

AN ENDNOTE TO HISTORY: JULIAN HUXLEY, SOVIET SCHOLARS, AND  
UNESCO'S *HISTORY OF MANKIND*, 1945-1967

Louis H. Porter

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of  
History.

Chapel Hill  
2012

Approved by:

Donald J. Raleigh

Louise McReynolds

Susan D. Pennybacker

©2012  
Louis H. Porter  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

Louis H. Porter: An Endnote to History: Julian Huxley, Soviet Scholars, and UNESCO's  
*History of Mankind*, 1945-1967  
(Under the direction of Donald J. Raleigh)

This thesis traces the relationship between UNESCO director-general Julian Huxley and the Soviet Union from 1945 to the completion of UNESCO's *History of Mankind: Scientific and Cultural Development* in the 1960s. I argue that Soviet participation in the UNESCO project was one of several instances of confrontation between Huxley's philosophy for UNESCO, "Scientific" or "Evolutionary Humanism," and Soviet ideology during the late-Stalinist and Khrushchev periods. As Huxley formulated his philosophy for UNESCO in the 1940s, he depicted the Soviet Union as an example of the ideological particularity that his universalist philosophy sought to overcome. The influence of Huxley's philosophy on UNESCO's *History of Mankind* determined the venture's ideological parameters and excluded Soviet contribution to the main narrative of the work, while the presence of Soviet commentary in the endnotes of the *History* undermined Huxley's original intention that the project show the universality of humanity's scientific and cultural development.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Huxley's Humanism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Soviet Union as a Particular Problem, 1945-53.....	8
III.	UNESCO's <i>History of Mankind</i> and the Soviet "New Look" at Science and Internationalism, 1954-58.....	23
IV.	Constructing <i>History of Mankind</i> : The Common Pool Meets Class Conflict, 1957-62.....	35
V.	Conclusion.....	50
	Bibliography.....	54

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

In 1966, the Soviet publishing house “International Relations,” in conjunction with the Soviet National Commission to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), released *UNESCO and Modern Times*, a book commemorating the international organization’s twentieth anniversary. While celebrating UNESCO’s efforts to provide technical assistance to postcolonial nations, the authors of the book lamented that “UNESCO has never been a universal organization,” and blamed its failure to achieve “an apolitical nature” in part on the “typical bourgeois idealism” of the UNESCO Charter—and especially, its preamble.<sup>1</sup> This “bourgeois idealism” derived from the popular belief in the West during the postwar period that UNESCO should lay the foundation for a permanent peace by creating a world citizenry founded on the recognition of a universally shared scientific and cultural heritage. British biologist Julian Huxley, the first director-general of UNESCO (1946-48), played an integral role in ensuring that this preamble remain in the Charter as the ideological framework of the new international organization.<sup>2</sup> His philosophy for UNESCO, “Evolutionary” or “Scientific Humanism,” represented the most extensive elaboration of the famous first line of the

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Romanovskiĭ, N. M. Sisakian, and Vasilĭi Vasil’evich Vakhrushev, *IuNESKO i sovremennost’: k 20-letiiu IuNESKO* (Moskva: Izd-vo “Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia,” 1966), 5-9.

<sup>2</sup> Vincenzo Pavone, *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart: Science and Humanism in UNESCO’s Approach to Globalization* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008), 83.

preamble that “since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that peace must be constructed.”<sup>3</sup>

In accordance with his vision for UNESCO as an instrument for instilling in diverse peoples a consciousness of a common cultural and scientific heritage, Julian Huxley in 1947 initiated UNESCO’s project for a “History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind,” for which the UNESCO General Conference provided funds and oversight. This project sought to create a universal history that would transcend the national and ideological histories that had supposedly provided legitimizing narratives for the waging of war.<sup>4</sup>

Coming late to the project, Soviet scholars travelled in 1956 to UNESCO headquarters in Paris to offer extensive commentary on the structure and content of what would become the final edition of the six-volume *History of Mankind: Scientific and Cultural Development*.<sup>5</sup> Although during the “thaw,” or the period of de-Stalinizing reforms conducted by Nikita S. Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party (1953-64), Soviet scholars attended many conferences with foreign colleagues, UNESCO’s *History of Mankind* differed from these international exchanges because of its imperative that scholars *cooperate* in producing a single work with a consensually constructed narrative that covered, from the Bronze Age to the 1950s, the entirety of world history. However, when UNESCO began publishing the volumes of *History of Mankind* in the 1960s, the result of over a decade’s work was anything but a single,

---

<sup>3</sup> “A Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,” in *Basic Texts* (Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2004), 7.

<sup>4</sup> Poul Duedahl, “Selling Mankind: UNESCO and the Invention of Global History, 1945-1976,” *Journal of World History* 22, no. 1 (2011): 101–3, doi:10.1353/jwh.2011.0000.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

unanimous narrative. *History of Mankind* contained two histories: a main text championing the gradual triumph of applied science and the universality of mankind, and a series of lengthy endnotes expressing Soviet scholars' own view of scientific and cultural development in world history. What caused this bifurcation? What specific ideological differences produced these divergent narratives?

In this thesis, I argue that UNESCO's *History of Mankind* project was one of several instances of engagement and conflict between the Soviet Union and Huxley's Scientific Humanism. I trace the relationship between the Scientific Humanist vision at the core of UNESCO's founding mission and Soviet ideology to show that the contradictory histories in the work functioned as legitimizing narratives for the competing global missions of UNESCO and the Soviet Union. Soviet scholars participating in the enterprise were confronted with an implicit Scientific Humanist orientation that adumbrated the discursive parameters of *History of Mankind* and required participants to adhere to certain values. Because the Scientific Humanist framework of UNESCO's *History* rested on the assumption that man had to evolve beyond his ideological and national predispositions, during the planning and in the pages of the work, the Soviet Union was cast as an ideological particularity standing in opposition to UNESCO's universalism—an ephemeral “other” that provided an example of the sort of ideological rigidity that should be overcome. However, the project also served as an arena in which Soviet scholars challenged Huxley's intention that the *History* contribute to constructing peace “in the minds of men.” The presence of Soviet commentary in the work undermined Huxley's original aim to delineate a unified cultural and scientific heritage that transcended nationality, ideology and class.

The tension arising between the founding ideologies of the Soviet Union and UNESCO is an example of the multiplicity of ideologies that, during the Cold War, interacted and contested each other outside of the main stage of capitalist-communist polemics. The *History* project represents what, when discussing Communist exhibitions at international fairs, historian György Péteri defined as a “site of encounter,” or a space in which “different cultures (and different cultural- and social-political projects) meet one another and where rivalry, confrontation and contestation take place.”<sup>6</sup> Many points of view surfaced throughout the drafting of the *History*. I do not presume to offer a complete picture of the myriad ideologies that surfaced throughout the enterprise. Rather, I focus on the relationship between Huxley’s Scientific Humanism and Soviet Marxism-Leninism in order to identify the fundamental disagreements between UNESCO’s founding ideology and the Soviet worldview that shaped the competing historical frameworks producing the work’s parallel histories.

Although Huxley’s Scientific Humanism and Soviet scholars’ Marxism-Leninism triggered disagreements that fractured the form of UNESCO’s *History*, a shared set of assumptions concerning the focus of the work had to exist in order for Soviet scholars to agree in the first place to partake in the ambitious project. Thus, I also argue that *History of Mankind* was what Péteri called a “site of convergence,” or a space that “promoted the mutual assimilation of norms, values, and standards” that reflected broader issues of the time.<sup>7</sup> As a result of its efforts in the 1950s to de-Stalinize Soviet science and participate in international intellectual projects, the Soviet Union moved closer to Huxley’s

---

<sup>6</sup> György Péteri, “Sites of Convergence: The USSR and Communist Eastern Europe at International Fairs Abroad and at Home,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 47, no. 1 (January, 2012): 8, doi:10.1177/0022009411422373.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.



Scientific Humanist vision during the preparation of *History of Mankind*. Both Scientific Humanism and Soviet Marxism-Leninism endorsed the application of scientific knowledge to society and international cultural exchange as a means to facilitate the development of this knowledge. They also shared the assumption that science and technology played a part in propelling history toward a more prosperous and globally connected future.

While historians have investigated the ideological origins of UNESCO as well as the *History of Mankind*, the Soviet Union's relationship with UNESCO's founding ideology and with this intellectual venture have largely been overlooked.<sup>8</sup> Poul Duedahl's study of *History of Mankind* as a precursor to the global history practiced in today's universities offers an excellent analysis of the arduous process behind this attempt to construct a collaborative universal history. But because of the understandable difficulties of writing transnational histories that involve countries and regions outside of a historian's field of specialization, Duedahl did not detail the Soviet side of this project or contextualize Soviet scholarly contributions to it, but instead portrayed their participation as little more than another unfortunate obstacle on the road to the work's publication. In addition, Duedahl failed to explore the broader history of the relationship between Julian Huxley and the Soviet Union, of which the UNESCO project was but one component.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> For an analysis of the ideological origins of UNESCO, see T. Sathyamurthy, *The Politics of International Cooperation: Contrasting Conceptions of U.N.E.S.C.O.* (Droz, 1964); Pavone, *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart*. Also Glenda Sluga, "UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley," *Journal of World History* 21, no. 3 (2010): 393–418, doi:10.1353/jwh.2010.0016.

<sup>9</sup> In terms of sources, I look at the Soviet journal *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* (Herald of the History of World Culture), which was published for the project, as well as archival material from the principle author-editor of the sixth-volume of *History of Mankind*. I also draw from other published primary sources, including Western and Soviet newspapers and journals. However, a great deal of my study of *History of Mankind* derives from a discursive reading of the published twentieth-century volume. See Duedahl, "Selling Mankind."

Because *History of Mankind* represents one of the first collaborative international projects Soviet scholars participated in after Stalin's death in March 1953, an exploration of their contribution to this work provides a deeper understanding of their experience during Khrushchev's push for "peaceful coexistence" as well as the Soviet academy's reaction to opposing Western worldviews.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, an examination of the Soviet contribution to UNESCO's *History of Mankind* sheds light on the tendencies of an international organization that presented itself as a universal and apolitical institution. During the Cold War, Western scholars of Russian history often expressed regret over the gulf between their supposedly more "objective" understandings of history and the overtly Marxist-Leninist works of Soviet scholars wrapped in an ideological straitjacket created by the Soviet government and censors. These criticisms were often based on the assumption that Western scholars lacked the kind of *a priori* thinking of their Soviet counterparts because of the pluralism permitted in the West. However, I show that such pluralism often had its own set of rules and boundaries concerning notions of objectivity that originated in specific projects.

Moreover, in order to understand how our own worldviews shape our expectations of Russian scholars, historians should further investigate encounters between Western and Soviet academics as instances of struggle over the ownership of knowledge. In what direction do ideologies flow after the Iron Curtain has been lifted and we can converse with a post-Soviet academy? Is intellectual discourse between Russian and American scholars a cooperative and equal activity, or are there power relations

---

<sup>10</sup> The other cooperative project Soviet scholars engaged in: UNESCO's project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values. See Laura Elizabeth Wong, "Relocating East and West: UNESCO's Major Project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values," *Journal of World History* 19, no. 3 (2008): 349–74, doi:10.1353/jwh.0.0019.

when we appeal to Russian historians to reflect on standards of truth?<sup>11</sup> I argue that the Western scholars who possessed power over UNESCO's *History* marginalized viewpoints falling outside of an emerging consensus in some elite circles on the primacy of science and globalism that still shapes our thinking today.

---

<sup>11</sup> For an example of a “lite” version of this call for objectivity, see Abbott Gleason, “The Great Reforms and The Historians Since Stalin,” *Russian Histoire Russe* 17, no. 3 (January 1, 1990): 281–96.

## Chapter 2

### **Huxley's Humanism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Soviet Union as a Particular Problem, 1945-53**

In 1945, as the Red Army approached Berlin and delegates from all over the world met in San Francisco to discuss and ratify the United Nations Charter, Julian Huxley arrived in Moscow for the celebration of the bicentenary of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. During his visit, Huxley met in private with biologist and agricultural specialist Trofim Lysenko. "It was interesting, though maddening," Huxley recalled in his memoirs, "to see a real fanatic, a Savonarola of science, in operation."<sup>12</sup> In the early postwar period, the Soviet Union and its treatment of science had a significant impact on Huxley's thinking as he developed a philosophy for UNESCO and began to devise the *History of Mankind* project.

Rather than viewing UNESCO as a neutral space for international cooperation, Huxley based his vision for the international organization on an ideology that endowed it with a specific historical mission. In a hotly debated pamphlet published in 1947, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*, he declared that the philosophical foundation of UNESCO should "be a Scientific World Humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background."<sup>13</sup> Conceiving historical progress and the future of mankind in evolutionary terms, Huxley maintained that this evolution issued primarily from the spiritual and mental faculties of men as opposed to their material existence. In *UNESCO:*

---

<sup>12</sup> Julian Huxley, *Memories*, vol. 1, 2 vols., [1st U.S. ed.] (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 281, 284.

<sup>13</sup> Julian Huxley, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*. (Public Affairs Press, 1947), 8.

*Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*, he framed his understanding of the world on the assumption that the human mind represented the highest form of natural evolution and the starting point for future development. “The struggle for existence that underlies natural selection,” he wrote, “is increasingly replaced by conscious selection, a struggle between ideas and values in consciousness.” The general trajectory of this evolution was the globalization and unification of thought through cultural and intellectual exchange. Since man as thinker had become “the sole trustee of further evolutionary progress,” and because the Second World War and the recent invention of the atom bomb made all too clear the danger of adversarial ideologies, the evolutionary will to survive provided “important guidance as to the courses [man] should avoid and those he should pursue if he is to achieve that progress.”<sup>14</sup>

If conflicting national and ideological heritages provided the motivation for war, the world needed to aggregate its “cumulative tradition” to show the universal bond of mankind and thereby undermine the competing national and philosophical historical narratives that served to justify war. In Huxley’s opinion, “the more united man’s tradition becomes, the more rapid will be the possibility of progress: several separate or competing or even mutually hostile pools of tradition cannot possibly be so efficient as a single pool common to all mankind.” The “common pool” of human thought that gave historical evolution its hereditary material consisted primarily of scientific knowledge. Because it was “in machines and in ideas that human evolution is mostly made manifest,” UNESCO’s philosophy had to not only be an Evolutionary, but also “a Scientific

---

<sup>14</sup> Huxley, *UNESCO*, 8-9.

Humanism.”<sup>15</sup> Science, Huxley believed, provided UNESCO with a universal and neutral knife that could cut through the artificial divisions created by ideology and national chauvinism.<sup>16</sup>

Moreover, Huxley underscored the universality of *applied science*, or the utilization of scientific thought for the purpose of improving social organization and perfecting the human species through practices such as eugenics: “The application of scientific knowledge now provides our chief means for raising the level of human welfare ... the more complete that pooling, the more rapid will be the advance.” In order to lay the groundwork for a permanent peace and prevent another war motivated by national chauvinism or ideological dogma, Huxley concluded that “special attention should consequently be given by UNESCO to the problem of constructing a unified pool of tradition for the human species as a whole,” which “must include the unity-in-variety of the world’s art and culture as well as the promotion of one single pool of scientific knowledge.”<sup>17</sup>

In Huxley’s vision, then, UNESCO’s mission was to reveal this “common pool of ideas” through global scientific and cultural education. He envisioned UNESCO as a supranational, supra-ideological instrument through which the next step of the evolutionary process could be achieved.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, through international intellectual cooperation and the portrayal of mankind as sharing a common scientific and cultural past, UNESCO would lay the foundation for a future global community existing under a

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 7,10.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 35-36.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 12.

single political organization, and “must envisage some form of world political unity or otherwise, as the only certain means for avoiding war.” If Socialist Realism showed the communist future in present reality, Huxley instilled in UNESCO and its *History of Mankind* project the responsibility of making manifest, through the production of universal knowledge, a transnational and transideological future in the present. He believed that the organization “can do a great deal to lay the foundations on which world political community can later be built” by bringing about “the emergence of a single world culture, with its own philosophy and background of ideas, and with its own broad purpose.”<sup>19</sup>

While UNESCO never officially adopted Scientific or Evolutionary Humanism<sup>20</sup> as its official philosophy, Huxley’s position as the first director-general of UNESCO, as well as the language of the UNESCO Charter, created the perception among many that this philosophy provided an implicit ideological foundation for the new organization. Because of this ideology and its goal of establishing a global community through the transcendence of ideological and national boundaries, the Communist bloc had strong suspicions of Huxley’s motives. The Soviet Union refused to participate in conferences and international commissions involved in the creation of UNESCO and its Charter, but its allies in Eastern Europe expressed the Communist bloc’s general disdain for Huxley’s Scientific Humanism. At UNESCO’s First General Conference in Paris during the fall of 1946, the Yugoslav delegate to the conference, M. Vladislav Ribnikar, explained his

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>20</sup> Henceforth, I will refer to Huxley’s Humanism as simply “Scientific Humanism” unless I am quoting from a source. Although he used the terms “Evolutionary Humanism” and “Transhumanism” frequently, the terms signify the same philosophy with slight moderations.

country's hesitancy to ratify the Charter on the basis of its ideological underpinnings.<sup>21</sup>

Ribnikar regretted that "UNESCO has even elaborated its own philosophy, labeled 'World Scientific Humanism,' which according to the program, will be forcibly disseminated to and imposed upon the peoples of the world." Characterizing Scientific Humanism as a "casting of the various national cultures in a standard mould," he described Huxley's vision of the world as "a kind of philosophic Esperanto" that "would amount to subjecting science to metaphysics."

For Ribnikar, UNESCO's adoption of Huxley's "international official philosophy" and its attempt "to constitute a centre for the direction of national cultures" would lead to "the renunciation by mankind of its enormous share in the treasures of thought," especially dialectical materialism, "which has become the outlook of millions of men of all countries." Ribnikar also hinted that the presence of Scientific Humanism in UNESCO's Charter was one of the reasons for the Soviet Union's absence at the conference. Placing Scientific Humanism at the core of UNESCO's worldview would result in the rejection of dialectical materialism and thereby preclude the possibility of "cultural cooperation between *all* United Nations, in the first place between the Western countries and the Soviet Union." "Let us suppose," he asserted in his remarks to the Conference, "that the philosophy of dialectical materialism is confined to the Soviet Union." If this was the case, he asked, could UNESCO reject the cooperation of a country whose "culture has survived where others would have succumbed ... a country which in

---

<sup>21</sup> The conference occurred before the Tito-Stalin split. To many Western observers, Yugoslavia was a "mouthpiece" for the Soviet Union during these years. See Clare Wells, *The UN, UNESCO and the Politics of Knowledge* (London: Macmillan, 1987), 115. Others have briefly noted Ribnikar's rejection of Scientific Humanism, see Sathyamurthy, *The Politics of International Cooperation; Contrasting Conceptions of U.N.E.S.C.O.*, 163-69.



the war on the Fascist barbarians contributed more than any other to the salvation of mankind and civilization?”<sup>22</sup>

Huxley by no means perceived his Scientific Humanist vision for UNESCO as a distinct ideology that would exclude nations and individuals who advocated competing political philosophies. He believed that the universality of applied science provided a means to lay the groundwork for consensus between different sociopolitical points of view. He maintained that UNESCO could not “espouse one of the politico-economic doctrines competing in the world today to the exclusion of the others—the present versions of capitalistic free enterprise, Marxist Communism, semi-socialist planning, and so on.” It could not adopt a specific ideology “for the very practical reason that any such attempt would immediately incur the active hostility of large and influential groups and the non-cooperation or even withdrawal of a number of nations.”

Yet Huxley also paradoxically focused on aspects endemic to the Soviet Union that UNESCO should avoid at all costs, thereby conveying the ideological rigidities antithetical to his vision for the organization. He repeatedly used dialectical materialism as an ideological foil when describing his own philosophy and offered Soviet ideology as an example of the particularity his universalism sought to overcome. Instilling UNESCO with Western-democratic notions of individual autonomy, he noted that “with its stress on democracy and the principles of human dignity, equality and mutual respect,” UNESCO could not “adopt the view that the State is a higher or more important end than the individual; or any rigid class theory of society.” Although “dialectical materialism was the first radical attempt at an evolutionary philosophy,” Huxley criticized the fact

---

<sup>22</sup> *General Conference: First Session* (UNESCO House Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1947), UNESCO/C/30, UNESCODOC, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/resources/online-materials/publications/unescodoc-database/>.

that “it was based too exclusively upon principles of social as against biological evolution.”<sup>23</sup> For Huxley, science derived from man’s *mental* ability to comprehend nature and this consciousness evolved because of the improvement of spiritual values and morals rather than socioeconomic forces. He sought to combine scientific rationality with secular spirituality, rejecting Marxism because of its fixation on material needs. In *Religion Without Revelation*, Huxley again expressed the view that communism’s “purely material basis has limited its efficacy” considering that “it has tried to deny the reality of spiritual values,” while having to “grudgingly throw the churches open to the multitudes...”<sup>24</sup>

Huxley’s goal of transcending ideologies that divided knowledge led to a rejection of Marxism-Leninism because it seemed to be the most all-encompassing and rigid view of social organization, politics and history of the time. He believed that as long as both the capitalist and communist camps of the nascent Cold War avoided expressing “themselves as dogmas,” embodying “themselves in rigid social systems,” and allowing their ideologies “to become translated into terms of politics and power,” the two could “in principle be reconciled.” But he defined the ideologies UNESCO must defeat as “theological dogma or Marxist dogma or any other form of dogma,” thereby aligning Marxism with the stringent religious traditions that secularism in the form of science and “spiritual” Humanism should seek to crush.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Huxley, *UNESCO*, 7, 11.

<sup>24</sup> Julian Huxley, *Religion Without Revelation* [New and rev. ed.] (New York: New American Library, 1964), 63. The work was published originally in 1929 but republished in 1957 during the preparation of UNESCO’s *History of Mankind*.

<sup>25</sup> Huxley, *UNESCO*, 61.

In Huxley's opinion, UNESCO should cooperate with the Soviet Union in the present, but eventually, the march of history would overcome through synthesis the defining characteristics of the Soviet Union that differentiated it from the West. In *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*, Huxley asked whether the conflict between capitalism and communism could "be avoided, these opposites be reconciled, this antithesis be resolved in a higher synthesis," and answered with the declaration that not only can this happen, but that "through the inexorable dialectic of evolution it *must* happen."<sup>26</sup> Huxley understood the difficulties facing UNESCO in the present period of heightened ideological tension, but believed that through moderation, the two sides should ultimately be reconciled and synthesized through an understanding of the "common pool" of cultural and scientific knowledge. The social organization of his ideal global community remained undefined, but Marxism-Leninism had no place in its formulation.

In spite of Huxley's call for a "synthesis" of East and West on the basis of scientific knowledge, as the Cold War escalated the rigidity of Soviet Marxism-Leninism and its pervasive power over Soviet science and culture intensified. Stalin saw scientists as soldiers on the front of the Cold War who played the vital role of championing Soviet scientific achievements in newly created socialist countries, while criticizing Western science within the Soviet Union. Soviet scientific inquiry increasingly became subordinated to and determined by the dictates of *partiinost'* (party-mindedness). Although science held as central and vital a place in Soviet ideology as in Huxley's Scientific Humanism, Stalin, Andrei Zhdanov and other Soviet officials began to promote

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 61–62.

scientific theories that closely corresponded to their Marxist-Leninist worldview at the expense of those substantiated by empirical evidence and consensus among the international scientific community.<sup>27</sup> This production of scientific conclusions for the purpose of legitimizing Soviet ideology reached its zenith when Trofim Lysenko, in 1948, rejected the “bourgeois” Mendelian theory of heredity in favor of a more “proletarian” theory of human evolution. His “Michurinism,” or the conviction that environmental factors directly altered inherited traits, bolstered Marxism-Leninism’s pretensions of offering a truly scientific understanding of mankind by articulating a biological foundation for the creation of the new Soviet man.<sup>28</sup>

If Huxley had found Lysenko’s arguments “maddening” during his 1945 visit to Moscow, after the Soviet academy adopted Michurinism as its official stance on biology in 1948, Huxley came to perceive Lysenko and the concept of *partiinost’* as a threat to both scientific truth and his scientific vision for the world. In 1949, Huxley published *Soviet Genetics and World Science: Lysenko and the Meaning of Heredity*, a stinging critique of the ideological corruption of scientific purity in the Soviet Union. Huxley characterized the “Lysenko affair” of 1948 as a symptom of the broader corruption in the Soviet Union of intellectual thought and culture. According to Huxley, in the Soviet Union “common knowledge, thought and expression have been, to a greater or lesser extent compulsorily socialized—subordinated to an overriding social philosophy and

---

<sup>27</sup> Ethan Pollock, *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006), 21–27.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

subjected to state control, so that its freedom or autonomy is consciously and expressly restricted.”<sup>29</sup>

Huxley’s motivation for writing this book derived from his training in the scientific method and a belief that “a fact is a fact, whether discovered by a communist or fascist, whether in the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R.” However, when addressing the importance of Soviet biology’s corruption to the rest of the world and his solution to the “totalitarian regimentation of thought,” Huxley betrayed his political motives and couched his complaint in the language of Scientific Humanism. He emphasized that the question of the social and political place of science superseded the debate over the scientific soundness of Lysenko’s findings. “I hope I have made clear,” he wrote, “the scientific aspects of the controversy are subsidiary to the major issue of the freedom and unity of science.” To be sure, the scientific method and freedom of inquiry formed the backbone of Huxley’s explanation of the proper means by which knowledge should be attained. But the relevance and significance of this scientific knowledge grew out of its place as an essential practice of all mankind—a practice that, according to Huxley, “we used to imagine was the most universal and international of human activities,” but “has been split in two.”<sup>30</sup> In addition, Huxley used his portrayal of “the Soviet cultural system,” which had “been imposed upon Soviet society from above, by authority, as dogma,” as an occasion to demonstrate the necessity of his own universalist ideology. He advocated the establishment in the West, through a public sphere of “argument and persuasion,” of a philosophy similar in its universalism to the Soviet Union’s ideology, or a “common set

---

<sup>29</sup> Julian Huxley, *Soviet Genetics and World Science: Lysenko and the Meaning of Heredity*. (London, Chatto and Windus, 1949.: Chatto and Windus,, n.d.), 151.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 173, 61–62.

of beliefs as to human destiny and the major aims for human progress.” When posing the question of “what men of science can do to modify the policy of the U.S.S.R.,” he immediately proposed that, in order for the West “to provide an equally powerful and equally general appeal” as that of communism, “only some kind of dynamic or Evolutionary Humanism will suffice, a belief that man has the duty of carrying the general process of evolution to new heights.” Because “this Evolutionary Humanism must be partly based primarily [sic] on science,” it would be “the task of the men of science to provide the material basis for the heightened standards of living, and their share of the theoretical and philosophical background for the new ideology—what for a religion would be its philosophical framework.”<sup>31</sup>

The Soviet Union reciprocated Huxley’s disdain. During the late 1940s Huxley’s philosophy bore all the characteristics antithetical to Soviet ideology’s increasingly xenophobic tenor. The process of purging Soviet culture of Western intellectual and scientific thought, or what became known as the *zhdanovshchina*, contained a deep antipathy toward any person or form of knowledge resembling “cosmopolitanism.” While the Soviet “anticosmopolitan campaign” amounted to little more than a thinly veiled war on Soviet Jews, the existence of self-proclaimed “Cosmopolitans” in the West probably gave this term its power and weight as a code word for foreign or non-Russian intellectual influence.<sup>32</sup> During the early years of the United Nations, many intellectuals and dignitaries involved in the organization used this term to describe their hopes that the U.N. would serve as the prototype for a global order founded on the homogenization of

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 191–92, 198.

<sup>32</sup> Pollock, *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*, 6–7.

human culture. Huxley's Scientific Humanism, and his vision for UNESCO, represented the pinnacle of these visions of "World Citizenship" promoted by Wendell Wilkie, H. G. Wells (a close friend of Huxley's) and others.<sup>33</sup>

Consequently, the Soviet press portrayed Huxley as a symbol of the Western bugbears utilized by Soviet leaders to justify their position. In August 1948, a year before the publication of his *Soviet Genetics and World Science*, Huxley participated in the Soviet Union's "World Congress of Intellectuals for Peace" held in Wroclaw, Poland. The congress marked the beginning of the Soviet "struggle for peace in all the world," which became a massive mobilization and propaganda campaign that sought to engage Soviet citizens in the Kremlin's fight against "war mongers" in the West.<sup>34</sup> The Soviet press hardly mentioned UNESCO until after Stalin's death, but in the rare instances that Soviet citizens heard of the international organization before 1954, it mostly came linked to Julian Huxley and his actions at the Wroclaw congress. Writers for *Pravda*, *Izvestiia* and *Literaturnaia gazeta* all depicted Huxley's UNESCO and his hope for a "third force" in a bipolar world as veneers masking the ideological superstructure of imperialist economics and protofascism. "While it might be assumed," a reporter at the congress wrote, "that Mr. Huxley has not and does not participate in politics ... as a biologist Huxley is not a stranger to politics as such." The reporter noted as proof of this that "not only is he the Secretary General [sic] of UNESCO, and as such, or otherwise, subordinate to Ernst Bevin," he also adhered to the doctrine of eugenics, "the founding component of the Hitlerite doctrine of racial superiority of one people over the others." For these

---

<sup>33</sup> Sluga, "UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley," 395; 414–18.

<sup>34</sup> See Timothy Johnston, "Peace or Pacifism? The Soviet 'Struggle for Peace in All the World', 1948-54," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86, no. 2 (April, 2008): 259–82, doi:10.2307/25479199.

reasons, the reporter concluded, “we must first reject the statement by Professor Julian Huxley that his ‘scientific and cultural activities’ do not have a political character.”

At the same time that the Soviet press linked UNESCO and Huxley to the supposedly imperialist and fascist ideologies of capitalist nations, they mocked his Scientific Humanism as mere tomfoolery that distracted from the serious business of the congress, presenting him as an embodiment of the cosmopolitanism the Kremlin so intensely despised. “Apparently,” the reporter continued, “Huxley thought that he was participating in a salon on ‘cultural’ and ‘intellectual’ topics and in ‘games of the mind,’ only to realize that he was among people really willing to fight for peace, progress and democracy.”<sup>35</sup> A reporter from *Pravda* remarked that while “there were concerns that the congress would not find a ‘common language’ ... this was not the primary danger. The threat to the congress was that it would find too common of a language—a language of common phrases and ‘lofty’ pointless chatter.” Such chatter emanated from Huxley and his “enthusiasts,” who were “keen on ‘world’ government, the cosmopolitan depersonalization of national cultures under the flag of a ‘united language’ and ‘western culture.’”<sup>36</sup>

---

At first glance, Huxley seemed to play the role of a typical Cold Warrior, lamenting the ideological “dogma” of the Soviet Union and its suffocation of all truth through repression. Convinced that the Soviet intelligentsia believed in scientific autonomy but could not speak out, in 1950 Huxley took part in “The Congress for

---

<sup>35</sup> I. Zavich, “Professor Khaksli nedovolen...,” *Literaturnaia gazeta*, September 7, 1948, 4.

<sup>36</sup> D. Zaslavskii, “S kem oni, mastera kul’turny?,” *Pravda*, September 6, 1948, 4.



Cultural Freedom” in Berlin, which sought to deliver through radio and newspaper the message to the Soviet “intelligentsia” that freedom fostered intellectual achievement.<sup>37</sup> However, in the 1920s, he was a member of the “British Society for Cultural Relations” with the U.S.S.R.<sup>38</sup> More importantly, he had at one point viewed the country as an exciting and innovative example of the application of science to society on a massive scale. When in 1931, during the depression and the German economic crisis, Huxley visited the Soviet Union for the first time, he came to appreciate the economic planning of the Soviet Union as a possible antidote to the instability and poverty that the 1929 crash of the stock market had brought to the Western world. Inheriting the Western “gaze” that had long depicted Eastern Europe as a place in which the West could test-drive its grand social and political projects without consequence, he saw Russia as a laboratory for the experimentation with alternatives to capitalism.<sup>39</sup> He described the Soviet Union, which was in the midst of the First Five-Year Plan, as a “large-scale experiment, designed to test in practice the various conclusions reached by Marx.” Westerners, according to Huxley, must ignore the Soviet Union’s present poverty and misery, and judge this experiment by the “direction in which things are moving,” or “the scientific efficacy of the experiment.” Huxley saw the Five-Year Plan as “only a symptom” of “the birth of a new kind of society, a society which is coherently planned, and has not, like Topsy and the out-of-hand individualisms that constitute our Western

---

<sup>37</sup> “Peace Rally Plans Plea to the East: Cultural Congress in Berlin on June 26 Will Formulate Appeal to Intelligentsia,” *The New York Times*, May 3, 1950.

<sup>38</sup> Michael David-Fox’s book does not mention Huxley’s travels to Russia, and only mentions him as a member of this society. Michael David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and the Soviet Union, 1921-1941* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 82.

<sup>39</sup> Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994), 266–72.

nations, 'jest growed.'" In Huxley's opinion, the "scientific aspect" of the communist project represented its greatest promise, since "proper planning is itself the application of scientific method to human affairs; and also it demands for pure science a very large and special position in society."

For Huxley, the Soviet Union had lost this appreciation of the possibilities of molding human material into harmonious molecules of a world organism through scientific social engineering. Huxley did not object to the Soviet economic system. Rather, he rejected *partiinost'*, or the subordination of science and its application to the dictates of a particularistic ideology that saw the social world from a "narrow" perspective. State planning, after all, could be utilized without the legitimizing Marxist-Leninist historical narrative. Huxley even created a non-Marxist organization to study economic planning upon his return to Britain in 1931.<sup>40</sup> This meant that the Soviet Union could still play a role in Huxley's ideal of international cooperation if it rid itself of Lysenko, his patron in the Kremlin, and the Communist Party's meddling in scientific matters.

---

<sup>40</sup> Julian Huxley, *A Scientist Among the Soviets* (New York and London: Harper & brothers, 1932), 58-61. Huxley, *Memories*, 210.

### Chapter 3

#### UNESCO's *History of Mankind* and the Soviet "New Look" at Science and Internationalism, 1954-58

After Stalin's death, the Soviet leadership moved to reverse the xenophobic and anti-internationalist atmosphere of the late 1940s. Soviet leaders formulated a new foreign policy of "peaceful coexistence," or the belief that communism could catch up, overtake, and overthrow the capitalist mode of production by winning the "hearts and minds" of the peoples of the world through cultural, technological and economic competition. As a result, Soviet scholars travelled to conferences abroad and engaged in polemics with colleagues from the West. Soviet scholars' ability to contribute to UNESCO's *History of Mankind*, or to "converge" with the shared values of other delegates to the project grew out of the broader transformations taking place in the Soviet view of not just the world, but also science. Thus, Soviet scholars' participation in the planning and writing of *History of Mankind* paralleled the Kremlin's transition from reclusiveness to a cautious acceptance of cultural diplomacy. The Soviet Union joined UNESCO in April 1954, the same month in which the Comédie Française became the first cultural delegation from a nonsocialist country to visit the U.S.S.R. since the Second World War.<sup>41</sup> The official proclamation of Soviet scholars' involvement in the *History of*

---

<sup>41</sup> On the changes in Soviet foreign policy after Stalin's death, see Vladislav Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 94–104. For a general history of UNESCO and the Soviet Union, see I.V. Gaiduk, "Sovetskii soiuz i IuNESKO v gody 'kholodnoi voiny,' 1945-1967," *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, no. 1 (2007): 20–34. On Soviet cultural diplomacy, see Nigel Gould-Davies, "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy," *Diplomatic History* 27, no. 2 (2003): 204, doi:10.1111/1467-7709.00347.

*Mankind* project came in 1955 when an article in *Voprosy istorii* (*Problems of History*) briefly outlined the project's scope and ended with the terse declaration that "Soviet scholars have expressed their willingness to work on this publication and ... to undertake the compilation of chapters on the history of the U.S.S.R."<sup>42</sup>

Soviet readers, however, would not be introduced to UNESCO's project until 1957. During that year, the Soviet government created the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (SSOD), and the State Committee for Cultural Ties (GKKS), which allowed the government to foster and manage cultural diplomacy.<sup>43</sup> In the summer, Moscow hosted the International Youth Festival, which brought thousands of young people from Africa, Asia, Europe, and America to the formerly isolated Soviet capital.<sup>44</sup> Soviet cooperation with foreign scholars in the writing of *History of Mankind* introduced a small clique of Soviet academics to competing perspectives on history. It also resulted in the creation of a forum for the discussion of world history within the Soviet academy. In 1953, the International Commission for the UNESCO project, under the editorship of French historian Lucien Febvre, established *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* (*The Journal of World History*) as a space for Western scholars to workshop their research in preparation for *History of Mankind*. In 1957, the Soviet National Commission to the UNESCO project began publishing its own world history journal, entitled *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* (*Herald of the History of World Culture*). As editor-in-chief of the journal and the primary Soviet

---

<sup>42</sup> "Istoricheskaia nauka za rubezhom. Podgotovka vseobshchei istorii nauki i kul'tury v IuNESKO," *Voprosy istorii*, no. 1 (January, 1955): 191.

<sup>43</sup> Gould-Davies, "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy." 205-6.

<sup>44</sup> V Zubok, *Zhivago's Children : The Last Russian Intelligentsia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), 108-10.

representative to the *History of Mankind* venture, A. A. Zvorykin justified UNESCO's endeavor in the first issue, explaining that "based on the ideas of an amalgamation of all progressive forces of science and on the fertile ground of the general work to strengthen peace and cooperation among peoples, UNESCO has placed before us the task of creating a six-volume 'History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind.'" "For the preparation of material for the volumes," Zvorykin continued, "the International Commission has created a special journal, '*Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*.'" Similar to this journal, the role of *Vestnik* was "first and foremost to publish articles and material that address the little-researched questions of the history of culture and to gradually fill in the 'white spots' in the history of science."<sup>45</sup> The Soviet journal was published until the completion of the drafting of *History of Mankind* in 1961, and its editorial board consisted of the members of the Soviet National Commission to the project.<sup>46</sup>

According to Zvorykin, the primary appeal of the UNESCO project resided in its aim of avoiding eurocentrism.<sup>47</sup> For readers of *Vestnik*, the articles published in 1957 and 1958 served as a window onto both present Western scholarship on world history and a much more "cosmopolitan" past than that portrayed in the historical journals of the late 1940s. The writers in *Vestnik* expanded the geographical scope of their histories to mirror the new trend of public diplomacy during the Khrushchev era, exploring international

---

<sup>45</sup> A. A. Zvorykin, "Ot redaktsii," *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 1, no. 1 (February 1957): 3–5.

<sup>46</sup> The editors of the journal are listed at the back of each issue. Zvorykin remained the principle editor throughout. During the last year, however, the editorial board lost some of the delegates and new members were added. This was most likely because the UNESCO project had reached its conclusion. For a list of the members of the National Commission, see "General Conference, 9th Session: Annual Report of the President of the International Commission For a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind" (UNESCO, September 10, 1956), SC/PRG/9, UNESCODOC.

<sup>47</sup> A. A. Zvorykin, "Ot redaktsii", 3-5.

intellectual networks in articles such as “Russian-American Scientific Relations in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries,” and “Anglo-Russian Cultural and Scientific Relations.”<sup>48</sup> In order to prepare for engagement with the Western academic community, *Vestnik* published articles from *Cahiers d’histoire mondiale*, including Marshall Hodgson’s “Hemispheric Interregional History as an Approach to World History,” which came to be considered a founding text in the Western historiography of world history.<sup>49</sup>

In addition, *Vestnik* published the outlines for the volumes of *History of Mankind* that covered world history through the eve of the American Revolution. Members of the Soviet National Commission attached to these outlines extensive commentaries that urged the author-editors to include various Russian cultural figures in their narratives, and offered minor criticisms of the author-editors’ treatment of certain subjects. The principle complaint Soviet academics voiced in relation to the volumes on premodern history concerned Western scholars’ chronological division of world history into specific volumes and the periodization of history within each volume. For example, Soviet scholars objected to the inclusion of the 14-15<sup>th</sup> centuries in the volume on the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries because the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries were “more closely related to the preceding centuries.” As a means of clearly partitioning the multivolume work into historical epochs, Soviet scholars recommended the standard Marxist-Leninist periodization of

---

<sup>48</sup> M. I. Radovskii, “Russko-amerikanskii nauchnye svyazi v 18-19 vv.,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 2, no. 2 (April 1957): 100–6. And M. Malin, “Anglo-russkie kul’turnye i nauchnye svyazi,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 98–107.

<sup>49</sup> For Hodgson’s original article in Febvre’s journal, see Marshall Hodgson, “Hemispheric Interregional History as an Approach to World History,” *Cahiers d’histoire mondiale* 1 (1954): 715–23. For the republication of this in the Soviet journal, see Marshall Khodzhon, “Mezhregional’naia istoriia polusharii kak metod izucheniia mirovoi istorii,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 1, no. 1 (1957): 9–16. On the importance Hodgson’s article, see Duedahl, “Selling Mankind,” 120.

history, while emphasizing their openness to reformulating these periods based on further research.<sup>50</sup>

Unlike many Western scholars who came from countries in which their points of view competed with other perspectives, Soviet scholars brought with them to the *History of Mankind* project a more unified voice. Soviet scholars inevitably functioned as “managers of legitimation,” constructing and articulating a historical mythology that legitimized the Soviet Union and rationalized its policies both at home and abroad.<sup>51</sup> However, the Soviet National Commission comprised scholars with a range of experiences and political histories that might convey the extent to which they valued the new direction in which Khrushchev was leading them.

On the one hand, because of the extensive vetting process required to represent the Soviet Union abroad, the delegates were some of the most politically reliable. The majority constituted the editorial board of the academically powerful *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* and held other influential positions. Evgenii Mikhailovich Zhukov, for instance, edited the *Soviet Encyclopedia's Vsemirnaia istoriia* while serving on the Soviet National Commission. As academic secretary of the History Division of the Academy of Sciences, Zhukov oversaw all administrative issues related to the study of history and acted as “chief party guide” for historical research. In this role as a representative of the Communist Party in the Soviet academy, he took part in the conservative backlash

---

<sup>50</sup> For an example of the publication of the outlines, see L. Gotshok, “Proekt prospekta IV-go toma istorii nauchnogo i kul’turnogo razvitiia chelovechestva,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 127–58. For the Soviet commentary, see “Zamechaniia po proektu prospekta IV-go toma, razrabotannomu professorom Luisom Gotshokom,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 159–67.

<sup>51</sup> Roger Markwick, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia : The Politics of Revisionist Historiography, 1956-1974* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave, 2001), 36.

against historians' attempts to break away from Stalinist orthodoxy in the 1950s and 1960s.<sup>52</sup>

On the other hand, participation in the UNESCO project might have provided some members of the Soviet delegation a release from the stultifying atmosphere of the Stalinist years. Anatolii Alekseevich Zvorykin served alongside Julian Huxley as a vice president of the "International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind" and as chairman of the Soviet National Commission to the UNESCO project. A professor of the history of technology, from 1934 to 1939, Zvorykin attended the Institute of Red Professors, where he studied the history of technology and economics. He soon fell victim to the purges of the late 1930s, was expelled from the Party, lost his position as a doctoral candidate, and resorted to dyeing women's scarves for income. His service on the front and in Stalingrad during the war provided a path to rehabilitation and a means to climb the party ladder during the postwar years. In the late 1940s, he became editor of the *Soviet Encyclopedia*.<sup>53</sup>

In this position, Zvorykin expressed the confusion that many scholars experienced as a result of Stalin's sudden and abstruse reformulations of the relationship between Marxist-Leninist ideology and science. In 1951, he wrote a memo to Politburo member Georgii Malenkov expressing his frustration after the publication of Stalin's 1950 articles on "Marxism and the Problem of Linguistics." Because Stalin's articles indicated that some sciences were not part of the base or the superstructure (i.e. neutral), he complained about the difficulty of differentiating the categories of "science," "natural science" and

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 69, 264 f. 195.

<sup>53</sup> K. Shchadilova, "Riadam s nim liudi stanovilis' luchshe (k stoletiiu so dnia rozhdeniia A. A. Zvorykin)," *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* no. 12 (December 1, 2001): 81–83.



“social science” in his definitions for the *Soviet Encyclopedia*. This criticism reveals exasperation with the unclear signals coming from on high and thus a desire to have definite categories without the arbitrary intervention of the Communist Party into academic affairs.<sup>54</sup>

Zvorykin got his wish after Stalin’s death with the transition from *partiinnost’* to *nauchnost’* (science-mindedness) during the Khrushchev era, or the gradual loosening of the ideological grip of the Party on scientific inquiry, which enabled Soviet scholars to share with Huxley and other Western scholars an appreciation of science as an autonomous practice. Beginning with Stalin’s “Marxism and the Problem of Linguistics,” the Communist Party gradually loosened its hold and allowed scientists to rehabilitate formerly taboo disciplines. Uniquely Soviet scientific theories, such as the Lysenkoism that Huxley had bemoaned, haltingly lost their administrative and intellectual hegemony over the scientific community during the 1950s.<sup>55</sup>

Furthermore, the Soviet Union’s promotion of the “Scientific and Technological Revolution” resulted in a reexamination of the place of science in Marxism-Leninism’s understanding of historical development. During the Khrushchev era Soviet ideology reconceived science as a vital and independent force in historical progress and the construction of communism. Whereas traditional Marxism-Leninism understood science as dependent on and largely a byproduct of the development of technology, during the 1950s Soviet theorists viewed science as a practice that shaped the development of

---

<sup>54</sup> Pollock, *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*, 213.

<sup>55</sup> See Ethan Pollock, “From *Partiinost’* to *Nauchnost’* and Not Quite Back Again: Revisiting the Lessons of the Lysenko Affair,” *Slavic Review* 68, no. 1 (April, 2009): 95–115, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20453270>.

technology. Science became a “direct productive force” and “a vital part of the socioeconomic base.”<sup>56</sup> Moreover, this adjustment in ideology coincided with an increased investment in scientific research: Soviet scientific institutions experienced far-reaching modernization with the construction of large research institutions and the expansion of research. Khrushchev’s goal of catching up to America resulted in an acceleration of the importation of foreign scientific knowledge and the emergence of cybernetics as a major academic fashion.<sup>57</sup>

Far from weakening Soviet adherence to Marxism-Leninism, this turn toward *nauchnost*’ formed the foundation of Khrushchev’s optimistic belief in the possibility of constructing a communist society in the near future. According to the 1961 Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a fundamental component of the realization of communism by 1980 was the “organic fusion of science and production,” as well as “rapid scientific and technical progress.”<sup>58</sup> The Communist Party promised that it would “do everything to *enhance the role of science* in the building of communist society,” including the “rapid and extensive application of the latest scientific and technical achievements,” as well as “the efficient organization of scientific and technical

---

<sup>56</sup> Alexander Vucinich, *Empire of Knowledge : The Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1917-1970)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). 275.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., chap. The Thaw and the Scientific and Technological Revolution, 1954–1970.

<sup>58</sup> Gary Hodnett, ed., “XXII Party Congress: Programme of the CPSU, Oct. 31, 1961,” in *Resolutions and Decisions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: The Khrushchev Years, 1953-1964*, vol. 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 211. See also Susan E. Reid, “The Khrushchev Kitchen: Domesticating the Scientific-Technological Revolution,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 40, no. 2 (April, 2005): 289–316, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036325>.

information and of the whole system of studying and disseminating progressive Soviet and foreign methods.”<sup>59</sup>

Bonifatii Mikhailovich Kedrov, another member of the Soviet National Commission to the *History of Mankind* project, embodied this transition from *partiinnost*’ to *nauchnost*’. During the height of the *zhdanovshchina*, Kedrov defended the autonomy of science. As a professor of the history of the philosophy of science, Kedrov attended the discussions in 1946 of Georgii Aleksandrov’s book, *History of Western Philosophy*. The debates over this book, revolving around the question of whether scientists should view their research through the lens of Party interpretation, defined the relationship between science and Marxism-Leninism during the late-Stalinist period. Eventually, Andrei Zhdanov, in a speech that is often considered to be the first major formulation of the *zhdanovshchina*, declared scientific knowledge subordinate to *partiinnost*’. However, during the discussions preceding this speech, Kedrov opposed Zhdanov over the question of the role of Marxism-Leninism in the field of science. Kedrov supported the idea that Marxism-Leninism needed to adapt to modern science, while Zhdanov declared that scientists needed to adjust to the Communist Party’s dictates.<sup>60</sup>

Although the majority of scholars at the time argued for a focus on Russian philosophers and the exclusion of Western philosophy from the list of approved subjects, Kedrov defended Western philosophy, arguing that class provided a better litmus test than nationalism for the approval of correct views. Kedrov also argued that the Institute of Philosophy should have its own journal instead of simply printing propaganda pieces

---

<sup>59</sup> Hodnett, “XXII Party Congress: Programme of the CPSU, Oct. 31, 1961.” 216-17.

<sup>60</sup> Pollock, *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*, 27–37.

for Party publications such as *Bolshevik*. After some hesitation, Zhdanov agreed to support a philosophy journal and Kedrov became its editor-in-chief. Unfortunately, shortly after the journal's debut, members of Agitprop launched a campaign against it and succeeded in removing Kedrov as editor.<sup>61</sup>

The Soviet press attacked Kedrov's promotion of international solidarity among scientists and philosophers, advocating his removal from the Institute of Philosophy. He later recanted his position and characterized it as "bourgeois cosmopolitanism." "The slightest advocacy of cosmopolitic [sic] views," he wrote in a letter to the Soviet publication *Culture and Life*, "is direct treason to the cause of Communism." Or at least, this is how Julian Huxley characterized Kedrov's volte-face in *Soviet Genetics and World Science*. Huxley included Kedrov's self-criticism in regard to his position on science and philosophy as an example of the terror that reigned down on those who supported international intellectual cooperation.<sup>62</sup>

After Stalin's death, Kedrov's and Huxley's intellectual careers crossed paths again when Kedrov became a member of the Soviet National Commission to the UNESCO project. But by this time, Kedrov could move beyond the ideological dictates of late Stalinism.<sup>63</sup> Thanks to the role of *Vestnik* as a "cosmopolitan" discursive space founded for the purpose of improving Soviet contribution to the UNESCO enterprise, Kedrov could write analyses of Western thought formerly anathema to the rigid "dogma" of the *zhdanovshchina*. In the first issue of *Vestnik*, Kedrov criticized the nationalism that

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 37-40.

<sup>62</sup> I describe Kedrov's predicament in the same manner in which Huxley does in his work. Huxley, *Soviet Genetics and World Science; Lysenko and the Meaning of Heredity*. 161.

<sup>63</sup> For a discussion of Kedrov's views during this time, see Institut filosofii (Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk) et al., *Bonifatii Mikhailovich Kedrov* (Moskva: ROSSPĖN, 2010), 23.

had pervaded academia under Stalin and championed international cooperation as a vital catalyst of scientific progress. According to Kedrov, “in the natural sciences, this implies the interaction of scholars from different countries in acquiring and applying knowledge,” since “the spirit of nationalism and chauvinism distorts the real historical processes by exaggerating the contributions of some nations over others.”<sup>64</sup> Kedrov could even write an analysis of August Comte’s “classification of the natural sciences” and conclude that “Comte’s doctrine concerning the classification of the sciences, in spite of the positivism of his non-scientific sociology and his agnosticism, is preserved as the necessary preparation and precondition for the modern classification of the sciences.”<sup>65</sup>

During the “thaw,” the transition from *partiinost’* to *nauchnost’* represented a rejection of the ideological distortion of science that Huxley had criticized in relation to the Lysenko affair. These broader changes in the Soviet approach to international cultural exchange and science provided a set of shared values that enabled Soviet participation in the *History of Mankind* project. Some members of the Soviet National Commission to this venture had disapproved of both the subordination of scientific inquiry to ideology and the xenophobia of the late 1940s. As diplomats in Khrushchev’s new “public diplomacy” campaign in the 1950s, the same scholars explored topics that under Stalin had been condemned. Although this reformulation of Soviet ideology enabled Soviet scholars to agree on the importance of the general topics of inquiry of UNESCO’s *History*, it by no means resolved the differences between the Scientific Humanist and

---

<sup>64</sup> B. M. Kedrov, “D. I. Mendeleev ob internatsional’nom kharaktere nauki,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 1, no. 1 (February 1957): 63. A former student of Kedrov’s remembered that the professor criticized Khrushchev’s 1956 denunciation of Stalin as “superficial” and thought that it “failed to disclose the deep roots of the monstrous repression—for which they had tried to exclude him from the party.”

<sup>65</sup> B. M. Kedrov, “Ogiust Kont o klassifikatsii estestvennykh nauk,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 6, no. 6 (December 1957): 34.

Marxist-Leninist understandings of the social place of science, historical progress and the nature of mankind's universality.

## Chapter 4

### **Constructing *History of Mankind*: The Common Pool Meets Class Conflict, 1957-62**

Julian Huxley first publicly pondered UNESCO's involvement in the writing of a universal history in his inaugural address to the Preparatory Commission for UNESCO in 1946, during which he also introduced Scientific Humanism as the necessary philosophy for the international organization. He included the project as part of his Scientific Humanist vision in *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*, declaring that "the chief task before the Humanities today would seem to be to help in constructing a history of the development of the human mind, notably in its highest cultural achievements." *History of Mankind* would function as a vehicle through which a consciousness of the common cultural and scientific heritage of mankind could be instilled in "the minds of men."<sup>66</sup>

However, Huxley by no means dictated the planning and drafting of *History of Mankind*. Poul Duedahl has shown the competing interests and personal battles of the leading members of the International Commission that arose as Huxley's influence over the project decreased after he left his position as director-general of UNESCO in 1948.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, the author-editors of each volume did their best to exclude language that

---

<sup>66</sup> Duedahl, "Selling Mankind," 104.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 103–29. See for Huxley's diminishing power over the project and his original vision for the project. Lucien Febvre desired a less evolutionary, encyclopedic compendium of knowledge, while Yale University historian Ralph Turner sought to maintain Huxley's evolutionary approach but wanted to portray the American way of life as the culmination of historical progress. Furthermore, during the 1950s representatives of the national commissions turned the numerous planning sessions into noisy debates over the content of the volumes. While Duedahl provides a nuanced explanation of the project's planning after Huxley initiated it, and notes his founding of the work, he overlooks the Scientific Humanism of the final edition and how this ideology reflects the origins of the project.

promoted a single ideology. Caroline F. Ware, a cultural historian from Yale and the principle editor of the sixth volume on the twentieth century, ensured that much of the text lacked an orientation toward Huxley's Humanism. During the March 1956 round of revisions of the outline for the volume, Huxley suggested that Ware include a section on Scientific Humanism alongside Marxism, Existentialism and Pragmatism in a chapter on the major philosophical trends of the postwar era.<sup>68</sup> Ware seems to have overruled this revision, providing only a paragraph on Scientific Humanism in the thirteen hundred pages of the volume.<sup>69</sup> Huxley also proposed redefining the section on religion as "religion and ideology," adding "communism as a religion" as a subsection after covering the major monotheistic and polytheistic religions of the world.<sup>70</sup> Ware also omitted this addition from her final draft.<sup>71</sup>

Huxley had, in 1948, argued that UNESCO "should not seek to unify the widely divergent ideological concepts of 'East and West,' but should concentrate instead on 'definite practical projects capable of commanding general agreement.'" Huxley justified this change in dealing with the Soviet Union by asserting that "it is hardly possible ... to

---

<sup>68</sup> "History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind: Volume VI-The Twentieth Century, Revised Plan (Huxley's Comments)," March 1956, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives, 25.

<sup>69</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind: [Cultural and Scientific Development]*. ed. Caroline Ware, K.M. Panikkar, and J.M. Romein, vol. 6 (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 664.

<sup>70</sup> "History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind: Volume VI-The Twentieth Century, Revised Plan (Huxley's Comments)," 1, 20.

<sup>71</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, 850.



carry on discussions with representatives of such an ‘orthodoxy’ by the rationalist methods traditional in the West.”<sup>72</sup>

Yet Huxley remained a dominant voice in the *History* enterprise as one of the six vice presidents on the International Commission. He edited many of the chapters and participated in the planning process. *The New York Times* described Huxley as the “father of the venture,” and noted his emphasis that the *History of Mankind* “concentrates on the scientific and cultural development of the human race.”<sup>73</sup> Moreover, in the 1950s, Huxley still conceived *History of Mankind* as a vital contribution to his Scientific Humanist vision. In a collection of essays published in 1957, he used a refined scientific vocabulary to frame *History of Mankind* as part of his Scientific Humanist project. He explained his hope for a world “noosystem,”—a term he used to “denote the complex of the shareable and transmissible activities and products of human mind, the pattern thought and science, law and morality, art and ritual, which forms the basis of society.” The transmission and evolution of this system throughout history represented “the central quest of the sciences of man: we might call it *noogenetics*.”<sup>74</sup> Huxley claimed that UNESCO’s *History of Mankind*, “if this attempt is successful,” would “mark an important advance in the unified articulation of factual knowledge,” which would stand as one of several “valuable and necessary bases for noetic unification.”<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Kathleen Teltsch, “Cultural Deviation in Soviet Bloc Seen: Barriers in Iron Curtain Area Equal East-West Disparity, Huxley Says in Report,” *The New York Times*, November 17, 1948.

<sup>73</sup> Fred Hechinger, “UNESCO Finishing 6-Volume History: Mammoth Story of Man’s Development Will Begin to Appear in ’61,” *The New York Times*, December 4, 1960.

<sup>74</sup> Julian Huxley, *New Bottles for New Wine: Essays*, Readers Union ed. (London: Chatto & Windus, 1959), 50-52.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 56.

Huxley was not alone in his desire for *History of Mankind* to contribute to the fulfillment of his original vision for UNESCO. René Maheu, the director-general of UNESCO (1961-74), advocated a philosophy he called “Humanism of Development,” which combined Huxley’s Scientific Humanism with a greater emphasis on global economic development. Maheu expressed his regret that UNESCO had strayed from Huxley’s evolutionary and scientific stance during the 1950s. Endowing UNESCO with the mission of creating “l’civilisation de l’universal,” he sought to guarantee UNESCO remained “committed to the promotion of humanism, to a cultural regeneration, whose main fountainhead is science.” UNESCO had to make sure that science “permeate all spheres in order to bring forth a synthesis, for it is in this synthesis that the unity of man consists.”<sup>76</sup>

In *History of Mankind*, Maheu underscored the work’s mission of manifesting to the world the existence of a shared scientific and cultural heritage. For Maheu, the work offered a narrative constructed on the basis of the Scientific Humanist notion of universality. The “intellectual approach” of the project was “that of the interpretive as opposed to the descriptive historian” because it sought to foster “the gradual development, in its most expressive manifestations, of the consciousness of the universal in man.” “Accordingly,” he wrote, “the work is also an act; for this historical study is itself a cultural achievement calculated to influence, by its spirit and its methods, the present trend of culture.”

Moreover, Maheu depicted *History of Mankind* as a narrative that emanated from and reaffirmed UNESCO’s founding mission. “In this humanism” evidenced in the project, he continued, “whose universality springs not from a unique abstract nature but is

---

<sup>76</sup> Quoted in Pavone, *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart*, 109-21.

being gradually evolved, on the basis of a freely acknowledged diversity through actual contact and continuous effort at understanding and cooperation, UNESCO recognizes its own *raison d'être* and its guiding principle.” The work contained within it what “may well be said to be an *a priori* postulate. This is the very postulate on which UNESCO itself is based, namely, the conviction that international relations, in their ultimate reality, are determined not merely by political and economic factors and considerations but spring as well ... from the capabilities and demands of the mind.” Maheu noted the emphasis the *History* “lays upon this too little known aspect of historical reality in which the ‘intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind’ referred to in the preamble to UNESCO’s Constitution can really be seen at work.”<sup>77</sup>

The International Commission supported a broader Humanism outside of the pages of *History of Mankind*. It published in 1964 a pamphlet, *Modern Humanism*. Although the publishers made clear that “the opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily represent the views of the International Commission,” their publication of the work shows that Humanism pervaded the intellectual atmosphere surrounding the *History*. H. J. Blackham, a British Humanist and a close friend of Huxley’s, authored the pamphlet, which presented a narrative of the history of Humanism from ancient Greece to the twentieth century. He portrayed Julian Huxley as a principle advocate of the

---

<sup>77</sup> The International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, 1380-84. The Brazilian Professor Paulo E. de Berrêdo Carneiro, who served as president of the International Commission, also located the origin of the venture in Huxley’s early ruminations about the project, quoting at length from *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy* in his preface to the volumes. Both the foreword and preface were republished at the end of the final volume.

International Humanist and Ethical Union (IHEU), and the individual responsible for Humanism's resurgence after the Second World War.<sup>78</sup>

In spite of the lack of references to Huxley's philosophy in the body of *History of Mankind*, Scientific Humanism provided the overarching framework and defined the parameters in which other delegates to the enterprise debated the work. In the volume on the twentieth century, over half of the content filled a section, "The Development and Application of Scientific Knowledge." In their preface to this volume, the author-editors claimed that it was "only in the twentieth century that such a History could have been undertaken at all," since "only in the twentieth century have we had access to the knowledge which enables us to see mankind as one."<sup>79</sup>

With the exception of Libertarian, Catholic, and a few other criticisms of the twentieth-century volume, Western scholars presented a universal narrative of scientific and technological development that bore the spirit of Scientific Humanism. The degree to which each chapter championed secular, scientific progress depended on the views of scholars working on each chapter.<sup>80</sup> But for the vast majority of the work, the legacy of Scientific Humanism created a history in which the universality of mankind, or the falsity of national and ideological boundaries, and the universal potential of science, determined

---

<sup>78</sup> H. J. Blackham and The International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *Modern Humanism* (Neuchatel, Switzerland: UNESCO; Editions de la Baconnaire, 1964). For a brief discussion of Blackham's relationship with Huxley and Scientific Humanism, see Bill Cooke, *A Wealth of Insights : Humanist Thought Since the Enlightenment* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2011), 149-54.

<sup>79</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, xi.

<sup>80</sup> I have not looked into every scholar contributing to the project. What matters for my purposes is what was written, not their historical methodologies outside of the project. Because the UNESCO project was based on the premise of a common scientific and cultural development of mankind, it likely attracted scholars to the project who would emphasize the progression of globalization through the dissemination of science and cultural exchange.

the limits to the author-editors' acceptance of divergent views. Declarations such as "the emergence of a new scientific outlook and its impact on the thought and life of mankind," and "the elaboration of scientific thought and the application of scientific knowledge as the dynamic interplay between knowledge and action" that "remade one aspect after another of the life of mankind," provided the plot for the facts presented in the work.<sup>81</sup> The authors also depicted technological development (i.e. the application of scientific knowledge to industry) as a universal phenomenon. According to the chapter on modern industry, "the technological development of the twentieth century followed a common course throughout the world, despite difference in levels of development and in social institutions." In "a broad sense," the authors continued, "technology like science constituted a common pool of knowledge, available to all who commanded the understanding, skill and resources to make use of it."<sup>82</sup>

However, Soviet opinions were largely excluded from this narrative that supposedly conveyed a "common pool" or "noetic system" of scientific and cultural knowledge. Editors of the different volumes blamed the Soviet Union's belated enrollment in UNESCO for the multitude of endnotes that represented the major contribution of Soviet scholars to *History of Mankind*. Be that as it may, during the six years of drafting that followed Soviet representatives' involvement in 1956, Soviet scholars' divergence from the ideological premise of the venture accounted for the impossibility of seamlessly incorporating the Soviet view into the narrative. Regarding

---

<sup>81</sup> I have in mind here, vaguely, Hayden White's discussion of "emplotment." See Hayden White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 81–100.

<sup>82</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*. 121, 158.

the volume on the twentieth century, the author-editors had gathered most of the material by 1956, prepared the text in 1957-58 and allowed revisions until 1962.<sup>83</sup> Ware did everything in her power to include Soviet comments in the final draft, corresponding with an UNESCO secretary and her fellow author-editors about Soviet revisions via mail and telegram.<sup>84</sup>

Nevertheless, the ideological gulf between Western viewpoints and Soviet ideology proved impossible for the scholars to overcome. Serving as reminders of the ideological divisions remaining in the world, the endnotes interrupted the main text's "common pool" of scientific knowledge and presented constant qualifications to its claims of universality. In an endnote on "the new scientific thought," for example, Soviet scholars railed against the text's assertion that there was a "unifying outlook" in relation to science. They claimed that the "ideas put forward here as characteristic of the modern scientific world-outlook (for example, the ideas of indeterminism, uncertainty, the 'personal' character of science, etc.), in reality testify to the absence of proper scientific method." Soviet scholars noted the authors' propensity to gloss over major ideological differences and ignore the Cold War elephant in the room. "In science," they wrote, "a stubborn ideological struggle is in progress—one which has not been reflected by the authors of chapter VI."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, xii.

<sup>84</sup> Caroline Ware, "Letters to Jean A. Peters, Secretary to G.S. Metreux," 1962, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.; J.M. Romein, "Telegram from J.M. Romein via Imperial Telecommunication Service," January 23, 1962, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

<sup>85</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, 6:163–4, f. 29.

The author-editors largely confined Soviet scholars' influence on the main text to sections discussing the history of the Soviet Union, leaving the writing of world history to nonsocialist scholars. In response to the revisions Zvorykin brought to Paris in March 1956, Ware thanked him for his effort, but told him that the editors had "decided to maintain the plan which we had adopted after very careful thought and discussion." Instead of asking for further Soviet contribution to the content of the universal narrative, Ware urged Zvorykin to supply "notes for the two principle sections of our outline which deal directly with the Russian experience," as well as "specific information from Russian sources."<sup>86</sup> Zvorykin sent Ware several hundred pages of articles on an assortment of subjects, such as Soviet geographical exploration, public transportation and architecture. Ware marked some as "very interesting," and others as "dull."<sup>87</sup>

Relegated to the task of writing a particularistic historical narrative of the Soviet Union for a universal history, Soviet scholars focused on excising anti-Soviet language from segments relating to their own country's past. They managed to alter the work's representations of Stalinism, the tumultuous events of the "thaw" and recent international activities for which the Soviet Union had been criticized in the West. In the "minor revisions" sent to Ware during the spring of 1962, Zvorykin offered a deluge of adjustments to "unacceptable statements contained in the text of volume VI." Among the hundreds of corrections to the draft, Soviet representatives replaced the phrase "the extreme forms of dictatorship of Stalin," with "the cult of personality of J. Stalin;" the

---

<sup>86</sup> Caroline Ware, "Answer from Dr. Caroline Ware to Professor A.A. Zvorikine's Comments on Volume VI" Memo, July 10, 1956, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

<sup>87</sup> "Soviet Memo: Supplementary Materials," 1956, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 13, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

characterization of Eastern European states as “in the communist orbit” changed to an account of Eastern European states who had “joined the communist camp,” and the claim that the Soviet Union had “repressed with unhesitating ruthlessness signs of defection among its Eastern European states, notably Hungary” was rewritten as the Soviet Union having “resolutely helped the young socialist countries to struggle against all attempts at restoring the capitalist structure in Eastern Europe.”<sup>88</sup> According to an endnote added by the author-editors to the final edition, this whitewashing of the communist experience “has been criticized by several scholars on the ground that the author-editors have treated official communist ideology as if it were reality.”<sup>89</sup> In fact, communists had written a large portion of it!

Despite the Soviet National Commission’s control over the writing of their own country’s past, the subjugation of Soviet points of view to endnotes produced a narrative that often treated the Soviet Union with Western eyes. While Huxley’s drive to include a lengthy elaboration of the religious nature of communism met Ware’s axe, the introduction to the final draft of the section on religion began with the proclamation that “communism itself constituted a comprehensive system of thought and belief.”<sup>90</sup> In an endnote, Soviet scholars responded by stressing that they disseminated “genuinely

---

<sup>88</sup> “Unacceptable Statements Contained in the Text of Volume VI and the Formulations Offered by Soviet Scholars,” March 24, 1962, Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9: “Minor Revisions” suggested by Soviet Scholars, Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives. Some, but not all of these rewrites were rejected by Ware.

<sup>89</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, f. 8, 74.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 846.



scientific knowledge” to their people and that in the Soviet Union “the spiritual and material needs of people are being satisfied to a greater and greater extent.”<sup>91</sup>

The disagreements between Soviet scholars and their Western counterparts surfaced in the changing content of *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury*. By 1959, the UNESCO enterprise had almost completely disappeared from the journal's pages. Soviet scholars' failure to mention the project can be attributed to the cessation of major reformulations of the text around this time. However, the fact that the editors never included drafts and information concerning the volumes on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, debated until the early 1960s, suggests a willful concealment from the Soviet readership of the volumes covering the most recent events in world history. Instead, the editors filled the journal with negative analyses of various Western intellectual currents, some of which they had become acquainted with during their participation in the UNESCO project.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 896, f. 1.

<sup>92</sup> The journal contained numerous criticisms of topics covered in *History of Mankind*, as well as critiques of the historical methodologies of Ralph Turner, a vice president and former president of the International Commission, and Caroline Ware, the primary author-editor of Volume VI. It also contained a lengthy attack on the work of John Dewey, who described himself as a Scientific Humanist, participated in Humanist organizations, supported Huxley as director-general of UNESCO, and was a member of the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation (I.I.I.C.), UNESCO's predecessor. In 1949, Dewey wrote a widely discussed contribution to a symposium published by UNESCO entitled *Democracy in a World of Tensions*. In this work, Dewey criticized Soviet repression of freedom and argued that “UNESCO stands as a symbol” of the democratic values that the West had to support. For analyses of general Western topics, see E. A. Pogolian, “Sotsial'no-kul'tur'nye problemy v sovremennom neofreidizme,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 27 (June 1961): 22–39.; and V. A. Tumanov, ““Gosudarstvo vseobshchego blagodenstviiia”: Mif ili deistvitel'nost',” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 1, no. 25 (February 1961): 3–14. For criticisms of Turner and Ware see Ts. G. Arzakan'ian, “Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiia: Problemy teorii i istorii: k kritike sovremennoi zapadnoi literatury,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 27 (June 1961): 71–73. For the close expose of John Dewey's work, see L. C. Sentebov, “Voprosy kul'tury v filosofii dzhona d'iui,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 5, no. 17 (October 1959): 23, 28. For a discussion of Dewey's relationship with Huxley and UNESCO, see Pavone, *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart*. 49–53. For Dewey's writings on UNESCO, see Unesco and Richard (Richard Peter) McKeon, *Democracy in a World of Tensions: A Symposium Prepared by UNESCO* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951). For examples of the praising of Dewey's pedagogical theories in the main text of the *History*, see International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind,

A key divergence between Soviet and Western contributors to *History of Mankind* resided in the debate over whether science could exist as a “classless” common pool of knowledge in a world divided between the exploiters and the exploited. In contrast to the premise of the universality of science that Scientific Humanism gave to *History of Mankind*, and despite the Soviet Union’s emphasis on autonomous scientific research, for Soviet academics science and technology were enmeshed in a social existence that determined their value. Although pure scientific knowledge and machines could cross national and ideological borders, the social efficacy of applied science and its historical development were difficult to discuss without contextualizing them into political and social history. Any suggestion that technology could permanently improve life in the West did not fit into the Soviet assumption that only socialism and eventually communism provided the relations of production necessary for the positive use of scientific knowledge. The segments of the main narrative of *History of Mankind* that described technological advance as improving the standard of living among workers, increasing rates of industrial growth, and allowing social mobility in the West incurred the most endnotes from Soviet scholars.<sup>93</sup> “Through the very nature of its social and economic organization,” according to a Soviet endnote, “capitalism does not facilitate the general unlimited development of industry, in all countries and continents.” In contrast,

---

*History of Mankind*, 928-930. Dewey’s presence in UNESCO was so pervasive before his death in 1952, that UNESCO honored him with a radio broadcast and dinner on his birthday in 1949, see Jaime Bodet, “Jaime Torres Bodet to Harry W. Laidler,” October 10, 1949, *The Correspondence of John Dewey, 1871-1952*, Intellex Pastmasters.

<sup>93</sup> For examples, see International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, 284-288, f. 1, 2, 4; 568, f. 7. Criticisms of bourgeois “fetishization of technology” and “technological determinism” dominated the pages of *Vestnik*. Contributors to the journal questioned the supposition that technology could improve life regardless of social structures and argued that only the socialist application of technology truly brought progress.

“the socialist system opened up new opportunities for the development of the productive forces of society, such as were unknown to capitalism and which it was incapable of realizing.”<sup>94</sup> Soviet scholars criticized the assumption of the main narrative that technology was a neutral force transcending socioeconomic conditions, often referring in the endnotes to “the clearest demonstration of the distorted development of technology under capitalism” as being “its subordination to purposes of destruction.”<sup>95</sup>

Soviet scholars also discerned and disapproved of the Humanism that formed the foundation of the *History* and pervaded the discourse surrounding its construction. In the second to last issue of *Vestnik*, the editors included analysis of what they considered the well-meaning but futile and even deleterious philosophy called “Realist,” “Ethical,” or “Natural” Humanism—strains of essentially the same “Bourgeois” Humanism.<sup>96</sup> “Recently,” the author observed, “Humanism has served as not only a belief system in the bourgeois world, but the movement has also begun to institutionalize itself” with “a sort of parliament in the form of the congresses of the International Humanist and Ethical Union.” According to the article, Humanists supported “the concept of world order based on human solidarity and not some particular form of society or special social or political program.” But because “Humanism is primarily an educational movement that strives to reach their goals through the dissemination of ideas,” the author continued, Humanists

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 288, f. 5; 568, f. 7.

<sup>95</sup> International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind*, 6: 289, f. 9. For an example from *Vestnik* of similar criticisms, see N. I. Os'mova, “O nekotorykh ‘texnologicheskikh’ teoriiakh sotsial’nykh progressa,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 4, no. 22 (August 1960): 22-29.

<sup>96</sup> The author of the article refers to the philosophy as “Real” (*real'nyi*) Humanism throughout the text. But in a endnote he claims that the “supporters of this Humanism use such terms as “Ethical” [*eticheskii*] Humanism, “Natural” [*estestvennyi*] Humanism, Humanism of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, etc.” He essentially portrays all modern Western Humanism as essentially the same philosophy.

limited their political program to a non-Marxist-Leninist worldview, which “thus leads it to reconciliation with anti-humanist influences in life.”

Humanism not only served as a counterrevolutionary force, the article asserted, but also had become a religion irrespective of its atheistic pretenses. The author observed that “the denial by secular humanists of religion is based on the fact that religion has resorted to a supernatural authority, while Humanists believe that ‘science,’ and not religion and the supernatural, ‘can help us understand the role we should play in the universe and thereby provide a healthier basis than traditional theology.’” The author turned Huxley’s charge that Communism constituted a religion back at him. Referring to a Western article, “The Religion of Julian Huxley,” the Soviet author pointed out that many Humanists actually called their own philosophy a “faith.” Thus, he concluded, “Humanism, in the end went from fighting against religion to entering into a union with it.”<sup>97</sup>

Members of the Soviet National Commission could freely subject Humanism and its presupposition that science transcended sociopolitical ideology to criticisms in the pages of its own journal. They could also have some control over the writing of their own ideology’s particularistic history. But Scientific Humanism held the power to define the discursive arena of *History of Mankind*. The UNESCO endeavor amounted to a hybrid of the Scientific Humanist ideology of UNESCO’s early years, which formed the framework of the main text, and the “functionalist,” or more democratic and less overtly ideological nature of UNESCO during the 1950s, which allowed for the plurality of

---

<sup>97</sup> V. I. Mikheev, “Idei gumanizma i sovremennost’,” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury* 5, no. 29 (October 1961): 30–43.

voices within this framework.<sup>98</sup> Yet Western participants operated within the project's founding Scientific Humanist narrative. The democratic space resulting from the input of the various national commissions largely excluded the Soviet emphasis on class conflict as opposed to universality, and its alternative universalism based on the development of the productive forces *within* broader social relations.

---

<sup>98</sup> Pavone, *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart*, 84–92.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion

In 1967, just a year after the publication of *History of Mankind*, *Literaturnaia gazeta* published a “polemic” between Julian Huxley and a Soviet academic, T. Oizerman. The pairing of the two authors’ editorials placed Huxley’s “Utopian” Humanism and the Soviet Union’s Socialist Humanism head-to-head. The Soviet author expressed his agreement with “the conviction of J. Huxley ... in relation to the genetic unity of all mankind.” But Huxley’s portrayal of humanity in evolutionary terms, according to the Soviet author, “begs a reservation: because capitalists and proletarians are of one and the same type of *Homo sapiens* does not diminish the glaring contrast between the social situations and way of life of the two. Unfortunately, the sociological naturalism of the author leaves in the dark that fundamental fact.”

The “unity of the fate of mankind,” from the Soviet author’s perspective, resided not in “the anthropological unity of the human race.” Rather, “today the interests of the future demand new steps in social development by means of the abolition of classes and the building of a classless society.” In relation to the environmental and social problems Huxley addressed in his article, the author critiqued Huxley’s support of eugenics and his Scientific Humanism, claiming that “the only thing he offers in the form of a solution, except for the improvement and dissemination of tools to prevent pregnancy, is to change consciousness, which, according to the logic of the idealist conception of history, should result in a change in social reality.” Furthermore, if the Western intelligentsia wanted to

reform capitalism, it had to exchange “Evolutionary Humanism for a real, revolutionary Humanism.” For Huxley’s aim to found ““a new dominate organization of thought and belief, which can stimulate our search and move us forward” ignored the determination of consciousness by the economic base: “As Marx and Engels explained more than a hundred years ago, a change of consciousness in itself simply means changing the interpretation of the existing situation of things, that is, an understanding of it by another interpretation.”<sup>99</sup>

During their participation in the project for a “History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind,” Soviet scholars contested UNESCO’s founding premise that such a change in consciousness, or in “the minds of men,” could solve social problems and build a permanent peace. Soviet dialectical materialism clashed with the “idealist” vision at the heart of UNESCO. Even though both Soviet ideology and the Scientific Humanist discourse surrounding *History of Mankind* placed science at the center of their philosophies, the difference between the two ideologies derived from their understanding of the relationship between socioeconomic forces and the successful application of scientific knowledge. *History of Mankind* treated scientific innovation as a fundamental component of an evolutionary development of universal consciousness that could transcend socioeconomic ideologies and systems, while Soviet scholars understood applied science as inevitably detrimental in the capitalist world and only emancipatory in societies that embraced socialism. The arguments over applied science were ones over the nature of humanity’s universality, and thus over the proper means to create global peace and prosperity in the future.

---

<sup>99</sup> Dzhulian Khaksli and T. Oizerman, “Dva vzgliada na sud’by chelovechestva,” *Literaturnaia gazeta* (Moskva, October 31, 1967), sec. Nauchnye sredi, 12.

The Marxist-Leninist historical schema accommodated a narrower array of philosophical positions. However, the Soviet presence in the endnotes to the pages of *History of Mankind* brought out the limitations to the UNESCO project's aspiration to reveal to humanity its common past in spite of the stark ideological divisions existing at the time. When Soviet academics joined the UNESCO project they did not step into a nonideological world. UNESCO, aspiring to universalism, sponsored a project pervaded with the Humanism of its founding Charter. Claiming universality, the main narrative failed to include an array of voices that represented present reality. Instead, the authors' description of human solidarity described the world the writers of UNESCO's Charter desired. Libertarian, Communist, or Catholic scholars' voices that undermined the effort for consensus in the main narrative were marginalized as mere endnotes to the dominate themes of secularism, the universality of mankind, and applied science that the ideology of the project portrayed as the primary story of all peoples in all places.

Julian Huxley never ceased to promote freedom of the mind in the Soviet Union. In 1958, during the writing of *History of Mankind*, he signed a letter delivered to the Soviet Writers Union protesting treatment of Boris Pasternak, urging the union "in the name of the great Russian literary tradition for which you stand not to dishonor it by victimizing a writer revered throughout the whole civilized world."<sup>100</sup> A year before *Literaturnaia gazeta* published the debate between Huxley and a Soviet academic, he also signed a letter requesting the release from prison of dissidents Iulii Daniel and Andrei Siniavskii.<sup>101</sup> Yet although the Soviet Union eventually ceased to exist, *History of*

---

<sup>100</sup> "Britons Decry Soviet Action," *The New York Times*, October 30, 1958.

<sup>101</sup> "Western Writers Appeal to Soviet: 49 in 5 Lands Ask Liberty for Sinyavsky and Daniel," *The New York Times*, February 1, 1966.



*Mankind* had very little impact on either academic history or “the minds of men.” The work was eventually published in Russian in the 1970s, but there is no evidence that it got a foot in the door of the Soviet Union, while in the West it has largely been forgotten.<sup>102</sup> In the end, Huxley’s Humanism and Soviet Marxism-Leninism shared a common fate: both were failed universalist projects. But only one changed the consciousness, for better or for worse, of peoples from all parts of the globe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>102</sup> Duedahl, “Selling Mankind,” 128–33.

## Bibliography

### *Primary Sources*

- Blackham, H. J., and International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind. *Modern Humanism*. Neuchatel, Switzerland: UNESCO; Editions de la Baconnaire, 1964.
- Bodet, Jaime. "Jaime Torres Bodet to Harry W. Laidler," October 10, 1949. *The Correspondence of John Dewey, 1871-1952*. Intellex Pastmasters.
- Hechinger, Fred. "UNESCO Finishing 6-Volume History: Mammoth Story of Man's Development Will Begin to Appear in '61." *The New York Times*, December 4, 1960.
- Hodnett, Gary, ed. "XXII Party Congress: Programme of the CPSU, Oct. 31, 1961." In *Resolutions and Decisions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: The Khrushchev Years, 1953-1964*. Vol. 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Huxley, Julian. *A Scientist Among the Soviets*. Harper & brothers, 1932.
- . *Memories*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. [1st U.S. ed.]. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- . *New Bottles for New Wine : Essays*. Readers Union ed. London: Chatto & Windus, 1959.
- . *Religion Without Revelation*. [New and rev. ed.]. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- . *Soviet Genetics and World Science; Lysenko and the Meaning of Heredity*. London, Chatto and Windus, 1949.: Chatto and Windus, n.d.
- . *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*. Public Affairs Press, 1947.
- . and T. Oizerman. "Dva vzgliada na sud'by chelovechestva." *Literaturnaia gazeta*. Moskva, October 31, 1967, sec. Nauchnye sredi.
- International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind. *History of Mankind: [Cultural and Scientific Development]*. Edited by Caroline Ware, K.M. Panikkar, and J.M. Romein. Vol. 6. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Romanovskii, S, Siskian, N. M. and Vasilii Vasil'evich Vakhrushev. *IuNESKO i sovremennost': k 20-letiiu IuNESKO*. Moskva: Izd-vo "Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia", 1966.
- Romein, J. M. "Telegram from J.M. Romein via Imperial Telecommunication Service," January 23, 1962. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

Teltsch, Kathleen. "Cultural Deviation in Soviet Bloc Seen: Barriers in Iron Curtain Area Equal East-West Disparity, Huxley Says in Report." *The New York Times*, November 17, 1948.

Unesco, and McKeon, Richard. *Democracy in a World of Tensions: A Symposium Prepared by UNESCO*. University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Ware, Caroline. Memo. "Answer from Dr. Caroline Ware to Professor A.A. Zvorikine's Comments on Volume VI" Memo, July 10, 1956. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

———. "Letters to Jean A. Peters, Secretary to G.S. Metreaux," 1962. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

Zaslavskii, D. "S kem oni, mastera kul'tury?" *Pravda*, September 6, 1948.

Zavich, I. "Professor Khaksli nedovolen..." *Literaturnaia gazeta*, September 7, 1948.

"A Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization." In *Basic Texts*, 7. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2004.

"Britons Decry Soviet Action." *The New York Times*, October 30, 1958.

*General Conference, Ninth Session: Annual Report of the President of the International Commission For a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind*. UNESCO, December 5, 1956. SC/PRG/9. UNESCODOC.

*General Conference: First Session*. UNESCO House Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1947. UNESCO/C/30. UNESCODOC. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/resources/online-materials/publications/unesdoc-database/>.

"History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind: Volume VI-The Twentieth Century, Revised Plan (Huxley's Comments)," March 1956. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

"Soviet Memo: Supplementary Materials," 1956. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 13. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

"Unacceptable Statements Contained in the Text of Volume VI and the Formulations Offered by Soviet Scholars," March 24, 1962. Caroline Farrar Ware Papers; MS 534, Box 9: "Minor Revisions" suggested by Soviet Scholars. Yale University Library Manuscripts and Archives.

“Western Writers Appeal to Soviet: 49 in 5 Lands Ask Liberty for Sinyavsky and Daniel.” *The New York Times*, February 1, 1966.

### *Secondary Sources*

Arzakan'ian, Ts. G. “Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiia: Problemy teorii i istorii: k kritike sovremennoi zapadnoi literatury.” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 27 (June 1961): 59–73.

Cooke, Bill. *A Wealth of Insights : Humanist Thought Since the Enlightenment*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2011.

David-Fox, Michael. *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and the Soviet Union, 1921-1941*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Duedahl, Poul. “Selling Mankind: UNESCO and the Invention of Global History, 1945-1976.” *Journal of World History* 22, no. 1 (2011): 101–133.  
doi:10.1353/jwh.2011.0000.

Gaiduk, I. V. “Sovetskii Soiuz i IuNESKO v gody ‘kholodnoi voiny,’ 1945-1967.” *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia* no. 1 (2007): 20–34.

Gleason, Abbot. “The Great Reforms And The Historians Since Stalin.” *Russian History-Histoire Russe* 17, no. 3 (January 1, 1990): 281–296.

Gotshok, L. “Proekt prospekta IV-go toma istorii nauchnogo i kul'turnogo razvitiia chelovechestva.” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 127–158.

Gould–Davies, Nigel. “The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy.” *Diplomatic History* 27, no. 2 (2003): 193–214. doi:10.1111/1467-7709.00347.

Hodgson, Marshall. “Hemispheric Interregional History as an Approach to World History.” *Cahiers d'histoire Mondiale* 1 (1954): 715–723.

———. “Mezhregional'naia istoriia polusharii kak metod izucheniia mirovoi istorii.” *Vestnik Istorii Mirovoi Kul'tury* 1, no. 1 (1957): 9–16.

Institut filosofii (Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk), V. A. Lektorski, Nekommercheskii nauchnyi fond “Institut razvitiia im G. P. Shchedrovitskogo.” *Bonifatii Mikhailovich Kedrov*. Moskva: ROSSPĖN, 2010.

Johnston, Timothy. “Peace or Pacifism? The Soviet ‘Struggle for Peace in All the World’, 1948-54.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 86, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 259–282. doi:10.2307/25479199.

Kedrov, B. M. "Ogiust Kont o klassifikatsii estestvennykh nauk." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 6, no. 6 (December 1957): 3-34.

———. "D. I. Mendeleev Ob internatsional'nom kharaktere nauki." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 1, no. 1 (February 1957): 63.

Malin, M. "Anglo-russkie kul'turnye i nauchnye sviazi." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 98–107.

Markwick, Roger. *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia : The Politics of Revisionist Historiography, 1956-1974*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ;New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Mikheev, V. I. "Idei gumanizma i sovremennost'." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 5, no. 29 (October 1961): 30–43.

Os'mova, N. I. "O nekotorykh 'texnologicheskikh' teoriiakh sotsial'nykh progressa." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 4, no. 22 (August 1960): 21-43.

Pavone, Vincenzo. *From the Labyrinth of the World to the Paradise of the Heart : Science and Humanism in UNESCO's Approach to Globalization*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008.

Pogosian, E. A. "Sotsial'no-kultur'nye problemy v sovremennom neofreidizme." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 27 (June 1961): 22–39.

Péteri, György. "Sites of Convergence: The USSR and Communist Eastern Europe at International Fairs Abroad and at Home." *Journal of Contemporary History* 47, no. 1 (January 1, 2012): 8. doi:10.1177/0022009411422373.

Pollock, Ethan. "From Partiinost' to Nauchnost' and Not Quite Back Again: Revisiting the Lessons of the Lysenko Affair." *Slavic Review* 68, no. 1 (April 1, 2009): 95–115. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20453270>.

———. *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Radovskii, M. I. "Russko-amerikanskii nauchnye sviazi v 18-19 Vv." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 2, no. 2 (April 1957): 100–106.

Reid, Susan E. "The Khrushchev Kitchen: Domesticating the Scientific-Technological Revolution." *Journal of Contemporary History* 40, no. 2 (April 1, 2005): 289–316. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036325>.

Sathyamurthy, T. *The Politics of International Cooperation: Contrasting Conceptions of U.N.E.S.C.O.* Droz, 1964.

- Shchadilova, K. "Riadam s nim liudi stanovilis' luchshe (k stoletiiu so dnia rozhdeniia A. A. Zvorykin)." *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* no. 12 (December 1, 2001): 81–83.
- Sentebov, L. C. "Voprosy kul'tury v filosofii Dzhona D'iui." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 5, no. 17 (October 1959): 22–44.
- Sluga, Glenda. "UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley." *Journal of World History* 21, no. 3 (2010): 393–418. doi:10.1353/jwh.2010.0016.
- Tumanov, V. A. "'Gosudarstvo vseobshchego blagodenstviia': Mif ili deistvitel'nost'." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 1, no. 25 (February 1961): 3–14.
- Vucinich, Alexander. *Empire of Knowledge : The Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1917-1970)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Wells, Clare. *The UN, UNESCO and the Politics of Knowledge*. London: Macmillan, 1987.
- White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*, 81–100. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Wong, Laura Elizabeth. "Relocating East and West: UNESCO's Major Project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values." *Journal of World History* 19, no. 3 (2008): 349–374. doi:10.1353/jwh.0.0019.
- Zubok, V. A. *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- . *Zhivago's Children: The Last Russian Intelligentsia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Zvorykin, A. A. "Ot redaktsii." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 1, no. 1 (January 1957): 3–5.
- "Istoricheskaiia nauka za rubezhom. Podgotovka vseobshchei istorii nauki i kul'tury v IuNESKO." *Voprosy istorii* no. 1 (January 1955): 191.
- "Zamechaniia po proektu prospekta IV-go toma, razrabotannomu professorom Luisom Gotshokom." *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul'tury* 3, no. 3 (June 1957): 159–167.