

музеи должны были превратиться в политический инструмент, при помощи которого можно формировать мировоззрение людей. В 1933–1937 гг. был утвержден пятилетний план реорганизации музея Зоологического института с созданием шести отделов. Контроль за работой музея осуществляла комиссия Ленсовета, которая следила также и за воспитанием кадров в духе материализма.

Профессор Э.И. Колчинский описывал влияние идей Ж. Кювье и Ж.Б. Ламарка на российских ученых. Идея о неизменности видов и о катастрофических сменах ископаемых флор и фаун Кювье стали основой формирования отечественной палеонтологии в первые десятилетия XIX в. Труды Ламарка стали известны в России только в середине XIX в. благодаря К.Ф. Рулье. Но после издания «Происхождения видов» имя Ламарка стало знаменем конкурирующего с дарвинизмом направления. В период лысенковщины Ламарк был признан создателем первой теории эволюции и его идеи использовались для доказательства правоты представлений Т.Д. Лысенко, а идеи Кювье жестко критиковались.

Сообщение М.Б. Конашева было посвящено анализу переписки одного из архитекторов эволюционного синтеза Ф.Г. Добржанского и убежденного креациониста Ф.Л. Марша, инициированной последним в 1945 г.

Работа ученых-биологов в годы Второй Мировой войны была рассмотрена в докладе К.В. Манойленко. Президент АН СССР ботаник В.Л. Комаров и агрохимик Д.Н. Прянишников обратились в первые дни войны к ученым с призывом интенсивно работать, способствуя разгрому фашизма. Многие из ученых ботаников и физиологов растений ушли в народное ополчение, а оставшиеся обратились к прикладным вопросам. Ленинградские физиологи в условиях блокады анализировали содержание витаминов в овощных культурах, работали с лекарственными растениями, изучали возможности использования в пищу мхов и лишайников. Самоотверженный труд ботаников-физиологов растений был вкладом в общую победу нашего народа в Великой Отечественной войне.

Overview of the section “History of biology” at the annual conference on the history and philosophy of science and technology

ANATOLY POLEVOI, ANASTASIA FEDOTOVA

Saint-Petersburg Branch of the Institute for the History of Science and Technology RAS
St. Petersburg, Russia;
polevoi66@mail.ru, f.anastasia.spb@gmail.com

The “History of biology” section was devoted to the history of Russian biology in the 19th century, 1920–1930 and during the Great Patriotic War. The section involved more than 30 people. Papers were presented by 10 researchers. The presented results of the research is reflected in the XXVI issue of the annual collection of papers “Science and Technology: historical and theoretical aspects” (2010).

International Workshop on Lysenkoism

WILLIAM DEJONG-LAMBERT

Columbia University, City University of New York, New York, USA:
wrl4@columbia.edu:

December 4–5, 2009, the International Workshop on Lysenkoism was held at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and the Harriman Institute at Columbia University. The meeting brought together thirty-three scholars from eleven countries who presented their research on the response and reaction to Lysenko’s anti-genetics campaign in the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Japan, East Germany, West Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Mexico and Holland. The workshop — the first ever devoted to this topic — was a tremendous success. The meeting demonstrated that the Lysenko affair is a topic of enduring interest to historians of science and the Cold War. A follow-up is currently being planned for the University of Vienna, in June, 2012.

The workshop opened with remarks by CUNY Vice Chancellor for Research, Gillian Small, and a panel, Lysenko and Agriculture, chaired by Deborah Coen of Barnard College. Jenny Leigh Smith of the Georgia Institute of Technology presented a paper, “Lysenko’s Legacy: Ignorance, Bliss, and the Persistence of Proletarian Science,” which compared Lysenkoism to another examples of “non-conformity” in the history of science. Stephn Brain of Mississippi State University presented, “Lysenko and the Transformation of Nature,” where he described Lysenko’s role in the 1949 Stalin Plan for the Transformation of Nature.

The next panel, The Reaction in the United States, was chaired by Chris Robinson, a professor of biology at the Bronx Community College, CUNY. In the first paper, “How Lysenkoism Became a Pseudoscience: Dobzhansky to Velikovsky,” Michael Gordin addressed the question of how “pseudoscience” is defined, by comparing the reaction to Lysenko’s theories with the response to the ideas of Immanuel Velikovsky. Rena Selya, an Independent Scholar, followed with a paper, “Defending Scientific Freedom and Democracy: The Genetics Society of America’s Response to Lysenko,” where she described the pressures within the Genetics Society of America over how to — or even whether to — issue an official statement on the controversy.

After a break for lunch in the Graduate Center café, the participants reconvened for a panel chaired by Frances Bernstein of Drew University, on The New Biology in Central Europe. The first paper, “Lysenkoism in Hungary,” was presented by Miklos Muller, professor emeritus at Rockefeller University, and provided a first-hand account of Lysenko’s 1960 visit to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The second paper, “Lysenkoism in Czechoslovakia,” was an account by Michael Simunek of Charles University, of the reception to Lysenko’s theories in Czechoslovakia. The third paper, “Lysenkoism in Poland,” was presented by the workshop organizer, William deJong-Lambert of Bronx Community College CUNY and the Harriman Institute of Columbia University. It focused on the response of one Polish geneticist, Stanisław Skowron, as way of addressing the relationship between Lysenkoism and Nazi eugenics.

The final panel of the first day, Lysenko, Stalinism and Lamarckism, was chaired by Daniel Kevles of Yale University. The first paper, “Lysenko and the Plot Against the Jewish Doctors,” was presented by Jonathan Brent of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, and covered Lysenko’s role in the notorious final purge of Jewish physicians, that was never carried out thanks to Stalin’s death. Next, Eduard Israelovich Kolchinsky, the Director of

the St. Petersburg Branch of the S.I. Vavilov Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Russian Academy of Sciences, presented “The Cultural Revolution in the USSR (1929–1932) and the Beginning of the Union of Present and Lysenko.” The paper chronicled Lysenko’s relationship with his most important sponsor, the communist party philosopher I.I. Prezent. The final presentation of the day by Nils Roll-Hansen, emeritus professor at the University of Oslo, “Lamarckism and Lysenkoism Revisited,” analyzed the difference between Lamarck’s and Lysenko’s ideas, further deconstructing conventional wisdom (i. e. Lysenko was a “Lamarckist”) on the topic. The day concluded with a banquet dinner at Bello Sguardo on the Upper West Side.

The second day of the conference began with a panel chaired by the Director of the Harriman Institute, Cathy Neponmyashchy, Lysenko and Genetics. The first presenter, Audra Jayne Wolfe of the University of Pennsylvania, described the influence of the Lysenko controversy upon planning for the Golden Jubilee of Genetics, in her paper, “Commemoration as Political Weapon, Or, Why We Think of Mendel as the Father of Genetics.” The next presenter, Luis Campos of Drew University, presented a paper, “Dialectics Denied: Muller, Lysenko, and the Fate of Chromosome Studies in Soviet Genetics,” wherein he described how the rise of Lysenkoism impacted research on the effects of chromosomal variation on speciation in plants.

The next panel, on Western Europe, was chaired by Bruno J. Strasser of Yale University. Francesco Cassata of the University of Turin gave the first paper, “The Price of Obedience: Italian Marxist Biologists Front of PCI’s Lysenkoism (1948–1953).” This presentation described how the Lysenko controversy caused ruptures within the Italian Marxist community for reasons ranging from Stalin’s demands for conformity within the Cominform, the refusal of the left-wing publishing house Einaudi to produce an Italian translation of the VASKhNIL conference. Leo Molenaar gave a paper, “Dutch Treat: The Reaction to Lysenkoism in Holland,” where he explained how and why Lysenkoism re-emerged as a controversial topic for Dutch Marxists in the 1980s.

After lunch at the Harriman Institute the participants reconvened for the two final panels covering East Germany, West Germany, Asia and Latin America. The first panel, Germany, was chaired by Philipp Rothmaler from the mathematics department at Bronx Community College, CUNY. The first presentation was by Alexander von Schwerin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin, on “Lysenkoism and the Reform of Postwar West German Genetics.” This paper focused on the motives and strategy of West German geneticist Hans Nachtsheim in speaking out against Lysenko. In the next paper, “Lysenkoism in East Germany,” Ekkehard Höxtermann of the Free University of Berlin described the response from the other side of the “iron curtain” in Germany.

The final panel, Asia and Latin America, was headed by Joe Dauben of Lehman College and the CUNY Graduate Center. The first paper, “Lysenkoism in China 1950–1957: Party Authority vs. the Autonomy of Science,” was by Laurence Schneider, emeritus professor at Washington University in St. Louis. The presentation chronicled the widely varying approaches to implementing the Lysenko doctrine in Chinese agriculture, amidst the turmoil of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. The next paper by Arturo Argueta Villamar of the Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias, de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, and Quetzal Argueta Prado from the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, “Lysenko and Vavilov in Mexico and Latin America,” chronicled Nikolai Vavilov’s work in Mexico, in context with the Mexican response to Lysenkoism several decades later. The last paper,

“Geneticist Hitoshi Kihara and His Particular Role in the Period of Lysenkoism in Japan,” by Hirofumi Saito of the Tokyo Institute of Technology, focused on the response of one biologist to outline the reception to Lysenkoism in postwar Japan.

As the brief summaries above indicate, the workshop was an invaluable opportunity to consider the extraordinary range of reactions to Lysenko’s anti-genetics campaign worldwide. These case studies revealed the importance of geographic and historical context, as well as the role and impact of the individuals involved. The papers also allowed us to compare variations within specific case studies (e. g. the genetics community in the United States), and address larger questions, such as how the Lysenko affair can inform our understanding of the broader topic of “pseudoscience.” This last question was addressed directly in the final roundtable, which included Elena Levina, Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Nikolai Kremontsov, University of Toronto, Loren Graham, emeritus professor of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Douglas Weiner, University of Arizona. Nikolai Kremontsov suggested we move beyond the term “Lysenkoism,” and continue working towards a deeper understanding of what the controversy meant, and why it has been a topic of such enduring interest among historians of science.

Portions of the workshop were filmed by CUNY TV, and can be viewed online at the following addresses:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oDQSmVtSzI>; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37ck9UPiJc8>; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ct3kA_0jgHs&feature=channel; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WVovS-pNnEk&feature=channel>; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3SPkuK3HMXI&feature=channel>; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c8pH_tF5hiI&feature=related; http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ZGKoGzCe_o&feature=channel.

Международный семинар по лысенкоизму

ВИЛЬЯМ ДЕ ЙОН-ЛАМБЕР

Колумбийский университет, Нью-Йорк, США;
wrl4@columbia.edu

Международный семинар по лысенкоизму был проведен 4–5 декабря 2009 г. в Центре докторантуры Нью-Йоркского университета и в Институте Харримана Колумбийского университета. На семинар собралось тридцать три ученых из одиннадцати стран, которые представили свои исследования того, как на лысенковскую антигенетическую кампанию отреагировали в США, Советском Союзе, Китае, Японии, Восточной Германии, Западной Германии, Италии, Чехословакии, Польше, Венгрии, Мексике и Голландии. Это был первый из когда-либо проведенных семинаров на данную тему, и он имел грандиозный успех. Он стал ценнейшей возможностью рассмотреть самые разнообразные и невероятные варианты реакции на лысенковскую кампанию по всему миру. Эти исследования выявили важность географической и исторической составляющих вопроса, равно как и роль воздействия, оказываемого отдельными личностями.