

VALENTIN BAZHANOV

PHILOSOPHY IN POST-SOVIET RUSSIA (1992–1997)

*Background, Present State, and Prospects**

ABSTRACT. The author argues that the decline of philosophical thought and research in Russia is over. He describes the state of present-day philosophy in Russia, its background, and prospects for development citing concrete examples and little known facts.

Any survey of the state of the philosophy in post-Communist Russia is a complicated task requiring accuracy and completeness. Whether I succeed in this task remains to be seen, although I shall be content if I manage to present a clear picture. It will of course be subjective and reflect my interests and preferences, remaining in this sense quite incomplete. But I aim to present a concise survey, identifying the most important trends, personalities, and topics of discussion.

I shall focus on changes with respect to the following issues: 1) the state of research in philosophy, in particular noticeable shifts in problematics, geography, and management; 2) philosophical education, i.e., noticeable development in problematics, approaches, geography, and management. Moreover, I shall examine the origin of these shifts and assess whether they are of a qualitative character.

KEY WORDS: philosophy in the Soviet Union, philosophy in post-Soviet Russia, institutional contexts of philosophy, currents in contemporary Russian philosophy, philosophical publications in Russia

Visiting Moscow in 1991 and 1992, I used to go to the Lenin Library (now the Russian State Library). Its halls were almost deserted, unattended; only a few tables were illuminated by enterprising visitors who had brought their own lightbulbs; the air was chilly. Everything about the place suggested an air of decadence and dejection. Things were no better at the Institute of Philosophy at Volkhonka. Its staff showed up only on those infrequent occasions when wages were paid. Gone were the days only a couple of years ago when the “Red Hall” of the Institute was overcrowded with all in attendance anxious to listen and to speak out during the

* An earlier version of this text was presented under the same title at the IREES annual conference in Glasgow, January 1998. My participation at this conference was made possible by a British Academy Fellowship.



stormy debates concerning issues about which it had been virtually impossible to speak just a few years earlier: the history of Russian philosophy, the history and reassessment of Marxism in Russia, Marxism's impact on the Soviet people, and the Stepanokert earthquake tragedy, as well as the events in Baku. The walls of the "Red Hall" had been shaken by novel words, novel issues, and novel approaches. Gradually the Hall became quiet. The debates subsided, people disappeared. Libraries substantially decreased subscriptions to periodicals and stopped purchasing books. Fantastic inflation gobbled up tiny earnings. A sense of irreversible decline went hand-in-hand with a sense of the uselessness of philosophy and philosophers. The early 1990s might be called the harshest period in the history of Russian science and philosophy in the second half of the twentieth century.

BACKGROUND

Gorbachev's perestroika had a profound impact on the "social sciences," as they were called in the USSR: the history of the CPSU, political economy, scientific communism, and Marxist philosophy. All these disciplines experienced the impact of the official ideology to a greater (for instance, the history of the CPSU) or lesser (say, philosophy) degree. As the ground began to give way under the feet of the CPSU, it launched a curriculum reform and renamed the Departments. Scientific communism became political science or sociology, scientific communists changed into political scientists or sociologists; the history of CPSU turned into the history of the Motherland. For the army of historical materialists affiliated with the Departments of Philosophy, and suddenly threatened with unemployment, the Ministry for Higher Education invented a new domain, culturology.

In 1989, the State Committee for People's Education (formerly, the Ministry for Higher Education) issued the new "Standard Philosophy syllabus" prepared by the Department for Social Science (including the Humanities). The syllabus differed radically from the previous one, being by far less ideologically saturated. Emphasis now fell on the history of philosophy, with Marxist philosophy rele-

gated to just one chapter. Lenin was mentioned only a couple of times.

Whereas in the the early and mid-1980s I had been obliged (following severe reprimand by my Chairperson) to adhere strictly in my lectures and exams to the official syllabus, by the late 1980s lecturers were given the freedom to create their own syllabus, taking the new official syllabus only loosely into account. In 1989, the State examination on Marxism-Leninism took place for the last time.

I recall that the vigorous debate concerning the state of Soviet philosophy began following the appearance of a short article by two graduate students in *‘Junost’*, published in 1988. About the same time, the works of the Russian philosophers who had been exiled in 1922 returned to prominence, signaling a revival of Russian philosophy as a field of investigation. Roundtable discussions devoted to Russian philosophy were held at the Institute of Philosophy as well as at the Philosophy Faculty of the Moscow State University (cf. *VF*, 1988, 9; *FN*, 1989, 8). *VF* issued a supplementary book series under the title “The history of Russian philosophical thought.” Several editions of Berdjaev’s books appeared. (I recall how envious I was to see my colleagues with Berdjaev’s *Istoki i smysl’ russkogo kommunizma*, published originally by the YMCA Press, and in Moscow in 1990. It soon sold out in most bookstores.) Daniil Andreyev’s book appeared, though it was quickly forgotten; titles by Orwell, Koestler, and Solzhenitsyn became available – a veritable flood of new literature. The “big” journals like *Novyj mir*, *Druzhba narodov*, *Znamja* published many striking articles and essays. It was impossible not to spend all one’s time reading. Long queues stood in front of the kiosks waiting for the *Moscow News* and *Ogonyok* (by the way, at the time the English edition of the *Moscow News* was much cheaper and more readily available than the Russian edition).

The former “servants” of the ideology now became leaders of new democratic movements and parties. Among them was the rector of the CPSU higher institute, V.N. Shostakovsky; V.N. Lysenko, G. Burbulis, both former teachers of scientific communism, assumed leadership of the Democratic platform in the CPSU. Many who had treated CPSU membership as a work permit – for instance, in philosophy – now abandoned it; others did so when they learned about communist atrocities, for instance the famine brought about

in the Ukraine. I dropped out of the CPSU in June of 1990. Among the 120 CPSU members in the Social sciences departments within the CPSU organisation of Kazan University, only two of us dared to say goodbye to the party: myself, as a Doctor of Science, not a Professor, and a graduate student of the Political Economy department, whose step was much riskier than mine. For a while many of our colleagues treated us like lepers, especially older members of the Department of Scientific Communism, although some remained outwardly indifferent. No one openly expressed approval. In the end, I lost no friends. The number of philosophers in Moscow who abandoned CPSU membership was much higher.

The social fermentation affected the philosophical community. Some skilled and high ranking philosophers began to move into different spheres of activity. For example, O. Terebilov, the chairman of the department in St.-Petersburg, entered commercial bookselling, lost interest in philosophy, and became a businessman. N. Gribanov, from Samara (likewise a chairperson) founded a bank. Some philosophers, first of all logicians, actively sought employment in the West; N. Kurtonina, N. Aleshina, and A. Blinov found positions in western universities. More traditional, so to speak, philosophers who relocated to the West included M. Akhundov, Yu. Balashov, and V.B. Rodos; others, while retaining their Russian citizenship, have been living abroad, such as A. Kozhevnikov, A. Alexandrov, and N. Kremontsov. Still others founded private universities, such as N. Voronina from Samara and A. Fedyayev from Naberezhnye Chelny. It is noteworthy that those who decided to begin a new life abroad or to move into commercial areas have all been relatively successful.

Scholars who had earlier kept clear of socio-political problems and were little inclined to adopt the primitive schemata of historical materialism, focusing instead on logic, philosophy of natural sciences, the history of ancient or non-Russian philosophy, as well as aesthetics, turned now with vigor to heretofore forbidden political problems. They began to publish insolent socio-political essays and to submit articles to journals abroad.

As usual, the truth came forth only gradually. Initially, communist crimes were spoken of as “deformations” of Lenin’s original ideas (the most shaking news was the publication of Raskol’nikov’s

“open letter” to Stalin). But a flood of new facts swept Lenin and Marx away (A. Tsipko, “Khoroshi li nashi principy?” *Novyi mir*, 1990, 4).

In academic circles, reinterpretation of the past began with pure, so to speak, scientific problems. The analysis of totalitarianism (see: *Totalitarizm kak istoricheskij fenomen*, M., 1989) included an account of the role of ideology in the development of science. M. Akhundov and L. Bazhenov published “U istokov ideologizirovannoj nauke”, *Priroda*, 1989, 2). Later it was published in expanded form in the brochure *Filosofija i fizyka v SSSR* M., 1989. In the field of mathematics N.M. Rozhenko told a similar story in “Filosofija, estestvoznamenie i politika: deformacija leninskogo zaveshaniya v 20-30-kh godakh” (M. INION, 1989). The Lysenko phenomenon was described in dozens of papers and books (see, for instance, V.A. Soifer, *Nauka i vlast'. Razgrom genetiki v SSR*. M., 1994; V. Filatov, “Ob istokakh lysenkovshiny of Lysenkois,” *Kvintessentia*. Filosofskii almanach. M., 1990; S. Resnik, “Pravda i loz' o Vavilove i Lysenko,” VIET, 1993, 2). The new concept of repressed science was introduced into the philosophers' lexicon (see: *Repressirovannaya nauka*, M., 1994; “Nauka i totalitarnaja vlast',” *Filosofskie issledovaniya*, 1993, 3, 4) and, thanks to my magic touch, philosophicide (Bazhanov V.A. “Istorija logiki i universitetskoj filosofii i logiki v Rossii. Vzgljad is Kazani,” *Modern Logic*, 1994, 2; *Prervannyj polet. Istorija universitetskoj filosofii i logiki v Rossii*, M., 1995).

Papers dealing with the low effectiveness of Soviet science were published everywhere (see, for example, G.I. Khanin. “Pochemu probyksovyvaet sovetskaja nauka?,” *Postizhenie*, M., 1989; G.A. Nesvetailov, “Bol'naja nauka v bol'nom obshchestve,” *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 1990, 1).

M.S. Geller published “Pervoe predosterezhenie – udar chlystom” (VF, 1990, 7), in which he recounts the horrifying facts about the destruction of the Russian intelligentsia in the twenties. Following the appearance of an article in *Literaturnaya gazeta'* (June 6, 1990), the topic of ships exporting the best Russian brains to the West became a platitude. The forceful deportation to the West of the Russian intelligentsia was described in all its details. In January 1991, the paper “Evening Kazan” (with a circulation

at that moment in the area of 700, 000 copies) and “Nauka” (very popular among Kazan intellectuals) published my translation of the chapter “Lenin, Trotsky, Gorkii” from B. Russell’s *The Theory and Practice of Bolshevism*. The book was published in the same year by Nauka. A year earlier, a chapter appeared from Z. Brzezinski’s book, *The Great Collapse. The Agony of Communism*, Kvintessetia, M., 1990, with detailed commentaries by Yu. Krasin. The latter did his best to “explain” Brzezinski’s claims and reject his conclusions, asserting that socialism was at the turning point. It is worth recalling that during the Soviet epoch when philosophers criticised Western ideas, they actually presented, in this strange form, the best and most interesting Western theories. The works of I. Lakatos, T. Kuhn, K. Popper, S. Toulmin, and M. Polanyi were published in this manner, and Soviet philosophers used and taught their ideas quite widely.

Two journals (*Priroda* and *VF*), to which I submitted my translation of Jean van Heijenoort’s article, “Engels and mathematics,” proposed to publish it simultaneously in the immediate future. This article dealt with Engels’ knowledge and treatment of philosophical issues related to mathematics and debunked the myth concerning his comprehension of both mathematics and philosophy of mathematics. As *Priroda* made a more attractive proposal, the paper appeared in the August 1991 issue of the journal (I hate to think what might have happened had the August 1991 putsch been successful). Many philosophers were engaged in publicist work or public activity: I. Mochalov had been writing for *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, N. Kiyashchenko for *Sovetskaja kul’tura* (later *Kul’tura*), and L. Radzikhovsky became a popular commentator. A.I. Uemov from Odessa was the leader of the People’s front, A.I. Tsofnas was among the candidates for a seat in the USSR Supreme Soviet but lost to the CPSU boss, M.V. Popovich from Kyiv, actively supported by “Ruch.” Some philosophers, including influential personalities, vigorously supported CPRF (I personally know several from Moscow, Nizhniy Novgorod, Perm, Kazan, and Samara). Philosophers are as stratified as the rest of society.

PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION

There are approximately 575 chairs in Philosophy in present-day Russia, some 5,800 lecturers, of them 15% hold the doctor of science (DSC) degree, 45% the PhD (L.N. Moskvichev's data, according to which there are 1500 DSC in philosophy, is implausible, although his estimation that 60% of DSC have "ideologized" degrees – in scientific communism or dialectical materialism – seems quite plausible). Since 1991, some 300 private universities have been opened. Only a couple are not given over to the Humanities, Social Sciences or Juridical faculties. Almost all lecturers at these universities work part-time.

Marxist-Leninist Philosophy was a mandatory subject for all Soviet students. In the 'classical' universities students followed some 140 hours of courses in the subject, whereas in the technical universities the load was reduced to about 90 hours. Philosophy is still mandatory along with History of the Fatherland (instead of the history of the CPSU), Economics (instead of Political Economy), Political Science (instead of Scientific Communism), Law, Psychology, and Culturology. Courses in philosophy comprise about 90 hours per year. Very often culturology is affiliated with the Philosophical Departments. In this case culturology becomes the Philosophy of Culture. If the Culturology Department includes former specialists in literature, musicians, or painters, Culturology becomes the study of art.

In 1994, the Ministry of Higher Education (I do not remember for sure, as its name changes frequently) issued new official syllabuses for all subjects, even theology. The syllabus for philosophy (applicable to non-philosophical and philosophical courses of study) remained vague consisting of only a dozen requirements. For culturology – four requirements.

The vagueness of the syllabus enables the lecturer to construct his courses in the way he deems best. However, the lack in the syllabuses of certain subjects (such as logic for students of law presupposed, so to speak, implicitly) opens the way to ousting useful subjects from the curriculums of certain areas of study.

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY

Personality plays the crucial role in the style, character, and art of teaching. The preparedness, involvement, and frame of mind of the teacher have a direct impact on the quality of teaching. I know young lecturers from Kazan University who still sincerely believe that we are not clever and educated enough to comprehend Marx. Even today there are a great number of PhD theses being prepared (especially in the old universities such as Kazan) on purely Marxist problems and in the Marxist idiom (on alienation for instance), usually by those who have backgrounds in the Humanities or Social Sciences. Many (but not all!) lecturers who are getting on in years continue to teach Marxist doctrine as they did 20 or 40 years ago. This is explained by their intellectual inertia as well as by their very restricted receptiveness to new knowledge and trends. But there is one consolation: students purge their minds swiftly. Those who engage in self-education will most likely not preserve devotion to the heritage of Marxism-Leninism. Younger lecturers have joined the permanent staff at the philosophical faculties only due to the natural process of changing generations. Thus fresh persons and fresh thoughts are not very frequent occurrences at the traditional centers of philosophical education in Russia—Moscow, St.-Petersburg, universities in the Ural, etc.

The philosophical faculty of Moscow State University, the best and leading Russian university, presents a typical case (see: A. Korolev. "Zapovednik krasnoj professury," *Moskovskii komsomolets*, 1996, July 11; A. Platonov, *Maski-shou*, *Ibid.*, 1996, November 27).

In 1990 all chairs of the faculty were – as elsewhere in the USSR – renamed. The chair for dialectical materialism became the chair for theoretical philosophy, the chair for historical materialism – social philosophy etc. Only the chair for logic was not affected by the sweeping changes. Nevertheless, according to the students' impressions most lecturers continue to speak about the same topics and in the same manner as before. Students continue to express esteem for the same professors as before the reforms, all of whom were neutral towards the ideology courses – history of philosophy (V.V. Sokolov, A.L. Dobrokhotov, A.N. Chanyshchev, and M.A. Maslin), theory of knowledge (V.V. Il'in). During the last

five years, only a few new lecturers have been affiliated with the philosophy faculty of the MSU.

Textbooks published nearly a decade ago were recently republished under another title (instead of “Dialectical Materialism” – “Philosophy”) without essential modification of the content. Often such editions were supported by Soros Foundation grants. The federal biblio-publishing program continues to exist. In 1994, under the auspices of this program, the textbook *Dialektika i teorija poznanija* (M., 1994) by I.Ya. Loifman and M.N. Rutkevich, was published. It was recommended by the Ministry of Higher Education. Were one ignorant of the year of publication, it would be absolutely impossible to guess, given the content of the book, when it was really published, in 1954, 1964, or 1994.

Almost all grant-providing foundations as well as the Ministry of Higher Education rely on experts affiliated with the biggest and leading universities, MGU, Russian State University for Humanities, St.-Petersburg University, and Urals University. It seems that Muscovites in particular are doing their best to ensure grants among their colleagues in the first round (the MGU staff holds 25% of all grants won by the Russian universities’ staff); moreover, the official directives as to what and how to teach reflect the values and traditions of the staff of these universities. The new universities which are springing up in provincial Russia like mushrooms after rain usually choose another approach, but the “center” is reluctant to give them much support.

The best philosophers were always concentrated not in the MGU but in the Institute of Philosophy of RAS as well as in the Institute for the History of Natural Sciences and Technology of RAS (both in Moscow; after V.S. Stepin became the Director of the Institute of Philosophy in 1987, many scholars affiliated with the Institute for the History of Natural Sciences and Technology followed him). Most of the best philosophical work is done by scholars within RAS, although the RAS contains its share of old-fashioned thinkers as well.

Accurate and extensive information about the philosophical community in Russia can be found in the source book *Filosofy Rossii XIX–XX stoletij*, P.V. Alexeyev (ed.), M., 1993/1995, revised and expanded edition.

CENTERS OF PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN
RUSSIA

Besides the philosophical faculty of the MSU, there are departments in St.-Petersburg, Rostov, Ural, Udmurt State University, Russian State University for Humanities (RSUH) as well as at some private universities such as the Samara University for Humanities. As far as I know, the mood in MSU is prevalent everywhere except, perhaps, in St.-Petersburg and in RSUH.

In my opinion, the philosophical “stars” in St.-Petersburg are M.S. Kagan and K.S. Pigrov (philosophy of culture), G.L. Tul’chinsky (very broad interests), T.V. Artem’eva and A.F. Zamaleev (history of Russian philosophy), B.V. Markov (philosophical anthropology), and V.P. Bransky (philosophy of science). The Dean of the philosophical faculty at the University, Yu. N. Solonin, has a profound and acute vision of modernity.

Rostov is not interesting in the philosophical sense (except for, perhaps, V. Makarenko in social philosophy).

In Ekaterinburg the notable figures are B.V. Emel’yanov (history of Russian philosophy) and D.V. Pivovarov (systematic philosophy). From the older generation, I.Ya. Loifman and K.N. Lyubutin are still active, but their conceptions are out of date.

In Izhevsk, N.S. Ladyzhets is well known for her investigations into the Idea of the University.

In Voronezh, A.S. Kravets and S.N. Zharov (philosophy of science and culture) are active.

In Tver, B.L. Goubman (philosophy of culture and religion).

In Samara, V.A. Konev (philosophy of culture), V.N. Borisov (1917–1997), and A.A. Shestakov – both in systematic philosophy.

In Kazan – V.I. Kurashov (philosophy of natural sciences).

In Nizhnii Novgorod – V.A. Kutyrev (social philosophy).

In Kaliningrad – V.N. Bryushinkin (philosophy of logic).

In Moscow, there is a whole constellation of notable scholars. V.I. Arshinov, E.N. Knyazeva, A.I. Panchenko, A.A. Pechenkin (philosophy of physics), A.G. Barabashev, M.I. Panov (philosophy of mathematics), N.I. Kuznetsova, M.A. Rozov, V.V. Nalimov (1910–1997), V.N. Sadovsky, V.P. Filatov, V.A. Lektorsky, L.A. Mikeshina, V.A. Podoroga, P.P. Gaidenko, A.P. Ogurtsov, Yu.A. Schreider, E. Solov’ev, G.V. Sorina (systematic philosophy), V.V.

Il'in, A.S. Panarin, K.S. Gadzhiev, B.G. Kapustin (philosophy of politics), A.A. Gusejnov, R.A. Apressyan, Ju. I. Davydov, E.Yu Solov'ev (ethics), S.S. Khoruzhyj (history of Russian philosophy), M.M. Novoselov (philosophy of logic), and I.I. Mochalov (history of Russian spiritual culture and science).

It goes without saying that this listing is not exhaustive.

Unfortunately, connections with philosophical centers in the new independent states – Kiev, Odessa, Minsk, Alma-Ata, and Erevan – have been substantially weakened. In the case of Erevan or Alma-Ata it is difficult to speak of 'philosophical centers' without abuse of the term. Scholars have sunk into depression or have even left the country. Many scholars still living abroad do their best to publish their works in Russia (from Minsk, V.F. Berkov, L.F. Kuznetsova, and Ya. S. Yaskevich; from Odessa, A.I. Uemov, A. Yu. Tsofnas, and L.N. Sumarokova). Scholars from Crimea are very closely tied to their Russian colleagues. Kyevan philosophers are mostly leading separate lives (except, perhaps, I. Dobronravova – philosophy of physics). Only the glorious Soviet past brings Kyevan scholars to the pages of Russian journals (see: "P.V. Kopnin: the philosopher and the man," VF, 1997, N 10).

RESEARCH

The state of research in philosophy is "bivalent." On one hand, the philosophical community has lost some of its members and interest in the academic profession has declined (as in other domains). The philosophical community at present consists mainly of those for whom science is a way of life. On the other hand, university lecturers have for the first time the chance to seek modest funding for their research. The overall situation is close to being paradoxical. Higher education (in the State Universities and Institutions) is funded by two different and disjunct channels – so-called "\$47" grants (namely education, lecturers) and "\$53" grants (scientific studies, researchers).¹ \$47 grants manage somehow to obtain support (usually 50–60% of its budget) from the Government. \$53 grants are close to death, for in the fifth year running they have received no more than one-tenth, at best one-fifth of the targeted budget (the average wage of a senior lecturer is \$180.00, that of a

researcher is ten times less.²⁾ Departments and institutions affiliated with the universities are catastrophically close to total disappearance. The situation in RAS is much better. Nevertheless, almost all RAS members work part-time in the universities.

a) Publications

The circulations of the leading philosophical journals have fallen (by a third or even a quarter for *VF* – to somewhere between 6000 and 7000, by a fifth for *VIET* – to between 600 and 700 copies). Some journals, in fact, virtually ceased to exist (*Filosofskie nauki*). The philosophical brochures of the “Znanie” society (12 issues per year, series in Philosophy, Aesthetics, Ethics etc.; the circulation of the Philosophy series in 1967, 1970, 1979, and 1988 had been 62 000, 56 000, 38 000, and 27 000 copies respectively) ceased to exist. The distribution and allocation of books have suffered. Most books published in Moscow do not reach the provinces. “Akademkniga,” an excellent system of book allocation is not doing well; many bookstores are selling detective and cheap romance literature, in some cases even other merchandise, not books. Meanwhile, the total number of books published has increased drastically. Everything we dreamed about a decade ago is available. Dozens and dozens of new magazines are being published. Almost every big town has its philosophical journal: the *Povolzhskij zhurnal po filosofii i social'nym naukam* (<http://www.ssu.samara.ru/research/philosophy/vjpss.htm>), Samara and Ulyanovsk, *Tezaurus*; Ulyanovsk, *Filosofija nauki*, Novosibirsk and Ekaterinburg, *Veche*, *Logos*, *Sfinks*; St.-Petersburg, *Nachala*, *Logos*, *Put'*, *Filosofija i obshchestvo*, *Filosofskie issledovanija*; Moscow, *Issledovaniya i proekty*, Naberezhnyi Chelny, *Credo*, Orenburg etc.

To publish a book these days is not a difficult undertaking. No need of severe referees or recommendations from chair members. Just money.

It is easy to guess that a great many books pretending to be academic are beyond any possible criticism. A decade ago, to publish a stupid book was no easy task.

VF, *VIET*, *Priroda*, *Chelovek*, and *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'* (formerly *Obshchestvennye nauki v SSSR*) still exist but

serve mostly Muscovites and are virtually inaccessible in the rest of the country.

Unfortunately, book exchange programs among the universities have been halted for lack of money, say to buy stamps. Many libraries, especially in the small towns, can afford to subscribe only to a couple of local newspapers, most often of the orthodox communist variety. Subscription prices are climbing, reaching Western standards.

In my judgment, Russia lost its status as a superpower not only due to the collapse of the USSR and substandard economic development, but also because it ceased to exist as great publishing power. Since the early 1990s, publishers think only of commercial profits. Public demand for “light” entertaining literary trash leaves hardly any room for academic works and translations, especially in the fields of mathematics, physics, chemistry, or biology. There is, however, a demand for computer books and dictionaries; they are in abundance.

If and when a book reaches the provinces, its price becomes two or three times that in Moscow. Hence, the provinces are on a book starvation ration.

b) Grants

Russian foundations providing grants were established for the first time in the early 1990s. The initial foundation for the Humanities was the Ural University grant center; later the Russian State Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) was established, which gave birth in 1994 to the Russian State Foundation for Humanities (RFH). Moreover, in the early 1990s, foreign Foundations such as the Soros Foundation, IREX, Fulbright, DAAD, and Eurasia etc. substantially extended their activity.

At first, scholars were not aware what the grant system meant. So, for instance, when I assumed the position of Dean at the Ulyanovsk branch of Moscow State University in the autumn of 1993, I was the only grant holder. At present more than 60 scholars at this university hold grants.

I was among the group that in 1992 worked out the grant system of Kazan University (see: Solomonov B.N., Bazhanov V.A., Semenov G.V., Zhuravleva N.E., *Sistema grantov v Kazanskom*

universitete. Universitety kak centry obrazovanija, nauki i kul'tury v regione, M., 1995, pp. 189–199). That is why I am thoroughly familiar with the development of the grant system in Russia.

Without doubt, the grant system means a great deal of support both to members and RAS and especially to University lecturers. When I, as full professor, received a grant for the first time in 1992, I finally obtained funding which allowed me to continue my research and to visit the Summer Institute for Political Scientists in the USA (USIA), to attend the Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science in Florence, the Summer Institute in Budapest (Soros Foundation), and the Institute for Russian and East European Studies at Glasgow University (British Academy).

Without question, Muscovites have the easiest access to grant resources. No less than 60–65% RFH grants in 1997 were distributed to Moscow city dwellers; in St.-Petersburg only 15%, in Siberia, 8.4%, with the rest of the country receiving 11.6%. Nevertheless, scholars in the provinces do have their share of the pie. Research in Philosophy is supported by 13.5% of all RSFH grants (History – 28%, Linguistics – 19.5%, Economics – 12.8%, Law – 0.9%; the last figure is easy to understand: lawyers are earning lots of money as attorneys and legal experts for commercial companies, and as they don't need funding for research, legal research is not attractive).

1998 has not been a good year for Grants Foundations. Federal law stipulates that no more than 4% of the annual budget is to be spent on Science and Education; 6% of this sum should have been given to RFBR and RSFH, but actually the amount given never exceeded 3%. Moreover, the 1998 RAS budget of 2,038 billion rubles, will be only 1,463 billion rubles for 1999 (if not less). The correction of the 1998 budget meant that instead of 13 billion only 8 billion rubles were allotted to Science and Education. Thus not all grants would be paid in full and at the proper time. How can one explain the sudden dwindling of *VF* circulation? The circulation for the sixth issue in June was 7076 copies, that for July, 5553 copies. The explanation is straightforward: libraries and scholars failed to receive funding for subscriptions at the right moment. Subscriptions to scientific periodicals are good for only half a year. Very often scholars spend a part of their grant for subscriptions. The delay in

issuing grant funds meant that they were not able to prolong their subscriptions at the critical moment.

In mid-1998, RFBR drastically curtailed its share of grants to the Humanities and Social Sciences. It may be that the RFBR Foundation has decided to restrict its activity and support only the natural sciences and mathematics.

In the period between 1995 and 1997, RFH financially supported 1022 publishing projects. About 750 books have been printed.

The politics of some foreign grant Foundations surprise me. For instance, TEMPUS (TACIS) grants, the weightiest in respect of their support (up to \$1,000,000.00) are often given to those who still regard Marx as a high point in human thought and who still adhere to the Marxist-Leninist worldview and evince strong communist sympathies. The project leaders and collaborators of TEMPUS grants travelled all over Europe and witnessed first hand Western European prosperity without being shaken in their beliefs. We could speak of the blind man syndrome. In 1996, Muscovites made up some 42% of TEMPUS grant recipients, 42% from St.-Petersburg, with 13% for the rest of Russia, the NIS making up 32%.

Despite all the shortcomings of Russia's grant distribution system it is the safeguard of Russian science (or what remains of it). The peer review system provides a more or less objective assessment of the grant projects and thus secures the potential success of a project for almost all scholars independantly of their university status or relationship with the local authorities.

RFBR has a website (<http://www.rfbr.ru>). The RFH website is under construction (<http://www.rfh.ru>). See also the Moscow Public Scientific Foundation website (<http://www.mpsf.ru>).

c) Internet

Internet enables Russian scholars to break out into global cyberspace. Personally I can't imagine my life without e-mail and I regard WWW resources as information treasures. I have been using e-mail since 1992, when a communication center for collective use was organized at Kazan University. At that time, the grant system was still in its cradle; the average fee was equivalent to \$8.00. Nevertheless by the fall of 1992 to mid-1993, the overall situation began

to change drastically. Presently, the majority of my colleagues have their own computers (purchased, however, with grant money). Most universities provide at least e-mail or even on-line facilities for the staff.

Despite the breakthrough to cyberspace, many Departments, especially in the provincial universities, have no access to Internet resources and no computers at all. Much depends on the, shall I say, modern mode of thinking of the Rector and Vice-Rectors. For instance, Ulyanovsk State Pedagogical University has only a few computers and so far no interest in hooking up to cyberspace (mainly as a result of the Rector's humour). A large number of Russian Social Scientists did not know English at all (those between the ages of 20 and 25 are better educated in respect to foreign languages), hence they lack e-mail correspondents and their interests are restricted to their city or at best the region. Moreover, many universities that have established Internet servers now have no money to pay postmasters and/or Internet channel providers. No wonder that Western scholars not infrequently find their messages sent to Russian scholars returned to them with the notification "Host unknown." A year or so ago, local phone stations in big cities began to connect private persons to Internet and e-mail facilities, but as the cost is very high, only a few customers can afford such conveniences (taking into account that at best no more than one-fifth of Russian families have phones at home).

A couple of years ago, George Soros announced a large scale program to provide provincial Russian universities with Internet facilities if the government would ensure adequate channels and free access to them. Three million dollars per university was a huge amount of money. Nevertheless, the selected universities raised certain questions. For instance, what does "province" mean in Russia? Everything outside of Moscow and St.-Petersburg? But if the province consists of those parts of the country which are removed from the major cities, then why are Ekaterinburg, Nizhni Novgorod, Novosibirsk and Kazan included on the list?

Why are only some 60% of Russia's republics and only a third of Russia's, so to say, 'true' universities on the list? Scholars in all of Russia's republics (for instance, in Tatarstan, Yakutia and Bashkiria) are extensively supported by their local governments; these repub-

lics have considerable tax franchises and can afford to run numerous regional Academies of Sciences.

Why are universities already supported by various foundations being supported once again? Is it the bandwagon syndrome? For example, three years ago, Kazan University received a RFBR grant worth \$700,000 for the same purpose. Only about 40% of the universities who did their best to promote the development of Internet facilities by themselves were included (Tambov, Penza, Khabarovsk, Ulyanovsk, etc. Universities are not among the fortunate).

d) New Topics of Research

Perestroika's first steps within Soviet philosophy were marked by the discovery of an enormous, new continent – Russian philosophy abroad. Virtually within one year – from mid-1989 to mid-1990 – a veritable host of works was published by V.S. Solov'ev, N.A. Berdyaev, Father P. Florensky, V.V. Rosanov, V.V. Zen'kovsky et al. The Institute for Scientific Information of the Academy of Sciences (INION) published, along with summaries of recent works in Humanities, forgotten or simply unknown texts by turn-of-the-century Russian philosophers. In this way, I published N.A. Vasiliev's *Logicheskij i istoricheskij metod v etike (sravnitel'nyj analiz eticheskikh sistem V.S. Solov'eva i L.N. Tolstogo)* and N.O. Lossky's *Mir kak organicheskoe celoe*. At present, Russian philosophy is a major subject of study in many universities and very popular. Soviet philosophy is subjected to (mild) reassessment (see: "Filosofija v SSSR: Versii i realii," *VF*, 1997, 11).

For social philosophy the analysis of totalitarianism was a radically novel departure. The Russian editions of Popper's *Open Society and its Enemies* (M., 1992) and *Poverty of Historicism* (M., 1993), the collective volume *Totalitarizm kak istoricheskij fenomen*, M., 1989, including articles by G.Kh. Popov, I.M. Klyamkin, A. Migraniyan, and especially A.S. Tsipko dotted almost all the i's and crossed most of the t's with regard to the phenomenon.

Ideologized science and philosophicide were analysed in detail. One of the first papers related to this topic was by A.P. Ogurtsov, "Podavlenie filosofii," in *Surovaja drama naroda* (M., 1989). The suppression of genetics, ideological constraints in physics, astronomy, and chemistry were debated in myriad detail.

Examination of Marxism itself, in its philosophical part, crept along sluggishly. Perhaps only A.S. Tsipko in *Novyi Mir* (4, 1990) and V.N. Sadovsky (“Filosofija v Moskve v 50-e i 60-e gody,” VF, 9, 1993) contributed to the subject. Those who felt no sympathy for communist ideas simply ceased to put standard quotations in their works. For that matter, previous censors or editors often put in Marxist-Leninist quotations without authors’ permission. Those who were sympathetic to Marxism did little more than give new titles to old books and/or republish them in new covers. For example, V.S. Barulin published two volumes entitled *Social’naja filosofija* (M., 1993). The question arises whether there is anything new conceptually in this edition if compared with his strictly Marxist *Istoricheskij materializm*, M., 1986 or *Social’naja zhizn’ obshchestva*, M., 1987?

Some whose works were rejected in the “stagnation” period by “official” philosophical journals (like VF or FN) profited from the absolute freedom of press to make their philosophical credos public. For example, L. Grinin sent his book *Filosofija i sociologija istorii: nekotorye zakonomernosti istorii chelovechestva*, Volgograd, 1996 without charge to every Chair in Philosophy. The author, who complained that his ideas and works had been ignored by philosophical journals, castigated historical materialism for its failure to comprehend “the essence of history.” Grinin claims to have laid a new road to the philosophy of history. Nevertheless, acquaintance with his book clearly shows that he continues the traditional historico-materialistic mode of thinking, even retaining its concepts. After reading his book, I learned that Grinin has become wealthy publishing and trading books. He launched a new journal, *Filosofija i obshchestvo*, with a Moscow editorial board, but the journal promotes orthodox historical materialism (with translations as the sole exception to the rule).

Of course, many books or journals do not appear in Russia’s capital cities and have miniscule print runs. Some are worthy of close attention.

Just before his seventieth birthday, Professor V.N. Borisov from Samara State University published a brochure (in 500 copies), *Marksizm kak nauka i utopija*, Samara, 1996. For financial reasons, it was published not as an academic but as a so-called “educational”

book. This small book (57 pp.) is a thorough and very profound criticism of Marxist doctrine generally (philosophy, political economy, construction of communist society (scientific communism)). Alas, it was disseminated only in Samara and its surroundings, but without any doubt it is worthy of Russia's huge scale. This is the fate of many provincial works.

A deep crisis afflicts Russian philosophy and methodology of science, which had been flourishing during the seventies and eighties. The reason for the crisis is twofold: the exhaustion of the genre and the lack of stimulating, new scholars. Many scholars active in the philosophy of science – an ideologically neutral subject within Soviet philosophy – moved to new fields. A case in point is V.V. Il'in. The author of interesting works in the philosophy of science (*Priroda nauki*, M., 1985 – with A.T. Kalinkin, *Kriterija nauchnosti znaniya* M., 1989, *Teorija poznaniya. Obshchie problemy*, M., 1993, *Teorija poznaniya. Epistemologija*, M., 1994, and numerous articles, all written with a fresh approach to the topic) transferred his interests to political philosophy and political science. Perhaps the turning point was his article “Velikaja konfrontacija: ideologija i nauka. O vozmozhnosti nauchnoj ideologii i ideologicheskoy nauki,” *Vestnik MSU*, ser. 12, 5, 1992. So far he has published several interesting books in collaboration with a leading Russian political scientist – A.S. Panarin (and lesser known scholars): *Teoreticheskaja politologija: mir Rossii i Rossija v mire – Filosofija vlasti*, M., 1993, *Filosofija politiki*, M., 1994), *Rossija: opyt nacional'no-gosudarstvennoj ideologii*, M., 1994, *Politicheskaja antropologija* (M., 1995), *Reformy i kontrreformy v Rossii*, M., 1996). In my opinion, the most interesting academic political scientists in Russia are A.S. Akhiezer and A.S. Panarin. The latter has written *Filosofija politiki*, M., 1996, an expanded edition of his *Vvedenie v politologiju* published in 1994. The former produced *Rossija: kritika istoricheskogo opyta*. Vol. 1–3, M., 1991. Recently, in his new book *Revansh istorii: rossijskaja strategicheskaja initsiativa v XXI veke*, M., 1998, Panarin puts forward a new national idea to pursue into the next century. The core of this proposal is that postindustrial society should be replaced by ‘post-economical’ society with radically new principles of life and values

– ecological, spiritual and cultural – which are said by the author to be close to the Russian mind.

Other philosophers of science have shifted to political science: N.G. Kozin, “The escape from Russia” (Saratov 1996), who was active in the philosophy of cosmology; G.L. Tul’chinsky, *Samoorganizacija: fenomenologija zla i metafizyka*, St.-Petersburg, 1996, was a logician; S.N. Zharov from Voronezh, and others. Synergetics is all that remains of Russia’s philosophy of science, which has been actively developing at the Institute of Philosophy (Moscow) since 1987. Recent publications in the domain include books by: E.N. Knyazeva, *Odisseja nauchnogo razuma*, M., 1995), *Samoorganizacija i nauka*, M., 1995), *Koncepcija samoorganizacii: stanovlenie novogo obraza nauchnogo myshlenija*, M., 1994, etc. Some works in the domain deal with politics and history: A. Vengerov, “Sinergetika i politika,” *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost’*, 1993, 4; G. Malinetsky. “Nelinejnaja dinamika – kljuch k teoreticheskoj istorii?,” *Ibid.*, 1996, 4 (the author is a physicist), S.P. Kapitsa, S.P. Kurdyumov, and G. Malinetsky, *Sinergetika i prognoza budushchego*, M., 1997.

There are novel trends and approaches in modern Russian philosophy. I have in mind, among others, phenomenology with its journal *Logos* (Moscow; 8 issues have been published). The most active phenomenologists are N.V. Motroshilova, *Principy i protovorechija fenomenologicheskoy filosofii*, M., 1986, V.I. Molchanov, *Vremja i soznanie*, M., 1988), and K. Svas’jan, *Fenomenologicheskoe poznanie: propedevtika i kritika*, Erevan, 1987.

As in the case of synergetics external considerations seem to motivate the introduction new topics into philosophical research. One of these is the problem of Russia’s security. At the XI All-Russian Conference of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science in 1995 (only the Philosophical Congress in 1997 had more participants; the Second Philosophical Congress is due to take place in June 1999 in Ekaterinburg) a special session on security was held chaired by Russia’s Security Council Secretary. At present a wide range of “security questions” is under scrutiny: national, ecological, demographic, informational, food resources, and who knows what else. The philosophical community has been intensively involved in discussions of these issues. Starting in the winter of 1997, calls

to create a new Russian national idea, which no longer coincides with the traditional Russian idea, have been put forward. It appears that the authorities have decided to give birth to a new ideology to replace the communist ideology and which would be at least as attractive as the latter.

e) Academic Degrees

In 1990–1991 the quality of Academic Dissertations declined sharply. The Russian system promotes a two-level degrees system: the first level is the Candidate degree, corresponding to something a bit less than the PhD, the second is the Doctorate, something like the Habilitation in Germany. Starting in 1994 the procedure to defend a thesis usually requires payment, not less than \$550.00 for the Candidate Degree, \$1000.00 for the Doctorate (the average salary of a lecturer runs to about \$120.00 to \$130.00 per month). Nevertheless, the numbers of dissertations (especially in economics, history, political science, and law) have been rising rapidly. So-called “New Russians” would like to add Academic degrees to their wealth, to attach ‘Dr’ to their names. I call this phenomenon “shadow science” since the theses presented by these persons are usually written by someone else who has not succeeded in business or is reluctant to leave the academic occupation and thus is permanently lacking money (see: Bazhanov V.; also: “Shadow Science Phenomenon in the USSR,” *Philosophy and Social Action*, 1991, vol. 17, 3–4).

Sometimes philosophy is chosen to acquire the anxiously desired title of PhD or DSC. For example, the leader of Russia’s communist party, G. Zhuganov, defended a Doctoral Thesis in the form of an “Academic report” (which spared him the effort of producing a volume of some 350 pages) several months before the Presidential elections of 1996. I’m not asking how Zhuganov managed to find the time to write a fundamental philosophical work concerning Russia’s place, fate, and prospects in the modern world. I’m not asking about the originality of Zhuganov’s thesis or about how he performed in front of the Super Academic committee. I’m asking the question – can Zhuganov’s Thesis really be called a philosophical work? (For the details of Zhuganov’s Doctoral Odyssey see: A.V. Maksimov, “Dr Zhuganov kak zerkalo russoj filosofii,” *Otkrytija politika*, 1996, 5–6). Once again I should mention that the MGU

philosophical faculty harbors very strong communist sympathies and conservative trends. Almost anyone with the same frame of mind would be supported by MGU colleagues in philosophy.

In the spring of 1998, V.V. Zhirinovskiy defended a DSC Thesis before the Sociological Faculty of MGU. He passed his PhD presenting his ideas likewise in the form of an "Academic report," in the same manner and approximately on the same topic as Zhuganov did. Prominent MGU sociologists awarded Zhirinovskiy the DSC degree. Thus in 1998, Zhirinovskiy became both a Colonel and a Doctor of Philosophy.

Why did Zhuganov and Zhirinovskiy oblige themselves to acquire high academic degrees? A considerable number of people's deputies, Ministers from federal, republican or regional executive and legislative branches of power, who are not as well known as these prominent personalities, have provided themselves with PhD or DSC degrees as they carried out their demanding duties. Climbing up the career ladder, they didn't have the time to think about research. Is it really so that only their high positions make this possible?

The lack of money in the pockets of Russian scholars (in the first place for those in RAN; the recently created Academies of Tatarstan or Bashkiria are exceptions, as they are vigorously supported by local governments) is one of the sources of shadow science. The head of the family and his/her children must find some way to survive under the new economic policy with respect to science and higher education.

CONCLUSION

The point of maximum decay in philosophy is now past. At present, the Lenin Library (Russian State Library) is overcrowded. Philosophy in Russia is developing toward a more civilized, open, and cumulative form. It is becoming more regional both in educational and research policies.

Still, many obstacles lie on the path. The main one, I would argue, is the temptation to underscore Russian exceptionalism and uniqueness, to insist on the originality of Russian culture, science, and philosophy, of the Russian soul and spirituality, to stress Russia's

dissimilarity to the West, emphasizing that “Russia is baffling to the mind . . .” This temptation is a threat to Russia’s society as a whole. In Tatarstan, Bashkiria etc., scholars launched a vigorous quest for their philosophical prehistory in order to substantiate their State. In this case philosophy is tied to politics. Would that our recent past secure Russians against repeating fatal errors!

NOTES

¹ “\$47” and “\$53” refer to paragraphs 47 and 53 of the Federal Budget, concerning funding to Russian Universities. “\$47” is for “educational purposes”, “\$53” for “research.” These paragraphs are independent in the sense that funds cannot be transferred from one account to another.

² The amount in US dollars corresponds to the pre-August 1998 period when the exchange was one US dollar to six rubles. At present [December 1998], the rate is 23 rubles to the dollar. Thus the salary is now six times less, as measured in dollars.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CPSU* – communist party of the Soviet Union;
VF – *Voprosy Filosofii*;
FN – *Filosofskie nauki*;
 M., – Moscow;
VIET – *Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniia i tekhniki*;
 MGU – Moscow State University;
 RAS – Russian Academy of Sciences;
 RFBR – Russian Foundation for Basic Research;
 RSFH – Russian State Foundation for Humanities.

Department of Philosophy
Ulyanovsk (Simbirsk) State University
P.O. Box 1602
Ulyanovsk-63, Russia 432063
E-mail: bazhan@bazh.univ.simbirsk.su
(or) bazhan@sv.uven.ru

