

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ, ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ И МЕТОДЫ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

Academic Science and Secrecy in the Late Stalin Period

M. D. Bukharin, S. G. Karpyuk

For citation: Bukharin M. D., Karpyuk S. G. Academic Science and Secrecy in the Late Stalin Period. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2020, vol. 65, iss. 1, pp. 278–296.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2020.116>

Since 1917 the Russian Academy of Sciences had been under intense pressure of the state, and from 1947 the pressure on the Academy of sciences of the USSR increased due to some new ideological campaigns in the internal policy adopted in the late Stalin Soviet Union, which affected a large number of scholars in all fields of science. Introduction of total secrecy in all kinds of scientific researches and resorting to isolationism as a basic trend of development of Soviet science caused inner opposition in the scientific milieu: in spite of the pressure from non-scientific bureaucratic institutions, Soviet scholars sought ways to continue regular research work, and sometimes this resistance proved to be effective. As a result, scientific councils of the institutes in Humanities and Social sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR were given the right to decide independently whether a work had to be examined for secrecy or not. This opened up opportunities for publication of the majority of works by historians, philologists and other scholars in Humanities of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Of

Mikhail D. Bukharin — Doctor in History, Full Member of the RAS, Chief Researcher, Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences, 32a, Leninsky pr., Moscow, 119334, Russian Federation; michabucha@gmail.com

Михаил Дмитриевич Бухарин — д-р ист. наук, академик РАН, главный научный сотрудник, Институт всеобщей истории РАН, Российская Федерация, 119334, Москва, Ленинский пр., 32а; michabucha@gmail.com

Sergey G. Karpyuk — Doctor in History, Leading Researcher, Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences, 32a, Leninsky pr., Moscow, 119334, Russian Federation; oxlos@yandex.ru

Сергей Георгиевич Карпюк — д-р ист. наук, вед. науч. сотрудник, Институт всеобщей истории РАН, Российская Федерация, 119334, Москва, Ленинский пр., 32а; oxlos@yandex.ru

The article was written within the framework of the project No. 18-18-00367 “Universal history in the framework of Soviet science, culture and education, 1917–1947” of the Russian Scientific Foundation.

Статья написана в рамках проекта РНФ № 18-18-00367 «Всеобщая история в системе советской науки, культуры и образования в 1917–1947 гг.».

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2020

course, the situation was far from ideal; party and ideological supervision over scientists was rigid, but scientists managed to defend the principle of scientific nature of their work. This article provides some previously unpublished documents from the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian State Archive of Social-Political History, letters to Soviet leaders (I. V. Stalin, L. P. Beria, G. M. Malenkov).

Keywords: Academy of sciences of the USSR, history of science, Soviet Union, state and science, secrecy, isolationism.

Академическая наука и секретность в период позднего сталинизма

М. Д. Бухарин, С. Г. Карпюк

Для цитирования: *Bukharin M. D., Karpyuk S. G. Academic Science and Secrecy in the Late Stalin Period // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2020. Т. 65. Вып. 1. С. 278–296. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2020.116>*

С 1917 г. Российская академия наук (впоследствии АН СССР) испытывала давление со стороны органов государственной власти, а с 1947 г. это давление еще более усилилось в результате идеологических кампаний эпохи позднего сталинизма. Внедрение режима секретности во всех отраслях научного знания, а также стремительное нарастание изоляционизма вызвали внутреннюю, хотя и скрытую, оппозицию среди советских ученых, которые уже привыкли к научным контактам с зарубежными коллегами, осуществлявшимся во время Великой Отечественной войны и в первые годы после ее окончания. Несмотря на давление со стороны бюрократических структур, советские ученые искали пути для продолжения нормальной научной работы и сохранения научной основы своих исследований, и иногда скрытое сопротивление ученых органам государственной власти оказывалось эффективным. Так, в Институте физической химии АН СССР была основана лаборатория радиоактивных изотопов, доступ в которую был открыт для ученых из других научных учреждений. Также ученые советов академических институтов в области гуманитарных и социальных наук получили право самостоятельно решать, какая научная публикация требует проверки на секретность, а какая — нет. Это открывало возможность для публикации большинства работ историков, филологов и других специалистов в области гуманитарных наук, которые работали в институтах АН СССР. Конечно, это не отменяло идеологического контроля над учеными со стороны партийных и государственных структур, но позволяло им оставаться в научном поле, давало возможность цитировать труды зарубежных коллег. В статье приводятся прежде не публиковавшиеся документы (письма ученых к руководителям Советского государства) из Архива РАН и РГАСПИ: письма президента АН СССР С. И. Вавилова к И. В. Сталину и Л. П. Берия, а также стенограмма заседания редакционно-издательского совета АН СССР и др.

Ключевые слова: Академия наук СССР, история науки, СССР, государство и наука, секретность, изоляционизм.

The history of the Academy of sciences of the USSR in the Soviet period, especially from 1917 to 1953, is the problem most actively examined by the history of science. For many years certain topics could not be taught; for different reasons scholars gained access to a large number of archival documents only in the recent years. The history of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR encompassed the whole history of the country: achievements and failures, bright personalities and repressions, creation of world class institutions and ascent of the crooks.

One of the most interesting periods in the history of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR is the time after the end of the Second World War until the death of Stalin (1945–1953). Its peculiarity is justified by such constituents as efforts to cut off ties with the outer world, an introduction of censorship in a manner quite tough even for the Soviet Union of Stalin times, and the ways scientific milieu tried to survive in such circumstances. The stringent policy of the state towards the Academy of Sciences totally contradicted § 2 of its Statutes of 1935 which stated that “the main task of the Academy of Sciences is... investigation and development of the world scientific thought”¹.

The research of this period in the history of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has begun only recently. The Soviet state did not allow any critical works on this issue; foreign scholars hardly had any access to the most interesting collections of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In addition, knowledge of Russian was *conditio sine qua non*. For these reasons, there are only few publications that came out during the period of the Soviet state which we are going to discuss². Political situation made many conclusions too harsh; the scale of the documents used — incomplete. On the other hand, the role and place of the Soviet Union in the world history and its influence on processes of all kinds, including international science, have always attracted attention to the history of Soviet sciences and its leading institutions.

Over the last 30 years there have been issued quite a lot of publications on the interaction between the state and science in the USSR, in late Stalin period in particular. The amount of new documentation is so large that the most useful works represent collections of documents,³ and conclusions still need to be made very cautiously.

The Russian Academy of Sciences was a source of liberal ideas and pre-1917 traditions in the Soviet statehood. The Bolsheviks soon realized that such type of institutions was not compatible with the Soviet state. The carrot and stick approach was used. In 1925, the Academy celebrated its bicentenary. The Political bureau of the All-Union Communist party (*bolsheviks*) (*Politbureau VKPb*) issued a special resolution, according to which the Russian Academy of Sciences was proclaimed the leading scientific institution of the country with nation-wide importance. The jubilee was celebrated with a strong support of the state. Leading scholars of the world were invited and took part in the sessions of the Academy, which received a new name due to the occasion — the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Afterwards specially organized commissions started elaborating on the new Charter of the Academy. Meanwhile *Politbureau* founded a special committee on interaction with the Academy. In May 1927 last free elections took place, and in January 1928 an-

¹ Ustav Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. 1724–1999. Moscow, 1999. P. 160.

² See e.g.: *Marchenko V.* Planirovanie nauchnoi raboty v SSSR. München, 1953; *Vucinich A.* The Soviet Academy of Sciences. Stanford, 1956; *Zankevich E. Kh.* K istorii sovetizatsii Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. München, 1957. See also: *Tolz V.* Russian Academicians and the Revolution. Combining professionalism and Politics. New York, 1997. Nothing can be found in such works as: *Komkov G. D., Levshin B. V., Semenov L. K.* Akademia nauk SSSR. Vol. II. 1917–1976. Moscow, 1976; Russian Academy of Sciences. Past and Present. Moscow, 1999; *Haynemann M., Kolchinskiy E. I.* Za “zheleznyy zavesom”: mify i realii sovetskoï nauki. St. Petersburg, 2002; Oreskes N., Krige J. (ed.) Science and Technology in the Global Cold War. Cambridge, 2014.

³ See some of the most important ones: *Esakov V. D.* (ed.). Akademia nauk v resheniiakh Poliburo TsK RKP(b)–VKP(b)–KPSS. 1922–1991. Vol. I. 1922–1952. Moscow, 2000; *Esakov V. D., Rubinin P. E.* Kapitsa, Krem’ i nauka. Vol. I–II. Moscow, 2003–2007; *Kolchinskiy E. I., Smagina G. I.* (ed.). Letopis’ Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. Vol. IV (1901–1934). St. Petersburg, 2007.

other period in the history of the Academy began. It was connected with the so-called “Academic affair” of 1928–1931. Hundreds of employees (including several members of the Academy) were purged — simply fired, exiled, shot. The 1930s was one of the worst periods in the history of the Academy of Sciences: personal and institutional repressions and tough policy of isolation from the world science were pursued. It is enough to quote a letter (dated 20 June 1934) of one of the Soviet leaders, member of the Central Committee of VKP(b), N. I. Bukharin who was responsible for scientific policy in the Soviet state to I. V. Stalin: “... In addition, I will say that in 1934 the Academy of Sciences did not receive any foreign literature! How can I take care of science...”⁴ In some aspects, World War II brought more freedom to the Academy, and the policy of the state in the sphere of science was more reasonable.

Immediately after the war the Soviet state adopted a new inner policy which concerned the Academy of Sciences as well. It was connected with the necessity to reestablish the former total governmental control over the country and with the necessity of the state to develop its own nuclear sphere. For more than twenty years state secrets had been kept according to the resolution of the Council of Ministers (*Sovnarkom* — SNK) from 27 April 1926 “List of information constituting state secrets”. Paragraph 8 of this resolution stated what could be regarded as scientific activity in the context of secrecy: “Discoveries, inventions, technical ameliorations if the Council of Labour and Defense or Presidium of the Supreme Board of the National Economy of the USSR considers them as such”. This means that scientific activity could not be regulated by the resolutions of state secrets until the object of this activity was not considered as such by special state bodies pointed out in this resolution — Council of Labour and Defense or Presidium of the Supreme Board of the National Economy of the USSR.

However, this provision did not function as it had been conceived. Both bodies — Council of Labour and Defense and Presidium of the Supreme Board of the National Economy of the USSR were too bulky to decide each time if a publication could be issued. Such decisions were often taken by a single person — after the end of the Second World War by Minister (*Narkom*) of Internal Affairs omnipotent L. P. Beria. One earlier unpublished document from the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences is quite typical in this respect. This is a project of a letter by recently elected (in fact appointed) President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Sergei Vavilov to L. P. Beria concerning the possibility of publishing the results of researches of *Dalstroï* (Far East Development) in North-Eastern Asia:

S. I. Vavilov — to L. P. Beria
(translation from Russian)
[no earlier than 27 October 1945]
Project
To Narkom of Internal Affairs L. P. Beria

At the joint session of the Department of biological sciences and the Department of geological sciences and geographical sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, on 27 October of this year, after the report by the academician A. N. Zavarnitski, there was recognized a great

⁴ A Letter of N. I. Bukharin to I. V. Stalin is translated from the original text published in: *Maksimikov L. Ocherki nomenklaturnoi istorii sovetskoi literatury (1932–1946)*. Stalin, Bukharin, Zhanov, Sherbakov i drugie // Vorposy literatury. 2003. No. 4. P. 339.

scientific, common theoretical importance of geological investigations conducted by *Dalstroï* in the Northeast Asia, which shed new light on all ideas of the geological aspect in the history of the Northern parts of our shores of the Pacific ocean. I pass you the request of the session about the possibility of publishing those works, which are of greatest theoretical importance, as soon as possible. The acquaintance with them of the large scientific milieu could play a great role in the development of the Soviet geological science⁵.

The situation changed soon. Inner pressure in the Soviet Union became much more intense, and 21 years after the previous resolution on secrecy in scientific investigations, on 8 June 1947, the Council of Ministers issued a resolution “On establishing a list of information that constitutes a State secret the disclosure of which shall be punished by law”. Scientific activity was pointed out in § 11 of this resolution: “Discoveries, inventions, technical ameliorations, research and experimental works in all areas of science, technology and economy before their final completion and receiving permission for publication”. On the following day, 9 June 1947, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR — the highest legislative body of the USSR — issued a decree “On responsibility for the disclosure of State secret and the loss of documents containing State secrets”. Such was the context of the development of Soviet science in late Stalin period. In fact, researches in such spheres of science as Classical philology or Buddhist studies (not to mention nuclear physics, chemistry etc.) could not be published without a special permission and were regarded as state secrets⁶. The resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, issued on 8 June 1947 marked a new period in the history of the Soviet science. This resolution signified a total absence of freedom in investigation since it deprived researchers — regardless of their discipline — of free access to professional discussions. Its key points were developed in June 1947 under the pressure of the state; the names of the scholars from the USA and Great Britain were removed from the list of candidates for the election in the Academy of Sciences of the USSR as foreign members.⁷

On 16 July 1947 *Politbureau* issued a resolution which stated that “the publication of Soviet scientific journals in foreign languages does damage to the interests of the Soviet state; presents the comprehensive results of achievements of Soviet science to foreign intelligence services” [3, 356–357; No. 337]. Three journals “The Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR” — English version of “Doklady Akademii nauk”, “Acta physico-chimica” (ed. by A. N. Frumkin) and “The Journal of Physics” (ed. by P. L. Kapitsa) stopped being published in foreign languages from that time on. From September the articles in these journals were not accompanied by English abstracts anymore.

In a note accompanying this resolution, G. Alexandrov, P. Fedoseev and S. Suvorov used quite a new concept of “servility”. They stated: “The desire of some scholars to be published in these very journals reflects the enduring worship of a part of our *intelligentia* of the opinion of foreigners, the inclination to estimate the importance of their own works according to their recognition abroad, which does not correspond to the aim of education of scholars in the manner of Soviet patriotism”⁸.

⁵ Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (further on — ARAN). F.596 (S. I. Vavilov). Inv.3. File 6. Fol. 1.

⁶ Even students’ theses then were secret, i.e. in aerodynamics in 1948; such was the work of future famous physicist and science popularizer in the Soviet Union Sergei Kapitsa; see: *Kapitsa S. Moi vospominania*. Moscow, 2008. P. 82.

⁷ *Esakov V. D.* (ed.). *Akademia nauk v resheniiakh Politburo TsK RKP(b)–VKP(b)–KPSS. 1922–1991*. Vol. I. 1922–1952. P. 348–353; № 333.

⁸ *Ibid.* P. 357; No. 337.

In this very context, it is noteworthy to consider the resolution of *Politbureau*, issued on 9 June 1950 “On the measures on elimination of facts of disclosure of the state secrets in museums”. According to this resolution, “facts of disclosure of state secrets in many museums of the Committees of the cultural and educational institutions of the Councils of Ministers of the Union republics, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and some ministries come to be known”. The public access to the expositions dedicated to the industry of the USSR and extraction of raw materials, indication to the mines of uranium and zircon caused the necessity to bring in “the most stringent order in the activity of museums and expositions” in compliance with which the law on state secrets had to be obeyed.

One of the first to have recognized the negative consequences of this campaign was the president of the Academy of Sciences, director of the Physical Institute of the Academy of Sciences (FIAN) Sergei Vavilov (1891–1951). He was a brother of Nikolai Vavilov — a prominent biologist who was arrested in 1940 (died in prison in 1943). Nevertheless, S. Vavilov was brave enough to start to react.

In 2000, a letter of S. Vavilov to I. Stalin was published⁹. It is kept in the Archive of the Department of sciences of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of VKP(b) and is dated according to the registration no earlier than 23 April 1948. Vavilov wrote to Stalin that the implementation of the resolution of the Council of Ministers from 1 March 1948 on the regulation of the regime of state secrets was detrimental to the Soviet science as far as the publication of actual works in physics and in investigation of cosmic rays in particular was concerned. Vavilov proposed to Stalin some criteria for the selection of works for open publications.

On 1 March 1948 the Scientific and Technical Council of the First Chief Directorate of the Council of Ministers of the USSR issued “The General plan of research and design works for 1948” (Protocol 112), according to which scientific supervision of the works on cosmic rays was assigned to S. Vavilov¹⁰. It is possible that having received such a task, Vavilov realized all the difficulties of the work in the given sphere and dared to write to Stalin to soften the censorship. Here follows the translation of this letter into English.

S. I. Vavilov to I. V. Stalin
(translation from Russian¹¹)

To comrade Stalin I. V.

Deeply Respected Iosif Vissarionovich!

Hereby I report to you some difficulties arisen in connection with the publication of scientific researches in physics with practical implementation of the Resolution of Council of Ministers of the USSR of 1 March, 1948.

According to No. 97 of the list enclosed in this Resolution, state secret is considered to be large scientific works in realms of modern physics. An ambiguous definition of a large scientific work leads to difficulties in discussion if any given work contains state secret.

I ask for your directions if the Academy of Sciences in solving <difficulties>¹² in this respect could be guided by the following criteria:

⁹ *Krivososov Yu. I.* Rukopisnoe pis'mo S. I. Vavilova Stalinu // *Physics-Uspexhi*. 2000. Vol. 170, iss. 9. P. 1024.

¹⁰ *Ryabev L. D.* (ed.). *Atomnyi proekt SSSR. Dokumenty i materialy*. Moscow; Sarov, 2008. Vol. III. *Vodorodnaia bomba*. 1945–1956. Kn. 1 / comp. G. A. Goncharov, P. P. Maksimenko. P. 90.

¹¹ *Krivososov Yu. I.* Rukopisnoe pis'mo S. I. Vavilova Stalinu. P. 1024.

¹² Absent in publication of the original text; evidently a mistake of the editors.

The following researches cannot be published: 1) works in physics directly connected with military equipment as well as those which have immediate prospect of military use; 2) works in physics important for different kinds of basic equipment and industry; 3) works in physics which contain important conclusions for medicine and agriculture

In connection with the general problem I outline the situation with publications on cosmic rays.

In 1946 and 1947, there were published 18 scientific reports on cosmic rays, which have no crucial importance for the problem of generating atomic energy. Currently, there are about 20 works ready for publication, which concern new experimental results regarding cosmic rays, and which are in need of the decision on the possibility of their publication. There is no sign of state secrets (according to the criteria listed above) in them. By the way, some of the phenomena discovered are of crucial interest not only to physics, but to natural science and philosophy in general (such as the discovery of new elementary particles of substance in cosmic rays).

As far as we can judge by scientific journals abroad, many important results of investigations of cosmic rays are being immediately published in the USA, in England, in France and in Italy. Meanwhile, undoubtedly, the majority of works which are directly connected with disintegration of nucleus of uranium and thorium under the influence of cosmic rays is not given to press.

Keeping in secret many new discoveries made by Soviet scientists examining cosmic rays will be of little benefit, in my opinion. Such secrecy doesn't enable a large number of our scholars to use new facts and conclusions in their work in due time. Additionally, secrecy practically eliminates deep criticism of new works, which is especially needed in investigations of cosmic rays. This sphere is now being studied worldwide by the same methods; in many countries a lot of scholars take part in this work, and that is why every discovery in the sphere of cosmic rays is made independently in each country a few months apart.. Under such conditions a delay in publication of the new results leads to the loss of supremacy of the Soviet science.

Reporting to You on these matters, I ask for your decision on the problems involved.

S. Vavilov.

There is another letter of Vavilov to Stalin in the collection of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences devoted to the same problem. The letter is not dated. In some fragments it repeats the first (earlier published) letter. This allows dating it by the time after 1 March 1948. This letter has not been published earlier, so for this and for other reasons it deserves more attention.

The message of the second letter of Vavilov to Stalin is different in comparison to the letter from the Archive of the Department of sciences of the Central committee of VKP (b). Vavilov did not hope anymore for the possibility of self-censorship within the Academy of sciences. He referred to the experience of foreign colleagues and suggested that a special body should be created which could decide which work could be proposed for the open publication or public discussion. It seems that he hoped for the participation of the leading scholars in different disciplines in this body, which could have protected the scientific society from excessively tough control of the state.

A reference to the situation abroad as to the possible *modus operandi* could hardly be a good idea. "Abroad" was rather a sign of evil, worthy of suspicion but not repetition. No less suspicious were the ideas about the necessity of discussion for the development of science. By the end of the 1920s the only possible form of discussion was already the direction supported by the state.

It appears that the first letter of Vavilov did not have any effect, and he wrote to Stalin a second letter in which he formulated his proposals — more concrete but less favorable

for science — for practical implementation of the decision of the Council of Ministers in regulation of the state secrets in scientific research.

The second letter of Vavilov to Stalin in its survived form is a draft, which is proved by the corrections, the absence of the date and signature. The text must have been typed on a typewriter or at least rewritten.

The crossed out fragments are given between the asterisks (*).

S. Vavilov — to I. Stalin
(translation from Russian)
[No earlier than 23 April, 1948]
To comrade Stalin

Deeply respected Iosif Vissarionovich!

Let me inform you about the ideas and projects of the practical measures on the problem of the level of secrecy in the works which concern nuclear kern, radioactivity and the particularities of the cosmic rays.

As the history of our science has shown in the last decades, besides the results of the great practical importance in this field of research, there is an immense number of reports, *having* defining further development of the related fields of physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology and other sciences, including philosophy. While studying the nuclear kern and space rays, some new elementary pieces of substance are discovered, new physical laws are found, and ideas of the Universe are changed. That is why total secrecy of the works in the given disciplines undoubtedly concerns the development of other sciences.

The ways of working while studying nucleus and cosmic rays — experimental as well as theoretical ones — are very complex, subtle and unusual. Here even highly experienced scholars commit mistakes. That is why mutual criticism, discussion and multiple controls of results are of great importance. The possibility of all this is ruled out by total secrecy of the works.

The involvement of the younger generations, popularization of the information on nucleus and cosmic rays are also strictly limited by total secrecy.

Partial secrecy has been in practice until now in America, England, France and Germany. A lot of investigations have been published on nucleus and cosmic rays in scientific journals, although, undoubtedly, especially important interim results have been kept secret.

It is possible that there existed special committees consisting of authorities who filtered scientific material and allowed its publication.

It is desirable to introduce such a system for the successful development of physics of nucleus and cosmic rays to support our scientific influence and supremacy.

It is necessary to organize a special control committee consisting of some leading experts, who would give permission for the publication of scientific articles on nucleus and cosmic rays for open communications, lectures and conferences on these matters.

Complete secrecy of works on nucleus and cosmic rays threatens the development of science with deceleration in this field and decrease of its level¹³.

It may be concluded from these letters that the highest official in the Soviet academic science dared to propose an alternative directly to Stalin — there was a kind of opposition to such a tough pressure from the state. One of the greatest physicists of the 20th century Piotr Kapitsa (1894–1984) openly expressed his views on the situation in the Soviet science, which contradicted the harsh line of VKP(b)¹⁴. He lost his administrative

¹³ Letter of S. I. Vavilov to I. V. Stalin // Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (firther on — ARAN). F. 596 (S. I. Vavilov). Inv. 2. File 25. Fol. 1–3.

¹⁴ *Kapitsa P. O nauke i vlasti*. Moscow, 1990.

influence — in 1946–1953 he lost all his positions; on the other hand, he was not purged like many other scholars. He could even continue his investigations albeit without former support of the state. Kapitsa was a renowned and recognized scholar worldwide. His cooperation with leading scholars of the world protected him from direct repressions¹⁵. Sergei Vavilov could express an opposing view probably because he was protected by the tragic destiny of his brother Nikolai. In 1947, Sergei Vavilov was already the holder of two Lenin awards and two Stalin prizes.

Not only leading physicists could express a kind of opposition to the dominating tough policy of the state regarding science. In 1946, the journal “Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia” was still releasing large summaries sometimes covering several pages: such publications were aimed at the foreign public. Authors actively used foreign scholarship.

Each state jubilee (anniversary of the October revolution of 1917, the birthday of Stalin) had to be reflected in an editorial. Such articles signaled editorial policy in general and normally received a lot of attention. The possibility of publishing a particular journal often depended on what was written in an introductory article.

The editorial of the “Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia” (1947. Vol. 11, iss. 5. P. 401–403) dedicated to the 30th anniversary of the October revolution contains almost nothing besides a usual greeting to the Communist party and gratitude for the support in the development of mathematics in the USSR. It only repeats some aspects of the law from 18 March 1946, which regulated the necessity “not only to catch up but also to surpass the achievements of mathematics abroad”.

Only three years later, in an editorial “Towards the 70th anniversary of Iosif Vissarionovich Stalin” (1950. Vol. 14, iss. 1. P. 3–6) the anonymous authors said that “Soviet mathematicians fight against servility vis-à-vis foreign bourgeois science” (P. 4). The rest of the publication, with the exception of the introductory preamble, was of professional importance, and “the fight against servility” did not prevent from using publications of “bourgeois” scholars. In the middle of 1947, “Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia” even published the works of foreign scholars¹⁶.

On the other hand, abstracts in foreign languages were gradually disappearing: in some articles of the volume 11. 4 (1947) they were absent. There were no abstracts at all in the articles which were received at the beginning of 1947 and published in the first issue of 1948, although references to foreign publications were still included.

The culmination of the “fight against servility” was evidently in the middle of 1952. Only in one article in the first issue of volume 18 for 1954, which was received on 25 May 1953, there was a reference to a work by a Japanese scholar¹⁷. Other papers were received on 5 July 1952, 16 October 1952, and 14 July 1953. The articles in the next volume still were not accompanied by the abstracts although they contained abundant references to the works of foreign scholars.

¹⁵ A seemingly quite truthful remark by Professor Sergei Kapitsa — son of P. L. Kapitsa: “Possibly only my father dared then to oppose to omnipotent Beria” (*Kapitsa S. Moi vospominania*. P. 81).

¹⁶ *Paul T.* On Riemann’s hypothesis // *Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia*. 1947. Iss. 11 (3). P. 197–262. The paper was received on 2 December 1945 and corrected version — on 5 February 1947.

¹⁷ *Shirokorad B. V.* On the question of applicability of central limit theorem to the chains of Markov // *Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia*. 1954. Iss. 18 (1). P. 95–104.

Editor-in-chief of the “Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia” in 1950–1983 was Ivan M. Vinogradov (1891–1983; editor from 1948). The career of I. Vinogradov developed swiftly. In 1929, he was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; in 1930–1932 — director of the Institute of demography; in 1934–1983 — director of the Steklov Mathematical Institute; in 1938 — a member of the Amsterdam mathematical society; in 1939 — a member of the London mathematical society. In 1941 he became a State prize winner, in 1942 — member of the Royal society of London, 1944 — a holder of Lenin award, in 1945 — a holder of the Socialist Labour award, in 1946 — a foreign corresponding member of the Institute of France, in 1947 — Honorary foreign member of the American academy of Arts and Sciences. Until 1983, I. M. Vinogradov was honored by the state with awards, prizes, positions etc. On the other hand, it should be noted that a considerable part of the Soviet system of science remained quite independent.

So, it was only in the very last months of Stalin period of the USSR that mathematicians had to stop citing works of foreign colleagues. For five years they had managed to continue publishing the results of their research in spite of the resolutions of *Politbureau* and Supreme Council of the USSR practically in the unchanged way.

The existence of the opposition among the physicists in the discussion on the place and role of science in the world is seen from another document, kept in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences — “Resolution of All-Union Conference of Physicists” held under the auspices of the Ministry of High Education of the USSR and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on 17 December 1948 — 14 March 1948. In particular, it says: “...In spite of the fact that some Soviet physicists (Landau, Ioffe), cringing before the West declared that our physics was in a provincial state, that before the Revolution physics had not practically existed in the Soviet Union, academician Kapitsa confessed to pure cosmopolitanism during the Patriotic war...”¹⁸

In 1949, the Soviet authorities were quite uncertain regarding the possibility of publication of scientific works of foreign colleagues. Some documents from RGASPI are quite characteristic in this respect. On 17 March 1949 S. I. Vavilov and Academician-Secretary of the Academy of Sciences V. P. Nikitin sent a letter to the Head of the Council of Ministers of the USSR V. M. Molotov. They said in particular:

“Until recently there has been an old tradition according to which the Academy of Sciences of the USSR might publish original works of foreign scholars...”

In our opinion, this right of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has to be kept further on. Publishing of articles of foreign scholars in journals of Academy of Sciences of the USSR promotes the authority of Academy in foreign scientific milieu; it is an additional source of information on the research work which is carried out abroad and stimulates sympathies of progressive foreign scholars to the Soviet science. Usually, the mere fact of sending articles for publication in the Soviet scientific journals shows sympathies of authors of these articles to the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile lately Glavlit¹⁹ and Leningrad Gorlit²⁰ have not allowed the publication of several articles by foreign scholars in journals of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

¹⁸ Materialy Vsesoyuznogo Soveshaniia Fizikov. T. I // ARAN. Fund 596 (S. I. Vavilov). Inv. 2. File 173. Fol. 69.

¹⁹ Glavlit — “Main directorship on literature and publishers”.

²⁰ Gorlit — “Main directorship on literature and publishers of the city of Leningrad”.

referring to the absence of the corresponding permission from the administrative bodies. In scientific terms, these articles meet the requirements imposed in these cases.

We ask for your permission to publish articles of foreign scholars in the press of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR provided that these articles are of sufficient scientific value²¹.

On 28 April 1949 the chief of foreign department of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR N. V. Svetaylo sent another letter to the Central Committee of VKP(b). He said that after the rejection of some articles of foreign authors sent for publication in the journals of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR at the end of 1948 and at the beginning of 1949, “this question remains unclear as the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has no instructions on cancellation of a former order of the publication of foreign works”.

The Academy of Sciences of the USSR suggested establishing the following way of the publication of articles of foreign authors in the journals of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR:

“1. Foreign honorary members and corresponding members of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR should retain the right for publications in editions of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. If social and political activities, or outlook of the foreign scholars do not allow us to publish their works in editions of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, then they even less can remain members of Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

2. As for the scientists who are not foreign members of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, publication of their works in academic press will be permitted by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR which will bear in this case full responsibility for the decision... When the public political image of a particular foreign scholar is not clear or raises doubts, the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR will make an inquiry in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. It would be desirable to oblige the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR to render the maximum assistance in this question to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR”²².

Both letters of the administration of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR were considered in the Central Committee of VKP(b). The Department of Propaganda (*Agitprop*) sent its recommendations to G. M. Malenkov — member of *Politbureau* and Secretary of Central Committee of VKP(b). As it follows from the document, the entire responsibility for the decision of such kind of questions had to be laid on the Academy of Sciences. The VKP(b) officials did not want to be responsible for the issues in which they were not sure. In any case — in case of any failure — they could point to the administration of the Academy of sciences and be free from any persecution:

D. Shepilov, Yu. Zhdanov — to G. M. Malenkov
(translation from Russian)

A note of *Agitprop* of the Central Committee to G. M. Malenkov about a request of Academy of Sciences of the USSR to keep its right on publication of the articles of foreign scholars in its press.

31.05.1949

²¹ A Letter of S. I. Vavliov and V. P. Nikitin to V. M. Molotov // Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsialno-politicheskoi istorii (Russian State Archive of Social-Political History; further on — RGASPI). F. 17 (Central Committee of VKP(b) — KPSS). Inv. 132. File 166. Fol. 40–41.

²² A Letter of N. V. Svetaylo to TsK VKP (b) // RGASPI. Fund 17. Inv. 132 (Central Committee of VKP(b) — KPSS). File 166. Fol. 43–44.

To the SECRETARY of the All-Union Communist Party (bolsheviks) of the Central Committee Comrade Malenkov G. M.

Presidium of Academy of Sciences of the USSR (com. Vavilov) in a letter addressed to your name requests to keep the right of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to publish articles of foreign scholars in press of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Until recently the Academy of Sciences published articles of foreign authors... In 1947–1948, over 50 works of foreign scholars were published in periodicals of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (from Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, America, Yugoslavia, England, France, India, Mongolia, etc.).

At the end of 1948 and at the beginning of 1949, a number of articles were rejected by Glavlit as the political image of authors was not known. These articles are: Jan-Young Tseng (China) “Property and classification of the ordinary linear differential operators”; M. Kraychinovich (Yugoslavia) “Application of diamine reaction to the definition of the macromolecular connections containing carboxyl groups”; Otto Sireni (Finland) “Method of definition and mixing of dyes” and others.

We would find it possible in principle to keep the right of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to publish the original works of foreign scholars in the periodicals. According to the existing tradition, scientists from many countries have published earlier their scientific works in German, French and English press. Now foreign authors are strenuously hired by the American journals. However, many foreign scholars, especially from people’s democracies, seek to publish works in the Soviet scientific publications. The issue of the original works of foreign scholars in the journals of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR will be an additional source of information about research work carried out abroad and will promote sympathy of progressive foreign scholars to the Soviet science.

At the same time, we would consider it necessary to specify to Presidium of the Academy of Sciences that in determining whether the publication of an article by a foreign author is appropriate, it is necessary to consider, along with the scientific value of article, the political image of the author.

According to the current order, the question of the publication of articles of foreign authors is solved in each case by the editorial board of a respective journal. We would suggest that it should be necessary to change this order and, considering political importance of such publications, to assign the question of publication of articles of foreign authors to the Main scientific secretariat of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

We ask for your instructions.

D. SHEPILOV

Yu. ZHDANOV

31.V–49²³.

The atmosphere of strict secrecy and isolation contradicted the interests of science impeding practical work. Documents from the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences enable to trace the process of solving this problem in the fields of science and technology connected with “the nuclear project”.

The Institute of Physical Chemistry of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR planned to launch an open (i.e. not secret) laboratory of radiations and isotopes in 1951, but the problem was that all the necessary equipment was secret. A special letter was required to consider this appeal. On 15 May 1951 it was sent by the President of the Academy of

²³ Note of Agitprop of TsK to G. M. Malenkov on the Request of Academy of Sciences of USSR on the Right to Keep Publication of Foreign Scholars in its Editions // RGASPI. F. 17. Inv. 132 (Central Committee of VKP(b) — KPSS). File 166. Fol. 47–48.

Sciences of the USSR A. I. Nesmeyanov and the scientific secretary of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR A. V. Topchiyev to the director of the Institute of Physical Chemistry G. V. Akimov. With reference to the resolution of the Council of ministers of the USSR from 14 July 1949 and resolution of the Presidium of the Academy of sciences from 10 August 1949 No. 1112-160cc they both unambiguously proposed: "...to carry out a radio-chemical practical work in an open way giving access to this workshop to the people directed by scientific and technical department of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR"²⁴.

Another case: two scholars engaged into "nuclear project" N. A. Dobrotin and I. T. Aladyev, sent a letter to the President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR S. I. Vavilov on 17 January 1951. They apparently dared to formulate the resolution of L. P. Beria by themselves in the following categorical way: "To oblige the First main department of the Council of ministers of the USSR to make and deliver to the Ministry of oil industry in 1951 polonium-beryllium neutron sources with general activity of 110 c. ... To coordinate the number of monthly deliveries and the place of delivery with the Ministry of oil industry"²⁵.

The reaction of the "nuclear department" headed by L. P. Beria is unknown, but on 9 July 1951 a letter was sent from the Prosecutor General's office to the Deputy-Director of the Council on Science and Technology of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR D. V. Skobelitsin²⁶. State councilor K. Kaverin insisted that an expert from the Academy of sciences should give a resolution on a level of secrecy of the documents involved. As follows from the remarks in this letter, this expert was sent and the problem was settled. Taking into consideration all terrifying consequences for those taking part in this affair, it should be pointed out that the expert opinion was assigned to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, i.e. to the scientific community.

General questions about application of sources of radioactive radiation in sciences and industry were solved by a "triangle" of L. P. Beria (the Council of ministers) — A. I. Nesmeyanov (the Academy of Sciences of the USSR) — K. K. Omelchenko. In 1951, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR attempted to release to the public a brochure "About the Ways of Use of Sources of Radio-emission with Radioactive Cobalt", thus removing the cloak of secrecy from this sphere of science and industry. This approach caused resistance of other involved departments: according to *Glavlit*, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR had to solve the questions of secrecy in each separate case, and L. P. Beria only suggested lowering the status of privacy to level "for office use"²⁷.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the Prosecutor General's Office as well as *Glavlit* and even omnipotent L. P. Beria provided the Academy of Sciences of the USSR with an opportunity to make specific decisions on the level of classification of information and didn't object to some selective declassification in certain cases. Thus the scientific community found its ways of adapting to the conditions of secrecy either by making its own decisions in concrete cases or by weakening a general regime.

²⁴ Plans of Scientific Research Works, Presented by the Institutes, Correspondence on Them // ARAN. Fund 530 (First Department of Academy of Sciences of USSR). Inv. 3. File 5. Fol. 1.

²⁵ Ibid. File 4. Fol. 10.

²⁶ Ibid. File 5. Fol. 57.

²⁷ Correspondence with Central Committee of VKP(b) and Council of Ministers of USSR // ARAN. Fund 530 (First Department of Academy of Sciences of USSR). Inv. 3. File 1. Fol. 29–30, 42.

The situation in Humanities and Social sciences developed similarly. Being much more dependent on the power and loyalty to the state, specialists in these disciplines managed to combine scientific activities with the requirement of totalitarian regime. Human and Social sciences were very sensitive to the pressure of the state. They suffered from the ideological campaigns²⁸ and from the introduction of strict secrecy even more than technical and natural sciences: history, philosophy and related disciplines had no practical implication and had to justify the way the country developed.

So, the reasons why specialists in Social and Human sciences experienced the greatest difficulties with the publication of their works do not seem very clear. Of course, the need to adapt a scholarly work to a changing ideological course played a very significant role was played by the need to adapt scientific work to the changing ideological course: to fight against cosmopolitanism, to condemn such teachings as “Marrism” which lost its previous support from the state etc. The specific reason for this situation in social sciences is the presence and active use of scientific *apparatus* — references, quotations etc., which is needed for guiding a discussion. Historians also need to use sources and quote their editions if they have been already published. It was scientific *apparatus* in Human and Social sciences which was most affected by the intense pressure of the state — its trend to isolationism.

New ideological campaigns in the Soviet Union were often launched by publications of “program articles” in newspapers. A special issue of “*Kul'tura i Zhizn'*” [Culture and Life] from 30 November 1947 was devoted to the historical science, namely, to the work of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the activities of publishing houses in the field of history. Tasks set to the historians (to actualize a perspective, to overcome “ themes of limited scope”, to adjust coordination to the activities of historians of the city and the periphery) were quite clear²⁹, however, in winter 1947–1948, due to the decrees of the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR from 8 and 9 June 1947, a secret edict was issued not to give scholars foreign literature, even outdated³⁰. Special lists of individuals to whom access to old foreign books could be granted were drawn, but these lists were carefully checked. Those who could use foreign books were instructed: they could only oppose, unmask, etc.³¹ Nevertheless, papers in “*The Journal of Ancient History*” contained references to foreign authors during the whole 1948 (“*The journal cycle*” from approval of the article’s manuscript until its publication spanned approximately a year and a half).

This possibly testifies to the absence of the direct ban on citing foreign authors. Given rigid ideological campaigns, nobody wanted to take the responsibility, and the result was

²⁸ See e.g.: *Tikhonov V. V. Ideologicheskie kampanii pozdnego stalinizma i istoricheskaya nauka. Seredina 1940-kh — 1953 g. Moscow; St. Petersburg, 2016.*

²⁹ *Sidorova L. A. Sovetskaya istoricheskaya nauka serediny XX veka: sintez trekh pokolenii istorikov. Moscow, 2008. P. 17.*

³⁰ This is one of the features which is different in comparison to early Stalin attitude to Soviet science. There is a letter of Felix Dzerzhinski — founder of the Soviet secret service to I. Z. Surte (Director of the Department of political control of OGPU — The United State Political Administration), dated 16 May, 1925, in which Dzerzhinski warns against delays of the books’ delivery and their loss. He finds it unnecessary to open parcels for their examination and advises to have a special official in the Academy of Sciences itself who can approve of all the books delivered to the Academy of sciences (Letter to I. Z. Surte on Delivery of Books to Academy of Sciences and Their Revision // RGASPI. F. 76 (Dzerzhinski F. E.). Inv. 2. File 178. Fol. 10).

³¹ *Druzhinin P. A. Ideologia i filologia. Leningrad, 1940-e gody. Dokumental'noe rassledovanie. Vol. I. Moscow, 2012. P. 571.*

catastrophic. In 1949, nine of out of thirteen articles in No. 1 of “The Journal of Ancient History” contained no references to foreign authors, the other four (two of which were posthumous publications) contained from 1 to 3 references, with obligatory sharp criticism. The section “Critics and Bibliography” was reduced to 23 pages (pages 120–142) and only works of the Soviet scholars were mentioned in it. Six out of eleven articles of No. 3 in this journal also contained no references to foreign authors, 4 contained one reference each, with obligatory criticism, and only one author — the deputy director of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR — S. L. Utchenko was permitted to give 5 references to foreign authors, even without mandatory criticism. The section “Critics and Bibliography” contained 5 reviews of the Soviet textbooks, 1 — of the monograph “Tauric Chersonese”, and 1 — of the “Fundamentals of history of China” (1946) by a Chinese author who referred to F. Engels.

As it is evident, the scientific community faced a problem. The solution to this problem were found in “The Note of *Agitprop* of Central Committee to M. A. Suslov on the Request of the Academy of Sciences to allow scholars to have access to the literature of special use” issued on 29 December 1950³² and in “The instructions and the shorthand report of the Session of Editing and the Publishing department (RISO) on 16 August 1951 on preparation of works of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR for public edition”³³; archival documents of the Publishing council of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the publishing department of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR from other years haven’t survived.

The “Note of *Agitprop*” sent to M. A. Suslov who directed ideological work in the USSR from late Stalin until late Brezhnev periods is quite peculiar. It was issued after the reception of the letter of vice-president of the Academy of Sciences I. P. Bardin who asked to nurture a larger number of scholars who could use “literature of special use”. The letter produced an effect: “to conduct counterpropaganda” — all the scholars with recommendations from the administration of the institutes and other scientific bodies had to have access to such kind of literature. Quite expectedly all the state services (*Glavlit*, *Agitprop*) were against this proposal; nobody wanted to go against the “tough line”. Even A. V. Topchiev — Academician-Secretary in 1950 — did not support the request of Bardin. Nevertheless, M. A. Suslov, known as one of the staunchest supporters of the ideological campaigns in late Stalin period, was of another opinion. His resolution on the document was: “We need to consider it and to put forward proposals”. It is evident that the Academy of Sciences of the USSR did not abandon its efforts to remove the cloak of strict secrecy and isolation, and that these efforts — in spite of all dangers — brought about results. This is perfectly seen from the following document.

The resolution of RISO of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR adopted on 21 May 1951 and signed by the president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR A. N. Nesmeyanov³⁴ opened up with the report of the Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on implementation of the thematic plan for 1950. It stated that “the number of

³² Note of *Agitprop* of TsK to M. A. Suslov on the Request of Academy of Sciences to Enlarge Access of Scientists to Literature of Special Keeping // RGASPI. F.17 (Central Committee of VKP(b) — KPSS). Inv. 132. File 317. Fol. 158–159.

³³ Protocols of Sessions of Presidium of Editorial-Publishing Council // ARAN. Fund 454 (Editorial-Publishing Council of Academy of Sciences). Inv. 1. File 4. Fol. 1–56.

³⁴ *Ibid.* Fol. 1–6.

editions in 1950 reached the highest level during the whole existence of the Academy of Sciences — about 14 thousand ‘authors’ folios³⁵. However, the indicators on release of scientific literature of various branches of science differed drastically (Tab.)

Table. Release of Scientific Literature of Various Branches of Science

Departments of the Academy of Sciences	Fulfillment of a plan target according to publications for 1950, %
Physics and mathematics	164
Chemistry	161
Geology and geography	129
Biology	112
Technical sciences	112
History and Philosophy	90,5
Literature and languages	59
Economy and Law	32,2

As it can be seen, the most considerable backlog of work (848 AF) was accumulated in the Departments of History and Philosophy, Literature and Language, Economy and Law³⁶. Characteristically, that there were no problems with the publication on physics, chemistry, biology, technical science. Obviously, both Institute of Natural Science and Technical institute of the Academy adapted to the requirements of secrecy.

A temporary instruction about the rules of providing permission for scientific works of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to be publicly released was signed by the chairman of RISO A. N. Nesmeyanov and the scientific secretary A. M. Samsonov³⁷:

“In the act of the expert examination it has to be specified...

3. That work doesn't contain any data forbidden for publication by the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR from 8 June 1947 “On establishing a list of information that constitutes a State secret the disclosure of which shall be punished by law” and also the corresponding orders of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

4. In the act of the expert it also has to be specified:

a) that incomplete works and researches are not included in the given edition, and data is provided only on the finished researches;

b) *that there is no reference to the editions closed or withdrawn from open use in bibliographic materials;*

c) that all the theses which are referred to in the manuscript or materials which are used are open;

d) that the work is allowed in the public domain³⁸.

³⁵ Ibid. Fol. 2. An author's folio amounts to about 23 standard pages.

³⁶ Ibid. Fol. 3.

³⁷ Ibid. Fol. 15–16.

³⁸ Ibid.

The temporary instruction was adopted, and in three months it was necessary to discuss the possibility of its implementation: specialist in human and social sciences couldn't refer to books and articles of Western scholars. "Shorthand report of a Session of RISO of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR" on 16 August 1951³⁹, chaired by A. M. Samsonov, is evocative of the discussion thread:

The chairman: The purpose of the debate "is to discuss the draft of the instruction for preparation of scholarly works for release in the public domain. It is necessary to examine the introductory amendments. The project takes into consideration offers of the Department of Literature and Language and other departments"⁴⁰.

Popov: All our works on modern and contemporary history are based on the closed-access content. If we don't use it, we won't be able to publish any work on modern and contemporary history. So we used this closed-access content and referred to it without footnotes and references absolutely freely. The authors who used this literature had corresponding permission. It would be very bad if, for example, talking about American politics in the East, we didn't refer to sources. This point needs to be withdrawn...

The Chairman: Most of colleagues incline to withdraw the first part⁴¹.

Shparo: If a person works on the contemporary history, mainly, with the closed-access data, then in spite of its closed-access nature, he may quote and give the bibliography. All printed foreign works are in closed-access storage, but they may be published as a bibliography.

Ivanov: Two things ... are confused here... If you as a historian have gained access to such storage, and you were allowed to make references, this means that you may do that. And if another colleague from the Department of Technical sciences has written a work and refers to the book from the classified source with the stamp "strictly secret", he may not refer to it⁴².

Popov: According to the instruction, the publishing house relieves itself of any responsibility.

Ivanov: I consider that it is correct⁴³.

Sergiyevsky: To attach the certificate to the manuscript that the author doesn't disclose the data which are not allowed in the public domain.

Popov: The reference from the relevant archival fund is required. The state has created the whole organization for reviewing the literature — what can be kept in an open access fund and what can not. And you want the author to challenge the decision of the state organization and tell: it is possible, and it is impossible. Thus we substitute the whole state organization by the author. After that any author will tell that he won't give such a permission. This is the work of reviewers, work of institute, work of the commission which will solve this issue.

Mikhnevich: Humanitarian party⁴⁴ makes most of the objections. A collection of papers "Against the Philosophizing Armour-bearers of Anglo-American Imperialism" is going to be published. All this is based on criticism of imperialistic bourgeois authors. Nobody has ever had any doubts of the problem formulated here: whether it is possible or not to mention these books. If it is impossible to mention, then it is impossible to publish such books. Another matter is if you take anti-Soviet statements and begin to discuss them. Possibly it won't reach even the scientific council of the institute, and the author will know that it can't be done. This side of a question shouldn't confuse us⁴⁵. The problem is with the other side: for example, about the theses kept in

³⁹ Protocols of Sessions of Presidium of Editorial-Publishing Council // ARAN. Fund 454 (Editorial-Publishing Council of Academy of Sciences). Inv. 1. File 4. Fol. 17–47.

⁴⁰ Ibid. Fol. 18.

⁴¹ Ibid. Fol. 22.

⁴² Ibid. Fol. 25.

⁴³ Ibid. Fol. 26–27.

⁴⁴ Specialists in humanities and social sciences.

⁴⁵ Protocols of Sessions of Presidium of Editorial-Publishing Council // ARAN. Fund 454 (Editorial-Publishing Council of Academy of Sciences). Inv. 1. File 4. Fol. 29.

the closed-access storage. The author himself has to take care of the legality of the documents in the manuscript⁴⁶.

Chairman: Concrete proposal: to attach to the manuscript the certificate that he, the author, bears full responsibility for preservation of the state secret, for the actual data provided in the manuscript, quotes, bibliographic instructions (a possibility of their revealing to the press)⁴⁷

Volkov: ...If the author bears responsibility, it is clear. But another matter is when we deal with the paper which he has to submit. Will this piece of paper save any of the reviewers, the scientific council or administration if something is not OK in it? It won't save. It is a piece of paper which means nothing⁴⁸.

Mikhnevich: And this piece of paper will kill the author for his flippancy.

Volkov: This is overcautiousness which will give nothing to us and will only intimidate many authors.

Lobachev: And instead of articles and monographs only reports will be submitted. And only some desperate persons will write.

The chairman: What we have to be responsible for, shouldn't pass the author. It is the first and decisive instance, and I think it is pointless to be afraid that they won't write⁴⁹.

The chairman: I work at the Institute of History... Any work undergoes scrutiny in the Scientific Council and we don't make any exceptions⁵⁰.

As a result, the following "Instruction for preparation of edition of scientific works of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR for the public domain" was developed on 19 October 1951⁵¹:

Not for publication

No. 19.

Annex to the resolution of the

Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

October 19, 1951 No. 625.

Instruction for preparation of edition of scientific works of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR for the public domain⁵²:

1. While preparing the manuscript for printing the author is obliged:

e) to attach to the manuscript a written confirmation that he is aware of the content of the resolution of the Council of ministers of the USSR of 8.VI. 47.

7. For the works which are of benefit to the economy of the country and are within the competence of a particular department, it is necessary to get a permission from it.

11. The editor-in-chief and an editorial board bear responsibility for the content of the manuscript and provide scientific and political editing.

14. As for the Departments of Social sciences, when a work considers questions which are not connected with the materials which are not intended to public domain, the Scientific council of an institute (presidium of a branch), approving the work for the publication, notes: "It is approved for the public domain. It doesn't need an act of examination". In all other cases examination is carried out by a usual order, including drawing up the act of examination.

⁴⁶ Ibid. Fol. 30.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid. Fol. 30–31.

⁴⁹ Ibid. Fol. 31.

⁵⁰ Ibid. Fol. 34.

⁵¹ Ibid. Fol. 48–56.

⁵² Ibid.

Statements of examination are not to be drawn up on abstracts of Master and doctoral theses of the Departments of Social sciences, but are to be done on abstracts of theses of the following departments: Physical and Mathematical, Chemical, Biological, Geological and Geographical and Department of Technical science?

The main objective was achieved: scientific councils of the institutes in Humanities and Social sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR could decide independently whether a work needs examination in terms of the level of secrecy or not. This opened the way to publication of the majority of works by historians, philologists and other scholars in human sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Of course, the situation was far from ideal: party and ideological supervision over scientists was rigid, but scholarly community managed to defend the principles of their work.

References

- Druzhinin P. A. *Ideology and Philology. Leningrad, 1940s. Documentary investigation*. Vol. I. Moscow, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 1360 p. (In Russian)
- Esakov V. D., Rubinin P. E. *Kapitsa, Kremlin and Science*. Vols. I–II. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 2003–2007, 655 p. (In Russian)
- Haynemann M., Kolchinskiy E. I. (ed.) *Behind the Iron Curtain: Myths and Realities of the Soviet Science*. St. Petersburg, Dmitrii Bulanin Publ., 2002, 526 p. (In Russian)
- Kolchinskiy E. I., Smagina G. I. (ed.) *Chronicle of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. Vol. IV (1901–1934). St. Petersburg, Nauka Publ., 2007, 1075 p. (In Russian)
- Komkov G. D., Levshin B. V., Semenov L. K. *Academy of sciences of the USSR*. Vol. II. 1917–1976. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1976, 816 p. (In Russian)
- Marchenko V. *Planning of Scientific Work in the USSR*. München, Institut po izucheniiu istorii i kul'tury SSSR Publ., 1953, 46 p. (In Russian)
- Oreskes N., Krige J. (ed.) *Science and Technology in the Global Cold War*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2014, 472 p.
- Paul T. On Riemann's hypothesis. *Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia*, 1947, iss. 11 (3), pp. 197–262.
- Shirokorad B. V. On the Question of Applicability of Central Limit Theorem to the Chains of Markov. *Mathematics of the USSR — Izvestia*, 1954, iss. 18 (1), pp. 95–104.
- Sidorova L. A. *Soviet Historical Science of the Middle of the XX century: Synthesis of Three Generations of Historians*. Moscow, Institute of the Russian history of RAS Publ., 2008, 294 p. (In Russian)
- Tikhonov V. V. *Ideological Campaigns of the late Stalinism and Historical Science. Middle of the 1940–1953*. Moscow, St. Petersburg, Nestor-Istoria Publ., 2016, 424 p. (In Russian)
- Tolz V. *Russian Academicians and the Revolution. Combining professionalism and Politics*. New York, St. Martins' Press, 1997, 236 p.
- Vucinich A. *The Soviet Academy of Sciences*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1956, 157 p.
- Zankevich E. Kh. *Towards the History of Sovietization of Russian Academy of Sciences*. München, Institut po izucheniiu istorii i kul'tury SSSR Publ., 1957, 93 p. (In Russian)

Статья поступила в редакцию 29 июля 2019 г.

Рекомендована в печать 2 декабря 2019 г.

Received: July 29, 2019

Accepted: December 2, 2019