

дольше, чем в других государствах Восточной и Центральной Европы. Даже после разоблачения сталинистской науки «мягкая» версия «мичуринской биологии» сохранялась по крайней мере, до 1960-х гг. Другим фактором, который помог длительному присутствию «мичуринской биологии» в Чехословакии, было влияние чехословацкой Академии наук (CSAS). Созданная в сталинские времена (1952) на основе советской модели биология в Чехословакии была организована согласно принципам «мичуринской биологии». Несмотря на это, CSAS способствовала развитию настоящих исследований, давших ценные и оригинальные результаты, но одновременно она помогла пропагандировать «мичуринской биологии» дальше, чем в других странах. Парадоксально, но в период господства лысенкоизма были созданы четыре важные научные школы, которые, в конечном счёте, позднее стали соответствовать международным научным стандартам и оказали важное влияние на развитие эволюционной биологии как в Восточной, так и в Западной Европе. Это были:

1. Школа иммунологии Милана Гашека.
2. Школа микробиологии Ивана Малека.
3. Школа радиобиологии Фердинанда Герчика.
4. Теория эволюции Владимира Дж.А. Новака и теория социопроисхождения.

Более подробно остановились только на первом из вышеупомянутых: открытие Гашеком иммунологической толерантности интерпретировалось в зоологии с точки зрения растительной гибридизации (Питер Б. Медавар получил Нобелевскую премию по тому же самому открытию, и он признал вклад Гашека). Чехословацкая иммунологическая школа получила международное признание, и студенты Гашека (бывшего радикального лысенкоиста), эмигрировавшие после советской оккупации в 1968 г., все ещё работают в лабораториях американского и европейского континентов. Несколько подобных историй можно было бы рассказать о других школах и их основателях, упомянутых выше. Это показывает, что в некоторых областях Чехословакия функционировала как уникальный мост между западной и советской наукой — факт, который, возможно, оказал более общее влияние.

The Review of Symposium “From Lysenkoism to Evolutionary Biology”

MIKHAIL B. KONASHEV

St. Petersburg branch of Institute of History of Science and Technology
of Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia; mbkonashev@mail.ru

The overview of the symposium 116 “From Lysenkoism to evolutionary biology”, which took place within the VII International Conference of the European Society for the History of Science (22–24 September 2016, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic). Various aspects of the long and complex process of contacts, struggle, transitions and conceptual overlays of Lysenkoism, neo-Darwinian evolutionary biology, and unorthodox versions of the evolutionary theory, such as the theory of epigenetic inheritance, were considered. These contacts and transitions occurred in almost all countries of the Eastern bloc, including the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. The aim of the symposium was to examine different versions of Lysenkoism and evolutionary biology in these countries and to compare the biographies of the main participants in these processes, and the consequences of their actions.

Symposium on Soviet and American influences for Central and Eastern European academic system in 1945–1989

ELENA F. SINELINKOVA

St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute for the History of Science and Technology,
St. Petersburg, Russian Federation; sinelnikova-elena@yandex.ru

The symposium “The Big Brother Role Model? Soviet and American impulses for Central and Eastern European academic systems, 1945–1989” took place as part of the 7th International Conference of the European Society for the History of Science held in Prague, Czech Republic (September 22–24, 2016). It was organized by **Martin Franc** (Masaryk Institute and the Archives of the ASCR, Prague, Czech Republic), **Johannes Feichtinger** (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria), **Jakub Jareš** (Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic) and included academics from Czech Republic, Austria, Slovenia, Slovakia, Russia and the United States.

In the XIX century and at the beginning of the XX century Europe, and, particularly, Germany, became the cradle of influential scientific system models which were spreading worldwide including Russia and the United States. The end of the Second World War and the profound changes in the social and economic structures in many countries led to principal changes in the prevailing scientific and educational system in Central and Eastern European countries and the situation reversed in many respects. The influence of two great powers, whose importance had rapidly grown during the conflict, played a key role in the emergence of new mechanisms and institutions. Most countries in Eastern and Central Europe found themselves in the sphere of hegemonic influence of the Soviet Union. Austria and Germany also massively adopted impulses from the United States, supported by the USA sectors of the administration of these countries. In the second half of the XX century the so-called Eastern Bloc was dominated by the Soviet model of organizing and managing science with a central Academy of sciences playing a representative role as a coordinator of its own basic research sites. However, the degree of adoption of the Soviet model in some ways was differed in the individual countries and periods. Nevertheless, the Soviet model reflected on science management and institutionalization of Central European countries even which were outside the hegemonic influence of the Soviet Union.

A key aim of the symposium was to investigate this situation marked both the returning the original German models complemented with additional elements and the building of entirely new traditions. In particular, the symposium addressed such issue as differences between the mechanisms of the Soviet influence on the establishment of the scientific system and the mechanisms of enforcement of American models, the influence of the Soviet and American scientific policies at each other in Central and Eastern Europe, the correlation between any of the imported models and local traditions, the role of foreign impulses in an actual transformation of scientific management and institutionalization of in Central and Eastern Europe countries, the dynamics of acceptance of stimuli from the USA and the Soviet Union in the region in 1945–1989, the growing of the openness to incentives from the “other side of the Iron Curtain” in some the Central and Eastern European countries and the fixation scientific systems in the shape they had taken just after the war and during the 1950s in others.

The session began with a presentation by **Martin Franc** “Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and accepting Soviet experiences and models 1956–1968”, which analyzed the transformations in the mechanisms of adoption of Soviet experience and models by the Czechoslovak Academy of

Sciences (CSAS) in 1956–1968. It was shown that the influence of the Soviet Union remained crucial virtually until 1962, when Zdenck Nejedlý, a president of the CSAS and big supporter of Sovietization, died. His successor was František Šorm who tried to adopt the experience and models from the USSR more critically. But all such attempts were brutally cut by the occupation of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the following political purges. The hegemony of Soviet models was restored and any endeavors at their weakening were considered as ideologically unacceptable.

Miroslav Kunštát's (Czech Academy of Sciences, Masaryk-Institute and Archives of CAS, Prague, Czech Republic) paper “Sovietization of historical and archival sciences in Czechoslovakia in the first half of the 50s? Institutions and actors, discourses and codes, transfers and projections” explored the question of the influence of Soviet patterns for the transformation of the network of scientific institutions and their personnel background and for the gradual stabilization of normative Marxist-Leninist discourse in historiography. In conclusion Kunštát underlined that there was rather loud “projection” of Soviet models, less actual “reception” or “transfer”.

The presentation by **Adéla Júnová Macková** (Masaryk Institute and the Archives of the ASCR, Prague, Czech Republic), entitled “Scientific state institutes and their transformation in 1948–1953”, showed in particular the organizational transformation of the National Institute for Folk Songs and the Institute of Oriental Studies and the Institute of Slavic Studies from 1948 until 1953, when they voluntarily became parts of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. It was stressed that the incorporation of state institutes into the Academy of Sciences to give a clearer picture of the centralization of sciences in the 1950s, arranged according to the Soviet model.

The paper “Academies of Sciences in Central Europe during the Cold War. Towards a comparison of transformation processes in different political systems” by **Johannes Feichtinger** explored the question of how central European Academies of Sciences acted within the context of the East-West conflict and its rivaling systems discussed by means of selected examples (e.g. Austria, Germany, Hungary, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Poland). He focused especially on the processes of transformation during the early phase of the Cold War in which the Academy's scopes of action were re-negotiation and new organizational structures were implemented in between the conflicting poles of autonomy and political intervention.

Jakub Jareš's presentation “Post-War Reform of Higher Education in Czechoslovakia, 1945–1950: Origins, Implementation, and Legacy” was devoted to analyses the post-war reform of Czechoslovak higher education, however politically skewed it was, as part of modernization of higher education. The paper examined roots of the reform from the beginning of modern higher education in early XIX century, showed the turning points in the development of higher education in the Habsburg Empire, investigated the influence of Soviet models, and reviewed Czechoslovak discussions about a reform of higher education from the interwar period until the 1950s.

Elena Sinelnikova (St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute for the History of Science and Technology, St. Petersburg, Russia) in her paper “Science societies and the Soviet power during the 1920s” presented results of comprehensive and detailed study of the relations between the Soviet power and science societies in the 1920s based on plenty archival materials. It was shown that the relations were strained in that period. They depended on the socio-economic and political situation in Soviet Russia, as well as on its international position, personal contacts and scientific expedience. In the late 1920s and early 1930s science societies lost their independence and government control over all aspects of their live and activities became pervasive.

The presentation by **Joseph Bradley** (University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA), entitled “Associations in Times of Political Turmoil: Science Societies and the Bolshevik Regime, 1917–1921”, examined the fate of independent science societies in Russia under conditions of war and revo-

lution in the years 1917 to 1921. Although Russia before 1917 certainly did not possess a liberal political regime or a democratic society, an associational culture was growing rapidly. More specifically, Bradley demonstrated how a handful of prominent, so-called “bourgeois” associations that, after a brief “springtime” following the overthrow of the monarchy, struggled to cope politically with the Bolshevik regime and materially with the dislocations and deprivations of the civil war.

The main theme of the paper by **Aleš Gabrič** (Institute of Contemporary History, Ljubljana, Slovenia, “The Influence of the Soviet model of science policy and its abandonment in Slovenia” was the development of Slovenian science which depended on the relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Most scientific institutions were nationalized and the majority of the budget devoted to science have received those of the engineering science. It was noted that change of the science-policy occurred after a dispute between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, when Yugoslavia started to open to Western influence and from there import the scientific literature. Engineering sciences have begun to lose privileged position.

Finally, the paper by **Adam Hudek** (Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia) — “American inspirations for socialist science. Unsuccessful proposals for better effectiveness of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (1968–1989)” — focuses on attempts and plans to achieve a better work effectiveness at the Slovak Academy of Sciences during the last 20 years of the Czechoslovak communist regime. Hudek compared reform efforts during three different situations: the liberalization era of the Prague Spring, the subsequent “Normalization” and years of the “Perestroika”. In all three periods specific proposals for the new politics of science were introduced.

Симпозиум, посвящённый влиянию советских и американских моделей науки на академические системы стран Центральной и Восточной Европы в 1945–1989 гг.

Е.Ф. СИНЕЛЬНИКОВА

Санкт-Петербургский филиал Института истории естествознания и техники РАН,
Санкт-Петербург, Россия; sinelnikova-elena@yandex.ru

Представлен обзор симпозиума «Ролевая модель Большого Брата? Влияние советских и американских импульсов на научные системы стран Центральной и Восточной Европы в 1945–1989», который состоялся в рамках VII Международной конференции Европейского общества истории науки (22–24 сентября 2016, Прага, Чехия). С докладами выступили представители историко-научного сообщества из Чехии, Словакии, Словении, Австрии, России и США.