

THE REFORM OF SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Practically from its beginnings the Soviet Union has been a totalitarian state where open scientific debates were dangerous or impossible. Although it would be an exaggeration to claim that "the evil empire" has now become an open society in the sense given to these words by Popper,¹ it is true that many things have changed for the better. The political reform promoted by Gorbachev and his allies has led to great changes in Soviet social and scientific life. One of the scientific disciplines that has profited from these recent political changes is psychology. Contemporary psychologists feel freer to discuss certain sensitive topics and have even been urged to do so by the political leaders of the country. So far the result of this new relative freedom is a rather chaotic jumble of issues suggested for future discussion and rethinking. Understandably, researchers have turned to theories that for ideological reasons were smothered in the past in order to find new theoretical perspectives in psychology. Such a turn to history is part of the general and painful process of rethinking history that Soviet citizens are now undertaking. It is clear now more than ever, that Soviet society as a whole, and psychology in particular, cannot make a fresh start until their history — in the present-day understanding of it — has been (re)written. Soviet psychologists are now in the midst of such a process of re-evaluating their own science, its history, and its heroes. As a result, the contemporary psychology journals are full of references to thinkers and ideas of the past. We do well, then, in order to improve our understanding of the changes brought about by Gorbachev's political reform, to cast a cursory glance at some pages from Soviet psychology's history.

FROM 1924 TO 1929: THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY

It was only in 1924 that "traditional" (read: non-communist) psychology lost its most prestigious research institute to the communist believers

who kept emerging as the Soviet regime gradually strengthened its power. In that year the Marxist convert Kornilov replaced his former teacher and colleague Chelpanov as the head of the Moscow Institute of Experimental Psychology. Chelpanov had stubbornly defended a point of view that by now had become simply unacceptable: that psychology was a purely empirical science "free of all philosophy."² Chelpanov's students Blonsky and Kornilov — who demonstrated a far better understanding of the political demands of that time — vehemently criticized their former superior, declaring that each and every science formed a mixture of empirical and philosophical viewpoints and that an objective point of view was unattainable. To them all methods, all approaches, and all scientific theories were determined by the social class of the investigator and the sole scientific system capable of giving an accurate analysis of this complex situation was Marxist-Leninist philosophy. In claiming this, Blonsky and Kornilov did, of course, no more than repeat Lenin's infamous slogans written down in his pamphlet *Materialism and Empiriocriticism*.³

This is to say, around 1924 the official ideology — the philosophy of historical and dialectical materialism — already dominated the social sciences, and that it had become virtually impossible to occupy an important position in the scientific world without being a convinced (or declared) communist. The official version of this ideology, of this world view, implied various points of view and taboos.

In the first place, it was understood that society, more specifically the social class, determined the mental development of the person. Evidently, this was an exceedingly optimistic point of view as its ultimate implication was that in an ideal society — that is, in the socialist society — mental development would know no limits. As in early American behaviorism the human mind was seen as made of an extremely malleable material and it was believed that if one had all means available it would in principle be possible to control mental development, to create the "new man," a being that was very superior to the wretched persons living in capitalistic societies.

Of course, this approach terribly underestimated the role of heredity in the development and behavior of individuals and likewise overestimated the role of the collective. The temptation was great to consider the social collective as the sole determining factor of mental

development together with the fact that individuals were no more than insignificant components of the social machine. Although a modest role for hereditary factors was formally recognized, it was considered reactionary to dedicate more than a few lines to them.

All the important psychologists of this period more or less shared this point of view or, of course, payed lipservice to it. The now famous Vygotsky,⁴ for example, suggested that "the revolution undertakes the re-education of the whole human species" and he approvingly quoted Trotsky on the possibilities of reforming human nature. Defending a blend of eugenics and politically leftist ideas — which was quite characteristic of that historical period (cf., for example, the similar ideas of George Bernard Shaw⁵) — he declared that we should not be swayed by "the sinister laws of heredity and blind sexual selection." One understands that in this mental climate it was not easy to publish on mental differences between children, and that it was somewhat complicated to carry out mental tests.

However, it should be realized that in this period, despite the many taboo subjects, a certain freedom still existed: it was still possible, for example, to travel abroad, to attend foreign conferences, and to correspond with foreign investigators. It is true, though, that these activities became increasingly difficult for non-communist thinkers. It was also still possible to follow the international scientific literature. Many books by outstanding foreign researchers — e.g. Freud, Jung, and Adler — were translated and translations of articles by internationally famous researchers were published in Soviet scientific journals. All in all, it is no exaggeration to say that the average Russian psychologist of this period was well acquainted with the latest international developments in his discipline. The works of Bühler, Köhler, Watson, Thorndike, Lévy-Bruhl, Durkheim, and Piaget all were available in Russian translation. The works of Piaget, for example, greatly influenced the research of Vygotsky, Leont'ev, Luria, and Basov. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that Vygotsky's⁶ famous *Thought and Language* is to a great extent the result of a scientific dialogue between the author and Piaget.

In the list of translated foreign authors mentioned above the name of Sigmund Freud has been deliberately left out as the vicissitudes of Freud's theories in the Soviet Union constitute an instructive case that

deserves a more detailed treatment. The history of the development, flowering, and demise of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union is very characteristic of the tragicomic history of Soviet psychology as a whole.

THE CASE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

Until very recently, it was not possible to buy any of Freud's books in the Soviet Union, nor could they be borrowed from public libraries. To Soviet psychologists this seemed the normal situation, a situation that had existed for decades. Not more than a handful of elderly psychologists may have remembered that in the past it had been otherwise. For in the Soviet Union, too, psychoanalysis has known its golden age: the period between 1910 and 1929.

The pioneers of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union were Osipov — who had studied in Switzerland under the supervision of Carl Jung —, Wulff, and Feltsmann. Osipov and Feltsmann published a series of books on psychoanalysis in the so-called "Psychotherapeutic Library" published by the state publishing house. Wulff was, among other things, the translator of many of Freud's books for this series, while Osipov published translations of important psychoanalytic papers written by Freud, Jung, Adler and others in his journal *Psychotherapy*. In short, practically all of Freud's books were immediately translated into Russian and many psychoanalytic papers were available in Soviet journals.

Several other facts testify to the general interest in Freudian theory. One is the foundation of many psychoanalytic associations or circles, of which the most important was "The Russian psychoanalytic society" in Moscow under the direction of Ermakov and Wulff. Among its members we find the now famous psychologists Blonsky, Bernstein, and Vygotsky. The presence of the latter is surprising, but signifies, probably, no more than the fact that Vygotsky in this period — around 1927 — took a keen interest in psychoanalytic theorizing. Although he once wrote a rather enthusiastic preface to Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*,⁷ Vygotsky never would be among Freud's ardent followers and became increasingly critical of his theories.

Things were completely different for his colleague and friend Aleksandr Luria. Luria had for some time headed a small circle of psychoanalysts in his native town Kazan. When, in December 1923, he

moved to Moscow he immediately joined the Moscow society and became its "scientific secretary." He was to play a very active role in the society: he frequently gave talks during the society's meetings, corresponded with many foreign psychoanalytic celebrities — including Freud —, wrote a couple of books about (the compatibility of) Marxism and psychoanalytic theory, etc.

Another colourful member of the Moscow society was Sabina Spielrein, who first had been a member of the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society. Spielrein, who was a native Russian, had been a student — and according to some sources the mistress — of Carl Jung. After this unique experience she herself for several years practised as a psychoanalyst. Among her clients we find Jean Piaget, who at that time was a member of the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society.⁸

It is clear, then, that many Russian psychologists were interested in psychoanalysis and that the knowledge of this new current was, in general, fairly adequate. To promote the scientific study of psychoanalytic theory one also founded in Moscow the Psychoanalytic Institute which included a sort of a psychoanalytic clinic for young children under the direction of Vera Schmidt. The aim was to study the development — above all the psychosexual development, of course — of the thirty or so children living permanently in the clinic. Recently Jaroshevskij⁹ has claimed that Stalin's son Vasilyj was among these children, but this statement has not been confirmed by other sources. Although the Psychoanalytic Institute experienced from time to time problems with the authorities — in one case the authorities investigated the rumor that the psychoanalysts *promoted* the children's sexual development —,¹⁰ the institute existed for years and its staff was allowed to publish on psychoanalytic case studies and theory. All this, however, changed in 1929.

In 1929 the important Soviet scientific journal *Under the Banner of Marxism* (*Pod znamenem marksizma*) published an article by the Austrian communist and psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich and Sapir's reply to this article. Sapir's reply — clearly written with the consent of the authorities — announced the sudden end of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union and of the attempts to create a sort of Freudo-Marxism. Again, the issue of the biological heredity of mental traits played an important role in the "debate" between Reich and Sapir.

Reich felt that psychoanalysis was compatible with the Marxist-

Leninist ideology and argued that for psychoanalysis humans were both social and biological beings. They were social beings as the ego (partially) and the super-ego (completely) were determined by the social class the person belonged to. Sapir did not accept Reich's arguments and claimed that psychoanalysis was not just another scientific theory but an ideology. Referring to Freud's later books (*Totem and Taboo* and *The Future of an Illusion*) he remarked that Freud defended a very pessimistic view concerning the possibility of reforming society. Freud had also claimed that the possibility of a civilized society rested on the minimal chance of dominating or sublimating the biological forces of the unconscious. To Sapir this was a far too pessimistic and, therefore, unacceptable point of view.

Sapir summarized psychoanalysis' shortcomings in the following way: (1) in his later books Freud had developed a sort of social ideology. In so doing he had exceeded the bounds of the psychotherapeutic clinic and sketched a view of the human condition and society. This was a serious mistake as only one authority (the Party) was capable of really understanding the complex laws of society; and (2) every theory that seriously doubted the possibility of a radical reform of society and the human being was considered unscientific exactly for that reason.

Sapir's article proclaimed the condemnation of psychoanalysis and the closure of the Psychoanalytic Society and the Psychoanalytic Institute. All of Freud's books were removed from the bookshops and public and scientific libraries, and it was no longer allowed to quote from his writings. The results of this ban can be felt to this very day: a Soviet psychologist can easily sell his private copies of Freud's translated books for two or three hundred roubles, that is, the equivalent of a month's salary of a university teacher.

Sapir's paper also announced the end of a period of relative freedom in Soviet psychology. Now the horrible era of xenophobia had commenced in which all citations from foreign scientific works had become suspect and, practically, forbidden. The new norm would be that all foreign scientific theories were erroneous *because* the authors were foreigners and, thus, neither Soviets, nor therefore, real Marxists and, consequently, could not have correct opinions. The virtually complete isolation of Soviet psychology had begun, and it would not be long before it was officially declared a non-science.

1936: THE PEDOLOGY DECREE

The events of 1929 had greatly complicated the life of Soviet psychologists, but it was still possible to work in applied or theoretical branches of psychology provided one avoided quoting foreign authors. In fact, many applied psychologists worked with diagnostic instruments developed abroad, such as the translated Binet-Simon test, etc. Many of them called themselves "pedologists," that is, they considered themselves as representatives of the new science of pedology.

Pedology was an international phenomenon, its most renowned upholders being Claparède and Stanley-Hall. It was a discipline that, in particular from 1930 onwards, aimed to study the psychological development of children and young people and sought to combine the findings of several sciences. Combining the observations of all experts — medical doctors, pedagogues, psychiatrists, and psychologists — it attempted to understand and predict the course of child development. Pedology, then, constituted an interdisciplinary science ahead of its time.

The majority of pedologists frequently applied mental tests and, as many tended to consider the observed individual differences (whether they were seen as the result of the environment or of hereditary factors) to be hardly modifiable, their approach led to the multiplication of the number of special schools adapted to specific mental levels. Such was, at least, the opinion of the Party and on the basis of this diagnosis it was decided in 1936, by the Central Committee of the Party, to ban the science of pedology, pedological and psychological publications, and the application of mental tests. The Committee solemnly declared that

The antiscientific bourgeois pedology has as its goal the protection of the ruling class and ... thus seeks to prove that particular talents ... justify the existence of the exploiting classes ...

The background of this decree may have been that children of workers and farmers — the part of the population pushed forward by the Party for the occupation of important positions — did not score many points on the usual (and undoubtedly biased) mental tests. There is also a rumor that Stalin's son Vasily had been diagnosed as mentally subnormal.

As from this day, it was no longer advisable to determine individual differences in mental ability, and both pedology and psychology were banned. The books of prominent pedologists and psychologists were removed from all libraries, the quotation of their work became impossible, etc. In this way, all the writings by Vygotsky — who had been a prominent professor of pedology —, Zalkind — the chief editor of the journal *Pedology* —, and Blonsky disappeared for several decades from the domain of public debate. Vygotsky, in particular, must have been seen as a singularly dangerous pedologist, because even in 1937 (three years after his death!) a special brochure was published outlining his many mistakes in the field of pedology.¹¹

Another consequence of the Pedology Decree was that different branches of applied psychology, such as the psychodiagnostics of problem children, disappeared without a trace. The (in)famous pedagogue Makarenko, whose ideas about the formative role of the collective harmonized with the prevailing ideology, would henceforth dominate the domain of applied psychology.

Finally, in 1948, — when Lysenko and his comrades ran rampant — the Party took a decision that formally laid down the rules of the game for years to come. It was officially declared that science had established the unshakeable truth that

the psyche of man with his character traits, his motives and emotions is completely formed by the influence of education and upbringing.¹²

THE CASE OF DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN

After 1950 it became again possible to practise psychology, although the Party decisions of 1936 and 1948 indicated very clear bounds to the spirit of free scientific enterprise. Of course, psychologists differed in their way of dealing with these bounds. Some fled into relatively non-ideological branches of psychology, such as psycho-physiology, or gave up publishing. Others tried to avoid sensitive topics in their writings. Still others subscribed to the official world view and tried to corroborate it in practice. An instructive example of the latter approach is furnished by the psychologists Leont'ev, Mešeryakov, and Davydov, and the philosopher Il'enkov in their publications on the education of

deaf-blind children. It is well worth devoting a few lines to their remarkable investigations before switching to the discussion of the changes in psychology caused by Gorbachev's political reform.

According to these investigators, the case of deaf-blind children was theoretically very interesting, as one could observe the "pure" influence of the environment and demonstrate that even in this case it was possible to realize normal or even superior mental development.¹³ The investigators claimed that four of the children they had raised and educated had been deaf-blind from their birth¹⁴ and, consequently, "did not yet have a psyche." Mešerjakov and Il'enkov even claimed¹⁵ (*ibid*, p. 21) that these children did not show the orientation reflex and that it was necessary to create it deliberately.

The point of departure of Mešerjakov and his colleagues was that the education of these children should start with the formation of practical motor activity, followed by the learning of gestural language, and still later — as the crowning achievement — by vocal language. In this way the mental development of these children would repeat the development of the human species as described by Friedrich Engels: labor — that is, practical activity — developed first, and was only then followed by language.¹⁶

In sum, these researchers wished to argue that the results of the education and upbringing of these children were fully attributable to the environment — controlled by themselves — and that the children's mental development constituted the definite proof of the Marxist-Leninist world view.

The results of this unique experiment have been described in various books¹⁷ and they were truly remarkable. These four children learned to use vocal speech, to write, and even finished university studies. However, today we know that the history of this remarkable pedagogical experiment was a myth. One of the deaf-blind children, the psychologist Sirotkin, has recently revealed that none of them was truly deaf-blind from birth and that they had mastered vocal speech relatively well before the whole experiment commenced. He has also severely criticized the affirmations by Leont'ev, Davydov, Mešerjakov, and Il'enkov that their whole mental development was the result of psychologist's efforts. In reality the children were playing with peers practically all the time and communicating with each other by means of gestures. Sirotkin

underlined the importance of this spontaneous interaction and argued that one can never fully control or determine the mental development of children — not even in the extreme case of deaf-blind children — and that the striving for complete control betrays a totalitarian and dangerous ideal. Sirotkin and Šakenova¹⁸ were able to conclude that (1) the experiment proved very little as the children were not completely deaf-blind; (2) it was not true that these children “did not have a psyche” before the experiment. Moreover, they had already mastered vocal speech fairly well; (3) children who are completely deaf-blind from birth are extremely rare and so far no one has observed that such children reach superior development; and (4) it is not certain that the best way to speak for these children is through vocal speech. This is a very topical subject and in recent books¹⁹ the authors have pleaded the case of sign language.

It is important to stress that these fraudulent publications did not take place in 1940 or 1950, but only ten years ago. It was only after the reform initiated by Gorbachev that the real facts gradually became known and that the demasking of ideologues-imposters could start.²⁰

THE PERESTROJKA

It is well-known that Gorbachev from the beginning of his political reform has underlined the importance of the role of individual and humanitarian values. The background of this emphasis may have been a very practical one: Gorbachev knows very well that the attitude of most citizens is rather cynical and passive, therefore, psychologists should examine ways to stimulate their motivation. The economic reform is in need of capable persons in positions fitted to their capacities and, therefore, the educational system has to be reformed and individual differences between people have to be admitted.²¹ Gorbachev has understood that competition and rivalry between various groups of scientific researchers favor the progress of science and he has, consequently, *recommended competition and pluralism in science*. In addition, he has claimed that the social sciences have been perverted by Stalinism and “the era of stagnation” — that is, the period of Brezhnev’s rule — and he has indicated the necessity of studying anew the history of the sciences in the Soviet Union. In this way he has hinted that it

would be permissible to rewrite the history of psychology. As will be seen below psychologists have well understood this recommendation.²² Gorbachev wishes to reform the economy of the country and he has perceived that applied psychology — above all psychodiagnostics and ergonomics — can play an important role in this respect. He has, consequently, emphasized the importance of the applied social sciences. One may see that the reasons for Gorbachev's reform may not (only) have been a concern with the deplorable moral state of the country or a concern with the stagnation in science, but are based on sound practical reasoning.

Naturally, Gorbachev's words were received favorably by psychologists. They explain the onset of a feverish activity: the principal journals published reports of "round table discussions"; editorials repeated Gorbachev's wise words, various conferences on the reform of psychology were organized, etc. A quick scan of the last three volumes of the major Soviet psychology journals reveals more than fifty papers dedicated to the theme of psychology's reform. Below several of the positive results of the reform initiated by Gorbachev and his allies will be related. These will be followed in the final paragraph by some more sceptical remarks.

Rewriting History

Following official consent, many researchers have recently argued in favor of a renewed study of Soviet psychology's history²³ and, in fact, it can be said that today Soviet psychologists are in the process of rewriting the history of their discipline. Nikol'skaja²⁴ and Radzikhovsky,²⁵ for example, have pleaded for the re-evaluation of the writings of Chelpanov, and Mitjušin²⁶ has shown the value of the works of the maligned non-Marxist Gustav Špet, professor at Moscow University in the 1920s. Others have pleaded for a re-evaluation of psychoanalysis. Bodalev & Stolin²⁷ and Jaroševsky,²⁸ for example, — the latter in an article entitled "The return of Freud" — have argued that Freud's theories are not without practical and theoretical value and the journal *Psichologičeskij Žurnal* has published one of Freud's lectures.²⁹ Significant also is that several of Freud's books have now (again) been published by Soviet publishing houses.³⁰ Finally, Gil'bo³¹ has claimed

the theoretical compatibility of Freud's writings with Marxism arguing that the negation of biological factors in child development is as detrimental to psychology as the negation of the role of the environment. This last author also wishes to re-establish the Psychoanalytical Institute in order to promote the development of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union.

One finds also several authors³² who wish to rewrite the history of the Pedology Decree and the decision about heredity taken in 1948. Incidentally, the idea of an interdisciplinary science such as pedology is now considered promising;³³ recently the Institute of Man was founded, which has as its ambitious goal to integrate all the findings gathered by the various sciences dealing with the human being.³⁴

The Importance of Applied Psychology

Other authors have remarked that one of the most tragic consequences of the Pedology Decree was that great numbers of psychologists were forced to leave the applied branches of psychology. The consequences of the decree can be felt to this very day. Indeed, while in European countries the number of applied psychologists is approximately 85 percent, in the Soviet Union it is around 20 percent. As a result, the current scientific level of applied psychology is still very low.³⁵ The fact that in the Soviet Union the number of both applied and theoretical psychologists is very low is also in part a consequence of the Pedology Decree. Calculating the density of psychologists in the whole population one finds that the US has 75 psychologists per 100,000 inhabitants, whereas the Soviet Union has only 2³⁶ (one may, however, relativize these numbers by pointing out that in other European countries the density is also rather lower than in the USA. Switzerland, for example, is said to have a density of 8 psychologists per 100,000 inhabitants).

Still other authors have underlined the importance of humanitarian — and even Christian — values; they have criticized bureaucracy, the non-existence of competing schools in psychology; the lack of open scientific debates; they have underlined the role of the individual versus the collective; criticized the xenophobia and the misplaced superiority feelings of Soviet psychologists, and so on.

In short, reading the scientific journals one comes to the conclusion that a relative liberty of expression exists and that in this respect the situation has improved greatly since the 1980s. Soviet researchers are busy re-evaluating the classic Soviet and non-Soviet theories of psychology's history.

WHAT DID NOT CHANGE

The fact that several of the abovementioned new developments in Soviet psychology are clearly favorable for the development of scientific psychology should not blind us to some of the still existing deplorable features of Soviet psychology.

One can still read, for example, scientific articles³⁷ that adhere to the model that is well-known from totalitarian countries: "Mister Gorbachev has underlined . . . and, *therefore*, the degree of our responsibility to the Party and the people is very great . . .",³⁸ or "The Party and the government count on a more radical reform in psychology . . . The Soviet psychologists declare that they completely approve of the reform and innovation of society by the Party, and that they are aware of their responsibilities both as citizens and professionals . . .".³⁹

Such phrases are still rather frequent and they betray a style of writing — of thinking, perhaps — that is not much different from that of the scientific climate of 1929 or 1948. It is an unsettling idea that it may take decades to eradicate the culture of mental slavery these phrases stand for. In this context a recent article written by academician Egorov⁴⁰ is of great significance. Comrade Egorov wished "to study the passive attitude of certain persons regarding the reform of society" and he made it quite clear that it is the duty of each Soviet psychologist to stimulate a "more mature" consciousness in his fellow citizens.

Recently a major psychology journal even published a debate between two psychologists, in which one of them declared that his opponent had written letters to the Party accusing him of being an opponent of the reform in psychology.⁴¹ These are well-tried methods typical of an ancient tradition in totalitarian states such as China and the Soviet Union. It is also strange and unsettling that so far there is no sign of dissidence in the scientific press. Suddenly everybody wishes to rewrite the history of psychology, everybody wishes to improve the

situation in applied psychology, and all underline the need to study mental differences between individuals. Nobody defends the truths of former days, no one has defended the one-dimensional truth of the ideology of the social nature of human beings and virtually everybody agrees that above all Stalin and Brezhnev caused the contemporary deplorable situation. One may read several very interesting articles about Stalinism⁴² in which the authors represent Stalinism as a sort of pseudoreligion with all the rituals and sacrifices that go with it, but articles critical of Lenin, Marx, or Gorbachev himself have not yet seen the light.

It is evident, therefore, that for the moment the choice of subjects for scientific discussion is still rather limited and determined by the authorities. It would seem that Gorbachev and his allies are not striving toward (some limited form of) democracy for democracy's sake, but rather toward (economic) goals they have set themselves. In this sense Gorbachev is more of an enlightened despot than a democrat: he and his allies have stimulated the reform and so far have been able to dictate the rules of the game. But the game played is a very risky one and today we have seen in the political domain that when "homo sovieticus"⁴³ has come to like something it is very difficult to turn the hands of the clock back. Gorbachev risks losing the game he started and one can do little more than be poised between hope and fear.

NOTES

¹ Popper, K. R. (1945/1974). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

² Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1988), "Diskussionnye problemy marksistskoj teorii v sovetskoj psikhologičeskoj nauke", *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1, 124-131; p. 124.

³ Lenin, V. J. (1909), *Materializm i empiriokritizizm*, Moscow: GIZ.

⁴ Vygotsky, L. S. (1926), *Pedagogičeskaja psikhologija. Kratkij kurs*, Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveščeniija; pp. 345-347.

⁵ Kevles, D. J. (1985), *In the Name of Eugenics*, Berkeley: University of California Press; p. 86.

⁶ Vygotsky, L. S. (1934), *Myšlenie i reč. Psikhologičeskie issledovanija*, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Social'noe-Ekonomičeskoe Izdatel'stvo.

⁷ Vygotsky, L. S., & Lurija, A. R. (1925), Predislovie. In S. Freud, *Po tu storonu principa udovol'stviia*, Moscow: Sovremennye Problemy.

⁸ Van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991), *The Quest for Synthesis. Life and Work of Lev Vygotsky*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- ⁹ Jaroševskij, M. G. (1988), "Vosvraščenie Frejda", *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 129—138; p. 131.
- ¹⁰ Van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991). *The quest for synthesis. Life and work of Lev Vygotsky*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ¹¹ Rudneva, E. I. (1937), *Pedologičeskie izvraščeniya Vygotskogo*, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Učebno-Pedagogičeskoe Izdatel'stvo.
- ¹² "Puti perestrojki psikhologičeskoj nauki," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1988, 5, 5—16; p. 6.
- ¹³ Levitin, K. (1982), *One Is Not Born a Personality*, Moscow: Progress Publishers; Suvorov, A. V. (1988), "Problemy formirovaniya i samorazvitiya lichnosti v usloviyakh slepogluchoty," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 5, 97—106.
- ¹⁴ Sirotkin, S. A., & Šakenova, E. K. (1988a), "Aktual'nye problemy tiflosurdepedagogiki v svete perestrojki psikhologii," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 5, 20—22; p. 20.
- ¹⁵ See Suvorov (1988), p. 21.
- ¹⁶ Van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991), *The Quest for Synthesis. Life and Work of Lev Vygotsky*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ¹⁷ Mešerjakov, A. I. (1974), *Slepoglukhonome deti*, Moscow: Pedagogika.
- ¹⁸ Sirotkin, S. A., & Šakenova, E. K. (1988b), "Istorija vydajuščegosja eksperimenta: mify i real'nost'," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 5, 107—116.
- ¹⁹ Sacks, O. (1989), *Seeing Voices. A Journey into the World of the Deaf*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- ²⁰ "O zadačakh psikhologičeskoj nauki v svete rešenij fevral'skogo (1988 g.) plenuma CK KPPS," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 1988, 9, 3—9; "Puti perestrojki psikhologičeskoj nauki," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1988, 5, 5—16.
- ²¹ "Zadači perestrojki i aktual'nye problemy psikhologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 1987, 8, 4, 3—9.
- ²² "Zadači perestrojki . . .", pp. 8—9.
- ²³ Bodalev, A. A., & Stolin, V. V. (1988), "O perestrojke v psikhologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 3, 16—25; Gil'bo, E. V. (1988), "O sud'be psikhoanaliza," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 4, 9—11; Jaroševskij, M. G. (1988), "Vosvraščenie Frejda," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 129—138; Mitjušin, A. A. (1988), "G. Špet i ego mesto v istorii otečestvennoj psikhologii," *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Serija 13. Psikhologija*, 2, 33—42; Nikol'skaja, A. A. (1989), "Zadači razrabotki istorii psikhologii v Rossii," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1, 14—22; Petrovskij, A. V. (1988), "Nepročitannye stranicy istorii psikhologii — tridcatye gody," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 4, 125—138; Petrovskij, A. V. (1989a), "Ob etike, i ne tol'ko professional'noj," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 3, 132—137; Petrovskij, A. V. (1989b), "Zadači i napravlennija perestrojki pedagogičeskoj nauki," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 2, 14—19; Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1988), "Diskussionnye problemy marksistskoj teorii v sovetskoj psikhologičeskoj nauke," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1, 124—131; Ščedrina, E. V. (1988), "Zadači psikhologičeskoj nauki v period perestrojki," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 3, 180—183; Ždan, A. N., & Umrikhin, V. V. (1988), "Sostojanie i tendencii razvitiya istorii psikhologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 1, 159—160.
- ²⁴ Nikol'skaja, A. A. (1989), "Zadači razrabotki istorii psikhologii v Rossii," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1, 14—22.
- ²⁵ Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1988), "Diskussionnye problemy marksistskoj teorii v sovetskoj psikhologičeskoj nauke," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1, 124—131.
- ²⁶ Mitjušin, A. A. (1988), "G. Špet i ego mesto v istorii otečestvennoj psikhologii," *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Serija 13. Psikhologija*, 2, 33—42.

- ²⁷ Bodalev, A. A., & Stolin, V. V. (1988), "O perestrojke v psihologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 3, 16–25.
- ²⁸ Jaroševskij, M. G. (1988), "Vosvraščenie Frejda," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 129–138.
- ²⁹ Frejd, Z. [Freud, S.] (1988), "Razdelenie psichičeskoj ličnosti. Tridcat' pervaja lekcija," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 139–145.
- ³⁰ Frejd, Z. [Freud, S.] (1989a), "Vvedenie v psichoanaliz," Moscow: Nauka; Frejd, Z. [Freud, S.] (1989b), "Psikhologija bessoznatel'nogo," Moscow: Prosveščenie.
- ³¹ Gil'bo, E. V. (1988), "O sud'be psichoanaliza," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 4, 9–11.
- ³² Bodalev, A. A., & Stolin, V. V. (1988), "O perestrojke v psihologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 3, 16–25; Brušlinskij, A. V. (1988), "Uglubljal' fundamental'nye issledovaniya, povysat' kul'turu nauchnykh diskussij," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 1, 5–8; Etkind, A. M. (1988), "Vozmožnosti psichologii v obespečenii social'nykh izmenenij," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 3, 9–11; Gil'bukh, Ju. Z. (1988), "Kamen', kotoryj prezreli stroiteli," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 4, 7–9; Petrovskij, A. V. (1988), "Nepročitannye stranicy istorii psichologii — tridcatye gody," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 4, 125–138; "Perestrojka psichologii: Problemy, puti rešenija (Kruglyj stol)," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 1988, 5, 16–26.
- ³³ Tolstyykh, N. N., & Filippova, E. V. (1988a), "Kompleksnye issledovaniya čeloveka," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 5, 3–13.
- ³⁴ Tolstyykh, N. N., & Filippova, E. V. (1988b), "Kompleksnye issledovaniya čeloveka," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 23–25; Šorochova, E. V. (1989), "Psikhologičeskaja nauka v uslovijach perestrojki," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 10, 4, 3–18.
- ³⁵ Bodalev, A. A., & Stolin, V. V. (1988), "O perestrojke v psihologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 3, 16–25; Gil'bukh, Ju. Z. (1988), "Kamen', kotoryj prezreli stroiteli," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 4, 7–9; Nikologorskij, S. (1988), "Psikhologija i perestrojka (s točki zrenija molodogo učeno)," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 4, 159–161; Orlov, A. B. (1988), "K probleme dialektičeskoj paradigmy v sovetskoj psichologičeskoj nauke," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 1, 131–136; Ponomarenko, V. A. (1988), "Glasnost' kak golos sovesti (polemičeskie zametki)," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 6, 21–23; Ponomarev, Ja. A., & Gadžiev, Ch. M. (1988), "Problemy perestrojki praktičeskoj psichologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 2, 20–26; Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1988), "Diskussionnye problemy marksistskoj teorii v sovetskoj psichologičeskoj nauke," *Voprosy psichologii*, 1, 124–131.
- ³⁶ Šorochova, E. V. (1989), "Psikhologičeskaja nauka v uslovijach perestrojki," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 10, 4, p. 14.
- ³⁷ Bodalev, A. A. (1988), "Pedagogičeskaja nauka i perspektivy ee razvitija v uslovijach perestrojki obščestva i školy," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 2, 113–122. Ponomarev, Ja. A., & Gadžiev, Ch. M. (1988), "Problemy perestrojki praktičeskoj psichologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 2, 20–26. "Puti perestrojki psichologičeskoj nauki," *Psikhologičeskoj Žurnal*, 1988, 6, 3–10.
- ³⁸ "O zadačah psichologičeskoj nauki v svete rešenij fevral'skogo (1988 g.) plenuma CK KPSS," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 1988, 9, 4, 3–9; emphasis added.
- ³⁹ "Potencial psichologičeskoj nauki — perestrojke obščestva," *Voprosy Psichologii*, 1989, 5, 5–10.
- ⁴⁰ Egorov, A. G. (1988), "Nasuščnye zadaci perestrojki psichologičeskoj nauki," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 9, 4, 11–21.

⁴¹ Nemov, R. S. (1989), "O korrektnosti kritiki, professional'noj etike redaktora (avtora) i kačestve glavy "kollektiv" bazogo učebnika "Obščaja psikhologija," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 3, 127—132; Petrovskij, A. V. (1989a), "Ob etike, i ne tol'ko professional'noj," *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 3, 132—137.

⁴² Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1989a), "O psikhologičeskom aspekte kul'ta ličnosti," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 10, 2, 143—147; Radzikhovskij, L. A. (1989b), "Velikij psikholog," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 10, 5, 111—123; Džrnazjan, L. N. (1989), "Stalinism: preemstvennost' obščestvennoj psikhologii," *Psikhologičeskij Žurnal*, 10, 6, 110—116.

⁴³ Zinov' ev, A. (1982), *Gomo sovetikus*, Lausanne: L'age d'Homme.

Department of Education
University of Leiden
Wassenaarseweg 52
2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands