Перспективы Науки и Образования

Международный электронный научный журнал
ISSN 2307-2334 (Онлайн)

Адрес выпуска: pnojournal.wordpress.com/archive20/20-01/
Дата публикации: 29.02.2020
УДК 94(47+57) “1947-1948”

И. В. Сидорчук

«Против буржуазной лженауки»: кампания по борьбе за отечественные приоритеты в науке и технике и советская высшая школа

Изучение истории науки и техники является важной составляющей современного высшего образования, что признается как профессиональным сообществом, так и властью. Это делает актуальным ретроспективный анализ опыта преподавания данной дисциплины, который может способствовать ее конструктивному изучению в настоящее время. Одним из ключевых сюжетов в данном контексте является вопрос о влиянии на его развитие властных установок и идеологизации в советский период. В частности, речь идет о развернувшейся в позднесталинский период кампании по борьбе за отечественные приоритеты в науке и технике, направленной на борьбу с низкопоклонством перед западной наукой. Настоящее исследование опирается на широкую источниковую базу, основу которой составили опубликованные законодательные документы, публицистика, а также материалы собраний парторганизаций и партийных комитетов ряда вузов Ленинграда, хранящиеся в Центральном государственном архиве историко-политических документов Санкт-Петербурга. В результате рассмотрения хода кампании и ее последствий для высшего образования автор пришел к выводу, что даже формальное следование предъявляемым к преподавательскому сообществу и студенчеству требованиям означало существенные изменения в научной и учебной работе. Были пересмотрены учебники и программы курсов, жесткому регулированию подвергались научные работы преподавателей, а сами они могли стать объектами резкой критики и осуждения. Таким образом, кампания привела к тому, что по сути правильная идея отстаивания национальных достижений и сохранения памяти о великих представителях отечественной научной мысли зачастую заменялась грубым научным ревизионизмом. Она со всей очевидностью продемонстрировала не только опасность, но и обреченность на провал агрессивного государственного вмешательства и идеологизации истории науки и техники.

Ключевые слова: история образования, история науки и техники, борьба с космополитизмом, Ленинградский Политехнический институт, Ленинградской государственный университет

Ссылка для цитирования:
Сидорчук И. В. «Против буржуазной лженауки»: кампания по борьбе за отечественные приоритеты в науке и технике и советская высшая школа // Перспективы науки и образования. 2020. № 1 (43). С. 354-365. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.1.25

Perspectives of Science & Education

International Scientific Electronic Journal
ISSN 2307-2334 (Online)

Available: psejournal.wordpress.com/archive20/20-01/
Accepted: 12 December 2019
Published: 29 February 2020

I. V. Sidorchuk

"Combating bourgeois pseudoscience": a campaign for national priorities in science and technology and Soviet higher education institutions

Studying the history of science and engineering is an important component of modern higher education, which is recognized by both the professional community and the authorities. This makes relevant a retrospective analysis of the teaching experience of this discipline, which nowadays can contribute to its detailed study. One of the key issues in this context is the influence of establishment and ideologization in the Soviet period. In particular, campaign aimed at combating kowtowing to Western science which was launched in the late Stalin period to fight for national priorities in science and technology is meant. This study relies on a number of sources, at the core of which there are published legislative documents, publicism, as well as materials from meetings of party organizations and party committees of a number of Leningrad universities deposited in the Central State Archive of Historical and Political Documents of St. Petersburg. Considering the course of the campaign and its consequences for higher education, the author came to the conclusion that even a formal adherence to the requirements set for the teaching community and students meant significant changes in scientific and academic work. Textbooks and course programs were revised, the scientific work of teachers was subject to strict regulation, and they themselves could be under fire of severe criticism and condemnation. Thus, the program led to the fact that, the correct idea of standing up for national achievements in this field and preserving the memory of the greatest representatives of Russian scientific community was often replaced by scientific revisionism. It clearly demonstrated not only danger, but also that aggressive state intervention and the ideologization of the history of science and technology were fighting a losing battle.

Key words: history of education, history of science and technology, combating cosmopolitanism, Kalinin Polytechnic Institute, Leningrad State University

For Reference:
Sidorchuk, I. V. (2020). "Combating bourgeois pseudoscience": a campaign for national priorities in science and technology and Soviet higher education institutions. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education, 43* (1), 354-365. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.1.25

Introduction

The importance of studying the history of science and technology is nowadays recognized by both the professional community and the authorities. In particular, in modern Russia, Presidential Decree "On the Strategy for the Scientific and Technical Development of the Russian Federation" confirms the provision on the need to implement an information policy aimed at "popularizing significant results in the field of science, technology and innovation" and "achievements of prominent scientists". As part of a higher education institution's activities, the appeal to the heritage of its famous employees and graduates is an essential factor that forms the basis for its corporate culture and raises its standing in the eyes of potential students, partners and investors. For this reason, the country's leading universities pay close attention to their history [43].

In the Soviet period nationalization of science led to the fact that national history of science and technology developed in the context of the policy of the state. On the one hand, this was testimony to the authorities' interest and guaranteed the support of various scientific and educational initiatives. On the other hand, scientists were often forced to follow the state order, which could lead to the triumph of very dubious approaches and directions and adversely affect the quality of their research. This, in particular, can be said about the late Stalin period, when the restructuring of policies in the field of science and education was carried out to promote a national-patriotic idea, combat cosmopolitanism and achieve absolute political loyalty of the intelligentsia.

An integral part of these changes was the campaign to fight for national priorities in science and technology, which led to changes in the teaching structure of all scientific disciplines and mass adjustment of textbooks, as well as repressions against a number of professors and teachers. Despite the fact that it was short-lived and began to weaken rapidly after the death of I.V. Stalin, its influence on the subsequent teaching of the history of science and technology in the country's educational institutions was quite strong. This article discusses the course of the campaign, its implementation peculiarities and consequences for higher education.

The history of late Stalinist policy in the field of science is a hot topic among specialists. First of all, it is addressed in studies devoted to the functioning of science in a totalitarian state [32; 35]. The most popular topics that illustrate the problem of the relationship between science, the scientific community and the authorities are Lysenkoism [33; 40; 41] and Marrism [27] – the main symbols of pseudoscience success at the state level. In the context of this work, it is worth highlighting the approach of A.B. Kozhevnikov, who studied the "rituals" of the functioning of science in the period under review [37]. The works of foreign experts uncovering the influence of ideas that triumphed in late Stalinist science on the scientific world of the West are of great interest [34]. The relevance of the topic under discussion is indicated by the fact that a number of modern researchers see the danger of the revival of the ideas of T.D. Lysenko in the XXI century. In particular, this has been discussed by such recognized experts in the history of Russian science as E.I. Kolchinsky [38] and M.B. Konashev [39] in their recent studies. The influence of various campaigns on the fate of higher education does not remain outside the sphere of historian's attention [31], although this issue is given much less attention in historiography.

Materials and methods

Primary sources of the study included materials deposited in the Central State Archive of Historical and Political Documents of St. Petersburg. The materials mentioned relate to meetings of party organizations and party committees of a number of universities in Leningrad and haven't been introduced into scientific use before. The study also used legislative and regulatory documents, as well as, journalistic materials covering issues of life and reforms of higher education published in specific periodicals of the 2nd half of the 1940s.

The general scientific dialectic method of cognition, which includes the principles of historicism, objectivity and systematicity constituted the methodological basis of the research. The development principle, which is closely related to the idea of historicism (phenomena are considered on the basis of the concept of their continuous formation and transformation), was used among the methodological principles. Interpretative analysis made it possible to identify discursive strategies by which the desired image of the science of the past was produced and disseminated. The historical-systemic method was used to reveal the internal mechanisms of historical phenomena and objects development and functioning, and the historical-genetic method – to consider the origin and development of the phenomenon under study. Case-study was used to analyze specific historical conditions and social situations, explain the theoretical constructions and conclusions of the study applying empirical data.

Results of the study

With the onset of the Cold War, the former allies quickly became enemies, which led to another surge in espionage and the struggle of the opposing forces authorities for the full loyalty of their citizens. The cultural contacts between the USSR and the USA, which were developing during the WWII period, were cut off, and sympathy for the West was stigmatized as "kotowing". This certainly affected science and higher education that are traditionally relatively open and interested in international contacts. According to the secret Plan of measures for propagating the ideas of Soviet patriotism among the population of April 18, 1947, developed by the Agitprop Central Committee, it was necessary "to show that the reactionary exploitative classes that dominated in Russia did not care about the growth of science and culture, and hindered its development in our country. As a result, the fruits of Russian science were appropriated by foreigners; the priority of many great scientific discoveries made by Russian scientists was given to foreigners (Lomonosov – Lavoisier, Polzunov – Watt, Popov – Marconi, etc.)" [30, p. 112]. From now on, it became necessary to emphasize Soviet priority everywhere, "indifference to politics" and "objectivism" were recognized as sins, that is, the presentation of material without political and ideological assessments. Deputy Minister of Higher Education of the USSR V.I. Svetlov in his article published in the April 1947 issue of the Bulletin of Higher School, discussed how the situation could affect higher education: "If, for example, a teacher of history, philosophy or other science speaks only of Western European minds, and doesn't show what a serious role Russian minds have played in the development of sciences, then this teacher confuses students and creates an incorrect idea that all culture

comes from the West, that the Russians are incapable of independent creativity and can only tilt westward" [26, p. 12].

The signal for opening a full-scale campaign was the case of professors N.G. Klyueva and G.I. Roskin ("the case of KR"). They were accused of the fact that instead of ensuring the secrecy of their investigations, they sought to talk about them abroad for personal glory. According to the official version, Secretary of the Academy of Medical Sciences V.V. Parin received from them the manuscript of the book "Ways of Cancer Biotherapy" and krutsin ampoules, which he transferred to foreign experts during his visit to the United States [for more details see: 29, p. 42-74]. They were also blamed for their publications in American magazines and allegedly hiding the significance of their work from the Soviet authorities. To punish the scientists, it was decided to resort to a court of honor – a showtrial that dealt with anti-patriotic, anti-state and anti-social acts that were not subject to criminal trial. Upon the trial, at which the scientists showed repentance and confessed their faults, they received a public censure. The authorities believed such a measure was a good lesson for those Russian scientists who wanted to stay in contact with foreign colleagues or to deideologize their research activities.

After the trial a "Confidential Letter from the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks was prepared on the case of professors Klyueva and Roskin" [30, p. 123-138]. July 16, 1947 it was sent to party organizations. More than 88 thousand copies were prepared [29, p. 75]. They also included materials of the court of honor, a transcript of the first part of the court sitting, the speech by the public prosecutor, the decision and statement of the party organization of the ministry of health. The letter stated the accusations against scientists ("they handed over to the Americans an important discovery of Soviet science – a cancer drug") and made it clear in which direction the history of Russian science should be covered from now on: "Science in Russia has always suffered from this worship of a foreigner. Disbelief in the power of Russian science led to the fact that the scientific discoveries of Russian scientists were not given any importance, thus, the largest discoveries of Russian scientists were passed on to foreigners who fraudulently claimed authorship" [30, p. 125].

Local party members were required to convene meetings of party organizations to discuss the letter and develop a program for further actions. Due to summer holidays in higher educational institutions, such meetings took place after the start of the academic year. Similar "cultural rituals" [10, p. 33] were not new, the administration and the teaching community were already trained to receive these signals and correctly respond to them in accordance with changes. That exactly how it happened that time. Publications of university employees in specific periodicals and materials on confidential letter discussions clearly demonstrate how the state order adaptation was strategized in universities.

All discussions began with a condemnation of N.G. Klyueva and G.I. Roskin. Certainly, condemnations were in the manner of an aggressive rally-commissar style, which began to penetrate into scientific discourse back in the 1920s. [28, p. 66]. For instance, the Secretary of the Party Committee of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute I.K. Koryshev stated the following: "Having conveyed to the Americans an important discovery of Soviet science, Klyueva and Roskin committed a major crime against Soviet public and our people. Klyueva and Roskin made a poor return for the public's kindness, for the concerns of the party and government about the development and prosperity of Soviet science, about the life and work of our scientists. Only those who have lost the dignity of Soviet scientists can do this. By their servility and kowtowing to the West, to the decaying American culture, alien to socialism,

Klyueva and Roskin declared themselves petty cringing creatures" [23, l. 36]. The decision of the party organization of Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute of September 10, 1947 stated: "This unworthy, anti-state act clearly demonstrated how the backward-looking part of the Soviet intelligentsia is crawling to foreigners, worshiping the corrupt culture and science of the capitalist world. This is insulting to Soviet people. This groveling is the largest capitalist remnant in the minds of part of the Soviet intelligentsia" [17, l. 49].

Such campaigns demanded not only criticism, but also self-criticism. The universities management had to identify shortcomings in their work and find those who, like N.G. Klyueva and G.I. Roskin, could be blamed for the lack of Soviet patriotism and cringing. If the same "obvious" misconduct was not registered, one could be under fire even due to evidence-free accusations. For example, in the Report of the Party Committee of Leningrad State University on the implementation of the instructions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, professor P.O. Makarov, a biologist, was criticized for the fact that "in his course he used foreign terminology way too often" [14, l. 24]. Orientalist scholars S.A. Kozin, A.P. Barannikov and V.M. Alekseev were accused of the fact that "elements of objectivism and cringing prevailed" in their works. V.M. Alekseev was also credited with exalting the English language, which he allegedly considered the language of the future. Their colleague A.A. Kholodovich was accused of "not recommending Russian literature on Oriental studies to students, since "there is nothing good in it" [7, l. 134]. The fact that I.S. Nathanson, Professor and Head of the Department of Mathematical Analysis at Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute, published articles in a foreign magazine in 1944 was recognized as "kowtowing to the Western science", and served as a black mark against him [17, l. 49]. The "incident" with assistant professor Markov from Kalinin Polytechnic Institute was recognized as the most characteristic case of kowtowing to the West: "Giving a lecture on measuring equipment to students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, he spoke about measures to preserve instruments and equipment and, in particular, about their lubrication, Markov got a jar of imported vaseline, opened it with reverence and began to teach the youth that there was no such vaseline in the USSR, there was not and would not be. Such vaseline could be produced only in America. Students took this admirer of American technology up short and stopped the eruption of blasphemy against Soviet technology" [23, l. 37].

Not only lectures and scientific works of university teachers were criticized, but also textbooks they published. The most famous case was the book of G.F. Aleksandrov "History of Western European Philosophy". His approach to assessing the philosophical systems of the past was characterized by the Minister of Higher Education of the USSR S.V. Kaftanov as "toothless professor-vegetarian apolitical" [9, p. 3]. Rector of Moscow State University I.S. Galkin criticized one of the leading national experts in the field of economic geography N.N. Baransky for the fact that "he placed the textbook by Russel Smith, an American, above other textbooks" [5, p. 16]. Ya.M. Pavlov, Associate Professor of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute, pointed out that his colleague V.I. Kamenev in his college textbook on mechanical drawing completely ignored soviet machines and was in favour of foreign ones [15]. The textbook by G.S. Zhiritsky on steam turbines was criticized at the meeting of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute for the same reason ("there are absolutely no or not enough soviet machines") [8, l. 53]. Universities started revising textbooks and teaching aids to add information on the achievements of Russian and soviet science and technology. According to the Deputy Minister of Higher Education of the USSR A.M. Samarin, "the priority of Russian and Soviet scientists, the advantages of the Soviet social system, combating bourgeois pseudoscience,

the greatest achievements of Soviet people must be included not only in textbooks on socio-political disciplines, but also in any college textbook" [25, p. 5].

The same thing happened with curricula and courses. S.V. Kaftanov declared indignantly: "What else indeed if not a slavish admiration for foreignism can it be, when some professors in their education programs give the names only of foreign researchers, technicians and engineers, who are often far from being distinguished scientists? Whereas the major achievements of our science and its representatives are not indicated and understated in the programs." He also drew attention to the university program on the history of Russian literature of the XVIII century by D.D. Blagoy, which allegedly exaggerated "the value of Western influence on Russian literature of this time" [9, p. 4]. Universities had to revise programs and restructure courses within a short time. Units on Russian and Soviet physics were included in the course on the history of physics given at Leningrad State University; the course of general astronomy at the Faculty of Mathematics and Mechanics now included the chapter "History of Astronomy in Russia and the USSR". Moreover, courses at the chemical, geographical and other faculties also suffered significant changes [11, l. 7]. Over twenty programs underwent changes at the Faculty of Biology. The changes were mainly "in the direction of personalizing the achievements of Russian and Soviet science." The programs already modified and revised by the authors themselves were introduced "additional improvements" at the faculty meetings. For example, the program of the course "Physiology of Labor" revised by professor M.I. Vinogradov underwent five changes, and eleven amendments were introduced into L. L. Vasiliev's program on "Physiology of animals and humans" at a joint meeting of physiological departments [14, l. 24]. At the Faculty of Philosophy, major changes were made to the program on the history of Russian philosophy. The academic council of the faculty decided on the need "to include in the program a unit on the role of Russian materialist biologists in the development of Russian philosophy and natural sciences, as well as the outstanding role of such Russian scientists as Sechenov, Timiryazev, Mechnikov, Pavlov, Michurin in the development of world natural science" [14, l. 25].

According to the Action Plan developed at Kalinin Polytechnic Institute to implement the confidential letter instructions, it was decided "to popularize the role of Russian scientists in world science, to give lectures on the history of technology at all faculties" [16, l. 41]. In total, during the period from November 1947 to February 1948, 328 training programs were revised, and in some cases changed. Yet, the work was not recognized as completed, "since in some places the review of the programs was not carried out carefully, rather in a hurry and poorly, without enough public attention" [22, l. 47]. The content and research areas of student diploma papers were also changed: now numerous references to foreign studies were frowned upon and the priority of national specialists was to be emphasized.

Lectures and seminar classes also had to undergo changes. According to the editorial article "Struggle for the Priority of Russian Science," published in No. 1 of the Bulletin of Higher Education in 1948, "lectures given to students in most cases fully reflected the content of programs and textbooks recommended for universities. The suppression of the role of Russian scientists, the exaggerated, often incorrect coverage of the significance of foreign science created a misconception of Russian science among students and did not help to instill in them a sense of deep respect for our scientists and their wonderful works, a sense of patriotism, readiness to defend the honor and dignity of our Motherland in science and culture" [2, p. 2]. A.M. Samarin pointed out that teachers should not only provide information, but also parent students: "When giving any lecture <...>, words of truth should be said about the achievements of Russian and Soviet science, about its advantages over

bourgeois science, about the advantages of the socialist system over capitalism" [24, p. 2]. Teaching was actively discussed by the party organizations of pedagogical universities, because they trained not just specialists, but future teachers. According to A.M. Leushina, associate professor of preschool pedagogy at Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute, teachers of a pedagogical university "must always remember that we train fighters of the ideological front, that we process the consciousness of hundreds and thousands of people, who in turn will educate the consciousness of thousands and thousands of young people in our country" [21, l. 43]. Zoologist E.M. Heysin, who worked at the same institute and was forced to leave Leningrad after the August session of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences in 1948, stated that "the scientists of our institute are connected with students, so there is an unavoidable question whether we are covering the materials of bourgeois science critically enough and dwelling on the discoveries of Soviet science properly, or not" [21, l. 42].

Attention was also drawn to the fact that lectures should be not only informative, but also interesting. Professor of the Moscow Irrigation and Reclamation Institute I.I. Agroskin even highlighted the lecturing manner of pre-revolutionary professors, in particular, the historian V.O. Klyuchevsky and physicist O.D. Hvolson [1, p. 17-18].

In order to educate teachers of Moscow and Leningrad higher educational institutions, the USSR Ministry of Higher Education issued Order No. 1669 of November 14, 1947, "On the history of Russian science and technology lecturing to teachers of higher education institutions". It reported on the paramount importance of proper coverage "of issues of the Russian scientists' leadership in the development of world science and technology in the educational process", which required "lectures on the history of Russian technology for faculty members" [20].

New departments were created in some universities for better and more comprehensive implementation of the tasks assigned. January 14, 1948, the Order of the Minister of Higher Education of the USSR "On Teaching the History of Science and Engineering in Higher Education Institutions" was issued. According to it teaching of the history of science and technology was to be introduced in a number of educational institutions from the 1948/49 academic year "in order to educate well-rounded Soviet specialists who know the history of Russian science and technology, are selflessly devoted to their homeland and are able to fight against servility and worship of foreign science and technology". Directors of the chosen educational institutions were to submit for the Minister's approval candidates for heads of history of technology and history of other sciences departments [19, p. 9]. Directors of all higher educational institutions were obliged to "organize for students and faculty regular lectures on the role of soviet innovators in the development of science, technology and culture" [19, p. 10]. At the same time, they were to consider the experience of the department of history of technology of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute, founded and led by V.V. Danilevsky. The latter was widely known for his numerous books on the history of Russian technology, and, of course, could not help taking an active part in the campaign, because it was promising for the implementation of many ambitious projects of the scientist. V.V. Danilevsky argued that "the creation of the history of technology as a scientific discipline is the project of K. Marx and F. Engels," and "continuing and developing their project V.I. Lenin and I.V. Stalin raised the history of technology to the highest level" [6, p. 28]. In his opinion, "the sacred duty of all employees of Soviet higher education is to equip their students with the truth about the world significance of national innovations, about particular contributions of soviet minds to the world civilization, about the priority of the USSR in the most important discoveries and inventions" [6, p. 29]. Party Secretary of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute I.K.

Koryshev praised the role and prospects of the department: “We need to ensure that it develops on a wide scale. When we check the curriculum, it is necessary that it includes the course on the history of engineering, so that the department of the history of engineering could show young people how technology was developing, especially how Soviet science was developing, what Russian and Soviet people contributed to it ” [8, l. 52].

To enlighten students and faculty members, various scientific and leisure activities were organized, first and foremost, conferences. From November 17 to 21, 1947, the first science and technology conference “The Role of Russian Innovators in the Development of National and World Engineering and Technical Sciences” was held at Kalinin Polytechnic Institute. The organizers noted that the conference “contributed a lot to studying and reporting on the achievements of Russian science and technology, enriched all branches of the world engineering and technical sciences”, and facilitated the work on revising the curricula [22, l. 47]. The thematic plans of the Centre for Science in Lesnoy and the Club of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute included “lectures and reports on Soviet patriotism, on the historical role of Russian science, on the honor and duty of a Soviet scientist”, as well as “a series of lectures on the history of Russian engineering” [16, l. 41].

The work of faculty agitation groups that united agitators of student study groups was reorganized in the light of the instructions of the confidential letter of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks: “Fighting against particular cases of kowtowing to the West among students, showing the advantages of the ideology and morality of soviet people, agitation for a good soviet book, a movie, a play, an exhibition – is now common use” [14, l. 36]. At the end of 1948, the Ministry noted students’ massive participation in conferences that addressed issues of national priorities in science and technology [18]. The Ministry also wanted the institutions’ and universities’ directors to create classrooms for the history of science and technology and collect and use illustrative material [19, p. 10].

During the campaign, the preparation and publication of studies on the history of Russian science and technology was constantly under discussion. Moreover, it was not only about newspaper or magazine notes, but also about bulky editions. These requirements were fulfilled. Modern researcher M.A. Mamontova, having examined the topics of books published in the first post-war decade, came to the conclusion that the Russian scientist gradually became the main character of historical research instead of rulers and military figures [12].

The fight against cringing also included a change in attitude towards foreign literature and terminology. At the meetings it was repeatedly noted that a number of teachers know foreign literature, and ignore the national literature: “... today we can complain about the lack of criticism of foreign works at our Institute. This fact creates a false idea about the inerrancy of foreign science and technology in the minds of our young scientific personnel and students” [23, l. 38]. V.V. Danilevsky supported this criticism. He was especially indignant at translations of articles’ abstracts, which is widespread even nowadays: “... each of our articles ends with a summary in English or in German. And it is unlikely that we will find abstracts in Russian in American and other foreign journals. For what reason, do we burden ourselves when publishing our works? It is high time to put an end to this kowtowing to the West. If they want to know our Soviet, Russian science, they will have to study our language” [8, l. 67].

Results and discussion

At the very beginning of the struggle for national priorities in science and technology, the party leadership and its local representatives sought to prove that this was not an ordinary campaign. It was said about the need for a thorough restructuring of both the teaching material and lecture courses: “Some professors and teachers believe that in order to highlight the role of Russian science, it is enough to devote it a part of their course’s introductory lecture, and not to change the rest. Such understanding of the struggle for the priority of national science and cultivation of patriotism among students is not only mistaken, it rudely distorts the big idea underlying the latest decisions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks on ideological work. Such facts should not take place among Soviet scientists and in higher education” [2, p. 3]. Cases when foreign names were removed from the programs but the program itself was left without amendments were revealed, and the educational departments demanded a new revision [22, l. 45]. Faculty members were also blamed for their “toothless” criticism of each other's works and their unwillingness to “instill a sense of devotion and patriotism in youth” [13, l. 13-14]. It is rather difficult to assess the validity of such remarks, since the party bodies were to criticize themselves, even if there was no reason for it. Nevertheless, for most members of a scientific corporation it was supposedly a “campaign” to which it was necessary to adapt. As V.M. Alpatov, a modern linguist and historian of science, rightly noted, in those days not ignorance of facts but political mistakes were costly [3, p. 8]. Scientists readily demonstrated their loyalty, but it is hardly possible to talk about a complete victory over the “bad dangerous disease called “kowtowing to the West”. Nonetheless, even a formal adherence to the requirements set for the teaching community and students meant significant changes in scientific and educational work.

Conclusion

The implementation of the program promoting national priorities in science and technology led to the fact that, the correct idea of standing up for national achievements in this field and preserving the memory of the great representatives of Russian scientific community was often replaced by scientific revisionism. Instead of conscientious research, primitive, sometimes pseudoscientific, but ideologically correct speculations about the history of science were spreading. Claims for the most important discoveries, for priority in all areas, not supported by facts, could not give a boost to “Soviet patriotism”, but cause only irony and skepticism. It was at that time that the expression “USSR is the homeland of elephants” became popular [4, p. 7]. Thus, this late Stalinist campaign clearly demonstrated not only danger, but also that aggressive state intervention and the ideologization of the history of science and technology were fighting a losing battle.

Funding

The research was financially supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project № 18-78-00085).

REFERENCES

1. Agroskin I.I. Questions of pedagogy of higher school. *Bulletin of higher school*, 1948, no. 3, pp. 16-21. (In Russian).
2. Actively fight for the priority of national science. *Bulletin of higher school*, 1948, no. 1, pp. 1-3. (In Russian).
3. Alpatov V.M. Researchers of facts and creators of theories. *The Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Sciences: Studies in Literature and Language*, 2008, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 3-11. (In Russian).
4. Borisova N.A. Russia – the birthplace of "elephants" or "kulibins"? From the history of telecommunications in the 1830s-1930s. St. Petersburg, 2017. 344 p. (In Russian).
5. Galkin I.S. For combat scientific criticism, against adulation in science. *Bulletin of the higher school*, 1947, no. 12, pp. 11-18. (In Russian).
6. Danilevsky V.V. Arm future specialists with knowledge of the history of technology. *Bulletin of the higher school*, 1948, no. 3, pp. 28-33. (In Russian).
7. Report of the Secretary of the party Committee A. Andreev at the General party meeting of the Leningrad State University on November 19, 1948. Central state archive of historical and political documents of St. Petersburg (CSAHPD SPb). F. 984. Op. 3. D. 1. L. 127-146. (In Russian).
8. Closed party meeting on September 10, 1947 of the party organization of the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute. CSAHPD SPb. F. 40 Op. 2. D. 62. L. 44-77. (In Russian).
9. Kaftanov S.V. Results of development of higher education and its problems. *Bulletin of higher school*, 1947, no. 12, pp. 1-10. (In Russian).
10. Kozhevnikov A.B. Games of Stalinist democracy and ideological discussions in Soviet science: 1947-1952. *Studies in the history of science and technology,* 1997, no. 4, pp. 26-58. (In Russian).
11. A brief report of the Leningrad State University party Committee on the work during the period from April 1945 to January 1948. CSAHPD SPb. F. 984. Op. 3. D. 7. L. 1-10. (In Russian).
12. Mamontova M.A. How "Russian scientist" replaced the "Russian commander": changing the subject of historical research in the USSR in the first post-war decade (based on the "Yearbook of the book of the USSR"). *Scientific notes of the Kazan state University*, 2010, vol. 152, no. 3-1, pp. 195-203. (In Russian).
13. General party meeting of the Leningrad State University collective on April 22, 1948. CSAHPD SPb. F. 984. Op. 3. D. 1. L. 2-14. (In Russian).
14. Report of the party Committee of the Leningrad State University on the implementation of the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b), given in a closed letter in the case of Klyuyeva and Roskin. CSAHPD SPb. F. 984. Op. 3. D. 7. L. 20-39. (In Russian).
15. Pavlov Y.M. Catalogue of foreign cars instead of textbook. *Bulletin of higher school*, 1948, no. 2, pp. 55-56. (In Russian).
16. Plan of measures for the implementation of the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b), set out in the letter on the case of professors Klyuyeva and Roskin dated June 18, 1947. CSAHPD SPb. F. 40 Op. 2. D. 62. L. 41-42. (In Russian).
17. Resolution of the party Assembly of the Herzen State Pedagogical Institute party organization on September 10, 1947. CSAHPD SPb. F. 1158. Op. 2. D. 29. L. 49-49 back. (In Russian).
18. Order of The Minister of higher education of the USSR No. 1626 of November 16, 1948 "On the development of student scientific work in higher institutions". *Bulletin of the Ministry of higher education of the USSR*, 1948, no. 12, pp. 8-10. (In Russian).
19. Order of The Minister of higher education of the USSR No. 63 of January 14, 1948 "On teaching the history of science and technology in higher educational institutions". *Bulletin of the Ministry of higher education of the USSR,* 1948, no. 2, pp. 9-10. (In Russian).
20. Order of the Ministry of higher education of the USSR No. 1669 of November 14, 1947 "On reading lectures on the history of Russian science and technology to teachers of higher educational institutions". *Bulletin of the Ministry of higher education of the USSR*, 1947, no. 12. P. 5. (In Russian).
21. Protocol No. 10 of the closed party meeting of the Herzen State Pedagogical Institute on September 10, 1947. CSAHPD SPb. F. 1158. Op. 2. D. 29. L. 42-48. (In Russian).
22. Protocol No. 18 of the meeting of the party committee of the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute on July 28, 1948. CSAHPD SPb. F. 40. Op. 2 D. 89. L. 39-49. (In Russian).
23. Protocol No. 6 of the closed party meeting of the party organization of the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute on September 10, 1947. CSAHPD SPb. F. 40. Op. 2. D. 62. L. 36-40. (In Russian).
24. Samarin A.M. Higher education and the struggle for the priority of the Soviet science. *Bulletin of higher school*, 1948, no. 3, pp. 1-16. (In Russian).
25. Samarin A.M. For the high partisanship and the scientific integrity of textbooks for higher education. *Bulletin of higher school,* 1948, no. 8, pp. 1-7. (In Russian).
26. Svetlov V.I. Against formalism and dogmatism in the teaching of social Sciences. *Bulletin of the higher school,* 1947, no. 4, pp. 8-13. (In Russian).
27. Sidorchuk I.V. N.Ja. Marr and Marrism in Western historiography. *Dialog so Vremenem*, 2017, no. 58, pp. 330-339. (In Russian).
28. Sidorchuk I.V. Main features of institutionalization of new scientific institutions in post-revolutionary Russia (on the example of Petrograd-Leningrad). *Sociology of science and technology*, 2017, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 59-74. (In Russian).
29. Sonin A.S. The struggle against cosmopolitism in the Soviet science. Moscow, 2011. 663 p. (In Russian).
30. Yakovlev A.N. (Ed.). Stalin and cosmopolitanism. 1945-1953. Documents of the Agitprop of the Central Committee.

Moscow, 2005. 768 p. (In Russian).
31. Sushkov A.V., Yarkova E.I., Baranov E.Yu. “The order in scientific work should be established...”. Documents on the discussion in medical research institutes and universities of Sverdlovsk closed letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) “On the case of professors Klyuyeva and Roskin”. *Ural historical Bulletin*, 2008, no. 3(20), pp. 70-83. (In Russian).
32. Borejsza J.W. Stalin and cosmopolitanism (1945-1953) [Staline et le cosmopolitisme (1945-1953)]. *Vingtieme Siecle: Revue d'Histoire*, 2010, vol. 108, issue 4, pp. 113-126.
33. Borinskaya S.A., Ermolaev, A.I., Kolchinsky, E.I. Lysenkoism against genetics: The meeting of the lenin all-union academy of agricultural sciences of august 1948, its background, causes, and aftermath. *Genetics*, 2019, vol. 212, issue 1, pp. 1-12.
34. Gordin M.D. How Lysenkoism Became Pseudoscience: Dobzhansky to Velikovsky. J*ournal of the History of Biology,* 2012, vol. 45, issue 3, pp. 443-468.
35. John S. Science, truth and dictatorship: Wishful thinking or wishful speaking? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science. Part A*, 2019, vol. 78, pp. 64-72.
36. Koerth-Baker M. When biology meets ideology. *Technology Review,* 2016, vol. 119, issue 2, pp. 88-91.
37. Kojevnikov A. Rituals of Stalinist culture at work: Science and the games of intraparty democracy circa 1948. *Russian Review*, 1998, vol. 57, issue 1, pp. 25-52.
38. Kolchinsky E.I., Kutschera U., Hossfeld U., Levit G.S. Russia's new lysenkoism. *Current Biology*, 2017, vol. 27, no. 19, pp. R1042-R1047.
39. Konashev M.B. Lysenko Up Close but Afar, or Focus on Lysenkoism from the 21st Century. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 2019, vol. 89, issue 3, pp. 303-309.
40. Maderspacher F. Lysenko rising. *Current Biology,* 2010, vol. 20, issue 19, pp. R835-R837.
41. Reznik S., Fet V. The destructive role of Trofim Lysenko in Russian Science. *European Journal of Human Genetics,* 2019, vol. 27, issue 9, pp. 1324-1325.
42. Roll-Hansen N. On the philosophical roots of today’s science policy: Any lessons from the “Lysenko affair”? *Studies in East European Thought*, 2015, vol. 67, issue 1-2, pp. 91-109.
43. Ulyanova S., Sinepol V. Toolbox for historical and biographical research (prosopographic databases on Russian history). *Proceedings – 3rd International Conference on Computer Technology in Russia and in the Former Soviet Union, SoRuCom 2014*, 2015, pp. 183-186.

Информация об авторе
Сидорчук Илья Викторович
(Россия, Санкт-Петербург)
Доцент, кандидат исторических наук, доцент факультета свободных искусств и наук
Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
E-mail: i.sidorchuk@spbu.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9760-2443

Information about the author
Ilya V. Sidorchuk
(Russia, Saint-Petersburg)
PhD in Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences
St. Petersburg State University
E-mail: i.sidorchuk@spbu.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9760-2443