

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)
International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science
 p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)
 Year: 2025 Issue: 10 Volume: 150
 Received: 01.10.2025
 Accepted/Published: 30.10.2025 <https://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Yulia Igorevna Prokhorova

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
 Bachelor, Shakhty, Russia

Arthur Alexandrovich Blagorodov

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
 postgraduate student

Natalia Sergeevna Rumyantseva

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
 PhD, Associate Professor

Svetlana Yurievna Korablina

LLC CPOSN Ortomoda
 Candidate of Technical Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy director

Galina Yurievna Volkova

LLC CPOSN Ortomoda
 Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Gen. principal,
 Moscow, Russia

FEATURES OF THE PHENOMENON OF THE EVOLUTION OF EMIGRANT COSSACK HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE XIV-XX CENTURIES

Abstract: This article presents the results of a historiographical study of the entire body of research and publications devoted to Cossack issues, including scientific and popular literature, memoirs, fiction, legal, military, religious, reference, and other publications. It charts the history of the study of the Cossack phenomenon in Russia, beginning with the first mentions of Cossacks in Russian chronicles and continuing until the collapse of the USSR in the late 20th century. The emergence and development of a distinct Cossack historiographic tradition is examined separately. Particular attention is paid to the evolution of émigré Cossack historiography in the 20th century.

Key words: historiography, hypostasis, Orthodoxy, ethnocultural, demand, immunity, demography, political science, White Cossacks, Cossacks, geopolitical, stereotypical, sovereign, phenomenon, frontier.

Language: English

Citation: Prokhorova, Yu.I., Blagorodov, A.A., Rumyantseva, N.S., Korablina, S.Yu., & Volkova, G.Yu. (2025). Features of the phenomenon of the evolution of emigrant Cossack historiography in the XIV-XX centuries. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (150), 45-69.

Soi: <https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-150-4>

Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2025.10.150.4>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction

UDC 930.47:836.78.

During the Civil War and the existence of sovereign Cossack republics, which attempted to

organize genuine state-building with all the trappings of sovereignty, the phenomenon of "independent" Cossack historiography naturally emerged. Representatives of this school sought to create and interpret the history of the Cossack people, to establish

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

their own, Cossack, "independent" historical science. The Don and Kuban regions became the main centers of Cossack "independentists." Cossack newspapers and magazines during these years actively encouraged the Don intelligentsia to write the history of the Cossacks, to collect sources, and, especially, to perpetuate the memory of the Cossacks' exploits in the struggle for their freedom during the raging Civil War, which the independentists viewed as a struggle of the Cossack people against "Russian," "peasant," and "Bolshevik" aggression. As A. V. Venkov recently convincingly demonstrated in his major publication, many of these historical materials from the separatists later became part of the sources for the writing of M. A. Sholokhov's epic "Quiet Flows the Don."

During the short period of independence, independent Cossack historiography had only just begun to take its first steps. This independent historiography was primarily expressed in the Cossack periodicals of that turbulent time. The goal was only then to collect historical material, primarily "about the heroic struggle of the Cossacks against the Bolshevik (or, in the case of the independentists, the 'Great Russian' or 'Muscovite') invasion." But already at this time, the first attempt to write a fundamental, comprehensive historical work was made by E. P. Savelyev.

On the other hand, it cannot be claimed that Cossack historiography itself remained unified during the years of Cossack independence. Numerous Cossack authors and publications of this period were just as divided into several ideological camps as the Cossacks themselves were divided into Whites, Reds, Greens, nationalists, and a myriad of other diverse shades and trends.

During the Civil War, almost all the energy and time of the Cossack intelligentsia and officers were devoted to the arduous (and tragically hopeless, as we now understand) armed and ideological struggle against the Red and, at times, even the White armies. Only in exile did the Cossacks have more than enough time for historiographical reflection on the nature of Cossackism and its historical reflection.

This was well understood by émigré authors themselves. Here's what the renowned Cossack journal "Rodimy Kray" wrote on the matter in 1967: "Cossack self-awareness, characterized by Ataman Platov, persisted among the entire Cossack community right up until the civil war. This war gave impetus to the awakening of Cossack nationalism. Its growth was facilitated by Bolshevik brutality and lawlessness among the Cossack population, as well as the White command's overly biased attitude toward all things Cossack. They considered the Cossack Hosts to be Russian provinces, with all that that entailed. At the time, the civil war was raging, and the Cossacks, bleeding to death, were waging an untenable struggle, so there was no time to investigate the origins of the Cossacks. When the Cossacks lost the war and found

themselves abroad, there was more time than necessary for reflection. Every Cossack, against their will, wondered: why are we, the Cossacks, the only ones who have to pay for broken pots? Why did the Russian people, millions strong, contribute only a few thousand fighters to the Volunteer Army to fight Bolshevism? As can be seen from the above passage, the emergence of Cossack nationalism, and consequently, independent historiography, is linked here to the violence perpetrated against the Cossacks by both the Reds and the Whites during the war.

Main part

Below, we will examine in detail the various trends in Cossack émigré historiography, and now we will turn to the period of the Civil War and attempt to identify the specific conditions in which independent Cossack historiography emerged. During these same years, the White Cossack historiographic trends of "autonomists" and "unified" also emerged, becoming the direct successors of pre-revolutionary imperial historiography.

On the eve of the Revolution of 1917, there were officially twelve Cossack troops in the Russian Empire, the Cossacks of which were listed according to the corresponding military class. In addition, various groups of the historically existing Cossack population continued to exist from among some of the troops that had been abolished earlier, and in addition to this, it is necessary to mention the former "foreign" Cossack troops (usually from the steppe people), the population of which also lost the Cossack military class status, but continued to feel their kinship with the Cossacks.

Cossack troops: Don, Terek, Ural (Yaik), Kuban (as the successor to the Zaporizhian Cossack), Astrakhan (Volga) - officially since 1776, but even before that, for centuries, the Volga Cossacks were noted, who, as an organized force, were destroyed and dispersed by Ivan the Terrible, Siberian (since 1582), Orenburg (since 1736), Transbaikal (since 1851), Amur (since 1858), Semirechensk (since 1867), Ussuri (since 1889), Irkutsk (Yenisei) Cossacks.

Former Cossack troops: Bug, Yekaterinoslav (Voskresensk), Danube (Novorossiysk), Ukrainian, Azov, Stavropol Kalmyk, Bashkir-Meshcheryak (Bashkir), Crimean Tatar, Greek (Albanian), Chuguev and Bakhmut Cossacks. And, finally, we must recall the organization of the Euphrates (Mezhdurechensk) Cossack army, prepared during the First World War, but not completed.

By the beginning of the Civil War, there remained groups of Cossacks, some of whom were "former Cossacks." During the reforms of the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, they had lost their class status as Cossack troops and, accordingly, had become "de-Cossackized," that is, deprived of their Cossack rights, privileges, and obligations. However, these social and ethnic groups did not lose

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

their traditional Cossack culture and retained its corresponding worldview, behavioral patterns, and economic and everyday life. This applies primarily to Cossack troops of other ethnicities—the Kalmyks and Bashkirs—as well as to the Caucasian Line Cossacks from the so-called "old line" (Azov-Mozdok), in the part of it that became part of the Stavropol Governorate. These were long-time Cossacks who had settled in the North Caucasus before the region became part of the Russian Empire. They, for the most part, refused to be forcibly resettled to the newly established Sunzhenskaya "new line" after the official end of the Great Caucasian War and, as a result, when the Terek and Kuban troops were formed, they were deprived of their Cossack status.

In all "official" Cossack hosts, local authorities and the majority of Cossacks reacted extremely negatively to the 1917 revolution in general, and especially to the Bolshevik seizure of power and the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly. In any case, regardless of their political preferences, the majority of rank-and-file Cossacks did not desire any revolutionary changes in their Cossack host regions. Similar sentiments were expressed by the "former Cossacks" category. Initially, the Cossacks hoped to "reach an agreement with Russia" based on non-interference in each other's affairs and the preservation of the sovereignty of the Cossack hosts. However, the inexorable logic of the Civil War pushed all opposing sides toward a bloody, violent resolution of the festering contradictions. This situation was characteristic of all regions traditionally inhabited by the Cossacks. However, the contradictions of the Civil War manifested themselves most acutely and obviously in the "Russian Vendée"—the Cossack regions of southern Russia—on the Don, Kuban, Terek, Volga, lower Urals (Yaik), and Ukraine. Moreover, it was here that the Cossacks succeeded in establishing their own independent statehood, which found expression in the creation of their own independent literature, press, and historiography.

The Civil War became the greatest tragedy in the Cossacks' history. It was among the Cossacks that brother literally rose against brother, and son against father. This tragedy found brilliant epic expression in M. A. Sholokhov's novel "And Quiet Flows the Don." However, what the writer's genius had anticipated proved beyond the grasp of professional historians for many years. Here it is appropriate to note one purely literary and philological aspect of the problem, concerning the ongoing debate over Sholokhov's authorship.

While the "Reds" had no doubt about the authorship of the great Soviet classic, the "Whites" were convinced that Sholokhov had won the Nobel Prize by rewriting and reworking the notes of a certain White Cossack officer. What's important for us, however, is the fact that the novel's text itself "felt authentic" to both the "Whites" and the "Reds."

The rift between Soviet and White émigré historiography was an insurmountable, antagonistic contradiction, born of a monomethodological, class-based approach on both sides. Soviet and émigré historians were literally and figuratively separated by an "iron curtain" of mutual misunderstanding, distrust, irreconcilable political interests, and divergent source materials.

The civil war in the South of Russia developed particularly sharply and dramatically, which was caused by the complex interweaving of social, national (ethnic), religious and foreign policy contradictions characteristic of this unique region. The tangle of contradictions found its resolution in a multitude of diverse conflicts: interclass, interethnic, interfaith and international. Many conflicts overlapped, tearing the social fabric in different directions (vectors). For example, interethnic clashes in mountain societies often acquired the coloring of class struggle or, conversely, class struggle "dressed up" in the clothes of the struggle for the true faith. The situation was especially complicated by the active intervention of agents of foreign powers and interventionist troops. The Cossacks, willingly or unwillingly, found themselves involved in almost all of these conflicts. Interethnic conflicts with the mountain population, who had not forgotten old grievances from the Great Caucasian War. Social and class conflicts with the "out-of-town", mainly Russian and Ukrainian, peasantry. At the same time, the Cossacks formed a common front with the peasants against the food tax and similar emergency measures, i.e., in essence, against the urban proletariat. Confessional conflicts were generally typical for a region such as the North Caucasus, and in this case, the militant atheism of the Bolsheviks caused a sharply negative reaction from the traditionally believing Cossacks. Since the 17th century, Old Believer Cossacks found refuge in the Caucasus from the persecution of official Orthodoxy. In addition, the Orthodox faith served as a unifying principle for the Cossacks, which consolidated Cossack societies in a foreign-confessional and foreign-ethnic environment. It is no coincidence that the custom of requiring a new Cossack to cross himself "at the circle" when accepting him into a stanitsa has long been established. Finally, there was no unity among the Cossacks themselves - they also split into the Reds, the Whites, and the separatists.

At first, the Cossack masses reacted relatively indifferently to the revolutionary events of 1917. After the October Revolution and the establishment of Soviet power, the military circles and ataman boards of the Cossack military regions refused to submit to the new government and hoped to restore their former freedom and independence, which the Cossacks had been deprived of by Peter the Great. The military board of the Kuban region, led by the military ataman A.P. Filimonov, was one of the first among the

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Cossack regions in Russia to refuse to recognize Soviet power. The outbreak of the Civil War also provoked hostility among the majority of Cossacks, under the slogan, "It is not fitting for a Cossack to participate in a fratricidal war." However, even at this time, White and Red movements were beginning to form among the Cossacks. The active core of the future White movement was formed primarily from the officer corps and military administration. The foundation of the Red movement became frontline Cossacks, whose mass return from the fronts of World War I began after the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Peace. External forces also sought to draw the Cossacks into the nascent Civil War. The Bolsheviks, the Whites, and all counterrevolutionary forces, including foreign emissaries from England, France, the United States, and Germany, all sought to enlist the Cossacks' support. As early as late November 1917, the Paris Conference of the Entente powers discussed the "Russian question," which resulted in the adoption of the Foch Memorandum. This document "viewed the Cossacks as the organizing core around which all counterrevolutionary forces in the country were to unite." It was precisely to the Don, Kuban, and Terek rivers that officers of the Tsarist army, including Generals Alekseyev, Kornilov, Denikin, and other future leaders of the White movement and organizers of the Volunteer Army, made their way, hoping for Cossack support. As A. I. Denikin recalled, "Alekseyev intended to utilize the southeastern region, in particular, as a rich base, well-equipped with its own armed forces." As Denikin further notes, Alekseev understood that the Cossacks "were unwilling to advance" to "restore order in Russia," i.e., to shed their blood in a fratricidal war for foreign interests. However, the general hoped "that the Cossacks would defend their own property and territory."

Thus, one can see what the Whites' primary interest was. The White Guards consisted primarily of officers, of whom they had an abundance (entire officer battalions were formed), but the rank-and-file soldiers did not follow the Whites, but instead sided with the Reds. Therefore, the Whites were desperately short of "cannon fodder." The Cossacks understood this perfectly well and were not eager to fill such a vacant position.

At first, the Whites were not greeted with enthusiasm in the Cossack regions of southern Russia. As Denikin himself acknowledged: "The situation on the Don, however, proved to be unusually complex. Ataman Kaledin, having learned of Alekseev's plans and heard his request to 'give shelter to the Russian officers,' responded with principled sympathy; but, considering the prevailing mood in the region, he asked Alekseev not to linger in Novocherkassk for more than a week and to transfer his activities somewhere outside the region—to Stavropol or Kamyshevo." Kaledin also advised Denikin himself

during a personal meeting:

"You'll find shelter on the Don. But, frankly, it would be better for you to wait it out somewhere in the Caucasus or in the Kuban villages until the situation becomes clearer."

The situation in the Don region was truly the most complex and confusing of all the Cossack regions in southern Russia. Not only was the proletariat high in large industrial cities like Rostov-on-Don, and not only did the "out-of-town" peasantry lay claim to land, but the Cossacks themselves suffered from land shortages and were thus sooner divided by class struggle. In February and March, the formation of Soviets began, with Cossacks of the 32nd Don Cossack Regiment distinguishing themselves in their organization, including future Red Army heroes F.K. Mironov and S.M. Budyonny. As early as March 8, 1918, the regional Military Revolutionary Committee began organizing Red Army detachments. Recruitment was primarily from front-line soldiers, addressed in an open letter by the chairman of the Military Revolutionary Committee, F.G. Podtelkov. On March 23, the Military Revolutionary Committee, with Lenin's approval, decided to establish the Don Soviet Republic. And already from April 9–14, 1918, in Rostov-on-Don, the "First Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Cossack Deputies of the Don Soviet Republic" proclaimed itself the supreme authority and elected the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars. However, the bulk of the Cossacks remained neutral during this period, a fact acknowledged by both émigré and Soviet historiography. Soviet historian A.P. Yermolin wrote that "unfortunately, surviving documents from the Don and other Cossack regions do not allow us to determine the exact number of Cossacks who joined the Red Army during this period," and further stated that "the bulk of the Red Army detachments were workers and peasants," while "the Cossacks of the middle class mostly remained neutral."

Overall, the Don Host region had long occupied an inland position, closer in every sense to the center of Russia. Therefore, the Great Don Host, the primary "capital" for all Cossacks, largely followed the path of revolution and civil war typical of the central Russian provinces. However, with one significant difference: the Cossacks were not, by nature, Russian peasants.

As early as January-February 1918, on the orders of the Council of People's Commissars, the Cossack Committee of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee dispatched over 100 agitators from the "Detachment for the Defense of the Rights of Working Cossacks," formed in Petrograd, to the Don and Kuban regions. The results of Bolshevik agitation quickly bore fruit. In the winter of 1918, congresses of the Cossack departments of the Kuban Host were organized, which, among other things, resolved that "the positions of atamans, their assistants, and assemblies are abolished as no longer meeting the

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

requirements of life. The offices of stanitsa, village, hamlet, and other administrative boards, along with all their affairs and archives, are transferred to the jurisdiction of the Councils of People's Deputies."

However, as the leaders of local RCP(b) organizations in Kuban themselves acknowledged, Soviets were established primarily in large centers with a predominantly non-resident population and in peasant districts, while they were virtually absent from the Cossack stanitsas. Cossack stanitsas had historically had their own "Soviets"—they resolved all their issues at meetings (radas, maidans), and stanitsa self-government remained unchanged. Soviet researcher A.P. Yermolin concluded that "the class isolation of the Cossacks hindered political and class divisions within their ranks, which complicated Soviet construction in the Cossack regions of the country." The very first measures taken by the Soviet government in the Cossack regions, primarily to resolve the agrarian question in the interests of the non-resident peasantry and mountain peoples, caused a sharp alienation among the bulk of the Cossacks. Moreover, subsequent measures in line with the general policy of War Communism alienated the middle peasantry from other cities from Soviet power. Faced with a growing counterrevolution, the party leadership attempted to quickly revise its tactics in the Cossack regions. To seek a compromise with the "poor and middle peasant" layers of the Cossacks, the Central Committee of the RCP(b) and the Council of People's Commissars decided to convene an All-Russian Congress of Working Cossacks on May 7, 1918. However, the outbreak of the Civil War prevented the implementation of this large-scale undertaking. Nevertheless, based on proposals from a conference held under the Cossack Committee of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, the Council of People's Commissars adopted the "Decree on the Organization of Governance of the Cossack Regions" on May 31, 1918, which was published on June 1. The decree recognized the administrative autonomy of the Cossack regions, the equal right of Cossacks to participate in councils of workers, peasants, and Cossack deputies, guaranteed the right of working Cossacks to land, and defined the principles for the formation of Cossack units of the Red Army "taking into account all the everyday and military characteristics of the Cossacks." However, even official Soviet historians acknowledged that "the civil war significantly hindered the implementation of the Council of People's Commissars' decree of May 31, 1918."

The Bolsheviks attempted to use terrorist methods to suppress the Cossack elite and intimidate the middle peasant masses (circular of the Orgburo of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) of January 24, 1919) in order to split the Cossacks, draw them into class struggle, and provoke the outbreak of civil war in the Cossack regions. This was done by relying on

the poor peasantry from other cities and, especially, the mountain peoples of the North Caucasus, who acted against the Cossacks under "internationalist" Bolshevik slogans. However, these Bolshevik actions did not produce the desired result. On the contrary, the inconsistent Bolshevik policy towards the Cossacks and the leftist "excesses" at the local level during the violent "de-Cossackization" policy alienated the bulk of the Cossacks from Soviet power at this stage.

"Starting in March, the situation began to noticeably change to our disadvantage. The disintegration of the Cossack ranks gave way to their cohesion and organization. The Cossacks began to defect from us to the enemy."

The peculiarities of the military situation in the South of Russia during the most acute period of the Civil War, when Kuban and Terek were cut off from the central regions of Russia and became rear areas of the White movement, determined the leading role of the Don in the formation of Red Cossack units and formations. It was from among the Don Cossacks that the most prominent Red Cossack commanders emerged: S. M. Budyonny, M. F. Blinov, M. B. Dumenko, F. K. Mironov and others. Already in 1918, under the leadership of the Don Bureau of the RCP(b), the first Red Cossack units were created: the Don Combined Cossack, the 1st Don Cossack Regiment of Gurov, the 1st Don Cossack Infantry, the 2nd Cossack Cavalry Regiment of Blinov, the 4th Don Cossack Cavalry Regiment of Dumenko, the 3rd Don Cossack Revolutionary Regiment, the 5th Revolutionary Cossack Regiment, the Don Cossack Socialist Regiment of Polyakov, the Cossack Brigade of Mironov, the Don-Stavropol Division and other Red Cossack units. In 1918, a total of 14 Red Cossack regiments were active in the Red Army on the Southern Front. By the end of 1919, the Cossack force in the Red Army on the Southern Front numbered 40,000 bayonets and sabres. This formed the basis for the formation of the 1st and, later, the 2nd Cavalry Armies within the Red Army. It was Budyonny's 1st Cavalry Army that became a kind of "pole of attraction" for the consolidation of the Red Cossacks.

In the Kuban, isolated Red Cossack detachments arose semi-spontaneously under the leadership of N. E. Batluk, E. M. Voronov, M. G. Ilyin, I. A. Kochubey, and G. I. Mironenko, forced to engage primarily in guerrilla warfare after the victory of the counterrevolution. On the Terek, the Red movement developed primarily in the Pyatigorsk region and in the industrial zone around Grozny. These regions included relatively large cities, where a significant proportion of the population belonged to the proletarian strata, among whom Bolshevik organizations held strong positions. Here, of the numerous partisan detachments, the largest Red formations were a detachment of 1,500 bayonets and sabres under the leadership of the Cossack Bolshevik V. I. Kuchura and the so-called Soviet Troops of the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Sunzha Line, numbering approximately 3,000 men with 20 guns and 30 machine guns, commanded by another Bolshevik Cossack, A. Z. Dyakov. Later, in the final stages of the Civil War, after the Whites retreated from the Kuban and Terek Rivers, the Red Cossack detachments of the Kuban and Terek Cossacks were incorporated into Budyonny's 1st Cavalry Army.

The White movement gained momentum in the South of Russia in general and in the Kuban and Terek in particular. The first White Cossack detachments appeared in the Kuban and Terek as early as the beginning of 1918. One of these detachments, often spontaneously formed, was the "wolf hundred" of the legendary White partisan Shkuro, who assembled his detachment of only 20-30 men. And on May 21, 1919, the Caucasian Army was formed from the White Cossack units and subunits of the North Caucasus. It was led by cavalry general Baron Wrangel. The army included the following corps: the 1st Kuban, made up of Kuban and Terek Cossacks under the command of General V. L. Pokrovsky; the 2nd Kuban, under General S. G. Ulagay; The 4th Cavalry Corps of General P.N. Shatilov, which also consisted of Kuban troops, and the Combined Corps, which included the Combined Mountain Cavalry Division, composed of mountaineers from the North Caucasus. In mid-1919, the Caucasian Army numbered 25,000 bayonets and sabres, 50 guns, 250 machine guns, six armored trains, and several tanks.

Wrangel's Caucasian Army, in coordination with the Don Cossacks, advanced on Tsaritsyn while simultaneously fighting the Reds in the North Caucasus. Operating on two opposing operational fronts, Wrangel achieved only partial success at Tsaritsyn and ultimately suffered defeat. Having suffered heavy losses, the Caucasian Army was forced to retreat across the Manych River by the end of 1919 and, on February 8, 1920, was renamed the Kuban Army. However, Wrangel's forces failed to hold Kuban. After the Whites evacuated to Crimea, the 1st and 2nd Kuban Divisions had only 700 bayonets and 2,600 sabres. Most of the Kuban and Terek Cossacks grew weary of the war, and the Cossacks either returned home or surrendered to the Reds at Taman. However, the repressions of the Red Terror and the policy of decossackization carried out by the Reds in Kuban sparked a surge of White and Green rebellion, which the Whites attempted to take advantage of by forming the "Army of the Rebirth of Russia" under General P. P. Fostikov. But Fostikov's men were quickly defeated by the Red Army.

The White Guards lacked the ideological and political unity of their Bolshevik opponents. The White movement itself was split into many factions, from pro-monarchist forces to liberals and moderate socialists. In the Kuban and Terek regions, the Whites failed to consolidate their forces, unlike, for example, on the Don. Moreover, the Whites' harsh repressive

measures against "deserters and draft dodgers" among the Cossacks they were attempting to mobilize for the "main front" on the Don irritated and embittered a significant portion of the North Caucasian Cossacks, which objectively contributed to the spread of Red and Green insurgency in the White Guard rear.

Thus, it can be seen that in the North Caucasus, unlike in the Don region, the Red Cossack movement did not achieve widespread development. On the other hand, within the White movement, the North Caucasian Cossacks played a more significant role, although even here the significance of the North Caucasus is not comparable to that of the Don Host Region. Various forms and trends of insurgency, including Cossack ones, were significantly more widespread in the Kuban, Terek, and Stavropol regions. Moreover, here we see a wide spectrum of different insurgent movements – from the White partisans of Shkuro and the Red partisans of Kuchura, the Green rebels "against all" and a wide variety of ethnic (tribal) detachments of highlanders and "Ukrainian separatists" in the Kuban region, all the way to various gangs. At this, one might say, grassroots level of the "small civil war" in the 1920s, ethno-confessional conflicts, traditional for the North Caucasus, played a significant role.

In this complex environment of intertwined ethnic and political contradictions, the project of the Don-Caucasian Union—a federal Cossack state association—was put forward as an attempt to overcome them. It was on this basis that various proposals for the creation of a sovereign "Cossackia" would subsequently develop in exile.

The fundamental constitutional provisions of the Don-Caucasian Union were formulated in a draft of the same name, consisting of sixteen articles. The first article defined the form of government: "The Don-Caucasian Union shall consist of independently governed states: the Great Don Host, the Kuban Host, the Terek Host, the Astrakhan Host, and the Union of Highlanders of the North Caucasus and Dagestan, united into a single state on a federal basis."

The second article defined the complete internal sovereignty of the constituent entities of the federation: "Each of the states comprising the Don-Caucasian Union shall govern its internal affairs in accordance with local laws on the basis of complete autonomy." This provision implied that the proposed union was not actually to be a federal, but rather a confederal association. The union was to have its own flag, seal, and anthem (Article 4).

Article 8 determined that the Union would have a common army and navy, and Article 11 affirmed the commonality of the monetary system, banknotes, postage and revenue stamps, railway, port, postal and telegraph tariffs throughout the territory of the Union.

At the head of the Union, a "supreme council" was established, consisting of the atamans (or their deputies) of the Don, Kuban, Terek, and Astrakhan

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

regions, and the head of the Union of Highlanders of the North Caucasus and Dagestan, who would elect a chairman from among their number, who would carry out the decrees of the supreme council." A "sejm" of representatives of the populations of the states belonging to the Union was to convene at least once a year under the supreme council.

The federal government was to consist of six ministers (foreign affairs, military and naval affairs, finance, trade and industry, communications, posts and telegraphs), as well as a state controller and a state secretary. Novocherkassk was declared the temporary capital of the union.

However, even this compromise plan proved unacceptable, both to the White patriots and the Volunteer Army command, as well as to the Cossack and Ukrainian separatists. As a result, chronic internal contradictions remained the main characteristic of the entire White movement in southern Russia, as well as in all other regions of the country.

Much later, in the 1960s, in a speech at a Cossack gathering in New York City commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power and the outbreak of the Civil War, B. N. Ulanov characterized the outcome of the Civil War for the Cossacks as follows: "The Don Cossacks (like all Cossacks) did not recognize this authority 50 years ago. They fought against it for years, suffering countless human sacrifices, losing their most remarkable and talented sons and all their wealth." Regarding the reasons for the defeat of the Cossack military republics, the same author further comments: "The Cossacks suffered a military defeat because they were forced to fight virtually all of Russia, its restored army, armed and supplied by the former Empire. The majority of the General Staff and a significant portion of the officer corps sided with the Soviets..."

It must be said that this is a very honest and accurate characterization of the reasons for the military defeat not only of the Cossacks but of the entire White movement, a characterization fully confirmed by the latest research by Russian historians. Thus, according to research by V. Ya. Grosul, 75% of the Red Army command staff in 1918 were military specialists from among former officers, 53% in 1919, 42% in 1920, and 34% in 1921. The Whites faced an even more difficult situation in terms of staffing their units and subunits with rank-and-file personnel. Mobilizing human resources became the number one priority for the White command. Great-power fervor found little sympathy among the Cossacks, who were unwilling to shed their blood for the ambitions of the White generals. In their village circles, Cossacks resolved "not to participate in a fratricidal war" or "the Russian revolution does not concern the Cossacks." The Cossack military governments, elected democratically for the first time since the time of Peter the Great, were also reluctant to become embroiled in the standoff between the Whites and the Reds. The

Cossacks retained particularly negative memories of their use by the tsarist government as "whip-bearers" in 1905–1907. It is no coincidence that Cossack deputies in the first State Duma raised the issue of disbanding the privileged Cossack corps and ending the use of Cossack units to disperse demonstrations. They justified this legally by arguing that Cossacks should be called up for service in the event of a war with an external enemy, not for police duties. Given such sentiments among rank-and-file Cossacks, in the first months of the Civil War, the military governments hoped to reach an agreement with the Bolsheviks on the basis of neutrality. However, these hopes were dashed. Both the Whites and the Reds exerted every effort to exacerbate the political situation in the Cossack regions. They sought to draw the Cossacks into the war. The Whites hoped to organize a "Russian Vendée" in the South, while the Bolsheviks, for their part, distrusted the Cossacks and, under the guise of peace negotiations and neutrality, sought to ignite class warfare within the Cossacks themselves, using young Cossack front-line soldiers, demobilized soldiers, the urban proletariat, non-Russian peasants, and non-Russians. Therefore, the inexorable logic of the Civil War forced Cossack troops to enter the conflict. Those who tried to remain on the sidelines faced not only political pressure but also direct aggression and reprisals from both sides of the civil conflict.

Therefore, in the conditions of the Civil War, ideological and political propaganda work acquired special significance. Political propaganda was one of the main weapons in the struggle for the sympathies of the broad masses of the people and, what was even more significant for all warring parties, for the morale and readiness to fight of ordinary soldiers and officers of the White and Red armies. For these reasons, the periodical press became the most important front in the ideological struggle in those years. In the Cossack regions, the military press became a means of mobilizing ordinary Cossacks to "resist the Red aggression." On the other hand, the Cossack "independent" periodicals had to defend and justify their "independence" from the "great-power dictate" of the White generals.

One of the most important justifications for the "independence" of the Cossacks was the affirmation of their historical roots, rights and privileges. Only historical tradition could give the highest sanction to the national sovereignty of the Cossacks. In such extraordinary external and internal circumstances, the Cossack press became an arena not only for political but also for historiographical struggle for the independence and autonomy of the Cossacks, their national, cultural and political sovereignty.

During the years of the Revolution and the Civil War, in the context of the general collapse and destruction of the old state system, a huge number of the most diverse printed publications were published,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

often reproduced by handicraft methods, or even in manuscript. This applies to both the Reds and the Whites, and to the most diverse "local" publications of the county, district, stanitsa or regimental scale.

Cossack periodicals were no exception. Publications were often published irregularly, editorial offices moved from place to place following the kaleidoscopically changing White and Red authorities, employees and journalists were subjected to repression or trivial robbery, or simply disappeared without a trace. The situation was aggravated by the growing collapse of the market, supply systems and infrastructure, an acute shortage of paper and printing ink. Looking ahead, we note that we could observe a similar picture, although not of such a catastrophic scale, in Cossack periodicals not so long ago, at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s.

Furthermore, it must be taken into account that the Bolsheviks, who came to power, banned the publication of all newspapers, including Cossack and non-Bolshevik ones, and any other periodicals, and the editorial offices of such publications were disbanded. Later, Soviet citizens faced repressive punishment from the authorities for the mere possession of "anti-Soviet literature." Most of the surviving materials ended up in special archive and library repositories closed to researchers.

Therefore, source study and historiographical analysis, as well as a complete bibliographic description of these materials, present a very challenging task, one that is still far from complete. With regard to the Cossack press, particularly local publications, such bibliographic work is still far from complete. Below, without claiming to be exhaustive, we will examine the most significant and well-known Cossack publications from the period of the 1917 Revolution and the Civil War.

In Petrograd, in the spring and autumn of 1917, before the Bolsheviks seized power, the following were published: "Volnost: Daily Political, Social-Literary and Cossack Newspaper", "Bulletin of the Union of Cossack Troops", "List of the Central Council of Cossacks: Cossack Newspaper".

Other Cossack newspapers and magazines of this period included "Orenburg Cossack Herald: Independent, Non-Party Republican Organ of the Free Cossacks," published in Siberia and the east of the country by the government of the Orenburg Cossack Host in Orenburg from 1917 to 1919. "Volnaya Step: Non-Party Progressive Newspaper" was also published there, as was "Golos Bashkir: Organ of the Government of Bashkortostan" (later "Vestnik Gosudarstvennost Bashkortostan"). Local Orenburg Cossack publications included "Kazachya Rech: Non-Party Democratic Newspaper of the Orenburg Cossacks of the 3rd District." Omsk also published "Volny Kazak: Organ of the Siberian Cossacks," "Sibirsky Kazak: Daily People's Newspaper," and "Irtysh: Organ of the Siberian Cossacks: Publication

of the Military Government." The magazine "Irtysh: Voice of the Siberian Cossack Host" was also published there, a successor to the pre-revolutionary "Siberian Military News." A special issue of the one-day newspaper "Cossack Day: Organized by employees of the Omsk Railway Collection Service for the benefit of mobilized Cossacks and volunteers with the participation of "Irtysh" magazine was published under the auspices of "Irtysh."

In Krasnoyarsk, the newspapers "Yenisey Cossack Host: Herald of the Yenisei Cossacks" and "Herald of the Yenisei Cossacks: Political, Non-Party, and Economic Newspaper" were published. In Chita, the Pokhodny Ataman Printing House published "Zabaikalskie Oblastnye Vedomosti," "Vostochny Kurier," "Golos Zabaykalya," and "Vestnik Zabaykalya." The newspaper "Kazachye Ekho: Organ of the Transbaikals Cossacks" was also published there.

In the Urals (Yaik), the Ural Cossack Host's military printing house published "Yaik Volya: Daily Political and Literary Newspaper" and its supplement, "Yaik Military Newspaper: Weekly Official Organ with Government and Military Orders, Orders, etc." In Uralsk, the newspaper "Uralets: Daily Socio-Political Newspaper" was published. In the Cossack region of Semirechye, the "Semirechye Regional Newspaper" was published, with its editorial office located first in the military capital of Verny, and later in the village of Sergiopolskaya. In the North Caucasus, the Terek Cossack Host published "Forward: The Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host" in Vladikavkaz, and in Pyatigorsk "Terets: The Military Daily Literary, Political, and Social Newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host" and "Terek-Dagestan Herald: The Daily Social, Political, and Literary Newspaper."

In Kuban, the following were published: "Volnaya Kuban: Organ of the Kuban Regional Government", "Golos Kubanets: Daily Non-Party Newspaper", "Kubanskiy Put: Daily Political, Economic and Literary Newspaper" in Yekaterinodar, "Vestnik Kubanskogo Krai Government" in Sochi. In the mountain regions, the bilingual Russian-Kabardin newspaper "Kabardinets: Daily News and Telegrams" was published. And all this is far from a complete list of Cossack publications from the period of the Revolution of 1917 and the subsequent Civil War.

But despite the aforementioned abundance of Cossack publications in the capital and locally, the most significant ideological and organizational center of Cossack journalism during the Civil War was the Don. The main official government publication of the Great Don Host was "Volny Don: Herald of the Military Government," published from 1917 in the Don capital of Novocherkassk, under the editorship of Viktor Sevsky, a renowned Cossack writer (real name V. A. Krasnushkin), with whom we will become more familiar later. "Volny Don" was the direct successor

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

to the pre-revolutionary "Don Regional News." The newspaper was printed in the military printing house of the VVD, and on the front page of each issue, it announced its government affiliation and official status: "Government regulations and orders, subject to general information and execution, distributed by the newspaper 'Volny Don' or printed in it, are considered promulgated both in the Don Host Region and in the Rostov-on-Don city administration, and no one living in the aforementioned areas has the right to excuse themselves from knowing them." An illustrated magazine of the same name was published as a supplement to the newspaper in 1917. Thus, the military government newspaper possessed all the attributes and functions of an official, legally binding printed organ of a sovereign state—the Great Don Host.

Among the numerous Don press, we should first mention the "metropolitan" publications in Novochoerkassk. These included "Don: Evening Newspaper," "Donskiye Vedomosti," edited by the popular Cossack poet and writer F. D. Kryukov, and "Donskoy Kray." In 1918, "Vestnik Soyuz Kazachykh Voysk" (Bulletin of the Union of Cossack Troops) was published in Novochoerkassk; this title later became known as one of the most prominent and respected journals of the Cossack émigré community, as discussed in the next chapter. Another Novochoerkassk newspaper was "Donskaya Zhizn," published by the "Bureau of Don Cossack Propaganda." One of the most conservative independent Cossack publications was "Chasovoy: Daily Newspaper," devoted primarily to military news. In Rostov-on-Don, a key strategic hub for all railways in the Don Host, the official government journal of the Don railway workers, "Bulletin of Communications and Industry," was published. The official military (state) journals "Pedagogical Thought" and "Post and Telegraph Journal of the Great Don Host" were also printed here. An "independent" Cossack newspaper, "Narodnaya Gazeta," was published under the editorship of Nikolai Tuzemtsev (N. T. Dobrovolsky). Publication of one of the oldest liberal Don newspapers, "Priazovsky Krai," continued, and many other publications were also published.

It should also be noted that, in addition to the local press, after October 1917, some metropolitan and central publications closed by the Bolsheviks "moved" to the Don region, such as B. A. Suvorin's "Evening Time." Most of the capital's editorial offices "in exile" were located in Rostov-on-Don. Here, in the Cossack regions, the editors of the "former" newspapers and magazines were forced to consider the interests and sentiments not only of their target audiences but also of local residents and readers. Therefore, "Evening Time" also featured such regular columns as "Successes of the Don Cossacks," "From the Front," "Transcaucasia," "In Ukraine," and "In

Crimea." It is necessary to dwell separately on the peculiar contradiction between "Cossack" Novochoerkassk and "Russian" Rostov-on-Don, which is in many ways analogous to the cultural, political and historiographic opposition between conservative, Slavophile Moscow and liberal, Westernizing St. Petersburg.

Novochoerkassk was the traditional "ataman capital" of the Don Cossacks and was always distinguished by its conservatism, while Rostov-on-Don was the former fortress of St. Demetrius of Rostov, originally home to Russian government troops (or, for the "independents" since the time of Kondraty Bulavin, "occupation troops"), not Cossacks. It was an economic, commercial, and industrial center and a crucial railway junction, with a majority Russian "non-resident" (i.e., non-Cossack) population and a large proletariat, the backbone of the Don Bolsheviks, who published the party newspaper "Nashe Znamya" (Our Banner) here in 1917–1918, then "Rabochaya Pravda" (Working Truth), and, based on these, during the Soviet era, "Trudovoy Don" (Labor Don) and "Molot" (Molot). Accordingly, the nature of the prevailing public opinion in Novochoerkassk and Rostov was different, and, as a consequence, the periodical press that reflected and formed it was different.

Most of the Cossack "independent" newspapers and magazines were published in the military capital, while "White Guard" and liberal publications were printed in Rostov-on-Don. Thus, in Novochoerkassk, only one volunteer information newspaper was published: "Telegrams of the Novochoerkassk Propaganda Department under the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the South of Russia." Rostov-on-Don published such "VSYUR" publications as "To Moscow!: Organ of Russian National Thought," "Great Russia: Organ of Russian State and National Thought," "Vestnik Volunteer Army: Daily Non-Party Newspaper," and "Monarchist" magazine, among others. On the other hand, Rostov, as an industrial center, was also the main concentration of the Don proletariat. Therefore, with the arrival of the Reds, Rostov became the publication site of most socialist and Soviet newspapers.

Newspapers were also published in other cities of the Don Host Region. In particular, in Taganrog, K. D. Chumachenko published the newspaper "Taganrog Herald." In the city of Kaledinsk (formerly Millerovo, renamed by the Cossacks in honor of the first elected ataman), S. Sholkovich (Sirius) published and edited the newspaper "Donetsk Life: A Daily Little People's Cooperative Newspaper." Furthermore, many other periodicals were published in the Don region, touching on Cossack topics in one way or another.

Even "small-town" newspapers of the village scale were published here. However, the editorial offices of "serious" publications were often located in

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Cossack stanitsas, which were large population centers (sometimes larger than some Russian cities). It should be noted that to this day, the largest rural settlement in the modern Russian Federation remains the former Cossack stanitsa, now the village of Aleksandrovskeye in Stavropol Krai. Its population is over 26,000, whereas in Russia, settlements with populations over 2,000-3,000 are generally classified as urban settlements. Even in the early 20th century, it was not uncommon for Cossack stanitsas to have electric lighting, several schools, gymnasiums or secondary schools, local museums, libraries, and printing houses.

Among the village newspapers from the period of Cossack independence are "Kazachye Slovo" (Nizhne-Chirskaya village), "Donets" (Kamenskaya village), and "Kazak: Daily Non-Party Newspaper" (Konstantinovskaya village). And during the infamous "Veshensky Uprising," the Cossacks also published handwritten leaflets, appeals to the Red Army soldiers, and similar materials.

Overall, the Don and North Caucasus regions produced a vast number of periodicals covering a wide range of topics and focuses. These included student and teacher magazines, scientific and technical publications, cultural magazines, literary magazines, theatrical and film publications, women's, children's, and youth magazines. Numerous newspapers covered humor, economics, business, and agricultural topics. Numerous legal and underground publications were published by a wide variety of political parties and groups, from monarchists and Constitutional Democrats to socialists, Bolsheviks, and anarchists. Workers', trade union, zemstvo, municipal, peasant, military, and church newspapers were also published. A highly diverse and multilingual ethnic press was also published, including Jewish, Armenian, and mountain newspapers. All of these publications, existing in the Cossack republics, inevitably touched on Cossack issues to one degree or another.

Moving from a general description to a specific analysis of the historiographic legacy of the "independent" Cossacks during the Civil War, it is very important to immediately note the significant difference between the position of the Cossacks among the surrounding population, the degree of their cultural and political independence in the traditional Cossack regions in the South and East.

In Siberia and throughout eastern Russia, the Cossack military elders, their socio-political thought, and, consequently, their press, were greatly influenced by the local military and civilian governments, and later by the White Kolchak government. Historically, Cossack hosts in the east of the country were primarily created at the behest of the tsarist government, as a bulwark for the colonization of Siberia and as a border guard, subordinate to appointed provincial and military authorities. Siberian Cossacks lived in conditions significantly different from the native

Cossack regions of the former Cossack military republics, where Cossacks historically lived in compact settlements, constituted a large (or at least the most significant) portion of the population, and preserved democratic traditions and the military elders (the educated Cossack elite). Thus, the ground was ripe for Cossack "independent" state building. In Siberia, Cossacks constituted a minority of the population, and, furthermore, Cossack military districts were stretched out like a "thin thread" along borders or former border lines, so that Cossack villages were scattered in isolated enclaves among the local population. Let's not forget that, in absolute numbers, Cossacks, like Russians and even the entire local population of Siberia, constituted no more than one-tenth of the population of European Russia. In the recently annexed regions of Semirechye and Turkestan, Cossacks, along with Russian settlers, constituted both a relative and absolute minority among the local population, which was quite hostile toward the colonizers. Moreover, in the Far East and along the entire Trans-Siberian Railway, the intervention and influence of the invaders, and their main force—the "Czechoslovaks" (units of the Czechoslovak Corps)—was most strongly felt. For these reasons, the Eastern Cossacks failed to develop and organize themselves into an independent social and political force during the Civil War. This situation for the Cossacks of the Eastern Hosts resulted in the weak development of ideological, political, cultural, and historical Cossack literature, compared to the South. Consequently, Siberia lacked the historical conditions for the emergence of an independent Cossack historiographic tradition. For example, let's look at the first issue of the newspaper "Sibirsky Kazak" (Siberian Cossack) from September 10, 1919. The editorial address is particularly striking: "Omsk, Moskovskie Ryady, Information Department of the Siberian Cossack Host." As we can see from this address alone, the newspaper's editorial board was essentially a propaganda arm of the Supreme Ruler of Russia, Admiral Kolchak. The editorial, entitled "To Our Readers," outlines the editorial board's primary journalistic goals and objectives. The very first words of the article define the circle of its readers, which is very typical for the Cossacks in Siberia: "To you, dear Cossacks, to you, our brother peasants, and to you, all Russian people living in the military territory," Or in its vicinity," we address with our words. "We are beginning to publish our Cossack newspaper, sincerely desiring to serve you all, to the best of our ability, by providing you with accurate and truthful information about what is currently happening on Russian soil and how our great and holy struggle with our enemies and yours is proceeding on the Russian front." Even the style of this short excerpt immediately evokes the solemn, ecclesiastical "high style" of official government announcements of the 19th century, intended for reading after the Sunday

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

sermon in the village church.

The newspaper then goes on to outline the editorial board's vision of its primary journalistic mission: "We will write about how our fathers and brothers are living at the front, how they are fighting for the just Russian cause, and what they need, demanding help and sacrifice from us who remain in the rear." In short, the main idea is quite clear: "everything for the front, everything for victory." To boost the morale of the Cossack front-line soldiers, the newspaper will publish news from their home villages: "They would like to know what is happening at home, how the households left in the hands of women and the elderly are doing. After all, there at the front, our soldiers will be so pleased to receive news from their home village, or stanitsa, from people close to their hearts."

To facilitate this connection between the front and the rear, the editors call on their readers to become volunteer correspondents: "Therefore, we invite you to read our newspaper and report to us at the editorial office everything that is happening in your area, so that we can print it in the newspaper and send it to the front. Convene meetings in every stanitsa or village, invite a priest, a teacher, or any other literate person, and instruct them to write for our newspaper at least once a week, and if possible, more often, about everything that is happening in your area and that your loved ones at the front would be interested to know. Let them write as best they can. We will correct all errors ourselves." We have serious doubts about the feasibility of this last promise, especially if you check the punctuation in the preceding paragraphs of the article. But we must note that if we put aside the propaganda motives and the supposed internal editorial and external political censorship, then there is a clear desire on the part of the editors to collect and record historical evidence, to create a kind of chronicle of the Civil War, and to establish a network of correspondents.

The editors addressed a similar appeal to the front-line soldiers: "And to you, our brothers and fathers, standing at the front guarding Cossack freedom, we turn our voices: write to us about your life in battle, your needs, your campaigns, your victories and failures. We will print all of this in our newspaper and forward it to your home villages and stanitsas, so that we can come to your aid in time of need and rejoice with you in your good fortune." The article concludes with an editorial slogan entirely in keeping with the spirit of the times: "Remember, 'Sibirsky Kazak' is your newspaper."

The second article, on the front page, is titled "The Last Days." It proclaims that the Bolsheviks' days in Russia are numbered, their advance into Siberia is a sure road to final destruction, and that "fourteen allies, namely, the south and north of Russia, Siberia, Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, the Czechoslovaks, and the Serbs, and four allied

powers, namely, France, England, Japan, and America," have risen up against Bolshevism. After the Whites' "temporary retreat," when the Reds "are overthrown and driven back beyond the Urals by a powerful blow from the Siberian army... everything will be over."

In general, in this and other issues, the Siberian Cossack published government decrees and orders from the military command, regularly reported on the atrocities of the Bolsheviks at the front and in the rear, on the devastation among the Reds, posted short notes on the situation at the front, memoirs and letters from front-line soldiers and villagers, various announcements, appeals for the collection of funds and donations for the front, and in the last days of the Kolchak regime in Omsk, it called on all residents capable of bearing arms to defend it.

What we don't see in the newspaper are notes and articles about the history and culture of the Siberian Cossacks. The newspaper's entire cultural life is contained in poems and ditties of an overtly propagandistic nature, such as:

"(1) It is not the eagle that spread its wings / But called its eaglets, – / The seasoned Cossack calls / Cossacks and Cossack children. (2) The saber will not betray us in battle, / But the whip is light. / Hey, whip, have a good walk / On the Bolshevik's back! (3) We will not touch the Redskins, / We will only slash with the saber, / For our native villages / We will rip out their throats at once! (4) They say that Trotsky / Has not eaten or drunk for three days, – / He must have heard, my dear friend, / About our Cossack campaign. (5) Tell us, Lenin, is it true, / That you have lost your head... / It would be good for us to hang / You yourself, you scoundrel!"

The newspaper continued to be published until the evacuation of Kolchak's government from Omsk. In its final issues, the cheerful ditties were replaced by mournful and pitiful poems "with melancholy in the soul and a smile on the face," dedicated to Cossack soldiers going to their deaths. However, the newspaper's overall content and content remained unchanged.

Thus, during the years of the Civil War in Siberia, and in the East in general, we do not find in the local Cossack periodicals any serious publications of a historical nature about the Cossacks or broad historiographic generalizations dedicated to the Cossacks.

Things were quite different in the oldest Great Don Host. As an example, consider the popular liberal magazine "Donskaya Volna" (Don Wave), whose permanent editor was the most famous Don writer of the time, Veniamin Andreevich Krasnushkin, who wrote under the pen name Viktor Sevsky. We know little about the life of this Don writer. Biographical information is often inconsistent. The circumstances of his death remain unknown, and his trail was lost after his arrest by the Don Cheka in 1920. The

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

renowned Israeli philologist and linguist Ze'ev Bar-Sella (Vladimir Petrovich Nazarov before emigrating from the USSR in 1973), accusing M.A. Sholokhov of plagiarism, attributed authorship of "And Quiet Flows the Don" to V.A. Krasnushkin. We will not enter into this literary discussion here, which extends beyond the scope of the problem under consideration. Anyone interested in this issue from a historical and source study perspective is advised to consult A.V. Venkov's comprehensive study. We will simply note that the very formulation of this problem aptly illustrates the literary significance of Viktor Sevsky, a figure little known to Russian readers.

V. A. Krasnushkin was born in 1890 in the village of Konstantinovskaya in the 1st Donskoy District, into the Cossack family of a military sergeant major, Alexei Vasilyevich Krasnushkin. As a child, he was raised by his grandmother in the village and early demonstrated a love of literature and a talent for writing. While still in the Novocherkassk Classical Gymnasium, V. A. Krasnushkin began publishing literary works under the pseudonym Sevsky. The future writer failed to graduate from the gymnasium due to an extreme inability to study mathematics. For similar reasons, he failed to complete his studies at the private real school in Rostov. Nevertheless, teachers everywhere noted his aptitude for the humanities. His father wanted to enroll him in the cadet corps, but Veniamin firmly declared his intention to become a writer. In Rostov, Krasnushkin, without ever receiving a high school diploma, married Vera Alexandrovna Sevryugova. This led to a breakup with his father. As a result, Viktor Sevsky began his independent writing career, demonstrating remarkable literary talent but never receiving a full education. Viktor Sevsky's greatest success with readers was his humorous stories and feuilletons, often with satirical and sharp social content. But fiction wasn't the only thing that attracted this author.

Even before the war, the budding writer's sincere interest in the historical past of the Cossacks manifested itself. Here is the testimony of the Cossack émigré A. Padalkin, who personally knew Viktor Sevsky and collaborated with him during the years of Don independence. In an article dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of the writer's death, presumably executed in a Rostov Cheka prison in 1920, A. Padalkin recalled: "Despite his short life, V.A. [Krasnushkin] did not limit himself to literary activity alone. As an expert in Russian literature, history, and the history of the Cossacks in particular, he gave public lectures, not only to the intelligentsia and students, but also in the villages, where his lectures on Cossack history attracted particularly large audiences. This was explained not only by his ability to express his thoughts with talent and clarity, but also by his perfect knowledge of the subject."

By the outbreak of World War I, Viktor Sevsky's journalistic popularity had outgrown the Don region.

He moved to Petrograd, where he published in *Novoye Vremya* and led the literary section of the newspaper *Kopeyka*. After the February Revolution, Sevsky actively collaborated in Petrograd with the newspapers *Volya Rossii* and *Volnost Kazachya*, as well as with publications of the Council of the Union of Cossack Troops. However, Sevsky, who did not share the revolutionary sentiments of the capital's public, soon returned to the Don region. Here, at the suggestion of M. P. Bogaevsky, during the reign of Ataman Kaledin, he became editor of the main military government newspaper, *Volny Don*.

After Kaledin's suicide, with the rise of Golubov's Red Cossacks to power, Krasnushkin found himself in the anti-Bolshevik underground. After the overthrow of Soviet power in the Don region, Sevsky was ready to continue his journalistic work. But even under the rule of Ataman P.N. Krasnov, Viktor Sevsky, who held liberal and simultaneously White patriotic views, fell into unspoken disfavor with the pro-German Don separatist Krasnov.

Sevsky eventually left the capital, Novocherkassk, and founded his own magazine, "*Donskaya Volna*," in the liberal atmosphere of Rostov-on-Don. It immediately found itself in opposition to the official and propaganda publications of Ataman Krasnov's military government. It was an independent magazine, published by the newly established "*Donskaya Volna*" association, represented by its authorized representative, N. T. Dobrovolsky. The editorial office was located at 17 Sobornyy Lane, Rostov-on-Don.

The magazine's numerous contributors included not only writers, journalists, artists, and photographers, but also representatives of the educated Don intelligentsia, officers, and scientists who saw "their primary task as the broad coverage of events in the Don, Kuban, and Ukraine in 1917–18." Among them were the renowned journalists and writers F. D. Kryukov, G. P. Kumov, S. G. Svatikov, Nik. Tuzemtsev, and F. Penkov, generals A. P. Bogaevsky, E. I. Gulyga, P. Kh. Popov, E. F. Semiletov, V. I. Sidorin, colonels Ya. M. Lisovoy, V. K. Manakin, Novosiltsev, N. V. Shinkarenko, priest T. Donetsky, privat-docent I. Dyakov, prominent professors of the Don universities A. M. Evpakhov, I. A. Malinovsky, N. F. Melnikov-Razvedenko, M. Presman, chairman of the Don parliament - the Great Military Circle V. A. Kharlamov, F. F. Shcherbina, and many other famous authors.

The release of the first issue of *Donskaya Volna* was specifically timed to coincide with the anniversary of the rise to power of Ataman A. M. Kaledin, the first democratically elected Cossack leader in the Don region since Peter the Great. As already noted, politically, Sevsky and his *Donskaya Volna* shared the Cossacks' "indivisible" and "pan-democratic" views. However, politics was not the primary focus of the new independent journal. Viktor

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Sevsky wrote: "We timed the publication of the journal to coincide with the first days of sultry June, in order to parallel the march of Kaledin and his companions into history." From the very first days of publication, Donskaya Volna positioned itself as a historical journal, dedicated to preserving for posterity the story of the Don Cossacks' heroic struggle against the "Bolshevik invasion."

Already in the first editorial, we can read about the main goal of the new journal and its publication plan. This goal is formulated by Viktor Sevsky in a poetic and allegorical form, characteristic of the Symbolists of the early 20th century, which immediately refers the reader to the heroic historiographic tradition of antiquity. "Someday the Homer of the Cossacks will come and write a Cossack Iliad, sing of Kaledin, Bogaevsky, and other illustrious figures. But Homer lies ahead... For now, the wind blows and carries into the distance the petals of fragrant history." Therefore, the main task set by the editor for the journal is to chronicle the heroic struggle of the Cossacks for their freedom and the liberation of all of Russia, collecting and recording historical material for future historians and writers.

"...Don Wave" sets itself the task of picking up the petals of history, plucking from the merciless wind what is dear and sacred, and saving it from oblivion." Sevsky goes on to say that the efforts of the magazine's editors alone are insufficient to accomplish this task. The collective work of many people will be required to immortalize both the bright and dark pages of Cossack history in the Civil War. And the magazine calls on readers to join in this work. "Perhaps the task is beyond our capabilities. But we believe that distant, perhaps unknown friends will come to our aid, and with our combined efforts we will adorn the course of the Don wave through history with the lights of memory. The great Patroclus is gone—the contemptuous Thersites lives. The Patrocluses perished, for there were many Thersites. Let us also turn Russia's attention to the Thersites who killed the Patrocluses. In the robes of friends of the people, armored with bright ideals and slogans, they were great to the masses. We'll show them in a different setting." Sevsky sees this as the historical mission of his magazine, not only for the Cossacks but for the entire history of Russia: "We believe 'Don Wave' is needed not only by the Don; it will be useful to Russia as well." This editorial vision has become the general line for most of the magazine's publications.

The journal's editor places special emphasis on collecting and publishing testimonies, documents, and memoirs: "Dreamers and young partisans roamed the Don steppes, preserving the freedom of the Don. They will help us paint a picture of the Don fire." After all, according to Sevsky, "Every Don family has dearly departed martyrs. And these families will bring us monuments to the martyrs' lives, their final lines, their final deeds and words. The Don and Kuban regions

were wandered by strangers with Kornilov, a man close to Russia yet, by a cruel twist of fate, alien. Their exploits await the lamps of remembrance. The ink will never run dry in the hymns of their campaigns and suffering."

The magazine's publisher goes on to express confidence that "Together, through concerted efforts, we will help the future Homer write 'War and Peace' on the Don. Our shoulders are weak, but we will lean on all who love the flow of the Don's waves, who love the martyrs who perished for freedom and truth, and who are ready to warm their memory with the lamps of remembrance. We appeal to all friends of Don history and its heroes to help us." Here, as they say "in the margins," it should be noted that some researchers see Sevsky's appeal to readers as an "authorial statement" for a future "Quiet Flows the Don." However, more important for our study is the fact that Sevsky's magazine set itself the goal of collecting historical material for such a novel. It was not a request to write the novel itself, but rather to gather factual material, to write the history of the Civil War on the Don. Sevsky, apparently, understood that without material, without a written history, it would be impossible to write an epic novel. And, to Viktor Sevsky's credit, his magazine consistently followed its stated course.

Each new issue of the magazine featured numerous historical materials: articles, memoirs, eyewitness accounts, letters, drawings, and photographs. Thus, in that very first issue, V. Sevsky published an article, "Mitrofanov's Alarm," dedicated to the life and death of M. P. Bogaevsky, along with excerpts from his correspondence, supplemented with documents from the "revolutionary trial," several photographs, and sketches of Bogaevsky's execution site and grave. In the same issue, Sevsky included descriptions of the execution of other Don generals by the Red Cossacks, along with their suicide notes, farewell letters, and other historical materials. However, it cannot be claimed that the magazine devoted its entire attention exclusively to covering the immediate history of the Revolution and the Civil War on the Don. Viktor Sevsky's editorial team also addressed the distant past of the Cossacks. For example, the Christmas issue of Donskaya Volna on December 25, 1918, was dedicated to Kondraty Bulavin, the Yefremovs, Stepan Razin, and other fighters for Cossack freedom. And the editorial in Donskaya Volna on April 28, 1919, set the goal of writing an objective and truthful history of the Cossacks, free of the former censorship cuts of the tsarist administration.

The article's author, V. Kurganov, noted that "At the Don Military Circle, several speakers repeatedly emphasized the need to gather documentary evidence about the glorious past of the Cossacks. They emphasized the need for widespread public awareness of the Cossacks' historical past."

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Thus, throughout its short literary life, the magazine continued to fulfill its historiographic mission, declared in its first issue, and never ceased to urge its readers to collect, preserve, and study Cossack history. Here is how an émigré author, half a century later, assessed Donskaya Volna's contribution to preserving Cossack history and culture: "Donskaya Volna is a remarkable literary and artistic historical mirror, reflecting with astonishing clarity and vividness the heroic struggle, unparalleled in its exertion of all forces, of the Cossacks, particularly their partisans, and a handful of Russian volunteers. For future historians of Cossack and Russian tragedy, this magazine may well be a primary source; poets and writers will draw inspiration from its pages to create artistic monuments in honor of the glorious feats accomplished by Cossacks and volunteers, accomplished in the name of saving the Motherland—our common mother, Russia." The author of the article goes on to express confidence that Viktor Sevsky's historiographic work will not be in vain, his mission will be fulfilled, as will his dream of a "new Homer." Ultimately, "a new Leo Tolstoy will appear and, based on 'The Don Wave,' write 'War and Peace' on Cossack lands, telling the whole world how the Bolsheviks burned Cossack villages, tormented and raped Cossack women, how they killed them, their children, and their husbands, and how the Cossacks fought almost alone for their freedoms and for the liberation of the Russian people from communist slavery. And from this new 'War and Peace,' the Russian people will learn what a true and loyal friend the Cossacks have always been, a friend so poorly understood and appreciated by the Russian people and by Russia's rulers throughout history." And folk art from the "Don Wave" will borrow ideas for its legends and tales about the exploits, suffering and sacrifices of the Cossacks, suffered by them for the Cossack and Russian holy truth."

This rather pompous assessment, nevertheless, very well demonstrates the importance the Cossack diaspora attached to the journal "Donskaya Volna" and its editor, V. Sevsky, and, simultaneously, the extent to which they influenced Cossack historiography in exile. As we can see from a comparison of the cited characteristic examples of Cossack press in the East and South of Russia, there was a significant difference between these Cossack macro-regions, both in the political and cultural position of Cossacks among the surrounding populations and in the mentality of the Cossack periodical press, and, consequently, in its political, historical, and cultural ideology. Of course, a propaganda newspaper is one thing, and a literary and historical journal quite another, but in this case, it must be taken into account that the East initially lacked fertile ground for the emergence of such independent and influential Cossack journals as in the Don or Kuban regions.

In the East, the Cossack press was completely subordinate to the political leadership, which was almost entirely concentrated in the hands of Kolchak's government. There was no basis for the development of an independent ideology, nor even Cossack autonomy. There were no serious attempts to create truly sovereign Cossack states in the East, meaning there was no need to legitimize this sovereignty through historiographical justification. Frankly, it was difficult to find a genuine basis for establishing a historical tradition of such sovereignty. From Yermak until the annexation of Central Asia, the Cossacks in the East did not act entirely independently, but rather as the vanguard of Russian, imperial colonization. Nor did the East have a historical tradition of military democracy, so characteristic of the Cossack military republics from the Dnieper to the Yaik (Urals).

In the South, the situation among the Cossack troops was no less dramatic, but the public mood was far more complex. Here, various political and ideological currents clashed and contended among the Cossacks.

But there was also something that united Cossack sentiments on all sides of the Civil War in southern Russia: a persistent desire to resolve their differences independently, a reluctance to allow any outside interference in their "internal" Cossack military life. This applied equally to the "Red," "White," and "Green" Cossacks.

The position of the Red Cossacks is quite revealing. Even their first leader, Podtelkov, was clearly opposed to direct central intervention in the internal affairs of the Don, including land issues. At the beginning of the Civil War, the Red Cossacks sincerely hoped to restore the Don's historical independence within the Soviet system. It should be noted that the Bolsheviks at that time, at least outwardly and verbally, strongly supported these Cossack democratic sentiments. Lenin, in particular, fully considered the possibility of creating a Don Cossack Soviet Republic. He repeatedly spoke out against the forcible disruption of traditional Cossack life (stripes, shoulder straps, religion, etc.). Even the legendary Red Cossack "concommandarnes" Budyonny and Mironov consistently demonstrated independence that went beyond any military chain of command, while the rank-and-file Cossacks of the First and Second Cavalry Armies were by no means paragons of military discipline. For which, by the way, one of the army commanders, Mironov, soon paid with his life.

The Whites enjoyed a far greater degree of "Cossack independence" in the Don and especially in the Kuban region. Constant squabbles and disagreements between the Cossacks and the command of the Armed Forces of South Russia have characterized the entire political history of the White South. The inability and unwillingness of the Supreme Command of the Armed Forces of South Russia to

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

resolve these contradictions and achieve a genuine compromise with the Cossacks of the Don, Kuban, and Terek, Ukraine, and Transcaucasia became one of the most important reasons for the Whites' final defeat in the South. All these political, socioeconomic, and national-ethnic contradictions were fully manifested in the cultural and literary life of the Cossack military republics of Southern Russia. Naturally, all of this was also reflected in the Cossack historical literature published during that turbulent time. In particular, this discordant array of opinions developed and left an indelible mark on Cossack émigré historiography of the 1920s and 1930s. We still find noticeable traces of the historical and cultural discussions of that time in the latest Russian historiography of the Cossacks.

As noted earlier, the main energies of the Cossack intellectual and political elite during the Civil War were devoted to the direct military resolution of the conflict. The Cossack elite, overwhelmingly, came from the military elders and, in any case, were connected by blood ties to the Cossack officer corps. Therefore, the periodical press assumed dominant importance during the short-lived years of Cossack independence. The very short existence of the sovereign Cossack military republics left no time for serious scholarly research or the writing of fundamental works. Most publications were devoted to the historical recording of the current events of the Civil War, its chronicling, and the preservation of sources and eyewitness accounts.

Most of the publications of that time were openly propagandistic in nature. The Cossack military press and journalism tried to resist Bolshevik agitation. And, above all, to oppose the promised new "communist paradise" with the historical tradition of "Cossack antiquity", to rely on conservative Cossack and Orthodox values. As an example of typical propaganda literature, we can cite such Don publications as "General A. G. Shkuro" by P. Avramov, "General-partisan A. G. Shkuro" by N. Tuzemtsev, "Kolchak or Lenin" by E. Agelov, "Admiral Kolchak" by an unknown author with the initials "B. I. Ch." Similar literature was published in the East. As an example, we will name "The Testament to the Semirechye Cossacks of the Military Ataman General Ionov." All such publications are small brochures, intended primarily for educational and propaganda work among ordinary soldiers and Cossacks. They are distinguished by the simplicity and even primitiveness of the presentation, the calculation on predominantly emotional rather than logical perception, often a tendency to embellish reality. In general, they are a typical example of all the characteristic features and vices of any propaganda literature of that time.

Among the general mass of propaganda literature of that time, the "Essay on the Political History of the Great Don Army", published in 1919, stands out. That year, the political situation on the Don

changed dramatically. Economic difficulties were growing, the Cossacks were tired of the war, and there was no one to work in the villages. After the defeat of Germany and the withdrawal of the Germans from the borders of the Don, the Cossack separatism of Ataman Krasnov lost hope of defending the independence of the military republic. The Don Army alone was not able to resist the Reds. At the same time, the defeat of Germany opened the Black Sea to the fleets of the Entente. It was necessary to change the foreign policy orientation, and to seek internal political allies. Under pressure from circumstances, Ataman Krasnov was forced to resign. The Great Don Army was headed by a new Ataman: "General Staff Lieutenant General" Afrikan Petrovich Bogaevsky. With his election, the "patriotic party" of the White Cossacks, primarily officers, won a decisive victory. They advocated a close alliance with Denikin and the Entente. All hopes were now pinned on the Anglo-French "allies." The Don Army came under the direct command of the Armed Forces of South Russia.

In these new political circumstances, it was necessary to convey information about the Cossacks to the new allies. This task was to be accomplished by the "Essay on Political History..." Even in the introduction, the publishers clearly identified the book's primary addressees: "The compilation of this essay was primarily intended to inform our Allies about the historical destinies and national significance of the Don Cossacks." The precise allies to whom this publication was addressed is clear from the fact that "the publication is being published simultaneously, with minor variations, in Russian, French, and English. Even the Russian edition was intended to inform our related newly formed Slavic states." Therefore, it is not surprising that anonymous authors "often illuminate the events and phenomena of Don history from the perspective of a foreign reader." The book, lavishly illustrated, consistently advances the idea of the original "democracy of the Cossacks" throughout the history of the Cossacks. The authors take great pains to demonstrate their commitment to Western democratic values. In this context, a detailed examination of the legal foundations and limits of autonomy in Western European and international law seems natural. After all, regional autonomy within a "united and indivisible" state was the limit of concessions the White leaders of the Armed Forces of South Russia could grant to the Cossacks.

The authors state their understanding of the phenomenological nature of the Cossacks already in the first paragraph: "Among the 150 million people of Russia, until recently, Cossack hosts occupied a unique position – units with a barely perceptible ethnographic characteristic, but with some undoubtedly common socio-political character, military training, and historical destinies." To what degree of "elusiveness" of ethnographic characteristic "among a population of 150 million" did, for example,

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

the Don Tatars, Kalmyks, or Bashkirs possess? This question remained beyond the scope of the definition provided in the "Essay." It must be said that the tsarist government did not reach such limits of Russification even during the time of Alexander III. Here one can see a harbinger of the future "red" decossackization. Apparently, in this matter, the White patriots – the "unified people" – did not differ much from the Red internationalists. One can discern here a harbinger of the later "Russian" ideology of the Yeltsin era. Looking ahead, we should also note that during those same years, some leftist Trotskyists in the Don region were also hatching plans not only for "de-Cossackization" but also for "de-Kalmykization."

What unites all Cossacks, despite their ethnographic differences? The "Essay" provides a clear answer: "This commonality is a love of freedom, not... of the rebellious slave who equates freedom with the unbridled base instincts and anarchy, but in the understanding of the warrior and citizen, realizing freedom within the framework of statehood, discipline, and submission to the idea of law and order." This is clearly another nod to Western democracies and, simultaneously, a contrast between the Cossacks and the Red "rebellious slaves" on the Bolshevik side. Overall, it should be noted that the "indivisible" position outlined in the "Essay" would become one of two general lines of evolution in Cossack historiography in the subsequent years of emigration. The second such line was "independent" Cossack historiography. But propaganda and political journalism were not the only things sought by the military governments of the Cossack republics of southern Russia. The construction of a sovereign state urgently required more than just agitation and the mobilization of combatant Cossacks and the civilian population. A key component of state-building in the Don region was the creation of a Cossack system of public education. Above all, this involved the upbringing and education of the younger generation. That is, primarily, Cossack school education.

It must be said that primary education among the Cossacks always had a distinctive character. The Cossack school system and education system were unlike those of the interior Russian provinces. Above all, the Cossacks differed from the Russian peasants in their high level of mass public education and their profound respect for the School and the Teacher, as the most important social institutions in the army.

The Cossacks' generally high level of education, cultural and intellectual development, and broad outlook were greatly facilitated by the traditional Cossack custom of universal military service. Military service on the western and eastern borders of the planet's largest land empire, in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and other major cities, participation in various military topographic expeditions, and service as orderlies to the vast majority of senior officers—all of this broadened the cultural horizons of ordinary

Cossacks.

Cossacks played an active role in all, without exception, the frequent and numerous wars waged by Russia over the centuries. During these conflicts, the Cossacks, often without exception, as in 1812, became acquainted with other countries, peoples, their customs, and cultures. During military service, Cossacks, willy-nilly, mastered not only Russian but also foreign (European and Eastern) languages. At the beginning of the 20th century, when barely a tenth of Russia's peasant population was literate, literacy rates were much higher in Cossack regions. This was especially true for conscripted Cossacks, most of whom had only a primary education. Furthermore, a small, but still significant, proportion of Cossack women were more or less literate compared to Russian peasants. For example, according to the first general population census in 1897, the overall literacy rate in the Don region was 22.4% on average and 49.2% of the urban population. Moreover, literate men accounted for 3.8% of those aged up to 10, 49.4% of those aged 10 to 19, 48.7% of those aged 20 to 29, 46.5% of those aged 30 to 39, 40.2% of those aged 40 to 49, 34.9% of those aged 50 to 59, and 27.4% of those aged over 60. Literate men accounted for 32.9% of the total population. The percentage of literate women in the same age groups was 2.5 to 7 times lower. Moreover, unlike the rest of Russia, in the Don region, out of 1,000 literate men, or the overwhelming majority, were representatives of the "rural classes." For women, the same figure was 603 pro mille. Furthermore, one must take into account the census methodology and subsequent statistical processing, which arbitrarily grouped Cossacks and so-called non-resident peasants into a single, mixed group of "rural estates." This statistically increased the overall literacy rate of the empire's rural population, but simultaneously significantly reduced the figures for Cossacks. However, from the data presented, one can clearly conclude that the majority of the literate population lived in rural areas and belonged to the Cossacks of draft age. On the other hand, the majority of those with higher general (741 pro mille) and military (978 pro mille) education belonged to the nobility. In this case, primarily to the so-called Don nobility, or Cossack elders. Secondary vocational education was distributed more evenly among the estates, but predominantly among villagers, that is, the Cossacks themselves, as evidenced, among other things, by the relatively high proportion of secondary military education in rural areas along the Don. In other Cossack hosts, the overall literacy rate was significantly lower, both due to their border and outlying location and, most importantly, to the large proportion of "foreign" and "native" populations, most of whom remained illiterate. For example, in Kuban, the overall literacy rate in 1897 was 16.77%, 15.15% in rural areas, and 29.16% in urban areas. Literacy rates for men and women were as follows:

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

40.67%/16.96% in cities and 24.81%/5.26% in rural areas. In terms of age and gender, in Kuban, as in the Don region, the highest literacy rates were observed among men aged 10 to 14, 15 to 19, 20 to 29, and 30 to 39, with literacy rates of around 60%. This includes conscription-age Cossacks and teenagers preparing for military service. A distinctive feature of the Kuban region was a significantly higher level of female literacy than that of the Don region. At the same time, in Kuban there were 767,188 Cossacks of the military class, and 858,791 peasants, or, in round numbers, 39.98% and 44.76%, respectively, not counting foreigners and representatives of other classes.

An even more typical picture can be seen in the Ural Host, where a very significant part of the population was made up of the nomadic tribes of the Kirghiz-Kaisaks (Kazakhs). The overall percentage of literate people among the population of the Ural region was insignificant - 12.3% of the entire "available population", and three times higher - 38.2% separately for urban residents. In Kuban, as we saw above, this ratio was one to two. In terms of gender and age, the distribution of literate people corresponded to the above-mentioned trends. The most literate here were also men of conscription age in the groups of 10-19, 20-29, 30-39 and 40-49 years. However, in the Urals (Yaik), the percentage of literate people "in Russian" (as literally stated in the source) was significantly lower than in the Don and Kuban. For the indicated age groups among men / women - 14.7 / 9.0%; 13.0 / 8.6%; 14.0 / 8.6%; 12.7 / 7.7%, respectively. A distinctive feature of this Cossack region was the presence of a large and specific cluster of literate people "in other languages," which included the "Kirghiz," that is, the Kazakhs. According to the same age and gender categories, they made up 8.2 / 2.4%; 9.0 / 1.9%; 8.2 / 1.7%; 7.9 / 1.4%, respectively. Of the non-Russians "literate in languages other than Russian," the highest percentage of literate people was noted among the Germans - over 70%, and the lowest among the "Kirghiz" - 5%. The ratio of literate Cossacks to non-Russians (mainly Kazakhs) is very eloquently illustrated by the data on the distribution of literate people by religion. Among the Orthodox, the census recorded 39.7% of men and 21.4% of women. Among the Old Believers, the figures were 38.3% and 26.8%. Among Muslims, the figures were 9.1% and 2.0%, respectively. The Ural Cossacks were composed primarily of Orthodox Christians and Old Believers. The high percentage of literate women is noteworthy, again, among the Cossack population. As in the Don region, the majority of literate people were rural residents, primarily Cossacks and "Kirghiz" (Kazakhs), who constituted the majority of the Ural region's population. Thus, we can see that the Cossacks were generally more educated than the majority of the rural population of Russia. Moreover, here, as in many other areas, the Cossack hosts of Southern Russia, and

among these, the Great Don Host, occupied a leading position. Most Cossack educational institutions were supported by troop and stanitsa funds (capital), as well as by direct tuition fees paid by the Cossacks. Thus, the total amount of expenditure on the maintenance of primary and lower schools at the expense of military funds in 1899 amounted to 168,204 rubles, or approximately 4.82% of the total amount of state treasury expenditure on this item throughout the Russian Empire, or about 0.67% of all sources (the imperial court, state, tax, noble, zemstvo and city, private donations, tuition fees, own funds of educational institutions, from candle collections from Jews, etc.) of expenditure on primary education in Russia. According to the calculations of the authors of the collective monograph "The Cossack Don: Five Centuries of Military Glory", The Don Host Region's per capita education expenditures were three to four times higher than those of the average city dweller, and four to five times higher than those of the average Russian rural resident. Moreover, these expenditures yielded tangible results, primarily reflected in the rapid growth of educational institutions, teachers, and students, and, consequently, in the increase in literacy among the population. Thus, the Cossacks succeeded in creating not only the most expensive but also the most effective system of mass public education.

In the Don Host Region alone, according to 1897 data, there were 579 public schools under the Ministry of Public Education, 689 schools under the Holy Synod, 1,361 educational institutions under the Military Department, and a total of 2,629 primary educational institutions, which, roughly speaking, constituted 3.34% of the total number of all schools under all departments in the Russian Empire. For comparison, in the capital's St. Petersburg Province, there were 829 schools under the Ministry of Public Education, 391 schools under the Holy Synod, and 681 schools under the Military Department, which included educational institutions from the entire St. Petersburg Military District, not just one province. Total: 1,901 educational institutions, or approximately 2.41% of the total number for the empire. The Moscow province had the most schools in the country (though not many more than the St. Petersburg province)—around two thousand. However, it still trailed the Don region. Thus, by the beginning of the 20th century, the Don region held the highest number of primary schools, not only among the Cossack military regions but throughout the empire.

The curricula at Cossack educational institutions were also distinctive. In addition to general education subjects, they included many military-applied subjects and elements specific to the Cossack economy. Mandatory Cossack education included military-sports and drill training. Gymnasiums in the Don region taught the broadest range of specifically "Cossack" subjects. These included such subjects as

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

military regulations, primarily cavalry, military history, fortification, tactics, handling of bladed weapons and firearms, horseback riding, gymnastics, swimming, agriculture, veterinary science, and crafts.

The relatively high educational level of most Cossacks, the significant importance and development of the public education system, the specific content of the curricula in Cossack educational institutions, the disintegration of the old state education system, and finally, the ideological challenges of building Cossack military sovereignty—all of this urgently required the provision of Cossack schools with new, "independent" textbooks and manuals. From a historiographical perspective, the most interesting subjects are, of course, history and geography. They were primarily intended to substantiate the very idea of independence and the spatial organization of Cossack sovereignty. In particular, they provided historical sanction for the establishment of "national" borders.

First, let's consider historical geography from the perspective of "Don independence." This textbook, "Essays on the Geography of the Great Don Host," was published in 1919 and written by V. Bogachev, a Cossack from the village of Novocherkasskaya. This is a large and comprehensive textbook, with a total printed volume of over five hundred pages. In the introduction, the author states that he compiled the textbook "based on his own work... he spent over 20 years studying the nature of the Don, naturally encountering the local population along the way." He also emphasizes that "everything written here is the fruit of his research. What he hasn't personally verified or seen, he hasn't included." From the very beginning, the author states that the textbook was compiled "at the suggestion of Mr. Don Ataman," that is, the founder and ideologist of Don Cossack sovereignty, P.N. Krasnov. The author then briefly describes all the difficulties that were so characteristic of all Don publications during the Civil War, ranging from the failure of the initially intended co-authors to fulfill their obligations and ending with the shortage of high-quality paper for printing illustrations.

Let us take the liberty of quoting a short passage from this curious story, since all scholars and educators, especially historians, cut off from the capital's libraries and archives, had to face such problems at the time. "There was a time when he undertook a similar work, but both the complete literature he had collected on all the issues raised, and the manuscript he had begun, apparently perished in the Russian catastrophe, abandoned in 1917, along with his personal library, in the storerooms of Yuryev University. Only half the necessary sources and aids were found in Novocherkassk, and even then, if listed, they would have constituted an entire book. The volume of the 'Essays,' had the original plan been followed, would have been twice the size specified by Mr. Donskoy Ataman. The book was printed slowly, and the manuscript was constantly being revised. The

first part was submitted for publication on August 1st, but the printing work was slowed by the mobilization of typesetters and other reasons. We were unable to obtain good paper, and the drawings were completely illegible on the paper we purchased. V. N. Svetozarov, K. F. Kruse (Rostov), S. G. Gorshkova, I. V. Novopokrovsky, K. M. Zalessky, A. Z. Chekalov (Chekalov farmstead), and N. N. Varlamov (Kletskaya village) responded to a two-fold newspaper call for photographs for illustrations. We express our deepest gratitude to them. The Don Museum presented part of its collection, but the larger and more interesting portion of the photographs and drawings remained unknown to the compiler. He learned of their existence too late. The artist M. B. Grekov produced several drawings, and the artist A. N. Kucherova designed the cover. But despite all these difficulties, Bogachev managed to complete his work and publish his book, imbued from the first to the last with a passionate love for his native Quiet Don. This Don Cossack patriotism and its inculcation in students constitutes the essence of geography for the author: "There is no need to prove that a good geography teacher can only be one who knows and loves the region where their school is located, and it is better for the students if the teacher is a native of that region." After all, according to Bogachev, "a lack of love for one's homeland is unnatural. It can be caused not even by other people, but by one's own deformity. Degeneration, incompetence, laziness, weakness of will, spiritual or physical illness lead to physical suffering and spiritual dissatisfaction." And then the conclusion is drawn that it is precisely from such people that "homeland haters" emerge. Then, in the introduction to the textbook, the author discusses at length and cites quotes about the extraordinary love of the Cossacks for their homeland—the Quiet Don. And from the very first pages, literally from the cover, the author already turns to the historical past. Describing and explaining the cover design to the young reader, Bogachev uses the following images: "The silent guardian of the steppes, the stone woman, the nomadic knight, stands at the foundation: he determines the future way of life and history of the Wild Field, the Great Meadow, the Don steppes. In the steppe expanse, the primitive Scythians tame their horses – the prototype of the dashing Cossack cavalry of our era... The Cossack freebooters, wild and fighting, look at us from the seal of the Don Army... Everything was, but is overgrown with grass... The vast virgin steppe is mercilessly plowed, but it is too vast and strong: it deceives the inexperienced plowman, who has so recently exchanged the singing saber for a plow..." and so on, the distant and recent past of the Don land is described just as poetically. In this poetics, it is curious to note the obvious opposition of coal mines and factory chimneys to the Don steppes and the military Novocherkassk Cathedral. "The White Cossack Cathedral" is "an

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

aspiration upward, to the sky, to the kingdom of the Spirit, a mine is an immersion into the depths, in search of earthly riches." Such eschatology associatively connects industrialization, the proletariat, capital and revolution with the dark forces of the underworld, and the steppe under the "feather-grass veil of virgin lands", the Cossacks, the church - with the white color of the Christian paradise. This is a kind of hymn to Cossack traditionalism and conservatism, addressed to the historical past of the Cossacks. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the geography textbook much space is devoted to the history of the Don land and the Cossacks inhabiting it.

The introduction to the textbook clearly reveals features more typical of a history textbook than a geography one. It addresses the problems of source study and historiography. The textbook accuses older "tsarist" publications of bias and inattention to the Don region. For example, the works of D. L. Mordvintsev are characterized as "biased and imbued with deep hostility toward the Cossacks," and are also "replete with gross errors." On the other hand, they are contrasted with the works of Cossack scholars V. D. Sukhorukov, N. I. Krasnov, and S. F. Nomikosov. However, these are outdated and written in a dry manner. Therefore, the author offers the reader his own work.

Already in the first section, entitled "The Land of the Great Don Host," the author, after a brief introductory description of the general geographic, ecological, and climatic position of the Don region and its place on the globe, moves on to examine the history of the settlement of the Don. It must be assumed that such interest in historical geography was prompted by the fact that the Don had no so-called natural geographic boundaries. The very position of the Cossack region was always determined by its "borderline" nature. Regionally, the Don Cossack region has historically occupied a frontier zone of assimilation and acculturation on the border between the Forest and the Steppe, between sedentary farmers and nomadic herders. The economic life, settlement patterns, ethnic composition, language, and culture of the Cossacks themselves were all borderline. Therefore, for such a region, it was difficult to find the natural boundaries characteristic of European states along seas, mountains, and large rivers. Such natural boundaries have historically, since antiquity, formed the basis of European international law. For the same reasons, all European geography textbooks began their course with a description of these very natural boundaries or geographical limits of their country.

For the internal Russian region, which the Don Host Oblast was before 1917, this geographic issue was of no significant importance. The delineation of administrative boundaries with neighboring provinces certainly had economic and operational significance, but it had no political component. For the sovereign Cossack state—the Great Don Host—the problem of

delimitation, the establishment of officially recognized state borders, became one of the most pressing tasks of realpolitik and diplomacy. In the boundless, dry steppes, in the vast expanses of this "feather grass sea," such boundaries were as difficult to draw as across an actual sea. Consider also the fact that the steppe belt in southern Russia, like the entire Eurasian Great Steppe, stretches from east to west, and the rivers that cut through it flow from north to south. Thus, the entire steppe macroregion, shaped by low precipitation, extends latitudinally and is divided into several conventional segments by azonal (based on moisture, and therefore on soil and climate conditions) river valleys extending perpendicularly, that is, in a meridional direction. It is precisely because of these geographical features that the southern Russian steppe belt has served since ancient times as a unique corridor for repeated "migrations of peoples." Over the centuries, nomadic tribes, diverse in culture and ethnic composition, migrated and replaced one another across the steppe. Given this geographical location and historical background, it was very difficult to establish any stable boundaries. Therefore, defining these boundaries and substantiating them historically, rather than geographically, became the most important task of Don geography during the period of independence. Therefore, the geography textbook begins with an extensive and detailed historical overview and only then proceeds to describe the "present-day" borders of the Don region. This inseparability of geography and history became the main feature of the Cossack textbook.

The historical nature of the geography textbook was noted by contemporary critics even when its first part was published. The author responded to this criticism in the conclusion, where he substantiated his "historical" position, as well as his scholarly right and pedagogical duty to express his own perspective on the Cossacks, their ethnography, and history. It is appropriate to quote Bogachev's words in their entirety, uncensored: "They find the introduction of a historical element into my book inappropriate. This is perhaps fair, but it reflects an academic background, an unconscious use of the template of scientific research. I felt it necessary to provide information on the origins of the diverse elements of our region's population, since the general public has only confused notions about this, and for many geography teachers who have not specifically studied the history of the region, the inclusion of chronological dates and the recall of certain historical facts or phenomena can replace documentary data and references to literature, which are not always or everywhere accessible to them. Some socio-historical phenomena are illuminated by me differently than in the most popular literature, but I feel that I have the moral right to think this way and not otherwise, because there were cases in my working life that forced me to repeatedly reread

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

all the most important literature on the history of the Don and the Cossacks.”

Looking ahead a bit, it can be noted that this distinctive trait—that every scholarly inquiry, not only historical, begins with an excursion into Cossack history—remains a characteristic feature of Cossack authors to this day. This is the desire to immediately declare one's Cossack identity, to historically substantiate it, and to inform the reader of their view on the phenomenological nature of Cossackism as a historical phenomenon. We will encounter such examples repeatedly, both in analyzing émigré publications and in examining recent Russian historiography of the Cossacks, including current Cossack textbooks, such as Kuban studies for secondary schools. For now, we will note that this characteristic of all Cossack literature took shape during the Civil War, within the general context of the ideology of independence.

Bogachev, while maintaining a scientifically objective position and not breaking with Russian academic historical scholarship, denies the a priori ideological bias of his textbook, which, as we recall, was commissioned by Krasnov, a fact the author himself does not deny. Here is how he briefly formulates his position on the Cossack national question:

"I expect accusations of unbridled Cossackism. It would be unfair. I do not regard the Cossacks as a distinct tribe. I say that we represent a blend of ancient tribes, dissolved in the powerful flow of Great Russian blood. From their Little Russian ancestors, these or those clans have retained only their spiritual makeup. We do not have our own language, and the will of history has fused us with Muscovite Rus'. If the historical process of unification had stopped at the end of the 17th century, the Don Cossacks probably [in this context of the academic language of pre-revolutionary scholarship, the word "probably" means "for sure."] would have separated and formed a new tribe, no less distinct from the Muscovites and Novgorod Slavs, as well as from the Little Russians, than, say, the Belarusians. However, history has judged otherwise, and now our Cossack pretensions seem ridiculous and absurd to our older brothers."

Bogachev then discusses the differences and similarities between the English and Americans, Russians and Siberians. Where do these differences lie? How were they formalized in history, in class rights, in genetic "racial" inheritance? What are the causes of social discord and hostility toward the Cossacks? Ultimately, Bogachev arrives at the following conclusion:

"We cannot deny the law of heredity. Traits only gradually disappear under the influence of changing circumstances and interbreeding with representatives of other races or varieties." On this basis, the Cossack geographer draws a very revealing conclusion, characteristic of Cossack historiography: "The history

of tribal Cossackdom (as opposed to ascribed) could not yet be erased from the legacy passed down from generation to generation: this requires much more time. This legacy exists, and those who consider the Cossack mentality a product of artificial indoctrination are wrong. One more thing must not be forgotten: atavism. History has contrasted Cossack with non-Cossack, and we have no right to deny the differences this has generated." In essence, this conclusion is nothing other than an affirmation of the biological, or, we would now say, ethnogenetic, distinctiveness of the "tribal" or "hereditary" Cossacks.

Today, when we see in the Russian Federation heated disputes, literally to the point of violence, between "independent" and "registered" Cossacks, at their core we find the same opposition from a century ago

"Clan" and "affiliated" Cossacks. Although Bogachev, naturally, does not speak of yet-undiscovered genes, but rather of "atavism," this should not mislead us. In such a "biological" basis, at the level of the natural sciences of the time, he clearly sees confirmation of the special "independence" of the Cossacks. Although, we repeat, he outwardly distances himself from the "independence" ideology in every possible way. And, as we saw above, Bogachev did not share the "romantic" views on the "antiquity" of the Cossacks that characterized some of his contemporaries. In particular, the author of the Cossack textbook expressed fundamental doubts about the veracity of the concept of the ancient origins of the Cossacks, which was championed by another of his contemporary—the renowned Don writer, local historian, and "independent" historian, E. P. Savelyev.

When discussing "independent" Cossack historiography, one cannot help but mention the works of Yevgraf Petrovich Savelyev. Working during the years of turbulent revolutionary upheaval and remaining in Russia after the end of the Civil War, he was one of the first to formulate a comprehensive picture of "independent" Cossack history. This typical Don intellectual of the early 20th century expressed his own (Cossack) perspective on Cossack history, unconstrained by the "Red-White" framework.

Savelyev began his research in the early 20th century, and his main work, "Ancient History of the Cossacks," was published in three volumes between 1915 and 1918 in Novochoerkassk. It was forgotten after the Civil War and was only reprinted in Rostov-on-Don in 1990. In 2007, to commemorate the historian's anniversary, the Veche publishing house released a third, revised edition of E. P. Savelyev's major work, "Ancient History of the Cossacks." Despite its many shortcomings from a professional historiographic perspective, Savelyev's work is valuable for its original perspective and represents the first attempt to create a national Cossack history. Reader interest in this book is demonstrated by the fact

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

that a new edition was published soon after—in 2020. One indicator of the interest in Savelyev and his works in Russia and abroad today is the creation of a personal memorial website dedicated to the legacy of this historian and writer: "The Old Don Roads of Yevgraf Savelyev." The website was created by the late M. A. Kochetkov at the initiative of the writer's great-granddaughter, Kristina Popova, who now lives in Sofia and whose daughter emigrated to Bulgaria at the end of the Civil War. The website's activities are supported not only by descendants, but also by enthusiasts and the Cossack community. This information resource aims to collect and publish information about the writer-historian and his descendants, and to preserve the creative and historical legacy of Y. P. Savelyev.

Yevgraf Petrovich Savelyev did not receive a special historical education, but was a self-taught historian, which left a significant imprint on all his works and served as one of the reasons for the frivolous and inattentive attitude towards him on the part of domestic historiography of the Soviet period. Perhaps the only serious attempt to date at a historiographic analysis of Savelyev's works was the critical study by N. A. Mininkov, entitled "An Alternative View of a Soviet Historian." It was placed as an afterword to the reprint republication in Vladikavkaz, in the wake of Perestroika, in 1991 of Savelyev's "Ancient History of the Cossacks." As is clear from the title, in this work the now well-known specialist in the history of the Cossacks presented a brief but well-founded historiographic criticism and analysis of Savelyev's historical concept from the standpoint of traditional Soviet historical materialism. Let us recall that in this ideological and methodological framework, class was the main criterion of analysis. Therefore, the historiographic phenomenon of Savelyev found its natural and simple explanation in the class nature of the interests of noble and bourgeois historiography. The Savelyev family came from the nobility of the Don Cossack army, and in terms of his social status, E. P. Savelyev was a typical representative of the Don common intelligentsia (although in the 1915 questionnaire he indicated his class origin as "Cossack farmers").

From the point of view of classical Soviet historiography, Savelyev's pan-Slavic ideas of Cossack nationalism fit into the general scheme of the confrontation between noble and bourgeois historiography in the context of the local interests of the Don nobility and Cossacks, who were sharply critical of the so-called "runaway serf theory" of the origin of the Cossacks.

Here is what N. A. Mininkov wrote about this in 1991: "The statements of Russian historians seriously affected the Don Cossacks, and especially the newly-minted Don nobility, which sought to merge as closely as possible with the Russian nobility. Therefore, in the nascent Don historiography of the 19th century, all

attempts to somehow "belittle" the Cossacks were rebuffed. In the works of Don historians, the Cossacks began to be presented as a cohort of heroes who had the most ancient and high origins."

Based on a critical analysis of Savelyev's work, N. A. Mininkov reached the following conclusion: "E. P. Savelyev failed to prove his main idea—the existence of the Cossacks in ancient times, long before our era. His works were distinguished by a methodology that was backward for the early 20th century and contained numerous inaccuracies and outright distortions. Nevertheless, knowledge of them offers certain benefits to the modern reader. They demonstrate the complexity of resolving the question of the origins of the Don Cossacks and the possibility of fruitful research only on the basis of reliable factual material and a comprehensive study of the situation throughout Southeastern Europe in the late Middle Ages, which facilitated the emergence and establishment of the Cossacks on the Don." Nowadays, a historiographical analysis based solely on an analysis of class interests seems somewhat simplistic. Furthermore, in his article, Mininkov did not dwell on the writer's biography, limiting himself to a general critique of his "Ancient History..."

At the same time, N. A. Mininkov's historiographical and source-study critique of Savelyev's weaknesses remains relevant to this day. However, two decades have passed since the reprint of Savelyev's main book, and Mininkov's short article remains, to the author's knowledge, the only scholarly historiographic study of Savelyev's legacy. For example, it is regrettable to note that even such a comprehensive publication as the Encyclopedia of the Cossacks lacks an article dedicated to this original Cossack historian. It must be said that this gap is being filled by various amateur Cossack enthusiasts in the online community and so-called "alternative" historians, representatives of "folk history," such as A. I. Asov, known for his, to put it mildly, unconventional historical views. At the same time, public interest in the legacy of E. P. Savelyev has only increased in Cossack circles in recent years. In such a situation, the conclusion about the relevance of the historiographical study of Savelyev's works, made by Mininkov twenty years ago, remains relevant for Russian historiography.

Yevgraf Petrovich Savelyev was born to hereditary Cossacks Pyotr Gerasimovich and Domenika Andreyevna (?) Savelyev on December 10, 1860 (Old Style) in the village of Konstantinovskaya. He died, presumably, in 1927 in Novocherkassk; researchers have not yet been able to determine the exact date. Little is known reliably about the writer's biography. His personal and family life were tragic, quite in keeping with the spirit of those revolutionary times. The historian's eldest son fought in the White Army, his mobilized daughter served as a nurse, and his youngest son became a Red Commissar. The

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

historian's descendants emigrated to Bulgaria, Germany, and Venezuela. The historian himself was unharmed during the Soviet era, but his works and research were forgotten for many years. The results of the research from the last years of the historian's life were not published and, along with his personal archive, were apparently lost irretrievably during the Great Patriotic War.

One of the few surviving sources is a questionnaire filled out by E. P. Savelyev himself at the Rostov-on-Don City Museum, which is available in photocopy and transcript form on the writer's memorial website. According to E. P. Savelyev's personal data, he received his primary education at the Konstantinovskiy Parish School and the 1st Donskoy District School from 1872 to 1874, and his specialized education at the Novochoerkassk Teachers' Seminary from 1874 to 1879. From 1880 to 1894, Savelyev served as a public teacher in the Don region, and then, from 1895 to 1910, he held a minor official position as a clerk in the Regional Administration of the Don Cossack Host. Later, before the 1917 Revolution, he served as chairman of the board of the Don Society for Mutual Aid of Employees and was a member of the board of the Novochoerkassk Mutual Credit Society. For his achievements and merits in public service, E. P. Savelyev was awarded medals and, on May 6, 1907, the Order of St. Anna, 3rd class. In 1911, Savelyev was brought before a jury in the case of the Don writers (Savelyev and Chesnokov) for criticizing the autocratic regime. That same year, Savelyev, the clerk of the regional government and court councilor, was dismissed from service "due to illness."

While still working as a teacher, Savelyev began his literary and journalistic work. His first articles appeared in the newspaper "Donskoy Golos" (Don Voice) in 1882–1884. Later, he published in "Donskiye Oblastnye Vedomosti" (Don Regional News), "Golos Kazachestva" (The Voice of the Cossacks), and "Donskoy Literary Collection." It was then that the budding publicist and writer became fascinated with the history of the Don Cossacks. During his fieldwork from 1900–1905, Savelyev, by his own account, traveled throughout the entire North Caucasus, Transcaucasia, and the Caucasus Mountains, from Derbent to New Athos and Kutaisi, studying the daily life and customs of the Lezgins, Chechens, Khevsurs, Ossetians, Svanets, and Circassians, as well as archaeological antiquities for the history of the Cossacks. In 1914, Savelyev went to the capital's libraries, where he continued his research in the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg and the libraries of Moscow.

Beginning in 1904, Savelyev published a series of articles on the history of the Don and the Don Cossacks. His first work was entitled "Essays on the History of Trade on the Don. The Society of Don Trading Cossacks."

In 1908, Savelyev published a short article in the

Don Regional Gazette, entitled "How to Write History in General, and the Don Cossacks in Particular." In this article, he outlined his historical credo and made a claim for an independent vision of the history of the Cossacks as an original and very ancient people: "The Don Cossacks, who served the Muscovite state with honor for about four centuries and are known throughout the world for their valor and knightly courage, should have their own history. In the days of Russia's enslavement, its impotence and disorder, on its southern borders, they themselves stood as a formidable wall and with their daring and stubborn struggle, which lasted for centuries, amazed all neighboring peoples. From the banks of the Danube and the Dnieper, along the steppes of the Don, Kuban, Terek, the lower Volga, the Urals and further east through the wilds of Siberia to the Amur and Kamchatka, along the border of great modern Russia, the Cossack communities were the first to draw the cherished line, which neighboring peoples were not destined to cross, and with their courage and blood they defended the lands they occupied. An example in the life of peoples is rare, if not to say - isolated. And such a people does not have its own history, there is no research on its origin, if not to count the inventions of some historians alien to the Cossacks, inventions that do not stand up to historical criticism. "It was this article that served as the programmatic basis for the future main book of the Cossack historian: "The Ancient History of the Cossacks."

Savelyev wrote and published his primary works on the history of the Don Cossacks and the North Caucasus in the early 20th century. These include the aforementioned "Essays on the History of Trade on the Don" (1904), "Ataman M.I. Platov and the Founding of Novochoerkassk" (1906), and "Types of Don Cossacks and Peculiarities of Their Dialect" (1908), a total of more than 13 historical works. During the 1917 Revolution and the Civil War, Savelyev published works in which he expressed an interest in the revolutionary and democratic traditions of the Cossacks: "Bulavin and Nekrasov" and "The Military Circle on the Don as a People's Government." According to some reports, individual articles on local history by Savelyev were published under Soviet rule; however, this information has not yet been confirmed. Savelyev's major historical work was the monograph "Ancient History of the Cossacks," written in 1913 in six parts and published in only the first three volumes (a total of 475 pages) at the height of World War I and the revolutionary upheavals in Russia from 1915 to 1918 in Novochoerkassk. The final three parts of the work remained unpublished in manuscript form and, presumably, can now be considered lost. This was the first work in which the historian attempted to provide a comprehensive picture of the Cossacks' historical past from his own Cossack perspective—figuratively speaking, to present a picture of Cossack history through the eyes of a Cossack in the folk tradition.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Despite all its shortcomings, emotionality, and the sometimes almost childish naivety of some of its constructions, E. P. Savelyev's "Ancient History of the Cossacks" was one of the first attempts to offer an independent vision of Cossack history, alternative to official imperial historiography. This is precisely why "Ancient History of the Cossacks" is of great historiographical interest and lies at the very foundation of the entire "Cossack nationalism" movement in modern Russian historiography.

Within the pages of Savelyev's monograph, we find elements of both pan-Slavic ideas and early Cossack nationalism, an attempt to formulate the Cossack people's own historiographic credo, and the evolution of the author's own views, from those initially quite loyal to the tsarist autocracy to those almost revolutionary at the end. It is important to note that the early 20th century, namely, the years from the outbreak of World War I to the end of the Civil War, saw a radical shift in Russia not only of the old social order but also of the essentially nationalist scientific paradigm of the social sciences that had dominated since the late 19th century. This paradigm is linked to the theory of Pan-Slavism, which is methodologically related to similar movements both in Europe (for example, the Pan-Germanism of the Great Germans) and in Asia (for example, the Pan-Turkism of the Young Turks). In its development, Pan-Slavism went from flourishing on the wave of nationalist and chauvinistic frenzy in the first days of the World War of 1914 to complete ideological bankruptcy at the end of the Civil War.

Savelyev begins his study with a discussion of "how history should be written," stating that "the history of the Cossacks, including the Don Cossacks, remains poorly researched, and therefore the Cossack population as a whole knows very little about the great deeds of their ancestors. They have no idea whatsoever about the original origins of this people, save for baseless legends passed down to us through oral tradition or written down and thoughtlessly accepted as reliable by some gullible historians." The historian notes the complete lack of study of "written monuments about the antiquity of the Cossacks," which are very few, "and even those scattered across various, poorly studied, Russian and foreign archives and libraries." The author particularly laments the irreparable loss of the entire Don archive, which "burned to the ground in the city of Cherkassk in 1744." The historian then discusses the need to create a history of the Cossack people and defines the fundamental principles required for such research. Among the latter, Savelyev names not only impartiality and objectivity, but also independence, which a historian must possess when writing the history not of the Russian state and "its outskirts," but of the peoples inhabiting it (the state).

The historian asks, "Can the Don Cossacks boast a historical literature?" and answers, "Unfortunately,

we have very little such literature in the Don region, although sufficient material has already been collected for the history of this army." Savelyev notes that the Don Cossacks, in most cases, don't even know who their ancestors were, where they came from, or why they are called Cossacks. The historian writes bitterly that "not to mention the mass of Cossacks, who are illiterate or even semilliterate, even among the intelligentsia, there is little interest in history, and books on historical matters sell poorly."

Savelyev considered the primary goal of his new history of the Cossacks to be clarifying the origins of the Cossack people. Interestingly, in this regard, Savelyev's work is in many ways reminiscent of the early works of pioneering Russian historians V.N. Tatishchev and M.V. Lomonosov. In this regard, Savelyev is characterized by a flaw that is generally characteristic of the formation of any independent historiographical tradition: an uncritical acceptance of all evidence that can be interpreted as confirming the exceptional antiquity of the people's origins and, consequently, an uncritical and insufficiently scientifically substantiated "ancientization" of Cossack history.

Savelyev begins his examination of the problem of the origin of the Cossacks with criticism of the official autocratic-monarchist historiography (N. M. Karamzin, D. I. Ilovaisky). And, first of all, Savelyev categorically rejects the thesis about the origin of the Cossacks from runaway Russian peasants or fugitive robbers, which was persistently prevalent in general works on the history of Russia in the 18th–19th centuries. Savelyev also criticizes local Don historians for "the lack of critical methods of historical research, or too one-sided an attitude to such work." In searching for the roots of the Cossacks, one must, according to the historian, "know where to look" and "be able to find." And for this, one needs love for the subject and love for the people, "whose history one is going to write."

It's worth noting how the historian justifies the need to create a truly independent, distinctive Cossack historiography and ethnography: "One must be born among these people, live with them for a long time, study their customs and traditions, language, songs, games, beliefs, and historical tales in the form of folk epics; one must study the people's anthropology and all the archaeological sites of a given area." The scholar also justifies the need for archaeolinguistic and other supporting research.

The final conclusion of the author of the "Ancient History of the Cossacks" is as follows: "The Don Cossacks, who served the Muscovite state with honor for about four centuries and were known throughout the world for their valor and knightly courage, should have and know their own history." This conclusion, as we remember, was made by Savelyev in his article of 1908 (see above). Thus, E. P. Savelyev defended the right of the Cossacks to their

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

own history, the history of the Cossack people, written by the Cossacks themselves from their own national positions.

Savelyev devotes the first part of his work to the ancestors of the Cossacks and to clarifying the meaning of the name of the Cossack people. This part consists of 11 chapters, in which the author consistently analyzes the historiography of the problem and the views of historians on the origin of the Cossacks, and also gives a brief overview of the modern peoples of the North Caucasus, considers the possible ancestors of the Cossacks, starting from the Scythians, Circassians and ending with the Amazons, Khazars and Tatars.

From a pan-Slavic position, Savelyev comes to the conclusion that the Scythians-Sarmatians, "they were also Sakas, Chigi-Getae, Getae-Russes, Massagetae, Varangians-Russes, Cherkassy-Kazakhs, Az, or Yasses, Alans-Roksolani and other peoples who inhabited the shores of the Azov, Black, Marmara and Caspian Seas, Western Asia and lower Italy, were Slavs, divided into many independent tribes and having their own high culture and writing." And further: "the military class of these tribes was called Getae, or Goths, and in the Azov region Az, Kazakhs, Kasogs, Kasags, Kazakhs or Cossacks from Az and Sak."

Thus, E. P. Savelyev traces the origins of the "Cossack tribe (people)" to the Scythians and considers them Slavs. It should be noted that such constructions, tracing the history of Rus' back to Scythian times, were quite popular at the time. Similar constructions by D. I. Ilovaisky and other anti-Normanists serve as examples. It is especially noteworthy that, according to Savelyev, the ancestral homeland of the Cossacks is the Ciscaucasian steppes and the Azov region. The historian emphasizes not the Russian, or rather, the Great Russian, origins of the Cossacks. He argues that this large people with a rich, distinctive culture, language, and original social structure could not have descended from fugitive "Muscovites," but rather has its own historical Slavic roots, reaching back to the most ancient times of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, and the prophets of the Old Testament.

In the second part, entitled "An Investigation into the Origins of the Russian Cossacks," Savelyev examines the emergence of the Zaporozhian, Don, Terek, Greben, and other Cossack armies, as well as the early history of the Cossacks from the Middle Ages to the time of Stepan Razin. Here, the self-taught Cossack historian boldly raises and, in his own unique way, addresses questions of medieval Cossack history that, in his words, "our historians for some reason have hushed up, avoided, and even deliberately evaded."

In the final, third part of "The Don Serves the Russian Tsars," the historian examines the social and military structure, daily life, and customs of the

Cossacks at the end of the 17th century, and the history of the Cossacks' gradual integration into the Russian Empire. Savelyev extends this portion of his work to the end of the 18th century. A distinctive feature of the scholar's presentation of Cossack history during the imperial period is a clear departure from the official autocratic-monarchist historiographic tradition. The historian draws attention to the complex relationship between the Cossacks and the imperial administration, without avoiding the "sharp points" that were common in works devoted to loyal subjects (for example, in P.N. Krasnov's history of the Don Host). E.P. Savelyev thoroughly examines, for example, such topics as the rebellion of Stepan Razin and the Pugachev Rebellion. Moreover, the historian reveals the internal causes of the Cossack uprisings from a position of complete loyalty. In these stories, one can see elements of the emerging "Red Cossack," revolutionary-Marxist historiographic tradition, which would become dominant in the work of Soviet historians who studied Cossack issues.

Unfortunately, the limited space of this work does not allow for a detailed presentation and examination of all the features of Yevgraf Petrovich Savelyev's historiographical legacy. Above, we have highlighted only the most striking and distinctive features of the conceptual position of this Don Cossack intellectual of the early 20th century—a publicist, poet, playwright, historian, archaeologist, and local historian. However, in our opinion, the facts presented are sufficient to confirm that this position is of historiographical significance, and further study of Yevgraf Petrovich Savelyev's creative and scholarly legacy, as well as clarification of the details of his biography, is of undoubted scholarly interest. In summary, it can be noted that, from the standpoint of historical scholarly professionalism, the works of E. P. Savelyev, like the entire emerging "independent" Cossack historiography, were characterized by a profound, almost childish, historical naivety, simplistic assessments, unprofessional selection of sources, and other flaws that can be called the "infantile diseases" of Cossack historiography. However, the very attempt by the Cossacks to create and interpret their own history is of historiographical value, as the first stage in the development of this distinctive scholarly field.

Conclusion

It must be said that the majority of historiographic materials from this brief period of Cossack state sovereignty remain unpublished. Many manuscripts perished in the fires of the Civil War and the subsequent dispossession of the Cossacks and kulaks, the Great Terror of the late 1930s, and finally, the German occupation and subsequent liberation by the Red Army during World War II.

For example, in the author's family history, the home archive and library, which contained books and

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

archival materials from the village church during the Revolution, was burned by the author's barely literate great-grandmother in full view of the author's then-young father during the German occupation, when a German officer billeted in the modest Cossack hut discovered books in German, including a lifetime edition of Karl Marx. This book was inherited from his great-great-grandfather, who served in the village church, from whose library he had brought it. If, under the Bolsheviks,

Marx "posed no threat," but under the Germans, the opposite was true. All adult men (i.e., all those who had attended school) were, understandably, at the front. So, an uneducated woman, ignorant of politics, decided to burn all the books and papers indiscriminately, "out of harm's way."

It should be noted that the published materials of that period were also largely lost. A small portion was

taken by émigrés. Most of the publications that survived in the USSR ended up in special library collections and closed archives, making them effectively inaccessible to researchers. Thus, historical works from the period of Cossack independence essentially "dropped" from historiography and de facto became relegated to the realm of archival sources. It should be noted here that the "independent" historiography of the Cossack republics suffered the same fate in this regard as pre-revolutionary military publications on the Cossacks, albeit due to military secrecy. As a result, "independent" Cossack historiography, banned in the USSR, continued to exist and develop only among the Cossack émigré community, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

References:

1. Bugay, N. F. (2024). Cossacks of Russia: From Rejection to Recognition – a Century-Long Road // *Historical Journal: Scientific Research*. 2024, No. 4.
2. Godovova, E. V. (2025). New Approaches to the Study of Everyday Life of the Cossacks // *Problems of History, Philology, and Culture*. 2025, No. 3 (41).
3. Erokhin, I. Yu. (2025). The State and the Revival of the Cossacks // *Priority Scientific Areas: From Theory to Practice*. 2025, No. 6.
4. Ivanov, A. V. (2025). "De-Cossackization" – a Tragic but Natural Ending. The Revival of the Cossacks: What Will It Be Like? // *Scientific Dialogue*. 2025, No. 6 (18).
5. Isakova, A. A. (2024). *On the Origin of the Word "Cossack"* // The Cossacks of Siberia from Ermak to the Present Day: History, Language, Culture: Proceedings of the All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participation / edited by V. N. Evseev, G. S. Zaitsev. Tyumen.
6. Kozlov, A. I. (2024). *Cossacks – a Nation, a Class?..* // The Revival of the Cossacks: History and Modernity: Proceedings of the V All-Russian Scientific Conf.: Collection of Scientific Articles, Novochoerkassk.
7. Kokarev, E. A. (2024). Administrative and Legal Characteristics of the Legislation of the Russian Federation on the Cossacks of the 1990s // *Administrative and Municipal Law*. 2024, no. 7.
8. Lapteva, E. V., & Rozhkova, L. P. (2025). On the History of Russian Cossacks // *Humanities. Bulletin of the Financial University*. 2025, no. 4.
9. Matsievsky, G. O. (2025). Revival of Russian Cossacks at the End of the Twentieth Century: Main Sources and Features // *Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University*. 2025, no. 10.
10. Ovchinnikova, B. B. (2024). Brodniki – Ancestors of the Don Cossacks // *Rodina*. 2024, no. 10.
11. Penkovsky, D. D. (2025). Revival of Russian Cossacks at the Present Stage // *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*. 2025, no. 1.
12. Popov, V. P. (2024). History of Russian Cossacks // *International Journal of Applied and Fundamental Research*. 2024, No. 7.