

The cover of the journal 'Revista Inclusiones' features a dark blue night sky with a prominent galaxy. A telescope is visible in the lower center, its lens reflecting the light of the galaxy. The title 'REVISTA INCLUSIONES' is written in large, bold, white capital letters across the middle. Below the title, a red horizontal bar contains the text 'NUEVOS AVANCES Y MIRADAS DE LA CIENCIA' in white capital letters. At the bottom left, the journal's name and issue information are listed in white text.

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

NUEVOS AVANCES Y MIRADAS DE LA CIENCIA

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Número Especial Julio / Septiembre

2019

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Ruropa del Este

Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Sr. Felipe Maximiliano Estay Guerrero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Rosario Castro López

Universidad de Córdoba, España

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Per

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas

Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia

Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López

Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo

Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques

Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez

Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec

Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía

Santiago – Chile

Representante Legal

Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**SOCIO-CULTURAL HERITAGE OF VICTORY IN THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR
IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN ETHICAL AND HISTORICAL REALITIES**

Valery V. Kasyanov

Russia Kuban State University, Russia

Galina I. Davydova

Vernadsky Crimean Federal University, Russia

Natalya A. Shilina

Southern Federal University, Russia

Sergey V. Aleshin

Southern Federal University, Russia

Diana V. Volkova

Don State University, Russia

Sergey I. Samygin

Rostov State University of Economics, Russia

Fecha de Recepción: 04 de marzo de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 30 de marzo de 2019

Fecha de Aceptación: 22 de junio de 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2019

Abstract

This article attempts to analyze the differences in the interpretation of Victory in the Great Patriotic War within the framework of the historical policy of the Soviet state, which gradually replaced the attitude to war and victory as real life experience, and the post-Soviet situation, characterized by the lack of consistent state memory policy accompanied, on the one hand, with spontaneous grassroots activity, the need for identity, and on the other hand, with political technology attempts to manipulate historical memory. The main content of the socio-cultural heritage of the victory in the Great Patriotic War is the preservation of the memory of the historical event of the heroism of the Soviet people in the victory over fascism that is large-scale for the peoples of the world.

Keywords

Sociocultural heritage – Victory – History – The Great Patriotic War – Politics of memory

Para Citar este Artículo:

Kasyanov, Valery V.; Davydova, Galina I.; Shilina, Natalya A.; Aleshin, Sergey V.; Volkova, Diana V. y Samygin, Sergey I. Socio-cultural heritage of victory in the great patriotic war in the context of modern ethical and historical realities. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 6 num Esp Jul-Sep (2019): 121-131.

Introduction

The problems of the sociocultural heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War in the context of modern ethical and historical realities are of particular importance in Russian society, where the political and socio-economic transformations of the late 20th century led to a dramatic change in the status of the socio-cultural heritage both at the level of public consciousness and in the practice of the work of the executive authorities. The indicated contradictions actualize the problem of the essential and functional definition of the socio-cultural heritage, the identification of models of its perception and relationship paradigms in the context of modern ethical-historical realities.

The scale of the historical event associated with the legacy of victory in the Great Patriotic War, which influenced the gene pool of three continents, including Europe and Russia, determined the scale of its reflection in the world artistic culture, determined and strengthened the geopolitical influence of the USSR as the victorious power. This is explained by the fact that the USSR, which defeated fascism, approved its own standards of social justice and forms of administrative-political structure in the liberated territories.

As pointed out by G. V. Bakumenko and T. V. Kovalenko, the relevance of considering the social and cultural heritage of the Great Victory is due to the fact that the symbols of success, reflected in the socio-cultural heritage, “are the leading factors in the daily reconstruction of modern historical reality, and their analysis allows us to identify the resource value of the cultural heritage. Including the discovery of the resource for strengthening modern statehood of Russia, manifested in the stability of social, cultural and economic development”¹. The main content of the socio-cultural heritage of the Great Patriotic War is the preservation of the memory of the historical event of the feat of the Soviet people, which is large-scale for the peoples of the world in victory over fascism.

Materials and methods

An important result of the scientific discourse on the problems of the sociocultural heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War was the formulation of D.S. Likhachev's principle of an integrated approach to its protection and use². An integrated approach to the concept of heritage includes not only individual historical monuments, but also a complex of historical and modern traditions of using and studying objects of heritage, forming and developing their environment, various activities to popularize the cultural and historical heritage of the victory in the Great Patriotic War and incorporating them into the context of modern historical realities. The modern integrated approach is based on the principle of preserving and reconstructing all the objects of socio-cultural heritage in the whole diversity of their material, ethical, aesthetic, modern cultural and historical value characteristics. In modern studies of sociocultural heritage, an integrated approach is defined as a method for reconstructing the communication potential of the sociocultural heritage, which emphasizes its enduring historical and cultural significance³.

¹ G. V. Bakumenko and T. V. Kovalenko, “Monuments of the Great Patriotic War: symbolization of success and issues of reconstruction of historical and cultural heritage”, *Heritage of centuries* num 1 (2015): 80-89.

² D. S. Likhachev, *Ecology of Culture. Monuments of the Fatherland: Almanac of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture*. 1980.

³ G. V. Bakumenko and T. V. Kovalenko, “Monuments of the Great Patriotic...”

In addition, the methodological basis of the study are both scientific methods of cognition – dialectical, descriptive, methods of system and scientific analysis, and special methods – historical and comparative, problem-chronological, method of an integrated approach to the selection and use of sources.

The results of the study

Lotman, who gave a sociocultural substantiation of the “cultural and historical heritage” as a socio-cultural phenomenon, describes the space of contemporary cultural-historical realities as a space of shared memory, where “texts” can be saved and updated.

But, what is meant under the concept of "modern ethical and historical realities"? We believe that in addition to the most obvious meaning of the historical situation, other meanings are also possible - first, what does the reality of history mean for us today? In answering this question, we are highlighting some of the specific characteristics of the historical realities in the first of above-mentioned meanings – the historical situation.

In the constancy of references to the facts of history that still structure our view of the present as a continuation of the past, the continuity of self-positing is the reality of history, as we understand it today⁴. This is not an appeal to the future in its connection with the present and not a question of how our today affects our tomorrow. Rather, it is the question “how our understanding of yesterday’s influences our today’s.” So the question posed suggests that the past is changeable and accessible, we have access to the past in its variability, in its transformations where we find today's ourselves. This incompleteness of the past, which returns to us in an unpredictable form, is a frame, a background against which our thinking about specific historical events arises; an event is something that has the potency to repeat in a different form. These are the most common ideas about the modern reality of history.

In this context, a few words should be said about the concept of "modern". “Modern” in relation to “modernity” is a mega construct, invented or designed as a fundamentally self-sufficient phenomenon, already withdrawn from the flow of historical time and capable only of self-reproduction in endless “post-states”. Moreover, it contains some positive voltage between the "historical realities" as we understand them today and the meaning of the concept "modernity".

This tension, as we see it, is solved in the postmodern aesthetics, in which references to the past with its eternal return in a different guise bare a frank nature of reconstruction. Moreover, reconstruction with the nature of revelation of time, which had begun, but did not continue, did not acquire duration of foundation: we mean here the October Revolution, which initially reproduced itself in its birth and the reconstruction of which continued later – in the attempt to find an authentic source. It is the search for an authentic source that is the goal of historical reconstructions, in the material of which our thinking about history dwells; it is where it searches for the coherence of historical time and itself in the flow of time, itself, as continuous self-detection. It is the problems of identity that come to the fore with such a view on history, and here it is impossible not to notice the politicization of thinking about history and its connection with the problem of power and the state, problems that problematize the very concept of history in its essential definition. As a result, we find that, living in history, we have no history: families, cities,

⁴ F. Artog, *World time, history and writing history* (Minsk: BDU, 2007).

clans. Hence the repulsion from history: silence, taboos, censorship, closeness and direct distortion of facts, and at the same time - the struggle with the distortions of history, all this plunges us into a state of uncertainty in relation to the volatile past, and also the fundamental impossibility of its clarifying, which can only be striven to, but very difficult to be achieved. Hence, the features of nihilism and unethicity, which are colored by the concept of “official history”.

It is impossible not to take into account the concept of "official history" when we think about specific events in Russian history today. A nihilistic and unethicity attitude is reflected in the desire to present history as a set of fabrications – and nothing else, from which there is not and cannot be any exit, and therefore there is no sense in counting on objectivity, that is, on generally accepted assessments of one or another historical fact. It is precisely distortions, and at the same time struggle with distortions, that schizophrenic position that the “official history” is trying to drag us into, which can only be resisted by unleashing knots and secrets in the history of a family, city, or clan. Here a double stream of historical thinking, conditionally speaking “official” and “private”, reveals itself; it is with the latter that hope can be associated with the existence of historical consciousness.

All of the above is directly related to our understanding of historical facts

Now, before turning to answering the question about the sociocultural significance of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War, it would be necessary to give a brief historical overview of meanings attributed to the fact of victory at different stages of national history.

According to numerous evidence from literary sources, as well as from private experience, for the winners returning from the battlefields Victory was an experience of freedom, liberation from all types of oppression: invaders, political, ideological, state⁵. People returning from the front had a unique experience of freedom; they returned to a country that had been liberated not only from invaders, but also from in the broad sense understood state dictatorship. In this case, Victory in the Great Patriotic War did not become an element of state ideology in the form of mythologizing history, but was a living experience of concrete people, who had the potential to transform their lives as a whole, based on certain value systems, and the main one is the value of freedom as a person's ability to self-reliance. It can be said that this situation largely influenced the culture of the 60s with its local “renaissance”, but in a completely different way, when the experience of Victory began to be attributed to the official culture within the framework of state policy, and the direct experience of the participants in the events caused a change in the language and forms of self-expression. This experience in many ways became mythologized in artificial forms of utterance, which leveled the potential of direct action, gradually splitting the experience of freedom, both external and internal. Of course, all this happened against the background of the same repressive state policy of the late 40s – early 50s.

Later, during the so-called “thaw”, the experience of Victory finally solidifies in epic and monumental forms. Although artists of the 60s tried to preserve the experience of the freedom of the previous generation, they still could not stop the inertial nature of the state cultural policy, which was aimed at consistently appropriating the experience of freedom and turning it into already memorial culture. These processes and related problems are

⁵ V. V. Kasyanov, “State ideology of modern Russia”. Society: philosophy, history, culture. Num 3-4 (2011).

perfectly reflected in the film “Belarus Station”, where heroes with military experience and victory experience find themselves in a situation of loss in the world of social routine. Turning to military experience, they derive from it a source of power that hangs in the air, in some eternal “now-then”, but no longer manifested in “here and now.” In this sense, the victorious story takes on a tragic dimension. From this point on, nothing prevented the final transformation of the experience of victory into sacral value and glorify it as much as possible from transcendental distances, depriving this experience of real human meaning and actual value.

Victory becomes an instrument of state ideology, acquiring annual rituals of worship, pilgrimage events with laying flowers, visits to sacred sites; monuments are getting higher and higher, but victory and real winners farther and farther. The living experience of the winners was finally cast into oblivion. Although planned meetings of Soviet youth with veterans were educational⁶, they at the same time kept silence regarding the specific realities of the experience and life of the war participants. What was said from the scene of the assembly halls could not be reproduced at home at the family table – thus, the foundation of historical consciousness – family history began to collapse, and it was replaced by endless official songs about the Victory on the radio. But, in general, despite the extreme formalism, as well as silence, until the actual witnesses of the events of the Great Patriotic War passed away, the victory still served as a historical reference point in the Soviet people's thinking about history, as well as the fact of the revolution remained a reference to a new beginning, with its new temporary countdown, is a very characteristic feature in the whole historical thinking of the Soviet man.

The very memory of the short-term experience of freedom, fixed in consciousness in alienated ideology, is the social and cultural role of the Victory, which was literally played out by the Soviet people as a role on the historical scene. All this gradual rethinking of the history of the Great Patriotic War acquired a new meaning and new sounding already with the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the emergence of a new state – the Russian Federation.

In the modern history of Russia, the Victory in the Great Patriotic War plays a completely different role, both cultural and social, than in the Soviet Union, although something remains common. In this case, it is necessary to return to the beginning of the article, which deals with the “contemporary historical realities”, and to completely different questions that are addressed to the past.

These are the following questions: Who are we? Are we still those whose grandfathers won the Great Patriotic War? Are we alive in relation to ancestors or are we dead and are they immortal? That is, the question of identity in the context of distinguishing between the living and the dead has become the main issue related to the Victory in the Great Patriotic War. The search for the source of identity sends us to the primary experience of freedom, but in other alienated images of the same state policy, only within the framework of which this issue can be resolved. The source, the essence of which was just in the distance and emancipation with respect to the state, is still cloudy with ideology. The tools of mythologization are completely different from those in the Soviet Union. In the latter, it is the perpetuation of the fact of Victory in stone and bronze, time turned into a space of monuments, a ritual of pilgrimage, movement in space — in

⁶ V. V. Kasyanov, State youth policy (regional aspect): monograph (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov State University Press, 1997).

fact, the overcoming of the time distance. The image of the Victory greets us with a grandiose monument of a woman with an ascended sword, a solely mythological figure, devoid of individual features, columns of living descendants with offerings move towards it. In the sociocultural historical heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War, the symbols of victory are summarized and realized in modern historical reality in the images of the Eternal Flame, the Unknown Soldier, and the Motherland. The question of the identity of descendants is completely redundant in this case.

The descendants are real people, grandchildren and sons of those who acquired titanic and superhuman traits. Nevertheless, megalomania and brutalism are just the way for eternity frozen in a stone, there is nothing really human as well as temporary in these images of winners. Whereas descendants seem to enliven the monuments in the rituals of worship. This is the limit of mythologization.

Eternal memory draws its strength from oblivion – the oblivion of the experience of freedom in its alienation by eternity. No one remembers the names of concrete people, the soldier is unknown, but we, descendants of flesh and blood, are known, we know our source, and in turning towards it, we confirm our presence and identity. Each year on May 9, laying flowers, we coincide with ourselves – and so, in these series of coincidences, we discover historical time as the eternity of the return of the same – that is, a myth.

The situation changes radically with the emergence of the Russian Federation, worshipers and worshipped ones change their roles, the form of reference to the past is completely different, as well as historical thinking undergoes a dramatic change.

Most clearly, this can be observed in such a phenomenon as the “Immortal Regiment” – an international public civil-patriotic movement to preserve the personal memory of the generation of victors in the Great Patriotic War.

It seems that the analysis of the emergence and functioning of this social movement can provide the answer to the question about the role of the sociocultural heritage of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War in modern (post-Soviet) historical realities.

First of all, unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, in this case we are dealing with a grassroots nature of activity in the form of a request addressed to both the past and the present – everything is the same in form, but differs in content. We all also discover our present by looking to the past, but not to the future. The latter is given at the mercy of utopia, which in fact sends us back to the act of its acceptance lost in the past.

Nevertheless, in content, we see striking differences: if, in the case of the Soviet past, the attitude to Victory was formed within the framework of cultural policy, but today it practically does not exist. In the first case, cultural policy was expressed, as mentioned above, in the extreme degree of formalization of social movements, but today we are dealing with an informal in its origin phenomenon, although it should be noted that its informality is largely the effect of the absence of cultural policy; the request ultimately refers to the self-determination of the subject through belonging to the formal aspects of state policy in the cultural sphere, which is the meaning of the “memory policy”⁷.

⁷ A. Miller, “Russia: Power and History”. Pro et contra. Journal of Russian domestic and foreign policy. Vol: 13 (2006): 6-23.

The subject seeks his identity through affiliation, through the reconstruction of family and personal history – what is the main difference from the Soviet experience of worshipping the winners. Today, a person, being historically left to himself, due to the nature of "modern historical realities", arbitrarily, informally, produces forms in which he will be limited. In the forms of self-restraint, he literally produces the state-patriotic nature of social activity, primarily by reconstructing personal history, for lack of a meaningful state policy in the sphere of memory, as well as culture in general.

In our opinion, it is precisely the reconstructive-illusionistic nature of the attitude to the past, which, in many respects, is a much broader phenomenon today, and reveals the forms of state patriotism cast into the forms of micro-history, literally in reconstructions of family history.

After all, in fact, "family albums" are walking along the streets of cities, and private life is the material of historical reconstruction, and not mythical generalizations, as in the Soviet period.

In what sense can we talk about "immortality", the word that is used in the name of the movement "immortal regiment"? Is this the same as immortality in the case of "your Feat is immortal"? It seems that there is a difference and a rather significant one. In the case of the "regiment", it is about the immortality of specific people, and not just the immortality of their deeds – the "feat", which enlivens the descendants through their memory of the feat. Today, just descendants feel less alive than forever living ancestors. First, this is the problem of identity, the answer to the question: who am I and where do I come from? They try to find the answer in references to history, but no longer as duration, which unfolds from the very fact of the feat, which is simultaneously removed into the infinite past of its constituting duration of an act, but into the proximity of the presence of specific people. Their eternal life is eternal "now", that is, in reconstruction the duration is abolished, the eternity of the present is the main feature of modern historical realities.

All this, of course, is a reflection of the very problem of identity, its existence and construction, which has become, apparently, a problem of social life, although, of course, one cannot lose sight of the fact of state propaganda and the planting of patriotism with clumsy methods, kurtosis of which can be the appearance of grassroots social activity.

In general, the attitude to the Victory in the Great Patriotic War in modern historical realities can be considered problematic⁸. Attempts to implant patriotism in the absence of a full-fledged cultural policy, as well as attempts by a certain part of society to solve identity problems through appeal to the past with a generally descending interest in history, lead only to the archaization of both the rituals of turning to the past and, in general, to greater primitivization.

In general, such a phenomenon as the "Immortal Regiment" in its organizational aspects can be attributed to attempts to think about history in the framework of political technology discourse. Which, of course, does not mean that the motives of the participants can be brought under a common denominator.

In general, the sociocultural heritage of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War is so great that in order to comprehend its scale, a classification of the heritage objects is

⁸ A. Miller, "Russia: Power and History". Pro et contra. Journal of Russian domestic...

required. According to the type of translation of value concepts, the following can be distinguished: historically significant memorable places; works of monumental art; memorial burials; honors and awards of settlements in Russia; literary heritage, including poetic; musical heritage; historical and archival documentation, including photographs and film materials; scientific and journalistic literature; thematic paintings and drawings; thematic masterpieces of cinema; memorable calendar dates, etc.

Separately, it is worth noting: the legacy of the oral testimony of eyewitnesses to the Great Victory over fascism, the archaeological heritage that has received a commendable assessment recently, is a reflection of the socio-cultural historical heritage on the Internet⁹. Numerous artifacts of national culture are united by a common theme, addressed to the events of the Great Patriotic War and its consequences.

The traditional concept of preserving and using the tangible socio-cultural heritage, in the context of modern historical realities, is typified on three characteristic grounds:

- the ideological function of the heritage is used to reconstruct the dogmatic worldview: Christian, Islamic, nationalist, communist, and socialist;
- the preservation and use of objects of the material socio-cultural heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War takes place in an extensive way by constantly attracting other material resources;
- the sociocultural legacy of victory in the Great Patriotic War receives an ideological assessment, which is embodied in the hierarchy of the ideological significance of individual historical objects and non-recognition, and, consequently, in the destruction of objects that are contrary to dogmatic ideas.

Discussions

Preservation and use of the objects of social and cultural heritage of the victory in the Great Patriotic War, according to A.I. Grishin should fully comply with the goals of sustainable ethical and historical social development, defined as “socially desirable, economically viable and socially and environmentally sustainable development of society”. The problem of sociocultural heritage, as well as the preservation and use of its objects is currently worldwide, since “the study of problems associated with cultural and historical monuments, as well as the study of the monuments themselves will always be relevant for society”.

Modern society, being deeply injured, is experiencing the consequences of socio-cultural trauma, including in relation to its legacy of victory in the Great Patriotic War. Both the immediate and remote consequences of the war for modern historical reality can be divided into several categories according to the content¹⁰:

- humanitarian (victims): irrevocable and sanitary;
- economic (material costs and destruction);
- social (changes in the social, demographic, national, ethnic, racial, religious, professional structure of society);

⁹ V. V. Kasyanov and V. N. Nechipurenko, *Sociology of the Internet: a textbook for academic undergraduate* (Moscu: Yurayt, 2017).

¹⁰ G. V. Bakumenko and T. V. Kovalenko, “Monuments of the Great Patriotic...”

- political (changing the role of the state, political parties and social movements in society, changing the nature of the exercise of democratic rights and freedoms of citizens);
- spiritual (changing goals, motives, attitudes, social ideology and psychology of people);
- environmental (degradation of the natural environment);
- military (related to the state of the armed forces and the level of the development of military art).

In modern reality, a popular mass history was formed, where instead of the fact and document, myth comes first. According to B. A. Lanin, “mythologization became the main method, if not of historical research, then at least of historical narration, and history itself became the subject of a postmodern game, and if there is no truth that is meaningful and fixed by historians, then you should trust your feelings, intuition, emotions”¹¹.

According to P. A. Shumeev, an important condition for the preservation of the socio-cultural heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War in the modern socio-historical reality is:

- firstly, the improvement of the legal framework for the preservation, use and promotion of the objects of the socio-cultural heritage of victory;
- secondly, decentralization of management, when strategic functions in this sphere are carried out at the federal level, tactical at the level of the subjects of the federation, operational at the local level;
- thirdly, the broad democratization of management, based on the development of amateur activities of modern citizens in the field of preserving the historical and socio-cultural heritage and the active participation of voluntary communities, creative unions and initiative associations;
- fourthly, ensuring the infrastructure of the tourist sites to be visited, thereby popularizing the socio-cultural heritage and historical sites;
- fifthly, “organizing monitoring of the territory of historical buildings and objects of social and cultural heritage, with the aim of not only active intervention but also to predict the development of problem situations in the future”¹².

In the historiography of the Great Patriotic War, according to V. N. Paramonova, three tendencies began to appear:

- 1) the denial of well-established ideological concepts and principles for covering various aspects of the history of war, the unjustified refusal of the positive capital of the conducted research; an attempt to write a history of war from a “clean slate”;
- 2) an attempt to objectively analyze long-known facts and events of the period under study and new data through the prism of obvious reasons and factors that determined their place in history, the desire to preserve a holistic perception of history;
- 3) the preservation of the prevailing ideological ideas, the rejection of the opening “blank spots of history”¹³.

¹¹ B. A. Lanin, Transformation of history in modern literatura. Social Sciences and Modernity. 2000. 180.

¹² P. A. Shumeev, Urboecological support for the preservation of historical buildings based on monitoring of the environment (for example, the city of Rostov-on-Don): Diss. Cand. Techn. Sciences. Rostov on / D, 2014.

Conclusion

The main content of the sociocultural heritage of the victory in the Great Patriotic War in the context of modern ethical and historical realities is to preserve the memory of a historical event that is large-scale for the Russian people and peoples of the world, and assess the significance of the heroic feat of the Soviet people in the victory over fascism.

It was the victory of the coalition of communist and liberal ideological principles over the anti-human ideology of fascism, formed within a number of national totalitarian cultures, that unites the symbols of success of the winning nations in the Great Patriotic War and global symbols of the success of the victorious nations in the Great Patriotic War and global success symbols of humanistic ideals. The victory of humanism over inhumanity is reflected in the sociocultural heritage of victory in the Great Patriotic War, symbolizing the success of unity in front of a common threat.

References

Artog, F. World time, history and writing history. Minsk: BDU. 2007.

Bakumenko G. V. and Kovalenko, T. V. "Monuments of the Great Patriotic War: symbolization of success and issues of reconstruction of historical and cultural heritage". Heritage of centuries num 1 (2015): 80-89.

Kasyanov, V. V. and Nechipurenko, V. N. Sociology of the Internet: a textbook for academic undergraduate. Moscú: Yurayt. 2017.

Kasyanov, V. V. State youth policy (regional aspect): monograph. Rostov-on-Don: Rostov State University Press. 1997.

Kasyanov, V. V. "State ideology of modern Russia". Society: philosophy, history, culture. Num 3-4 (2011).

Lanin, B. A. Transformation of history in modern literatura. Social Sciences and Modernity. 2000.

Likhachev, D. S. Ecology of Culture. Monuments of the Fatherland: Almanac of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture. 1980.

Miller, A. "Russia: Power and History". Pro et contra. Journal of Russian domestic and foreign policy. Vol: 13 (2006): 6-23.

Paramonov, V. N. Modern historiography of the Great Patriotic War: public inquiry and scientific response. Collection of materials of the All-Russian scientific conference with international participation, dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. Omsk. 2015.

¹³ V. N. Paramonov, Modern historiography of the Great Patriotic War: public inquiry and scientific response. Collection of materials of the All-Russian scientific conference with international participation, dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. Omsk. 2015.

Socio-cultural heritage of victory in the great patriotic war in the context of modern ethical and historical realities pág. 131

Shumeev, P. A. Urboecological support for the preservation of historical buildings based on monitoring of the environment (for example, the city of Rostov-on-Don): Diss. Cand. Techn. Sciences. Rostov on / D, 2014.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.