrushchev, the state authorities of the Soviet Union transferred Crimea from the RSFSR to the Ukrainian SSR without the consent of the population of Crimea.

Under these conditions, a popular movement for the return of this autonomous republic to Russia became more active in Crimea. In 1954 on the initiative of N.S. Khrushchev, the state authorities of the USSR, without the consent of the population of the peninsula, adopted the decision to transfer Crimea from the RSFSR to the Ukrainian SSR. When the danger arose of threatening bloodshed clashes between supporters of fully-fledged Crimean autonomy and supporters of the Maidan, Russia decided temporarily to take over the maintenance of peace in the predominantly Russian-speaking peninsula. In this situation, guards consisting of Russian military personnel appeared at the parliament building, at the airport and at some other facilities. They did not interfere in anything and worked closely with the Crimean police. Thanks to this, possible bloodshed was prevented.
In the passage below, students are taught about the annexation of Crimea, with textbooks explaining that Russia’s justification of annexation was driven by the people of Crimea requesting its help.

On March 11, 2014, by resolutions of the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the Sevastopol City Council, the Declaration of Independence was adopted, and on March 16, a referendum was held on the fate of Crimea. More than 90% of Crimeans and Sevastopol residents voted in favor of joining the Russian Federation [...] On March 18, Russian President Vladimir Putin and the leaders of the Republic of Crimea, as well as the head of the city of Sevastopol, signed an Agreement on the admission of the Republic of Crimea to the Russian Federation, the formation of new subjects as part of the Russian Federation.
The text teaches students about the West and the United States' reaction to Crimea's annexation, and about how the West refuses to recognize the referendum results, ignoring what the Crimean people want, while portraying Russia as the aggressor.

The results of the referendum and the reunification of Crimea with Russia were not recognized by the United States and the European Union, which, apart from the opinion of the Crimeans, declared their illegality. The situation was further complicated by the fact that people's republics (DPR and LPR) were proclaimed in the Donetsk and Lugansk regions of Ukraine. Not going to dialogue with the population of the southeast, the Kyiv authorities began to pursue a repressive policy. Many Russians began to voluntarily provide assistance to the residents of the DNR and LNR, who relied on the sympathy of Russian society in the struggle for recognition of the state status of the Russian language and self-determination. It came to an armed struggle, when the new President of Ukraine P.A. Poroshenko and the Rada resorted to deploying a punitive operation using artillery, mortars and aircraft. Instead of establishing a dialogue with the DPR and LPR, the Kyiv authorities began to issue ultimatums to them and accuse Russia of aggression.
Selected Examples from Ukrainian History Textbooks

27. *History of Ukraine (Pometun, Hupan, Smahin)*. **Grade 9**. 2017, p. 128, 129

This lesson teaches students about a secret communique issued by the Russian government in 1863, in which the Russian Minister of Interior at the time, Pytor Valuev, “defined the Russian government’s policy concerning Ukraine, as agreed previously with the Tsar.” The lesson explains that the Russian government ordered the censorship office to cease publishing books written in “little-Russian language,” referring to the Ukrainian language.

…the minister of the interior, P. Valuev, had published a secret circular on July 2nd, 1863, in which he defined the Russian government’s policy concerning Ukraine, as agreed previously with the Tsar.

“… until future consideration [of the given issue] … there will be an order to the censorship office to only send to print works which belong to literary writing; publishing of books (written in) little-Russian language (hereby referring to Ukrainian) of spiritual content, educational, and intended for initial reading, is to be stopped.”
In this lesson, students are taught about the complexity of Russia-Ukraine relations. The text states that after the election of Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko in 2005, Russia initiated a policy of “securing control over Ukraine,” involving “economic, political, cultural, and religious,” as well as “international relations” intervention. Primarily concerned with economic intervention, the text presents Russian intervention as having the goal of controlling leading enterprises and industries in Ukraine, with a particular interest in controlling natural gas infrastructure as a means to threaten Ukrainian stability.

Hybrid war of Russia against Ukraine:

The development of Ukraine-Russia relations had been the most complicated. After the election of Ukrainian president Viktor Yushchenko, Russia had launched the policy of securing control over Ukraine, which included an intervention into economic, political, cultural and religious fields, as well as international relations.

In the economic field, Russia had tried to take under control leading enterprises and entire industries of Ukraine, while especially interested in taking control of Ukrainian gas transmission system.

Russia’s goal:

To threaten Ukrainian status as a transit country
To take control over Ukrainian gas transmission system and gas storage facilities
To convince Europe that Russia must stand as a leading energy source in order to achieve stability in the gas field, and that Russia’s gas pipelines are needed for that.
In a lesson about the Russia-Ukraine conflict in Crimea, a passage states that a serious conflict occurred due to Russia’s illegal occupation of Crimea in 2008, years before a more extensive conflict would occur in 2014.

A serious conflict with Russia had occurred in 2008 over Crimea. Ukraine had tried to put in order the presence of the Black Sea Fleet nearby the peninsula and to take under control objects of navigation on the Black Sea coast, which Russia illegally withheld.

In a lesson about the conflict in Crimea in 2014, a paragraph explains that Russia’s aggression against Ukraine began with its open annexation of Crimea, following the events of Euromaidan. The textbook states that Russia created an agency for the purpose of spreading separatist influence across Crimea, alleging that it influenced the Presidium of the Verkhovna Rada of Crimea to consider changing Crimea’s constitution by parliamentary procedure.

**Russian occupation of Crimea**

*After the events of Euromaidan, Russian aggression openly took another step forward. The first object (of interest) was Crimea. The Annexation operation began on February 20th, 2014. This date can be considered as the beginning of the Russian Federation’s armed aggression against Ukraine.*

*Russia had then created a strong agency network, which was ready to begin to spread a separatist spirit over the Crimean Peninsula. Meanwhile, on February 4th, 2014, the Presidium of the*
Verkhovna Rada of Crimea had agreed to consider the question of changing Crimea’s constitution by the parliament. Moreover, the readiness to return to Russia while securing the rights of the residents was announced.


This section focuses on the beginning of Russian aggression in eastern Ukraine. The text explains that the events of the conflict in Crimea in 2014 led to the spread of separatist ideology and protests across other regions of Ukraine. The textbook recalls the first large-scale pro-Russian protests and speeches that took place in eastern and southern Ukraine in March 2014, mentioning protesters’ chants for “Russia!” and “Putin is our President!” Attributing these separatist protests to Russian intervention and influence, the textbook then teaches students about the resistance of pro-Ukrainian citizens. After a reference to the Ukrainian police as “useless in most cases,” it is explained that violent clashes between pro-Ukraine and pro-Russian civilians lasted for a month.

The beginning of Russia’s armed aggression in Eastern Ukraine. Antiterrorist operation
The events of Crimea had set an example for spreading separatist spirits across other regions of Ukraine. The first large-scale Russian speeches took place in Eastern and Southern Ukraine on March 1st, 2014 (Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhzhia, Mykolaiv, Kherson and Odesa). On that day, the protesters tried to raise Russian flags over Ukrainian building of regional state administrations, pronouncing “Russia!”, “Putin is our president!”, etc. “Tourists” from Russia had taken a major part in those actions. The protests had had the support of “Party of Regions”, and of the Communist Party of Ukraine. The actions had met the resistance of pro-Ukrainian citizens and clashes took place. The police were useless in most cases, and the events continued till the end of March, and Ukrainian side of the conflict had done everything that had been possible to avoid the invasion of Russia’s regular troops, that were focused in full readiness at the Ukrainian border, into Donbas.
This paragraph discusses Russia's propaganda against Ukraine. Russia was openly opposed to Ukraine joining NATO and the EU, and had done everything in its power to prevent this from happening. The paragraph discusses Russia's policy toward Ukraine's goal of self-determination, and teaches students about Russia's imperialist mindset.

Aggravation of relations with Russian Federation

In relations with Ukraine, even at the beginning of a new millennium, Russian politicians continued to use imperialistic historical myths - allegedly, that Ukraine is a part of Russia and thus might stay in unbreakable ties with it; that Russians and Ukrainians are the same nationality; that Independent Ukraine is a historical anomaly, caused by the betrayal of Ukrainians and the machinations of the European West and other nonsense. When Ukraine had strictly defined the course for Euro integration, Russia had immediately decided to resort to gas blackmail, demonstratively closing the pipes on January 4th, 2006.

Moscow had tried to prevent the rapprochement of Ukraine with the EU and NATO. Inside Ukraine, Moscow was organizing anti-NATO speeches, supported pro-Russian spirits, reacted inadequately to the subject of Holodomor 1932-1933, which was acknowledged in Ukraine as the genocide of Ukrainian people. Russian media carried out Ukrainophobic information policy. As a result, by 2008 most of the Russian people considered Ukraine an enemy country.
The paragraph teaches students about the Holodomor, a famine resulting in the deaths of millions, and that it was brought on by Stalin’s regime due to the perceived threat of the proletariat to the Soviet leadership. The famine is seen by Ukraine and its people as a genocide, and this view is also acknowledged by many countries around the world. Despite this, Russia refuses to recognize the Holodomor as a genocide.

Continuous collectivization of agriculture in Soviet Ukraine - 1932-1933

The hunger that was happening in Ukraine in the first half of 1932 was caused by grain harvests from the 1931 harvest. As a result of punitive seizures from the Ukrainian peasants of not only bread but all food stocks without exception, the hunger turned into famine. The confiscation of non-grain food products under the guise of a grain procurement campaign took place in two turns: November-December 1932 - in the wealthy villages, and January-February 1933 - throughout the territory of Ukraine. The result of this hunger terror was the death of millions of Ukrainians during November 1932 - June 1933.
The paragraph teaches students about the changes that occurred in the minds of Ukrainians before the country’s independence, and the question of why Ukraine should remain under Russian control (Soviet Union) while countries such as Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and others have achieved independence. This passage teaches students about the first seeds of patriotism that led to Ukrainian national sovereignty.

Changes in the consciousness of Ukraine.
In the years when the Stalin regime recovered full control over the inside policy and reached the top of Imperialistic greatness, surpassing even the power of the Russian Empire, the awakening realizations came to life, the ones that became reasons for destruction of the communist regime. First of all, the realizations were feelings of pride for their Motherland - Ukraine, caused by recognition of Ukraine’s role in the international area, Ukraine’s significant contribution to defeating Nazism, and Ukraine’s inclusion in the list of UN founding states. Also, the first doubts of Ukrainian patriots regarding state status of Ukraine in the post-war international situation: Ukraine was no longer bordering with capitalistic, but with friendly countries of democracy. Why should it remain part of the USSR, whilst her neighbors - Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria - held the status of Independent Countries?
The chapter focuses on the Orange Revolution that took place in 2004. The story has come to be a serious turning point in Ukrainian history.

The elections of President of Ukraine of 2004 had become a turning point in the history of Ukraine. Long before the official start of the election campaign, all political forces in the country, both government and opposition, began to prepare for them.

The next day, the rally turned into a mass protest, which lasted until December 8th, 2004. Yushchenko’s supporters used the orange color as a symbol of their participation (ribbons, scarves, etc.,) and so it was named the Orange Revolution.

This paragraph discusses the events prior to the Euromaidan (the Maidan Revolution). It does not glorify these events to instill patriotism in students, but is portrayed realistically and objectively.

The Revolution of Dignity - the Maidan Revolution. Meanwhile, the dictatorial threats of the regime of Yanukovich were getting stronger. A close circle of people had formed around him, which got the name “sim’ya” (family). Moreover, an actual looting of the state budget was happening in favor of “sim’ya”. The interests of the country were given up on in favor of Russia, which increasingly advocated the restoration of its own influence within the former Soviet
The development of Ukraine had, in fact, stopped, and the corruption had gotten to the scale never seen before. Stability was achieved through the accumulation of domestic and foreign debt.


The paragraph informs students about the wave of protests in Ukraine in 2012 to protect and support the Ukrainian language. Historically, Russia has tried to suppress the Ukrainian language on numerous occasions. The text discusses the allegations against former Ukrainian president Yanukovich, who is accused of ignoring Ukrainians in favor of Russia.

At the beginning of July 2012, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine makes the law “On the principles of state language policy”, or unofficially - “Law of Kivalov-Kolesnichenko”, which was actually to broaden the official use of the Russian language. As a result of that, the “Language Maidan” had gathered (03/07 - 08/08/2012).

On July 3rd, after the acceptance of the law by the Verkhovna Rada, a protest gathered at the European Square (Kyiv) by the Ukrainian House. The protesters gathered then to support the Ukrainian language, some of them declared a hunger strike, and some stayed at the square throughout the whole night. The next day, clashes occurred between special unit forces “Berkut” and the protesters, “Berkuts” using tear gas. On July 8th, ignoring the waves of protests not only in Kyiv but in other areas of Ukraine, Yanukovich had signed the scandalous “Law of languages” that was supposed to provide for the possibility of official bilingualism in regions where the percentage of national minorities is more than 10%.
The relations between Ukraine and Russia stood on uneven ground. The signing of a large-scale political Ukrainian-Russian agreement on 15/05/1997 had turned to be historical, as that document had secured Russia’s obligation to respect Ukraine’s Independence and had become a legal basis on which the relations between the two countries stand. Moreover, there had been a transition from uncertainty to equal partnership.

However, with Putin coming to power in Russia, the relations between the two countries had begun to crumble rapidly. Russia’s government viewed Ukraine as a territory of Russia’s own exclusive influence and strived to return full control over it.

This paragraph states that the OUN organizations foresaw the potential for war between the Soviet Union and the Nazi regime, and so turned to the Nazis for collaboration – only to achieve the goal of restoring an independent and sovereign Ukraine.
Foreseeing the possibility of Soviet-German war, both organizations (OUN-M and OUN-B) had turned to the German government with memorandums in which they explained that their goal is only restoring an Independent and Sovereign Ukraine.

This paragraph openly teaches that the OUN organizations turned to the Nazi regime for assistance, but states again that the goal of collaboration with the Nazi regime, and the reason for all of Bandera’s actions, was to create a sovereign Ukraine.

З благословення митрополита А. Шептицького Я. Стецько оголосив Акт відновлення Української держави: «Волю українського народу Організація українських націоналістів під проводом Степана Бандери проголошує створення Української держави, за яку поклали свої голови цілі покоління найкращих синів України». В Акті зазначалося, що відновлена Українська держава буде співпрацювати з націонал-соціалістичною Великою Німеччиною, яка «допомагає українському народу визволитися з-під московської окупації». Акт закликав

.......Stetz’ko (first deputy of Stepan Bandera) had declared the Act of restoring Ukrainian state: “By the will of the Ukrainian people, OUN, led by Stephan Bandera, is declaring the creation of Ukraine, for which generations of the best Ukrainian sons had given their lives.” Stated in the Act was that Ukraine will cooperate with Germany, which is “to help Ukrainian people liberate themselves from under Moscow’s occupation.”


This paragraph teaches that “Banderites,” Ukrainian nationalists following Stephan Bandera’s ideology, were officially outlawed by the Nazi regime occupying Ukraine in 1941, because their nationalistic ideas were “putting Germany’s interest into acute danger.”

на загоні німецьких каралів. Спецслужби гітлерівців повідомляли до Берліна, що пропаговані бандерівцями національні ідеї «становлять гостру небезпеку для німецьких інтересів сьогодні й у майбутньому». 25 листопада українські націоналісти були остаточно поставлені нацистами поза законом. Таємна інструкція

Special services of the Nazis had been reporting to Berlin that the nationalistic ideas which the Banderites were spreading are “putting Germany’s interest into acute danger, today and in the future.” By November 25th (1941), the Ukrainian nationalists were officially outlawed by the Nazis.
Conclusion

IMPACT-se's examination of history textbooks across Russian and Ukrainian curricula demonstrates that both countries rely upon narrow and skewed perspectives when teaching students about historical events and concepts, in particular the 2014 annexation of Crimea and Euromaidan Revolution; the 1920s and 1930s famine in Ukraine; and the presentation of Ukrainian nationalism throughout time.

Ukraine and its people are only depicted as having a separate identity in Russian textbooks when acting in the interests of, or when part of, the Soviet Union; in contrast, Ukrainian nationalism post-succession from the Soviet Union is delegitimized, and its sovereignty is undermined. Russian textbooks explore contentious events which have deteriorated the relationship between the two countries through the partisan lens of the Russian government, and use Ukrainian involvement in the Holocaust to explicitly link Ukrainian nationalism with Nazism.

While Ukrainian textbooks teach disputed events in an objective manner, they do still portray Russia as an aggressor which has impeded Ukrainian sovereignty throughout history, with the aim of instilling patriotism in students. Despite striving for objectivity, Ukrainian textbooks fail to mention atrocities perpetrated by Ukrainians during the Holocaust, namely the Babi Yar massacre, and explain Ukrainian collaboration with the Nazi regime as being a means to restore sovereignty.

These findings highlight the one-sided approach to historical events and dismissal of the “Other”, which deprive Russian and Ukrainian students of the context to understand the modern-day relationship between Russia and Ukraine.
Methodology

IMPACT-se applies methodological standards which are based on UNESCO and UN declarations, and international recommendations and documents on education for peace and tolerance (see notes). Our methodology is designed to consider every detail within the textbooks; it does not paraphrase, rely on interpretations, or attempt to illustrate preconceived notions.

The following is an updated, condensed version of the IMPACT-se UNESCO-derived standards for peace and tolerance in school education:

1. **RESPECT**: The curriculum should promote tolerance, understanding and respect toward the "Other," his or her culture, achievements, values, and way of life.\(^7\)

2. **INDIVIDUAL OTHER**: The curriculum should foster personal attachment toward the "Other" as an individual, his or her desire to be familiar, loved and appreciated.\(^8\)

3. **NO HATE**: The curriculum should be free of wording, imagery and ideologies likely to create prejudices, misconceptions, stereotypes, misunderstandings, mistrust, racial hatred, religious bigotry and national hatred, as well as any other form of hatred or contempt for other groups or peoples.\(^9\)

4. **NO INCITEMENT**: The curriculum should be free of language, content, and imagery that disseminate ideas or theories which justify or promote acts and expressions of violence, incitement to violence, hostility, harm and hatred toward other national, ethnic, racial or religious groups.\(^10\)

5. **PEACEMAKING**: The curriculum should develop capabilities for non-violent conflict resolution and promote peace.\(^11\)

---

\(^7\) As defined in the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance Proclaimed and signed by Member States of UNESCO on November 16, 1995, Articles 1, 4.2. See also the UN Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding Between Peoples (1965), Principles I, III. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948): Education shall be directed to the full development of human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial and religious groups and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

\(^8\) The goal of education for peace is the development of universally recognized values in an individual, regardless of different socio-cultural contexts. See Ibid., Article 6. See also, on exchanges between youth, the UN Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples (1965), Principles IV, V.


\(^11\) Based on the Integrated Framework for Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy, approved by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twenty-eighth session, Paris, November 1995, Article 9; and on the
6. **UNBIASED INFORMATION**: Educational materials (textbooks, workbooks, teachers’ guides, maps, illustrations, aids) should be up-to-date, accurate, complete, balanced and unprejudiced, and use equal standards to promote mutual knowledge and understanding between different peoples.¹²

7. **GENDER IDENTITY AND REPRESENTATION**: The curriculum should foster equality, mutual respect, and should aim for equal representation between individuals regardless of their gender identity. It should also refrain from language, content, and imagery that depicts limiting and/or exclusionary gender roles.¹³

8. **SEXUAL ORIENTATION**: The curriculum should be free of language, content, and imagery that promulgates violence or discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.¹⁴

9. **SOUND PROSPERITY and COOPERATION**: The curriculum should educate for sound and sustainable economic conduct and preservation of the environment for future generations. It should encourage regional and local cooperation to that effect.¹⁵

---


¹³ The preamble to the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance proclaimed and signed by member states of UNESCO on November 16, 1995, notes the Convention on the Elimination of Any Form of Discrimination against Women and emphasizes respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to gender.

¹⁴ Based on Resolutions 32/2 (adopted June 30, 2016) and 17/19 (adopted July 14, 2011) of the UN Human Rights Council, and numerous UN General Assembly resolutions expressing concern and condemnation of laws and practices around the world which target individuals based on their gender identity and/or sexual orientation for discrimination, violence, and even extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions—all of which contradict the most basic principles of the UN and have no place in education.

¹⁵ Based on UNESCO recommendation concerning education for international understanding, cooperation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms, adopted by the General Conference at its eighteenth session, Paris, November 19, 1974, Articles III.6, and IV.7. On the imperative for developing "systematic and rational tolerance teaching methods that will address the cultural, social, economic, political and religious sources of intolerance," see the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance proclaimed and signed by member states of UNESCO on November 16, 1995, Article 4.2. On education for international cooperation, see also the UN Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples (1965), Principle II.
List of Textbooks

The following 12 curriculum textbooks were analyzed for the research in this study. The titles both here and referenced in the text have been translated into English to aid the reader.


*Russian History.* A basic level. Grade 10


*History of Ukraine.* Grade 9. Vol. 217

*History: Ukraine and the World.* Grade 10. 2018

*History of Ukraine.* (Strukevich). Grade 10. 2018

*History of Ukraine.* (Vlasov, Kulchitzy) Grade 10. Vol 1. 2018

*History of Ukraine.* (Sorochins’ka, Hisem) Grade 11. 2019

*History: Ukraine and the World.* Grade 11. 2019

*History of Ukraine.* (Hisem, Martynluk) Grade 11. 2019

*History of Ukraine.* (Strukevich, Drovozyuk) Grade 11. 2019