

Li Jingjie: How Did The Fate of Soviet Social Sciences Study Change After Stalin's Secret "Talk"; Problems in Social sciences Became an Important Reason for the Disintegration of the Soviet Union

Source: "Eastern Europe and Central Asia Studies" Year 2001 No. 2

Li Jingjie, born in October 1941, is the director, researcher and doctoral supervisor of the Institute of East European and Central Asian Studies of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. (Beijing 100007)

Abstract

On December 9, 1930, Stalin met with members of the Party Branch Committee of the Soviet Red Professors' Academy of Philosophy and Natural Sciences and delivered an important talk on the situation and tasks of philosophy, social sciences and natural sciences. The Soviet social science management system was formed under the guidance of Stalin and under special historical conditions in the 1930s. The Soviet social science management system and the Soviet Communist Party's line and policy in the field of social sciences led to the stagnation and distortion of the development of Soviet social sciences. The ideology of the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet social sciences have long been dominated by dogmatism. The theories constructed by dogmatists cannot reflect the ever-changing reality in a timely and accurate manner and cannot give convincing answers to the issues that the people really care about. Therefore, no matter how powerful the Soviet Communist Party uses its propaganda machine to instill its theories into society, it still cannot generate the necessary attraction and appeal to the people. This management system does not conform to the development law of social sciences. It not only hinders the development of various disciplines of social sciences and Marxism itself, but also ultimately leads to the drying up of the ideological source of the ruling party's eternal youth, causing the country to lose the driving force for prosperity and development. The shortcomings of the Soviet social science management system are an important reason for the Soviet Communist Party's loss of power. The Soviet Communist Party has been in power for 73 years and has not been able to solve the problem of how to correctly lead social sciences. This is a historical regret and a historical tragedy.

Text Begins Here

Science includes natural science and social science. The basic function of natural science is to solve the relationship between man and nature, while social science is to solve the relationship between man and society. In the process of its own development, human society has created both material civilization and spiritual civilization. If it is said that human beings cannot create material civilization without the participation of social science, then the task of creating spiritual civilization is mainly undertaken by social science. Therefore, the state of social science directly determines the rise and fall of a country and nation.

The 1930s was the period when the Soviet political and economic system was formed, and it was also the period when the Soviet social science management system was formed. The social science management system is an important part of the Stalinist socialist model. This article mainly discusses the historical background of the formation of the Soviet social science management system and the drawbacks of this management system. The social science mentioned here is a broad social science, including philosophy, social science and humanities. Since social sciences and natural sciences belong to the same academic community, this article not only introduces the situation in the social science community, but also mentions some situations in the natural science community.

1. Stalin's secret "talk" on philosophy and social sciences

On December 9, 1930, Stalin met with members of the Party Branch Committee of the Soviet Red Professors' Academy of Philosophy and Natural Sciences and delivered an important talk on the situation and tasks of philosophy, social sciences and natural sciences. This "talk" was kept secret for a long time. It was not until 60 years later, in early 1990, that the Soviet academic community discovered this material from the archives and made it public. This "secret" immediately attracted the attention of academic and public opinion circles at home and abroad.

In the 1930s, the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet academic community held many anniversary commemorations of this "talk", which shows the importance of this "talk".

If we compare this "conversation" with the relevant resolutions and policy practices publicly issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) afterwards, we can see that this conversation actually provided the guiding ideology for the Soviet Communist Party to determine the line and policy in the fields of philosophy and social sciences. Therefore, its role was decisive and its influence was far-reaching. The content of Stalin's "conversation" can be summarized as follows:

1. Estimates of the situation in the academic field

Stalin's overall estimate of the situation was that the "opposition" was "dominating philosophy, natural sciences and certain delicate political issues." Since philosophy is a summary and conclusion of social sciences and natural sciences, Stalin focused on philosophical issues.

Stalin pointed out that "the main danger is the mechanists", "but we must be particularly vigilant against the Deborin elements as formalists. From the perspective of our struggle on the theoretical front, we must pay special attention to the idealism of the Mensheviks."

Stalin mentioned natural sciences twice in the "conversation". Stalin said that in the field of natural sciences, "God knows what they have done, writing about Weismannism and the like ("**Weismannists-Mendelists-Morganists**") , and all this is disguised as Marxism." "The works we have written here on the theory of natural sciences contain a lot of materialism. The information on this subject in the Soviet Encyclopedia is at least a bunch of nonsense. Therefore, we are faced with a huge task of criticism here."^①

2. On the tasks on the academic front Stalin believed that in the fields of philosophy and social sciences, "the important task is to launch a comprehensive criticism.

The main issue is to attack. Attack in all directions, in places that have not been attacked before." "All the accumulated feces in philosophy and natural sciences should be turned out and turned over. ... Destroy all the wrong things."

Stalin mentioned that the targets of "severe criticism" included Bukharin and Ryazanov, who held important positions in the party at that time, in addition to a group of philosophers in the party.

It is worth noting that Stalin also mentioned Engels' name. He said, "Engels is not entirely correct." "If we, in this work (referring to the exposition of Lenin's ideas - the author), for example, touch Engels somewhere, this is not a bad thing."^②

3. Stalin clearly proposed to link academic issues with political struggles and class struggles within the party.

When a branch member who participated in the meeting asked Stalin whether the debate in the theoretical field should be linked to the political tendencies within the party, Stalin replied: "**It can and should be linked, because any tendency that deviates from Marxism, even the deviation on the most abstract theoretical issues, has political significance under the circumstances of increasingly acute class struggle.**"

Stalin emphasized that the study of materialist dialectics should be combined with "the most important class struggle tasks facing us" and now "should be based on socialist construction and linked to it."

"If philosophy is separated from politics and theory is separated from practice - what kind of Marxism is that?"

In this conversation, Stalin admitted on the one hand that the Deborin school did not provide "formal basis for anti-Marxism", but on the other hand, he put on them fatal political labels such as "anti-Marxism", "Plekhanovites", and "Menshevik idealists".

In a "conversation" of just over 3,300 words, Stalin actually put 13 different political hats on the targets of his criticism^③.

4. He proposed a method of "all-out offensive".

Stalin emphasized that the "offensive" and "criticism" launched in the fields of philosophy, social sciences and natural sciences must be comprehensive, thorough and at all costs.

Stalin said, "All the feces accumulated in philosophy and natural sciences should be turned over and dug out. All the things written by the Deborin school should be turned over and all the wrong things should be destroyed." For writers who have been criticized, such as Plekhanov, Yushkevich, etc., "their works should be turned over again". Bukharin should be "thoroughly turned over."

Stalin particularly emphasized that "everything should be turned over. In order to fight, all weapons are needed." He criticized the criticism of Deborin's academic views at that time as "too soft and not strong enough", and characterized the views of the Deborin school as "formalists - this term is too light and too academic, and should be strengthened."

Instructions were made publicly in newspapers and periodicals that "they have embarked on an anti-Marxist path." In the conversation, Stalin also gave specific instructions on how to organize "offensive" forces in the field of philosophy, "carry out ideological struggles like warriors", and take organizational measures. In the "conversation", Stalin also repeatedly emphasized that Lenin made "new contributions" in all aspects of Marxism.

2. The background and motivation of Stalin's conversation

It was not accidental that Stalin summoned some people in the philosophical community during this period and delivered such a "conversation", but it had important historical background and political motivations.

1. In order to adapt to the change of the party's political line and the need to build a new political and economic system, after Lenin's death, Stalin defeated the "New Opposition" headed by Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1926, and the "Right Opposition" headed by Bukharin and Rykov in 1928-1929.

At the same time, he began to cancel Lenin's New Economic Policy and promote the policy of rapid nation-wide industrialization and agricultural collectivization. ① ② ③ ④ Ibid. Ibid. Ibid. Ibid.

Talks of the Party Branch Committee of the Red Professorial College of Philosophy and Natural Sciences with Stalin on the Situation on the Philosophical Front", now in the Russian Modern History Document Preservation and Research Center, No. 17, No. 120 Catalog, No. 24 File.

That is, in industry, give priority to the development of heavy industry and the establishment of state-owned enterprises, and in agriculture, eliminate rich peasants and implement compulsory "total collectivization".

The 16th Party Congress held in June 1930 put forward the slogan of "socialist all-out offensive", requiring the whole country to carry out socialist construction at the speed of "military Bolsheviks".

In 1932, the Soviet Union announced that it had completed the first five-year plan one year ahead of schedule, the "full collectivization" of agriculture was basically completed, the Soviet Union had "changed from an agricultural country to an industrial country", and the Soviet Union's "socialist economic foundation" had been established.

It was at this time that the highly centralized political and economic system, which was later called the "Soviet socialist model" or "Stalin socialist model", was basically formed. In order to adapt to this "great transformation" of the party's line and political and economic system, a "great transformation" in the field of ideology was inevitable.

The Soviet theoretical community was not prepared for Stalin to abandon Lenin's new economic policy and implement the "great transformation" mentioned above.

At that time, the authority of Marxist theory, especially in economics, was Bukharin, who was called "the most precious and greatest theorist in the party" by Lenin. In addition to publishing works such as "ABC of Communism" and "Theory of Historical Materialism" that expounded the basic principles of Marxism, Bukharin also published a large number of political and economic works on the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Bukharin advocated balanced development of industry and agriculture, giving play to the role of market regulation, opposed the method of depriving farmers of their wealth to accumulate funds for

industrialization, and proposed to squeeze out and eliminate capitalism through economic means such as competition, and to achieve the transition to socialism through a peaceful, gradual and evolutionary path. It can be seen that Bukharin's theories that were compatible with Lenin's new economic policy practice were incompatible with Stalin's "great transformation" line.

On December 27, 1929, Stalin delivered a speech at the meeting of Marxist land/agriculture experts held by the Academy of Communist Sciences, pointing out that "our theoretical thinking cannot keep up with the achievements of practical work, and there is a certain disconnect between our practical work achievements and the development of theoretical thinking", emphasizing that "new practice has produced new views on economic issues in the transition period".

"Now, the new economic policy, class issues, construction speed issues, combination issues, and party policy issues should all have new formulations." It was in this speech that Stalin made a comprehensive and systematic criticism of Bukharin's theory of transitional economics.

2. In order to establish the need for Stalin's personal theoretical authority, the "great transformation" of the line and policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and the formation of the Soviet socialist model were also the formation period of Stalin's personality cult.

On December 21, 1929, the Soviet Union held a grand celebration of Stalin's 50th birthday. During the week-long commemoration, Pravda devoted a large number of pages to report on birthday celebrations in various places and aspects.

Other party leaders, such as Kaganovich, published "Stalin and the Party" and Voroshilov, published "Stalin and the Red Army", took the lead in praising Stalin, making the wind of personality cult spread throughout the country.

After Stalin defeated various oppositions within the party and consolidated his political position, he urgently needed to establish his own authority in terms of ideology and theory.

Stalin first attacked the field of political economy, and then expanded to philosophy, history, education, linguistics, literature and natural sciences, almost overthrowing all academic authorities that hindered the establishment of Stalin's personal authority in the corresponding disciplines. As Soviet scholars said, Stalin personally launched a criticism of the Deborin school with the aim of "clearing the way for Stalin to climb the philosophical Olympus of philosophy" and praising Stalin as "the philosophical master of subsequent periods"^②.

According to Deborin's recollections in the 1960s, at the end of 1930, the Minister of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) announced to Deborin that "from now on, an authority must be established in all fields, including the field of philosophy, and this authority is our leader Stalin." Mitin and others who had received personal instructions from Stalin once forced Deborin to "declare Stalin himself as a great philosopher" at the meeting criticizing him. 3.

The Great Criticism and Purge in the Academic Circles in the 1930s

After Stalin's "talk", an unprecedented large-scale criticism was launched in various fields of social sciences, including natural sciences, and a large number of famous scholars and scientists were labeled with one political hat or another.

In the late 1930s, many scholars and scientists who had been criticized and those who had not been criticized were charged with various crimes such as "enemies of the people" and were brutally suppressed.

Almost all the leaders of social sciences and natural sciences were not spared. The following introduction to the situation of scholars and scientists who were criticized and suppressed is from the rehabilitation materials of the Soviet Union in the 1950s and 1960s. As for the later rehabilitation materials of the Soviet Union, this article does not quote them.

1. Political economics

Political economics was the breakthrough point for Stalin to implement the "great transformation" in the field of ideology. Stalin personally took the lead. As mentioned above, Bukharin was the authority of economic theory in the party at that time.

December 27, 1929 ① ② ③ "Soviet Culture Newspaper" June 7, 1988. N. N. Maslov: "The Formation Process and Essence of Stalinist Ideology", Moscow, 1990 Russian edition, page 56. Stalin: "On Several Questions of Soviet Land Policy", "The Complete Works of Stalin" Chinese Edition, Volume 12, page 126.

On December 27, 1929, Stalin summarized Bukharin's economic theory into the "balance theory" of national economic development, the "self-flow theory" of socialism, and the "stability theory" of small peasant economy in his speech at the meeting of Marxist land experts held by the Academy of Communist Sciences, and systematically criticized them.

On February 9, 1930, Stalin, in answering questions from students at Sverdlov University, drew conclusions on the debate in the economics community in the late 1920s on a series of academic issues, including the research object of political economy.

He said that both sides of the debate, represented by economics professor I.I. Rubin and A.A. Bogdanov, "had fallen into pedantic abstract arguments," and Stalin went on to say that their debate "was of course in line with the wishes of our enemies and beneficial to them."

The economists named by Stalin, including G. Groman (member of the Presidium of the State Planning Commission), Chayanov, Bazarov, I.I. Rubin, etc., were not only criticized academically and labeled politically, but were also later accused of participating in "sabotage activities," arrested and imprisoned, and most of them died unjustly.

Bukharin himself was shot on March 15, 1938. I.A. Teodorovich, a famous expert on land issues and an old Bolshevik, was also arrested and sacrificed. Others executed during this period included the famous economist and statesman AB Odintsov, the famous international affairs expert and economist A.Y. Kantorovich, the labor management expert O.A. Yermansky, etc. The leaders of the Institute of Agrarian Studies (such as Gestel, Kritsman, etc.) were arrested and the research institute was closed.

2. Philosophy Field After Stalin's speech.

The Party branch of the Red Professors' College passed the third resolution on the tasks of the philosophical front, cancelled the comments in the previous two resolutions that affirmed Deborin's line as "basically correct", and began to criticize Deborin.

Then the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) passed a resolution to reorganize the editorial department of "Under the Banner of Marxism" and revoked Deborin's position as editor-in-chief.

The wave of great criticism spread to the entire philosophical community, and the situation of free discussion and debate in the 1920s was gone. The criticized philosophers were first labeled as "anti-Marxist", "rightist", "opportunist" and other political hats.

By the late 1930s, dozens of Soviet philosophers were arrested. There were not only the original "mechanists" and "Menshevik idealists" but also many Marxist philosophers, including A.I. Valyas, I.K. Lubol, V.B. Milyunin, I. Razumovsky, N. Karev, V. Rudash, S. Pichukin, G. Timyansky, A.R. Medvedev, M. Furshik, G. Dmitriev and many others.

Most of them, including the philosophers named by Stalin in the "conversation", were executed. Yan Sten, who was criticized by Stalin in the "conversation", was Stalin's philosophy teacher and a famous old party member in Lenin's era. From 1925 to 1928, he explained Hegel's dialectics to Stalin twice a week. After being criticized by Stalin, Yan Sten was expelled from the party. In 1937, according to Stalin's instructions, Yan Sten was arrested and executed soon after.

3. History Field

History is one of the disciplines that has been hit hardest. In this discipline, Stalin also personally took action. For example, in 1930, A.G Slutsky, an ordinary scholar at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences, published an article in the sixth issue of the magazine "Proletarian Revolution" entitled "The Bolsheviks on the German Social Democratic Party in the Pre-War Crisis".

While fully affirming Lenin's great historical achievements, the article mentioned that Lenin had underestimated the danger of Kautsky's centrism before the war. In the period of free discussion in the academic circles of the Soviet Union in the 1920s, such a statement was not a serious problem. However, Stalin publicly published a "Letter to the Editorial Board of the Proletarian Revolution" magazine in November 1931, in which he "firmly protested" against the publication of this article in the Proletarian Revolution magazine, and labeled the author and a series of historians as "anti-party", and "Trotskyist smugglers", "forgers" and put other political hats, saying that the magazine had "committed decadent liberalism" by publishing this article.

As a result, the Proletarian Revolution magazine was ordered to suspend publication for one year, the editorial board was reorganized, and at the same time, a review of all historical works published and to be published in the country began. Like other disciplines, the great criticism in the historical community gradually developed into political persecution. For example: Mikhail N. Pokrovsky, an expert in Russian history and revolutionary movement history, was an old party member since 1905.

After the October Revolution, Pokrovsky served as Deputy People's Commissar of Education (Deputy Minister) and was elected as a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party in 1930.

During the Great Purge, Pokrovsky and his students and those who agreed with his views were declared "Trotskyists", "assassins" and "terrorists" and arrested.

Yuri M. Steklov, a famous historian and one of the earliest editors of Izvestia, also became a victim of the Great Repression.

V.G. Sorin, a famous party historian, the earliest biographer of Lenin and the earliest editor of Lenin's Complete Works, and vice president of the Marx-Engels Institute, was also executed.

V.G. Khorin, another party history expert, president of the Red Professors' College, a famous activist in the international communist movement, and a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU (Bolsheviks), was shot.

Academician Nikolai M. Lukin, director of the Institute of History of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, was arrested and died in 1936. Other scholars who died included other famous historians and party history experts, such as N.N. Bobo, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (Bolsheviks).

① ② Ibid., pp. 76-77. The Chinese version of the Complete Works of Stalin, Volume 12, p. 166.
4.

The field of educational sciences

The field of educational sciences was also strongly negatively impacted, and the situation was equally tragic. Many founders of people's education were sentenced to death, for example, M. C Epstein, Deputy People's Commissar of Education of the Russian Federation (Deputy Minister) was one of them.

And M. A Aleksinsky, a member of the People's Commissariat of Education who was awarded the Order of the Red Banner. Also sacrificed were famous pedagogists, scientific workers and organizers, such as A.P. Pinkevich, C. M Kamenev, A.P. Shaoshin, M. M Pestrak, C. A Geshinovich, M.B Krupinina, and others.

From 1937 to 1938, almost all the People's Commissariats of Education of the Union Republics and Autonomous Republics were destroyed. Among them, not only many cadres in the education sector but

also tens of thousands of ordinary teachers were suppressed. After the director of the Labor Institute, Aleksei Gastev, was arrested and suppressed, the Labor Institute was also closed in 1938. Scientific research work in education, psychology and labor issues was stopped.

5. The Field of Linguistics and literature and art

The fields of linguistics and literature and art also suffered heavy losses. In the early 1930s, due to the wrongful case of the so-called "Slavologists", famous linguists including Academician V.V. Vinogradov were arrested and imprisoned.

Linguists who were sentenced to death during the Great Purge included H. M Siak, the president of the Kiev Language Institute, for whom Lenin had given his trust for Siak's admission to the party, and H.A Nevsky, an outstanding linguist and expert on Oriental issues. H.A Nevsky was posthumously awarded the Lenin Prize in 1962 for his book "Tungusic Linguistics".

The losses suffered by the literary and artistic circles were extremely heavy. From 1936 to 1939, more than 600 writers were arrested, accounting for 1/3 of all members of the Writers' Association. Many talented writers were executed. Most of them died when they were under 40 years old. Many painters, filmmakers and musicians were also suppressed.

6. After Stalin's "talk" criticism of natural sciences study also began.

Some scientific ideas, scientific schools, academic journals and works were banned from publication, and some academic institutions were disbanded. Modern natural science theories such as quantum physics, Einstein's theory of relativity, the theory of physical and chemical principles of heredity, and resonance theory were declared "idealism", and cybernetics and logic were declared "bourgeois pseudoscience". In addition, research on eugenics, child studies, applied psychology, and individual ecology was banned.

The fate of biology was the most tragic. Biology was divided into "proletarian biology and bourgeois biology", and most biologists were labeled "idealists" and "slaves of imperialism" and were suppressed.

Professor I.I. Agor, a famous geneticist and academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, was arrested and executed. C.G. Levit, an authority on medical genetics in the Soviet Union and the leader of the Institute of Medical Genetics, was also executed. Professor Ya.M. Ulanovsky, a famous Darwin expert and natural science history expert, was also arrested.

Agricultural science also suffered a bad fate. Academician A.I. Muralov, the president of the Soviet Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, was shot; the leaders of the Institute of Cotton, Animal Husbandry, Agricultural Chemistry, and Plant Protection were also suppressed for "engaging in sabotage activities".

Academician G.K. Meister, a great scientist who had won the Order of Lenin, was also killed. N.K. Koltsov, one of the most famous biologists, was dismissed after being insulted and died soon after. The persecution of biologists and agronomists did not completely stop during the war years. Academician N.I. Vavilov, the first president of the Soviet Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, was arrested in 1940 and died in prison in 1943. All his students who had grown into famous professors were arrested, and only one of them survived.

Between 1937 and 1938, many leading officials and researchers from the Crop Rotation Bureau of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Planning Commission, and the All-Union Fertilizer Research Institute were arrested and sentenced to death for criticizing the grass-field rotation system supported by Stalin. The outstanding scientist and Communist Party member H.M. Tulekov was also arrested for opposing the grass-field rotation system and later died in a concentration camp. The great chemist I.I. Qinchadze also died.

The fields that suffered the most were not only genetics, breeding and agricultural chemistry, but also other disciplines of biology, especially microbiology. The famous microbiologists arrested included: Academician P.F. Zdradovsky, Professor V.A. Barykin, Professor O.O. Galdoch, Professor I.L. Krichevsky, and Professor M.I. Stutzer.

Great scholars in microbiology such as L.A. Diliber, A.D. Sheboldayeva, and G.I. Safonova were also arrested, and many of them died in prison. The famous microbiologist G.A. Nadson died in a concentration camp in the north. He was 73 years old when he was arrested. The biologist and botanist A.A. Mikheev, who served as the director of the Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries in the mid-1930s, was beaten to

death in a concentration camp. Also killed were the famous biologist I.N. Filippiyev, the entomologists A.V. Znamensky and N.N. Troitsky, and others.

In physics, almost all the leaders of the discipline were criticized, such as I.E. Tamm and V.A. Fock, who were criticized as "idealists" and "smugglers of hostile ideas."

Many physicists, including scholars who later became academicians, were arrested, such as: A.I. Berg, L.D. Landau, P.I. Lugielsky, Yu.B. Rummel, and others. M.P. Bronstein, an outstanding theoretical physicist and author of masterpiece books, was only 32 years old when he was shot.

Academician A.I. Nekrasov, the most famous mechanical expert at the time, was also arrested. Other scholars and experts who were arrested and killed included: theoretical physicist V.K. Fredericks, mechanical and mathematical physics expert Yu.A. Krutkov, young theorist S.P. Shubin, one of the founders of the Soviet school of non-linear oscillations A.A. Witte and physicist I.N. Spirielen, and others.

The "class struggle" in the field of mathematics field was also very sharp. In 1936, H.H. Luzin, a famous mathematician, the founder and leader of the then largest Moscow School of Mathematics, was declared a "gangster" and "counter-revolutionary" on the mathematical front. Subsequently, the entire school was declared "reactionary" and "bourgeois".

In other fields of natural science, many talented scientists and professors were also lost, the names too many to list.

7. Applied science intellectuals, including famous scientists, inventors, designers, factory directors, chief engineers, and others were also subjected to large-scale repression.

For example, H.M. Kharlamov, director of the Central Institute of Gas and Liquid Mechanics, and a large number of researchers from the institute were arrested and imprisoned. Famous aircraft designers A.N. Tupolev, BM Petlyakov, BM Myashishchev, D.L. Tomashevich, P. Bartini, K. Szilard, I.G. Nieman, and others. In fact, all the backbone scientists of Soviet aviation science were imprisoned.

In order to prevent the aircraft manufacturing industry from stagnating, a research institute code-named the Central Design Bureau (No. 29) was established in prison. In addition to the above-mentioned aircraft designers, there were also a large number of famous aircraft main component designers and many outstanding engineers and experts in supplementary disciplines related to aircraft production. Only some of these experts were released between 1940 and 1941, and some were released after the war. Many were rehabilitated after the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in 1956.

Many of the first generation of Soviet rocket experts were also executed in the late 1930s, including the inventor of the first batch of rocket engines, I.T. Klemenov, director of the Rocket Science Institute, and his assistant, G.E. Langemark, inventor of the "Katyusha" rocket launcher.

A large number of ordnance designers and engineers were suppressed. S.P. Korolev, the chief designer of Soviet rockets, was also arrested and imprisoned in the 1930s and worked in the prison institute for a long time.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, one of the focuses of the suppression was the old technical intellectuals. The Soviet newspapers at the time even believed that 95% of the old engineers had counter-revolutionary sentiments. By the late 1930s, the main target of the suppression was experts within the party. For example, among the 200 directors of large machinery manufacturing plants under the Ministry of Heavy Industry, 198 were members of the Communist Party. However, by 1939, almost all of these directors had been arrested.

IV. Consequences of the Great Criticism and Purge in the Academic Circles

1. The formation of the Soviet-style social science management system

The 1930s was the period when the Soviet socialism model was formed. It was also the period when the Soviet social science management system was formed and the line, principles and policies of the CPSU in leading the social sciences were established and fixed. The formation of the Soviet social science system and the line, principles and policies of the CPSU in leading the social sciences had the following prominent features.

(1) Social science was regarded as an important part of the party's ideology, and a top-down centralized management system was established.

During the Stalin era, in addition to the Politburo members who were in charge of ideological work, major ideological and social science issues were handled by Stalin himself. By the Brezhnev era, the second-in-command in the party was in charge of ideology. Social sciences and other cultural undertakings were centrally managed nationwide. Before the disintegration of the Soviet Union, there was always a CPSU Central Academy of Social Sciences, which was superior to other similar research institutions. In terms of book and newspaper inspection, a strict submission and prior inspection system was implemented. In addition, the all-pervasive KGB also infiltrated every corner of social sciences, thus establishing what Soviet scholars called "Arakcheev-style military-police rule" in the field of social sciences.

(2) Social sciences were in a closed state, isolating themselves from traditional culture and world culture, attempting to establish and develop their own "brand-new system" in a "sterile world."

The research results of pre-revolutionary social sciences and Western social sciences were all considered to be owned by the "bourgeoisie" and were completely denied. In the late 1930s, some scientists took the opportunity to go abroad to avoid repression and stayed there, so since then, the authorities have minimized the opportunities for Soviet scientists to go abroad. Social sciences have almost no contact with the outside world.

(3) The right to interpret and develop Marxism-Leninism, the "right to make inventions" in major fields of social sciences, and the right to draw conclusions were completely monopolized by the leader alone.

The criterion for testing truth was not seen as practice, but the truth was within the writings and speeches of the top leader.

"In the era of Stalin's personality cult, what was considered to be true was not what was in line with reality and had been tested, but what was confirmed by 'Comrade Stalin'."① (4)

Academic issues were confused with political issues. Soviet leadership especially Stalin emphasized that academic issues must be linked to political issues, that is, academic issues must be linked to intra-party struggles and class struggles. Free discussion and debate on scientific issues were prohibited. Those who expressed different opinions were subject to "political criticism" at the very least and violence at the worst. After Stalin's death, large-scale purges and repressions were stopped, but the situation of convicting people for their words and the rampant "literary inquisition" was not eradicated. For example, until the Brezhnev era in the 1970s, it was still common to forcibly send dissidents to mental hospitals and torture them physically.

(5) As mentioned above, theoretical knowledge and generalizations were monopolized by the top leader alone.

Researchers did not dare to conduct independent theoretical research and could only annotate and popularize the thoughts and speeches of the leaders. Citations of the leaders' works replaced independent theoretical thinking and creative research on real problems. As a result, dogmatism, book worship, and ideological rigidity emerged. There is no "science" in "social science". The wisdom and talents of the vast number of scientific researchers cannot be brought into play, and philosophy and social sciences became passive and inactive. The consequences were inevitable: the thoughts of leaders will dry up because they have no source, thus leading to the stagnation of the development of social thought and society itself.

Here we should especially mention the attitude towards Marxism. On this issue, Stalin also left a very bad style of study for future generations, which is the "absolutism", "pragmatism" and "slavery" of Marxist theory.

As some Soviet scholars who adhere to the Marxist position said: **"In many cases, Stalin absolutized some of Lenin's principles. These principles were correct in a certain historical environment, but inappropriate in another political and historical environment. In fact, Stalin's attitude towards theory itself was incorrect. Stalin did not mainly derive certain principles from the**

actual situation, but forced theory to cater to subjective wishes, let theory obey other situations, and in fact he politicized theory. In addition, Stalin cultivated a slavish attitude towards theory among both party cadres and scientific workers. Except for Stalin, no one could raise objections or make revisions to any theoretical viewpoints of the classical writers of Marxism-Leninism, and even worse, the principles put forward by Stalin himself should be treated in this way. These principles should only be followed slavishly, and no deviation was allowed."②

2. The 'Talk' in 1930 by Stalin seriously hindered the development of Soviet social sciences and other sciences and seriously hindered the establishment of new disciplines. The criticism and purge in the intellectual-scientist circles in the 1930s not only caused the death of tens of thousands of intellectual elites, but also had a very negative impact on the development of all social sciences, natural sciences, applied sciences, literature and art.

Economic science had made great progress in the 1920s, but after Stalin's "speech", the Soviet Union had almost no research on economic science, especially socialist political economy.

For 20 years, there was no political economy textbook in the country. In 1952, according to Stalin's instructions, the "Political Economy Textbook" came out. This book actually elevated the Soviet Union's practices and experiences in building socialism in the 1930s, such as industrial nationalization, agricultural collectivization, and central command planning, to the "universal laws" of socialist construction, and used them as the main criterion for distinguishing true and false socialism.

According to Stalin's instructions, this book was not only a "must-read textbook" for Soviet people, but also for communists all over the world. This textbook with obviously biased views and imprisoned people's minds dominated the field of Soviet economic science for more than 30 years.

In the field of history, historians had fewer opportunities to contact social, political and economic materials, especially historical archival materials, and it was impossible to think independently about social life phenomena and creatively analyze historical facts.

Historical books were full of "political nonsense" and praise for Stalin. The "Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)", published in 1938 and once hailed as the "Encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism", was entirely for the purpose of praising and glorifying Stalin and proving that Stalin was always correct.

In the works published after the war on the history of the Soviet Party and the state and Stalin's biography, the phenomenon of distorting and falsifying history was very serious. After Stalin's death, successive Soviet leaders rewrote history according to their own wishes. Voluntarism, one-sidedness, and concealing the truth of history have become the insurmountable chronic diseases of Soviet historiography.

There was also a clear regression in the field of philosophy. Stalin's "Dialectical Materialism and Historical Materialism" was declared the pinnacle of philosophical thought. In fact, this pamphlet and Stalin's other philosophical works were not as good as Stalin's.

Roy A. Medvedev: Let History Judge: The Origin and Consequences of Stalinism (Volume 2), People's Publishing House, 1981, p. 852.

Roy A. Medvedev was born in 1925, a historian. Since the 1960s, he criticized Stalin's mistakes from the standpoint of Leninism. In 1969, he was expelled from the party because **Medvedev's** works were introduced to the West. In 1989, **Medvedev** was reinstated as a member of the party and was elected as a member of the Central Committee at the 28th Congress of the CPSU in the same year.

After the CPSU was banned in October 1991, **Medvedev** established the "Russian Socialist Left Party" and served as one of the two chairmen of the party. At the same time, **Medvedev** actively participated in the reconstruction of the CPSU. After 1991, **Medvedev** continued to write books and criticize the policies of the authorities, emphasizing that the capitalist road would not work in Russia.

The explanation and development of the principles of Marxist philosophy in Soviet academic philosophical works are obviously one-sided and simplistic, and even these works made some distortions in some places. For a long time, the study of Stalin's philosophical works replaced the in-depth understanding and research of the philosophical thoughts of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

No serious research was conducted on materialist dialectics, epistemology, logic, laws of thinking and scientific methods. Research on German classical philosophy almost came to a halt. Philosophy did not study living things and scientific data, especially the laws of socialist social development, which turned

philosophy into cumbersome philosophy. In addition, the principle that dialectical materialism must be combined with natural science, which was repeatedly emphasized by Marxist classical writers, was seriously undermined.

Philosophers could arbitrarily label natural sciences that do not suit their own wishes or that they do not understand as "idealism" or "metaphysics". This not only negatively affected the development of natural sciences, but also directly affected the development of philosophy itself.

The situation in the field of law sciences was also extremely abnormal. In the era of personal superstition, law was not seen as a science to defend the rule of law and socialist social order, but a tool to defend arbitrary behavior that undermines the rule of law.

In the field of law, various erroneous views were prevalent, such as the court could not reach absolute truth (as long as there is a certain degree of probability to reach truth); if the law "lags behind" life, it will no longer be used; accomplices must be responsible for all activities of the group; sufficient evidence is not the sum of various evidences, but the confession of the defendant. The distortion of the legal system is also reflected in the fact that as long as the top leader proposes it, the legislative department will immediately enact any law, not to mention the trampling of the constitution and laws in practice.

In short, the development of various fields of social science has been hindered and destroyed. At the same time, disciplines and new disciplines that were very developed abroad, such as political science, sociology, and many related disciplines, could not be established in the Soviet Union.

3. Delay in the development of natural sciences.

For example, cybernetics was banned from research because it was "bourgeois pseudoscience", which delayed the development of electronics and computer industry, making Soviet computer technology almost two generations behind the United States. Because in the Soviet Union the new knowledge of organic synthetic chemistry in the West was regarded as "idealism" and was refused to be introduced, the Soviet Union lagged behind the West by 7 to 9 years in the production of many new synthetic raw materials. As for Stalin's promotion of Lysenko, and vigorous criticism of Weismannism, and the backwardness of biological genetics, the consequences were also very serious.

4. Problems in social sciences became an important reason for the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

This can be explained from the following three aspects:

(1) The object of social science research is the development of human society and its laws.

Its function is to provide theoretical guidance and methodological basis for human beings to understand the world, transform the world and improve the life of human beings. The essence of social science is innovation, just like in natural science. It should be said that the CPSU and the Soviet government attached great importance to social sciences.

However, due to the wrong methods, policies and lines for leading social sciences, the management system of social sciences did not conform to the laws of social science development. Therefore, despite the large number of scientific researchers, social sciences could not play its due role, especially in theoretical innovation and institutional innovation. The socialist construction led by the CPSU was an unprecedented great cause. Under such circumstances, the innovative function of social sciences should be fully utilized, keeping up with the changes in real life and the trend of the times, emancipating the mind, seeking truth from facts, constantly studying new problems, solving new problems, forming new understandings, opening up new horizons, proposing new theories and creating new systems.

If the construction of the socialist political and economic system in the Soviet Union in the 1930s was also a kind of "institutional innovation", then after the war, as this system was sanctified and fixed, the Soviet Communist Party's spirit of continued innovation became less and less.

"Innovation is the soul of a nation, the inexhaustible driving force for a country's prosperity and development, and the source of a party's vitality. Innovation includes theoretical innovation, institutional innovation, scientific and technological innovation and other innovations."^①

The Soviet Communist Party lost its innovative spirit, and the country it led gradually lost its driving force for progress. Under such circumstances, it was inevitable that such a party and such a state would go from prosperity to decline.

(2) The Soviet social science management system and the CPSU's line and policies in the field of social sciences led to the stagnation and distortion of the development of Soviet social sciences.

The CPSU's ideology and Soviet social sciences have long been dominated by dogmatism. The theories constructed by dogmatists could not timely and accurately reflect the ever-changing reality, and could not give convincing answers to the issues that the masses really care about.

Therefore, no matter how powerful the Soviet Union's propaganda machine was to instill its theories into the society, it still could not have the desired appeal and could not have appeal to the masses and public.

This is how the well-known "crisis of trust" came about. In the Soviet Union, the "crisis of trust" had already occurred as early as the 1950s and 1960s. At the first stage, it was directed at the leaders of the party. By the 1970s, a "crisis of trust" had arisen in the entire ideological and theoretical system of the CPSU. This dogmatic theory that was divorced from reality and the masses has long been supported by the state's coercive force and cannot have real vitality and combat effectiveness.

Because it was weak and dared not see the wind and rain, it had to close the doors and windows tightly. However, the tighter the doors and windows were closed, the less wind and rain can be resisted, the weaker they become, and a vicious cycle was formed.

Therefore, in the Gorbachev era, under the conditions of "diversified public opinion" policy promoted by Gorbachev, this ideological and theoretical system collapsed at the touch of a button in the face of the attacks by various anti-socialist trends of thought.

The people did not believe in the theories and propaganda of the Communist Party, which, in essence, meant that they did not believe in the Communist Party itself. It can be seen that the failure of the CPSU began with the loss of the party's ideological and theoretical innovation and advancement, which was directly related to the situation of Soviet social sciences.

(3) The CPSU ruled for 70 years, but it did not solve the problem of how to correctly lead social sciences, nor did it deal with the problem of how to correctly treat intellectuals in social sciences and other scientific fields.

As mentioned above, intellectuals were discriminated politically. In all previous political purges and criticisms, intellectuals, especially those in the social sciences, were the first to bear the brunt and suffered the most. Coupled with other restrictions, intellectuals were long deprived of good conditions and environment to display their intelligence, initiative and creativity. Therefore, when Gorbachev's reforms turned to the right and the struggle between various political forces in the country intensified, many intellectuals, including those in the field of social sciences, stood against the Communist Party. This was a very painful historical lesson for the Communists.

The Soviet Communist Party led the world's first socialist country for 73 years, but failed to solve the problem of how to correctly lead the social sciences studies. This is a historical regret and a historical tragedy.