

ХРОНИКА НАУЧНОЙ ЖИЗНИ

DOI 10.24411/2076-8176-2020-14010

An outstanding botanist and president of the USSR Academy of Sciences V.L. Komarov in the reports of the international conference on the history of science and technology (October 2019)

MARIA M. KLAVDIEVA

S.I. Vavilov Institute for the History of Science and Technology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia; mashak@rambler.ru

This is a review of papers presented at the international conference titled “History of science and technology: sources, monuments, legacy. In commemoration of the 150th anniversary of birth of Academician Vladimir Leontievich Komarov (1869–1945), President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The third readings in the historiography and source studies of the history of science and technology”. This event, jointly organised by S.I. Vavilov Institute for the History of Science and Technology (IHST) of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was held at IHST on October 15–17, 2019. The conference was devoted to the 150th anniversary of birth of Vladimir Leontievich Komarov, an outstanding botanist and plant geographer, science manager, and statesman, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, President of the All-Union Botanical Society, and Honorary President of the USSR Geographical Society, who was the founder and the first director of the Institute for the History of Science of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the only President of the Academy of Sciences who was a biologist. Particular attention is given to plenary keynotes devoted to Komarov’s contributions as a scientist and science manager, the presentations at the round table held in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Komarov’s birth, and other conference papers relevant to the history of biology.

Keywords: Vladimir Komarov, V.L. Komarov, history of science, history of biology, history of Russian science; history of Soviet science, Sovietisation of science in the USSR.

© Клавдиева М. М., 2020

An international conference titled “History of science and technology: sources, monuments, legacy. In commemoration of the 150th anniversary of birth of Academician Vladimir Leontievich Komarov (1869–1945), President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The third readings in the historiography and source studies of the history of science and technology”¹ was held at the S.I. Vavilov Institute for the History of Science and Technology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IHST) on October 15–17, 2019. The event was jointly organised by IHST and the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ARAS), with the participants coming from a wide range of organisations, including IHST, ARAS, Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, St. Petersburg State University, Russian State University for the Humanities, South Ural State University, F.M. Dostoyevsky Omsk State University, Russian State Archive of the Economy, Polytechnic Museum, etc. The conference was devoted to the 150th anniversary of birth of Vladimir Leontievich Komarov, an outstanding botanist and plant geographer, science manager, and statesman, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences (from 1936 to 1945), President of the All-Union Botanical Society (1930–1945) and Honorary President of the USSR Geographical Society, who was the founder and the first director of the Institute for the History of Science of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1944/1945), and the only President of the Academy of Sciences who was a biologist.



Fig. 1. Komarov readings
Рис. 1. Комаровские чтения

Four of the seven plenary keynotes, as well as the presentations at the round table held in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Komarov’s birth were devoted to Komarov and his role in the development of Soviet science (and history of science), his contributions as a scientist and science manager.

¹ History of science and technology: sources, monuments, legacy. In commemoration of the 150th anniversary of birth of Academician Vladimir Leontievich Komarov (1869–1945), President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The third readings in the historiography and source studies of the history of science and technology. Moscow: October 15–17, 2019. Proceedings of the international scientific conference, Moscow, October 15–17, 2019. Moscow: Yanus-K, 2019. 510 p. (in Russian)

An involved keynote by S.S. Ilizarov highlighted the role of Komarov in the development of the history of science as a profession in our country². The speaker stressed that it was due to Komarov that the Institute for the History of Science and Technology has been created and exists to this day and the history science develops as a professional area in its own right. This keynote paper focuses on Komarov's attitude towards the history of science and his interactions with the prominent Russian historians of science T.I. Rainov, S.L. Sobol, and B.G. Kuznetsov. The speaker emphasised that Komarov was a typical representative of a long-standing, classical scientific tradition in which a true scientist, besides being a professional in his chosen discipline, was also supposed to be knowledgeable in the history of science. Komarov's fundamental work, "The flora of Manchuria" (Vols. I–III, 1901–1907), as well as many of his other works, contains not only a comprehensive botanical and geographical description of the region but also an exhaustive and profound historic-scientific analysis of the works of his predecessors. Komarov developed his systemic approach very early in his scientific career. Thus, his early work on the flora of the Zeravshan River basin, published in 1896, reflected three consecutive stages of a study. Its first part contained a detailed description and analysis of the area that covered landscape, climate, soil, and human impact (cattle grazing, deforestation, agriculture and horticulture). The second part listed plant species growing in the region, and the third part was devoted theoretical concepts and assumptions, and their comparison with the actual situation. In the 1920s, Komarov published a number of works devoted to the history of biology proper. In his rather small book titled "From the history of biology (what is life)" he wrote that the history of biology reveals, first, a steadily growing accumulation of factual knowledge rather than abstract theorising; second, a growing influence of physicochemical method; and, third, the experimental method becoming increasingly more widespread and replacing the descriptive method. His interest in the legacy of his predecessors who studied the flora of Central Asia was reflected in his 1926 work devoted to the botanical routes of the most important Russian expeditions led by N.M. Przhevalsky (Przewalsky) in 1870–1885 and G.N. Potanin in 1876–1899. Komarov had authored many essays and books devoted to Russian (A.N. Beketov, O.A. Fedchenko, S.N. Kostychev, V.V. Sapozhnikov, P.P. Semenov-Tyanshansky, K.A. Timiryazev, etc.) and international (Carl Linnaeus and Jean-Baptiste Lamarck) scientists. He also promoted the publication of an academic edition of Charles Darwin's works. According to S.S. Ilizarov, the role of Komarov in the development of the history of science in Russia was not limited to his own studies in this field. His role in the organisation and preservation of this discipline in the USSR was at least no less important. It was the time when the history of science was going through the stage of disciplinary institutionalisation and becoming a profession. In Russia, this process was largely associated with the efforts of Academicians A.S. Lappo-Danilevsky and V.I. Vernadsky. A specialist research centre for the history of science in Russia, the Commission on the History of Knowledge (KIZ) of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was created in 1921. It was organised and chaired by Vernadsky. Even back in 1921, Komarov who became its member participated in the discussion of the programme of preparing the essays on the history of applied science in Russia. In 1926, after Vernadsky returned from Sorbonne where he taught geochemistry, KIZ became actively involved in the research and publishing work. In 1930, N.I. Bukharin succeeded Vernadsky as KIZ Chairman. Two years

² See in this issue the article based on this report: Ilizarov S.S. (2020). History of science in the life and work of Academician V.L. Komarov, *Studies in the History of Biology*, 12(4), 38–67.

later, Bukharin managed to get KIZ reorganised into the Institute for the History of Science and Technology (IINT) of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and became its director. The same year Komarov was elected the Academy's Vice President. IINT worked smoothly and effectively enough under Bukharin till 1936 when the situation changed dramatically and the destructive processes were set in motion that ultimately led to the elimination of the Communist Academy, the arrest of Bukharin in February 1937, and the destruction of IINT created by him. It was during that period that Komarov, for a number of reasons, became more actively involved in salvaging the history of science in the USSR. As President of the USSR Academy of Sciences since December 1936, he was obliged to react to these events. Vernadsky was sparing no effort to save IINT. Komarov often met with Vernadsky and actively supported him, which is reflected in Vernadsky's diaries from 1938. During the same period, Vernadsky often met with a number of historians of science and technology, particularly with B.G. Kuznetsov, T.I. Rainov, and S.L. Sobol (the latter was a biologist and historian of science), all of whom also met and communicated with Komarov who had a very high opinion of each of them. The author reconstructs these scientists' relationships and interactions with Komarov. IINT ceased to exist on March 5, 1938 but the new Institute for the History of Science (IIE) of the USSR Academy of Sciences was established in 1944 after much effort, largely on the part of Kuznetsov supported by Komarov. On November 13, 1944, the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences met with I.V. Stalin to secure his approval for the creation of IIE with Komarov as its director and for the publication of the "Scientific Legacy" ("Nauchnoye nasledstvo") series. The final resolution on the creation of IIE, adopted by the USSR Council of People's Commissars after this meeting, also approved the list of members of IIE's Academic Council. Apart from Komarov, included the eminent scientists and two professional historians of science, B.G. Kuznetsov (as deputy director) and T.I. Rainov. The creation of IIE was the last significant action of V.L. Komarov.

In her plenary keynote, Nadezhda Osipova provided a comprehensive review of Komarov's abundant documentary legacy deposited at the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ARAS). These are the documents from Komarov's fonds as well from the fonds of other scientists and organisations. Komarov's personal fonds at ARAS includes the manuscripts of his studies on flora in the Novgorod region, Zeravshan Range, Manchuria, Kamchatka, etc.; his works on the history of science, public and political speeches, correspondence, photographs, family archives, personal documents such as diplomas, passports, and many other documents. The documents that reflect Komarov's activities at the USSR Academy of Sciences are also contained in the fonds of the Secretariat of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Presidium, the fonds of the Main Botanical Garden, the fonds of the Academy of Sciences' Administration, etc.

The keynote delivered by Valentina Korzun from F.M. Dostoevsky Omsk State University was devoted to Komarov's speech at the celebration of the 220th anniversary of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the victorious year of 1945. In line with the Academy's tradition, this speech emphasised its past and present accomplishments. Komarov presented the image of Soviet science in the new, post-War context, and analysed the Academy's evolution as it passed through several periods: the 18th century that was associated with the names of Peter I and Mikhail Lomonosov and marked by the creation of the Academy Sciences, the search for a rational explanation of the world, the age of encyclopedic knowledge; the 19th — early 20th century marked by the differentiation of science and accumulation of knowledge; and, obviously, the third period that began after 1917 and was

marked by socialist transformations. Komarov emphasised the continuity of science, with Soviet science pursuing the great classical traditions of Russian science and developing within the space of international science. The author concluded that Komarov's speech also reflected the new moods, hopes and illusions that prevailed among the Soviet scientific community of the time.

Valerian Snytko's plenary keynote outlined Komarov's activities at the Russian Geographical Society (RGS), his scientific expeditions to Central Asia, sponsored by RGS.

The papers presented at the round table devoted to Komarov's anniversary highlighted different aspects of his life and work, his contributions to the development and organisation of science in the USSR, as well as some pages from his biography.

V.Yu. Afiani's paper was devoted to the attempts of V.I. Vernadsky and V.L. Komarov to defend science and scientists at the time of repressions and to their perception of the situation in Soviet science at the time. The author compares Vernadsky's and Komarov's scientific careers and life journeys that had much in common, and emphasises that both of them possessed enormous scientific erudition and gained international recognition. Among Komarov's significant contributions to science, the author mentions the thirty volumes of "Flora of the USSR," the publication of which was initiated by Komarov who was the editor-in-chief of the first thirteen volumes. To compare these two scientists' political and social views, public stance, and public behaviour, Afiani analysed Vernadsky's diaries and letters to his son. As regards Komarov, no such source base has been available but some information was drawn from Vernadsky's diaries. Thus, Vernadsky mentioned Komarov's appreciation of his "Biosphere." In the 1920s, Vernadsky decided to stay in Soviet Russia although, later in the decade, he wrote that he could only live in Russia as long as special conditions were provided for him. In his letter to Molotov, Vernadsky wrote that, far from being an advocate of the communist or socialist order, he nevertheless believed that an attempt at socialist construction could only be fruitful if based on science that was free and strong. Notwithstanding several failed attempts to accuse him of some political or ideological crime, the communist authorities valued Vernadsky as a scientist and gave him a lot of slack. It appeared that, for Vernadsky (and Pavlov), exceptions were made from the repressive rules. Although, when a student, Komarov had been somehow involved in the revolutionary movement, he did not actively engage in political activities afterwards and never joined the Communist Party. And yet, because of the positions he held at the Academy of Sciences, he was expected and obliged to participate in certain repressive campaigns (such as the ill-famed Figatner's Commission) and put his signature on certain declarations, letters and other damning documents. As for Vernadsky, he determinedly avoided getting involved in politics during the Bolsheviks' reign. Thus, in 1929 he refused becoming Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Referring to his poor health, he avoided participating in various collective actions to condemn the "enemies of the people" and signing various declarations of this kind. Nevertheless, his signature did sometimes appear on such documents, even if without his consent. Once, in 1936, during a discussion of the new Academy's Regulation, he could not help but speak out in favour of freedom of scientific work and protective and caring attitude towards talented people, which almost ended in his being persecuted in the press (such persecution would have been fraught with dire consequences for him). Vernadsky's diaries are full of mentions of the arrests and persecutions of his colleagues and friends, and of his petitioning V.M. Molotov, A.Ya. Vyshinsky, and others in the attempts to defend the victims of repressions. He supported the persecuted and condemned scientists, helped them with finding employments, and provided financial help to the families of the

repressed. Many of Vernadsky's friends, relatives, colleagues and students were arrested in 1936–1938. He believed that helping the wrongfully oppressed was his moral duty. In some cases Komarov helped Vernadsky in these efforts. V.Yu. Afiani writes that it was under Komarov's direction and with his participation that the "Sovietisation" of the Academy was pursued, all of the "Party and Government" resolutions were carried, and the decrees on the expulsion of the repressed scientists from membership in the Academy were passed. According to the author, Komarov's tactics in his interactions with authorities was probably akin to nonresistance to evil. At the same time, Komarov did his best to help concrete people and tackle concrete issues in the Academy's functioning. He was forced to constantly seek diplomatic ways for maintaining precarious balance and resolving conflicts between the interests of science and the Academy of Sciences, on the one hand, and the authorities' demands, on the other. Nevertheless, Vernadsky had a high regard of Komarov as a scientist and believed that his being the Academy's President was good for the Academy. Vernadsky often met with Komarov to discuss various issues, which included seeking his help and support for the scientists who found themselves in dire situations.

Irina Urmina's presentation was based on the materials of the exhibition devoted to the 150th anniversary of Komarov's birth, which was held at ARAS from October 17 to November 15, 2019. This exhibition was designed to portray Komarov both as a prominent scientist, a world-famous botanist, and as a statesman, a brilliant science manager who first became Vice President and then President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The exhibits were original documents from the ARAS collections: family and other photographs, portraits, plant drawings, letters, scientific works, manuscripts, expedition diaries, biographical documents (diplomas, passports, award certificates, membership cards, etc.) and other documents, with the emphasis placed on Komarov's abundant correspondence in the context of historical, social and cultural environment in which he lived and worked. The exhibits illustrated the facts from Komarov's life that reflected his contribution to science and his self-denying labour as a botanist and taxonomist before the 1917 Revolution. On the other hand, other documents reveal his perception of, and involvement in, these events (e.g. his letters to A.A. Rikhter) and thus shed light on his personal qualities that enabled him to survive and pursue his scientific and managerial work. His leadership and managerial talent became evident back in the 1920s, when Komarov promoted the work of local branches of the Geographical Society in the Far East. In 1930, he was elected Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences and effectively put in charge of the entire biological science. He advocated decentralisation of science, initiated and promoted the creation of the Academy of Sciences' regional bases and branches of the Academy. Valentina Urmina described the devastating, extremely difficult sociopolitical context in which Komarov served as the Academy's Vice President and President, some aspects of which were illustrated, for instance, by the letters written to him by A.M. Deborin or P.L. Kapitsa. In her comparatively brief presentation the author managed to convey the atmosphere of the time very vividly. She emphasised that Komarov's correspondence and other documents from his personal fonds reflect enormous devotion and self-denial of V.L. Komarov, a scientist and a citizen who took on the responsibility for national science.

A.V. Sobisevich and V.A. Snytko devoted their paper to Komarov's studies on the flora in the course of the Far East expeditions. Komarov published 3 volumes of the "Flora of Manchuria" (1901–1907), based on the materials collected during these expeditions that also covered the north of the Korean Peninsula and Manchuria (1895–1897). In these

books he described 1862 plant species, 84 of which were discovered by Komarov himself. This work earned him the N.M. Przhevalsky Medal awarded by the Geographical Society, the Karl von Baer Prize awarded by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, and a special medal awarded by the International Academy of Botanical Geography. The Far East expeditions as well as the expeditions to the Kamchatka Peninsula in 1908/1909 were sponsored by the Russian Geographical Society. Komarov described 825 plant species growing on the Kamchatka Peninsula, 74 of which were discovered by himself. The authors emphasise Komarov's innovative recognition of the influence of human activities on the formation of plant communities, both intentionally and unintentionally, and his impressive contributions to floristics and plant taxonomy.

E.Yu. Basargina described the celebration of Isaac Newton's 300th anniversary in 1942 and the letter sent by Sir Henry Dale, President of the Royal Society from 1940 to 1945, to V.L. Komarov, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This letter expressed Sir Henry Dale's appreciation of honouring the memory of Newton. The Royal Society presented the Academy with the draft of Newton's letter to Prince A.D. Menshikov, in which he informed the latter of his election as member of the Royal Society.

O.A. Valkova's paper introduced a previously unknown document, a letter written by woman astronomer N.M. Subbotina to V.L. Komarov, in which she expressed her gratitude for his help in dire circumstances. This document sheds light on Komarov as a person.

T.A. Kuzmenko's paper focused on Komarov's ability to recognise the importance of research works outside the scope of his own scientific interests and specialty. It describes how Komarov supported Lina Stern, an outstanding neurophysiologist and biochemist, in her attempts to introduce into clinical practice the methods for treating shock and tetanus, based on her physiological and biochemical discoveries.

The celebration of the Academy's 220th anniversary and Komarov's involvement and role in organising and convening this event was covered in two other papers presented at the round table by V.S. Gruzdinskaya and S.A. Limanova (the latter reviewed the relevant documents deposited at ARAS).

A.E. Rybchenkova's paper was devoted to the celebration of the 75th anniversary of Komarov's birth in 1944, particularly to numerous greetings sent by various scientists and institutions, which reflected Komarov's contributions both as an outstanding scientist and science manager.

The paper by L.D. Bondar was devoted to the Commission for the Study of Lake Baikal (the Baikal Commission) created in 1916 and to its restructuring under Komarov who was elected its chairman in 1928.

N.A. Vinogradova wrote about Komarov's important initiatives associated with the work of the academic libraries in Moscow during the War.

O.V. Selivanova described the mission of Soviet scientists, led by V.L. Komarov, to the Third Pacific Congress (1926). This mission presented the Soviet scientists' accomplishments to the international scientific community and, ultimately, led to the creation of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Pacific Committee chaired by V.L. Komarov.

Other presentations at the Conference were arranged into the following sections: "History of science and technology: sources" (with the subsections on written sources (23 papers), material sources (11 papers), and graphic sources (11 papers)); "History of science and technology: monuments" (9 papers); "History of science and technology: historiography" (18 papers); "History of science and technology: biographies" (17 papers); "Science of science: history, sources, legacy" (11 papers); and "History of science and

technology in the educational space” (8 papers). Of these presentations, the following are of particular interest for the historians of biological sciences.

In his paper devoted to the image of geneticists in the press in 1920–1940, R.A. Fando described how the ordinary people’s attitude towards science and scientists was changing in the process of Sovietisation of Russian science after the 1917 takeover. The images such as the “enemies of the people”, the “wreckers”, “cosmopolitans” and “mensheviks” began to be increasingly more often used to stigmatise scientists. This paper provides a vivid example of how the myth of “geneticists-wreckers” was planted in people’s minds through the Soviet press, theater, movies, and visual arts. The leading 1920s — 1940s periodicals have been analysed by the author to study the ways of formation of the public stereotype of the geneticists. It was during that period that a violent controversy over the studies of heredity and variation of organisms erupted in the Soviet Union. The author analyses a satirical piece on the well-known geneticists, published in a popular weekly magazine “Chudak” in 1929. In this article N.K. Koltsov, one of the leaders of Soviet biology, is portrayed as a proponent of wars as a way to physically improve humans while his colleague S.S. Chetverikov is depicted as a blatant anti-sovietist. The article was accompanied by the caricatures of the scientists created by the Kukryniksy, the famous Soviet caricaturists/cartoonists. The caricatures that stigmatised the enemies of the people among the scientists were very popular, providing quick responses to the latest events: for instance, a scientist would disprove a traditional knowledge and the next day a piece would appear in the press with satirical comments and a stinging caricature of the scientist. After the said publication in “Chudak”, Koltsov was forced to give explanations to N.A. Semashko, the People’s Commissar of Health, and stand up for his colleague Chetverikov. The author concludes that a profound emotional impact of caricatures on the ordinary people produced a long-lasting effect on their minds and provoked rumours about the “atrocities” committed by the geneticists. The latter were portrayed as collaborators of imperialism and fascism and the enemies of the people camouflaging as scientists devoted to science and their country. The use of vivid metaphors, hyperboles, and other satirical devices enhanced the impact on the audience and helped to manipulate public conscience

Yu.V. Shchepanskaya’s paper, largely based on the sources from ARAS, is devoted to Tatiana Vasilievna Asseyeva, one of the pioneers of Russian genetics who belonged to N.I. Vavilov’s scientific school. A talented plant breeder, she prepared the first manuals on potato taxonomy and variety identification back in 1926, and authored and coauthored the first Soviet potato cultivars, Lorkh and Korenevo. However, her very promising work was interrupted in the second half of the 1930s due to the notorious persecution campaign against genetics and geneticists in the Soviet Union. She was forced to abandon her experimental work in 1939 and became a graphic artist, an illustrator of flora and fauna for various botanical atlases (e. g. “Botanical Atlas for Schoolchildren”). Her biggest dream, however, was to resume research work and, not long before her death in 1975, she returned to the Institute of Potato Breeding. Her last work on potato genetics was published in 1968.

S.K. Pukhonto’s paper was devoted to A.A. Chernov’s collection of fossil flora from the Permian sediments of the Pechora Basin, stored at the V.I. Vernadsky Geological Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences. These specimens, handed over to this Museum in 1930, were collected by Professor Chernov and his colleagues most of whom were women. Alexandre Chernov (1877–1963), an outstanding Russian scientist who belonged to A.P. Pavlov’s geological school was the founder of the unique scientific school of women

geologists. Chernov's collection was processed and the specimens were identified by M.D. Zalesky (1877–1946), an outstanding Russian palaeobotanist.

T.Yu. Feklova's paper was devoted to botanical studies in China in the 19th century and focused on Emil Bretschneider and his book "History of European Botanical Discoveries in China" (1898). The Russian Orthodox Ecclesiastical Mission functioned in Peking since early 18th century (the first mission was sent by Peter I in 1713). Little or no scientific studies had been possible in China until much later. The first expedition of the Russian Academy of Sciences (1829–1831) that comprised an astronomer E.N. Fus and a botanist A.A. Bunge was sent to China together with the 10th Ecclesiastical Mission. The result of this expedition was an abundant floristic material, totaling 420 plant species. The 11th Mission's physician P.E. Kirillov both collected plant specimens and tried to elucidate the plants' names as well as their economic and medicinal use. He was the first to send ginseng to the St. Petersburg Botanical Garden. Kirillov brought from China more than 120 plant species. Emil Bretschneider's works came as a major breakthrough in the botanical studies in China. Bretschneider came to China as a physician to the Russian Legation in Peking where he combined his job with meteorological and botanical research. He studied Chinese language, Chinese history, and the history of botanical studies in China. His magnificent "History of European Botanical Discoveries in China" covers a timespan from 1275 Marco Polo's narratives to the Second Anglo-Chinese War (1860) and the area of not only China but also Mongolia, Macao, Canton, Tibet, and Korea, and contains the biographies of 627 explorers and researchers.

N.V. Litvina devoted her paper to the diaries of Vladimir Nikolayevich Sukachev (also spelled Sukaczew and Sukačev) (1880–1967), a prominent, internationally-known geobotanist, silviculturist and geographer, the founder of the Forest Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1944), professor at Chair of Dendrology and Plant Systematics at the St. Petersburg Forestry Institute, the Geographic Institute, the Botanical Garden, and St. Petersburg University. His "Fundamentals of Forest Biogeocoenology" (1964), the English translation of which was published posthumously by Oliver & Boyd in 1968, is internationally recognised as an important contribution to botany. The author emphasises that Sukachev's legacy also includes his numerous diaries and notes, including the field diaries from his expeditions. While Sukachev's scientific legacy is well-studied, little is known about the impact of the sweeping crisis in biological sciences in the 1930s — 1940s on Sukachev's life and work. There is very little mention of these events and of his impressions and views on the state of science in his diaries, which is suggestive in itself. At the same time, he meticulously recorded his observations of nature and plants. The author concludes that Sukachev's diaries and notebooks provide a very valuable material for the historians of science.

E.V. Kosyreva devoted her paper to the collection of glass plate negatives from the Altai expeditions of P.P. Sushkin (1868–1928). A talented Russian zoologist and taxonomist, morphologist and palaeontologist, Sushkin undertook his main ornithological expeditions to the Altai and neighbouring regions of North-East Mongolia in 1912 and 1914. The result of these expeditions was his book, "The birds of Russian Altai and adjacent parts of North-East Mongolia," published posthumously in 1938.

V.G. Bukhert introduced five letters from the ARAS collections, which reveal the role of Academician L.A. Orbeli in the lifting of restrictions on residence and upholding of civil rights for Evgenii Mikhailovich Kreps after his release from the forced labour camp. A prominent physiologist and biochemist, a disciple of I.P. Pavlov and an associate of

L.A. Orbeli, Kreps was arrested in 1937 and sentenced to 5 years of labour camps. In 1940, due to Orbeli's incredible efforts, he was released from the camp but was banned from living in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev till the end of the term he had been sentenced to.

A.I. Ignatova's paper titled "P.V. Tsiklinskaya's legacy for teaching microbiology at the N.I. Pirogov Medical University" presents the biography of Praskovia Vasilievna Tsiklinskaya (1859–1923), one of the first world-class women bacteriologists, a pioneer in teaching bacteriology in women's medical education, and the first female professor of bacteriology in Russia. A graduate from the Bestuzhev Higher Women's Courses, she attended the courses on microbiology and worked at the Pasteur Institute in Paris (and, at the same time, attended lectures on natural science at Paris University). She worked under Mechnikov and, after her return to Moscow, was offered a job at the newly founded Bacteriological Institute under the auspices of Moscow University, where she worked till her demise in 1923.

E.Yu. Zharova's paper titled "Science despite: documentary evidence of the life of university laboratories in the Russian Empire in the 2nd half of the 19th and early 20th century" identifies the following groups of sources: the universities' reports and accounts; the reports and accounts of other organisations, commissions, etc., the minutes of meetings, the reviews; the descriptive and historical essays on individual laboratories; the correspondence between the heads of the laboratories and their superior agencies; and the students' and professors' memoirs and recollections.

A.A. Fedotova et al. described the history of taxidermied European bisons, the 19th century museum exhibits, based on the correspondence between officials, zoologists and taxidermists.

G.G. Krivosheina's paper described the sources relevant to the history of the Society of Friends of Natural Science, deposited in the Archive of Moscow State University. Founded as the Society of Friends of Natural Science in 1863, it was transformed into the Imperial Society of Friends of Natural Science, Anthropology and Ethnography (OLEAE) in 1867. The most important of OLEAE's projects include A.P. Fedchenko's Turkestan Expedition (1868–1872), the Ethnographic (1867), Polytechnic (1872), and Anthropological (1879) Exhibitions in Moscow, and the Museum of Applied Knowledge (Polytechnic Museum) in Moscow.

Z.A. Platonova's paper addresses the history of congresses of Russian natural scientists and physicians, based on the memoranda and drafts of Professor Karl F. Kessler (1815–1881). It was his idea to organise such congresses in Russia, modelled after their counterparts in Western Europe that had been held since the early 19th century. Kessler fully devoted himself to this task and spared no effort to implement his idea.

Finally, M.S. Kozlova described the views of E.N. Mirzoyan, a Russian historian of biology whose primary interest focused on evolutionary and theoretical biology, on nomogenesis and evolutionary synthesis.

Two papers are also relevant to the history of medicine. G.I. Lyubina described and systematised the sources for the history of the governorate and uyezd zemstvo's public medicine in Russia from 1865 to 1917. She emphasised the abundance of these sources: the reports, financial statements, presentations, and resolutions of the governorate and uyezd zemstvo meetings, the publications of local self-governance bodies (zemstvo), bibliographies and bibliographical indexes, collections of papers/symposia, etc. The unique system of zemstvo public medicine, although relatively short-lived (1865–1917), provided medical services for low-income, mostly rural population. V.V. Sliskova devoted her paper to the

work of a Russian epidemiologist Lev Tarasevich (1868–1927) in the context of struggle against the epidemics of smallpox, diphtheritis, cholera, typhoid, etc., in the early 1920s, based on the sources from L.A. Tarasevich's fonds at ARAS. Tarasevich was the head of the Vaccine Control Station (1915), later reorganised into the Central Serum and Vaccine Commission (1918), and the first director of the Control Institute of Sera and Vaccines (one of the 8 biological institute under the auspices of the State Institute of Public Health) (1919). Apart from its core activities related to sera and vaccine control, the Institute also engaged in the studies on immunity and serology.

The Proceedings of the Conference also contain the titles of the papers in English and author information.

This paper was prepared with financial support from the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR Grant No 19-011-00366).

Выдающийся ботаник и президент Академии наук СССР В.Л. Комаров в докладах международной конференции по истории науки и техники (октябрь 2019 г.)

М.М. КЛАВДИЕВА

Институт истории естествознания и техники им. С.И. Вавилова РАН, Москва, Россия;
mashak@rambler.ru

Данная статья является обзором докладов, представленных на международной научной конференции «История науки и техники: источники, памятники, наследие: третьи чтения по историографии и источниковедению истории науки и техники», посвящённой 150-летию со дня рождения президента АН СССР В.Л. Комарова. Конференция, организованная Институтом истории естествознания и техники им. С.И. Вавилова (ИИЕТ) РАН и Архивом РАН, прошла в ИИЕТ РАН с 15 по 17 октября 2019 г. Конференция была посвящена 150-летнему юбилею Владимира Леонтьевича Комарова — выдающегося ботаника и географа, организатора науки и государственного деятеля, президента АН СССР, президента Всесоюзного ботанического общества, почётного президента Географического общества СССР, основателя и первого директора Института истории естествознания АН СССР — а также единственного биолога среди всех президентов АН СССР / РАН. Особое внимание уделено пленарным докладам, посвящённым научной и организаторской деятельности академика Комарова, докладам круглого стола «К 150-летию со дня рождения В.Л. Комарова», а также докладам историко-биологической тематики, представленным на секциях конференции.

Ключевые слова: Владимир Леонтьевич Комаров, В.Л. Комаров, история науки, история биологии, история российской науки, история науки в СССР, “советизация” науки в СССР.

Работа подготовлена при финансовой поддержке РФФИ (грант № 19-011-00366).