SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY continues the materialist tradition which has found its fullest expression in Marxism. Soviet historians are guided in their work by the method of historical materialism. The break with the theoretical and methodological postulates of bourgeois historiography does not, however, imply that we reject the scientific acquisitions of the past. There is nothing in Marxism resembling "sectarianism", in the sense of its being a hidebound, petrified doctrine.

While critically examining the heritage of pre-revolutionary historiography, Soviet historians by no means jettison the findings of its specific investigations, any more than they discard the valuable factual results of the investigations of contemporary foreign authors adhering to a different methodology.

The development of Soviet historical science has involved a struggle against two dangers. The one is mere empiricism, a skimming over the surface of the facts, a rejection of broad scientific generalisation. There is, of course, a trend in sociology which denies even the possibility of "generalising" individual and allegedly "non-recurring" historical phenomena, or of going beyond a mere description of the facts. Without generalisation, however, there can be no science. What runs through all the theories that deny the possibility of knowing the laws of social development is a fear of the future, an endeavour to halt the march of history, to retard social progress. For this reason, as far back as the nineteen-twenties Soviet historians had unanimously rejected the neo-Kantian methodology of history (W. Windelband, H. Rickert, G. Simmel, M. Weber, B. Croce, et al.), expounded in Russia by A. S. Lappo-Danilevsky, D. M. Petrushevsky and other historians.

The other danger is abstract "sociologisation", the replacement of specific material by concocted scholastic "tabulations", of which M. N. Pokrovsky and his disciples were particularly guilty in their day.

Marxist historical science by no means ignores the great complexity of the social, political and spiritual life of society. Soviet historians make an extensive study of the history of the state and other political institutions, of international relations and foreign policy, of social ideas and culture. We proceed, however, from the fact that the relations of production, the economic system of society expressed in its class structure, are the real foundation upon which rises the political and ideological "superstructure". For this reason, all our general historical investigations begin with a study of the material life of society.

At the same time, we take into account the reaction of political and ideological processes on the conditions of material life which generated them, for ideas and political institutions are a great and active force accelerating or retarding the course of history.

The founders of historical materialism constantly stressed the fact that the objective laws of historical development do not operate by themselves, as a sort of "fate" dominating mankind. In contrast to the laws of nature, social laws operate through the activity of men, classes, the common people, who are the real creators of history. Such past events as the anti-feudal movements and peasant revolts in the Middle Ages, the early bourgeois revolutions and
the righteous wars for independence of foreign rule are a graphic demonstration that history cannot be reduced to a mere narrative of the activities of conquerors, kings and generals, and that its decisive force and real shapers are the common people.

The leading representatives of nineteenth-century bourgeois historiography recognised the role of the people, though with many reservations, restricting it as a rule to spontaneous brief "incursions" into history. Thus Mignet asserted in his *History of the French Revolution* that "the lower class were well able to act and to govern in time of crisis, but could not do so permanently".

A great step forward in treating the role of the people in history was made by Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, the Russian nineteenth-century thinkers, who associated the revolutionary ideas they propagated with the struggle of the peasantry.

Only historical materialism, however, has proved able to give a comprehensive scientific solution to the problem. The changing position of the working people, the growing number of people actively and consciously taking part in the life of society, is the most important aspect of historical progress, in the view of materialist historians. Hence the attention devoted by Soviet historians to the history of the producers of material values; to the role of the working people in creating the material basis of civilisation; to the native roots of the spiritual culture of different epochs; and lastly to the struggle of the working people against oppression in any and every form.

The materialist method has removed historical knowledge from the sphere of subjective definitions and hypotheses, and has laid the foundations for transforming history into an objective and exact science.

We regard world history as one in its vast complexity, underlying which are the successive changes in socio-economic formations—primitive-communal society, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism—each determined by its dominant mode of production of material values. These formations, supplanting one another, constitute the principal stages in the progressive development of human society. All mankind as a whole passes through them, with greater or smaller variations.

Soviet historians also take into account the uneven development of various countries and peoples. The typical phenomenon is not the only one. As a rule, different modes of production co-exist in each of the great historical epochs. It was so in antiquity; when in Rome the slave system existed, in China the transition to feudalism had already taken place, while a large part of mankind was still in the primitive-communal stage. It was so in the Middle Ages also, when the feudal mode of production was not all-embracing, and the population of whole continents (Africa, America, Australia) still lived under the slave system or the primitive-communal order. Many social forms existed in modern times also, when along with the unquestionably dominant rule of capitalism in most European countries there remained more or less substantial survivals of feudalism. Lastly, we ourselves now live in an epoch in which two socio-economic formations, capitalism and socialism, exist side by side. The co-existence of the two systems determines the character and direction of the development of the modern world and all its peoples, including those who are still living not merely in pre-socialist but even in pre-capitalist conditions.

To show each world historical epoch in all its complexity and multifority, in the contradictory intertwining of the new with the old, is a tremendous and as yet far from completed task. The struggle of the growing new with the obsolescent old constitutes the chief content of great historical epochs, and determines their essence. For this reason, while preserving the generally accepted division of world history into antiquity, the middle ages, modern times and recent times, we set chronological boundaries to these periods which reflect their transition to a new and higher mode of production, or mark the
transition to a new stage of development within the framework of the same social formation.

Soviet historians consider the boundary between ancient and medieval history to be the fall of the Roman Empire owing to popular anti-slavery movements and to the onslaughts of the Germanic and Slavic tribes. Modern history opens with the early bourgeois revolutions in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. And finally the history of recent times dates from the 1917 revolution, which caused very profound changes not only in Russia but throughout the world.

Such, in broad outline, is the periodic division of history applied in our scientific works and in secondary-school and college textbooks, including the World History, a ten-volume collective work now in preparation, covering the history of human society from its earliest stages to the present day. The first two volumes, on antiquity, are expected to appear this year. (Of the other eight volumes, two are on medieval history, three on the history of modern times, 1640—1917, and three on the history of recent times, 1917—1945.)

Soviet historians try to show the historical role of all peoples, great and small. In our concept, the unity of the world-historical process necessarily includes the multiplicity of historical forms and ways of social development connected with the specific conditions in different countries and peoples. At the same time, we attach serious importance to the study of the manifold interconnections between peoples which arose long since in antiquity and gradually expanded and branched out in the course of history, as the social division of labour developed, the world market evolved, and world science and culture progressed.

The creation of broad generalising works is preceded by detailed elaboration of particular historical aspects, in separate monographs and essays. Much is done to develop archaeology and auxiliary subjects (archaeography, paleography, diplomatics, epigraphy, numismatics, etc.). We also make considerable use of economic statistics, statutes and other legislative materials, data from linguistics and other allied social sciences, including the history of technology, of the natural and technical sciences and of the arts.

Soviet archaeology has made great progress. It has advanced far beyond a mere “science of relics” and has become an independent branch of historical knowledge. Study of the remains and monuments of material culture (tools, settlements, etc.) plays a particularly important role in learning the character of the social system of those early societies of which no written sources have survived.

We make considerable use of pre-revolutionary documentary publications, and watch eagerly for new publications on the results of archaeological investigations abroad. At the same time, Soviet historians circulate their new materials in all branches of history as widely as possible. The centralisation of archives in the hands of the State, and the great work done in classifying them, has created favourable conditions for research workers and for publishing still unknown or little-known documentary materials.

Our history research personnel has grown in number and quality. We have built up a large network of scientific research establishments, institutes and museums. Instruction in historical subjects, which plays a large part in general secondary and college education, has considerably expanded. An important achievement by our historians is the issue of a number of new secondary-school and college textbooks, which are not only used by students but are read by many of the general public. In 1947-54 alone, eight new college textbooks on history were published, in editions totalling 1,775,000 copies.

New textbooks for elementary and secondary schools on the history of the USSR, of antiquity, of the Middle Ages and of modern times have been published in Russian since the war, in editions totalling 87,500,000 copies. Soviet
history textbooks give the principal facts and processes in Soviet and world history and propagate ideas of friendship among nations and respect for the distinctive national features of the history of other peoples.

Our universities and institutes have 296 chairs of history. Staffs total about 3,000. In addition to teaching, this great army of historians also carries out research.

We also have an extensive network of special scientific institutions working in the fields of history, ethnography, archaeology and the history of the arts. A number of history institutes and establishments make up the Historical Sciences Division of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. (The Historical Sciences Division comprises the Institute of History, the Institute of Oriental Studies, the Institute of Slav Studies, the Institute of the History of Material Culture, the Institute of Ethnography, the Institute of the History of the Arts, the Museum of the History of Religion and the Archives of the USSR Academy of Sciences.)

The Academy of Sciences in each Union Republic usually has several large scientific history institutions. Thus the Ukraine has five, Estonia three, and so on. All the Autonomous Republics have combined history-archaeology-ethnography institutes.

We regard it as a remarkable result of the cultural revolution in our country that scientific historians have been produced from among the formerly oppressed peoples. Works on history are now published in the languages of all the peoples in the USSR, by historians of all the nationalities in the Union. General histories have recently been compiled by the collective efforts of scholars in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tadzhikistan, Buryat-Mongolia, Yakutia, and so on; many of these peoples were scorned by bourgeois ethnography as "peoples with no history".

Creative collaboration between Russian historians and their colleagues from the other fraternal peoples of the USSR is developing successfully. We frequently hold joint scientific conferences to discuss complex unsolved problems concerning individual peoples and problems common to the history of the whole country. In recent years such meetings have been held in Tashkent, Baku, Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius, Minsk and centres in other Soviet republics.

A distinctive feature of Soviet historiography is the combination of individual and collective investigation. Examples of large collective works are Studies in the History of the USSR (seven volumes), History of Moscow (six volumes), Studies in the History of Leningrad (three volumes), History of Historical Science in the USSR (three volumes), and the World History (ten volumes), to name only a few. Every such collective production is a synthesis of the work of a large group of research workers, including historians from the non-Russian republics. Our collective works are unified by a common design, a common world outlook and scientific approach, developed through creative collaboration and through the scientific disputes and discussions which are an integral part of the life of all our institutions and chairs of history. The discussions make it possible for the various viewpoints on as yet unsolved problems to be brought out to the full and for positive solutions to these to be hastened, and they help to obviate one-sided and erroneous views on the part of individual scholars. They are also conducive to the theoretical and scientific growth of all Soviet historians, and in particular of our young research workers. Our discussions are open and public. They are also conducted in our journals, thus promoting historians' intercourse among themselves as well as with their colleagues abroad. (See, for instance, the letter from the British historian G. Thomson, in Vestnik Drevnej Istori, No. 4, 1953.)*
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The monthly journal of the Institute of History, *Voprosy Istorii* (Problems of History), has conducted several discussions in the last few years on the periodisation of the history of Russia,* on the genesis of capitalism in Russia, and on the basic economic law of feudal society, to mention only a few. At the same time it reports discussions going on in the historical institutions of the USSR and in other countries.

Besides this central journal, we also have periodicals on special spheres of historical knowledge: *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Journal of Ancient History), *Istoricheskiye Zapiski* (Historical Records), *Sovetskoye Vostokovedeniye* (Soviet Oriental Studies), *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* (Soviet Archeology), *Sovetskaya Etnografiya* (Soviet Ethnography), *Prepodavaniye Istorii v Shkole* (Teaching History in School). We have resumed publication of *Istoricheski Arkhiv* (Historical Archives), a bi-monthly. In addition, the Institute of History and other Academy of Sciences Institutes issue *Doklady i Soobshcheniya* (Proceedings and Transactions), symposia such as *Sredniye Veka* (The Middle Ages), *Vizantiiski Vremennik* (Byzantine Annals), and so on. The history departments of universities and training colleges, and the research institutes of the various republics, publish symposia and papers regularly.

In a general paper it is not possible to give any fairly detailed account of the results of our scholars’ researches in various branches of historical knowledge. I shall therefore touch on only a few of the problems on which Soviet historians have been working recently.

These include the problem of the formation of class society, the transition from the primitive community to the slave system. Noteworthy, too, are the investigations on the struggle of the oppressed against the slave-owners, and its significance in the history of ancient society; the historical role of Hellenism; the question of the crisis of the Roman Republic and the establishment of the Empire; the socio-economic characteristics of the provinces of the Roman Empire and of early Christianity; and so on.

In elaborating the genesis of feudalism, Soviet historians continue the traditions of pre-revolutionary Russian medieval studies, which devoted primary attention to the agrarian system of the Middle Ages. Historians of feudal society have at their disposal a wealth of documentary material, particularly on the histories of several of the peoples of the USSR. We have studied feudal relations among the peoples of the Orient both on the territory of the USSR and outside its borders.

Soviet historians also devote considerable attention to the medieval city as an economic and cultural centre, with the development of which is associated the appearance of capitalist relations and the rise of humanism.

Soviet Byzantinology, too, concentrates on problems of social and economic development and popular movements. The study of the history of the Slav peoples and their mutual relations in the past has developed considerably in recent years, especially since the opening of the Institute of Slavonic Studies, under the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Continuing the progressive traditions of the Russian oriental school, Soviet investigators have produced a number of works on the socio-economic, political and cultural history of the Orient. They have given a new interpretation of the problems of the development of feudal relations and states in the Orient and the peculiarities of the crisis of feudalism in oriental countries.

Soviet historians have investigated the genesis and evolution of the ancient Russian state. They have authentically proved that the so-called “Norman theory”, that the state in Rus was formed as a result of the “invitation” of the Varangians, is contrary to historical fact. Soviet historical science has conclusively proved that the ancient Russian state arose from the dissolu-

* See ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XII, No. 4.
tion of the primitive communal order and the formation of a class society among the eastern Slavs, and that their first state formations appeared long before the second half of the ninth century, when the Varangians are alleged to have been invited. By the time of the formation of the Kiev state, agriculture was their principal occupation, and feudal-type land-ownership was already being evolved.

In connection with the study of the feudal nature of the relations of production in Kiev Rus, Soviet historians investigate all aspects of its socio-economic, political and cultural history. Special mention should here be given to B. A. Rybakov's comprehensive study *The Crafts in Ancient Rus* (1948), where a detailed analysis of the technique of artisan production, which attained a high level in Rus, is combined with a social analysis and characterisation of the craftsmen's social position. Academician M. N. Tikhomirov, in his original study *Ancient Russian Cities* (1946), gave a new solution to the problem of the rise and development of cities in eastern Europe, analysed the class composition of the city population, and established the role of the cities in the country's social and political life.

Archaeological investigations are being systematically conducted in a number of ancient Russian cities (Kiev, Novgorod, Chernigov, Staraya Ryazan, Ladoga, Moskow, and others). A vivid example of newly discovered material is the collection of birch-bark scrolls discovered and described by A. V. Artsikhovsky.

The further development of feudalism after the disintegration of the Kiev state has not been studied to the same extent in all its stages. Thus the socio-economic history of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for example, has been little investigated, while the history of the peasantry and of popular movements in the medieval city of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries has been elaborated in greater detail.

While regarding socio-economic relations as a major factor in social development, Soviet historians by no means underestimate the role of political institutions and that of the state, which expresses the interests of the ruling classes in a given society.

Thus in studying the problems of the formation of the centralised absolutist feudal state, Soviet investigators note the distinctive features of this process in Eastern Europe and particularly in Russia. Soviet historical science has revealed the economic and social foundations of the origin of the Russian centralised state, and has shown that the requirements of defence, and the struggle with foreign enemies, were factors which merely accelerated the process.

In investigating the turbulent reign of Ivan IV ("Ivan the Terrible"), Soviet historians have revealed the role of the petty nobility and the cities (*posads*) upon whom the tsarist power relied in its struggle with the *boyars*, who were the chief exponents of feudal decentralisation, and have demonstrated the consolidation of the Russian state and its successes in foreign affairs, especially in the East.

Soviet historians have made a notable contribution to the study of the history of Russia under Peter I ("Peter the Great"). Our economists and historians have refuted the concept of an artificial implantation of large-scale industry in Russia by Peter, and have shown the internal prerequisites of the economic transformations at this time.

In recent years the attention of our historians has been attracted by the complex and as yet insufficiently elaborated problem of the disintegration and crisis of feudalism in Russia. Why did the feudal system survive here up to the middle of the nineteenth century? How, chronologically, did the new capitalist relations mature within feudal society? What were the distinctive features of this process? When did the industrial revolution begin and reach
its peak in Russia? These and a number of other questions evoke lively discussion, take up considerable space in the pages of our scientific journals, and are reflected in scientific degree theses.

It is now generally recognised that as early as the seventeenth century a new period began in the history of Russia, characterised by the growth of commodity production in agriculture and the crafts, the rise and development of manufactories, and the gradual evolution of an all-Russian market. Detailed investigations based on data of various estates and manufactories, and on the study of this process in various parts of the country, provide a good foundation for broader generalisations.

There are two main viewpoints among Soviet historians on the beginning, tempo and consummation of the industrial revolution in Russia. Academician S. G. Strumilin and others hold that it was completed even before the reform of 1861. Most of our historians, however, date the completion of the process from after the reform, in the eighties and nineties of last century, assuming that in the first half of the nineteenth century the process had merely made a start and was greatly impeded by the serf system as a whole, without the abolition of which the really rapid and multiform progress of the productive forces was impossible.

Historians, philosophers and literary scholars are carefully studying the ideological and scientific heritage of the great revolutionary democrats Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. These studies disclose the immense influence of their ideas and their tremendous contribution to the development of Russian literature, aesthetics, philosophy, political economy, history, and so on.

We consider the chief content of the history of modern times to be the triumph and consolidation of capitalism in Europe and in America, and the transition from "free"-competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

Two great stages in the development of bourgeois society emerge here. The first stage, covering more than two centuries, is regarded as the ascending curve of the development of capitalism; this is the epoch of the early bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Europe and America, of national-liberation movements and wars, which resulted in an immense upsurge of the productive forces as compared with the past. The rise of bourgeois parliamentary institutions on the ruins of the feudal absolutist regimes, the creation and consolidation of many sovereign national states—such are the progressive political results of that epoch. The old class antagonism between landlords and peasants is superseded by that between the bourgeoisie, which has gained power, and the rapidly growing proletariat.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries capitalism enters a new stage. The sharpening of the whole sum-total of social and political contradictions, the growth of the class struggle of the proletariat and the labouring masses, the awakening of the Asian peoples to a national liberation struggle—these are the major factors in the world history of this epoch.

Appreciation of the profound all-European significance of the bourgeois revolutions in the West has found expression in a number of works, both individual and collective, by Soviet historians. Collective works on the history of the English revolution in the seventeenth century, the French revolution in the eighteenth century, and the revolutions of 1848-9, generalise the results of earlier work by Soviet scholars.

The great French revolution of 1789-94 is being particularly widely studied by our historians, full consideration being given to the achievements of French historiography, both past and contemporary.

On the occasion of the centenary of the 1848-9 revolutions, a number of works were written by our historians, treating their course in the Slav countries and their influence in Russian from a new angle.
Soviet scholars take a great interest in the study of the history of socialist ideas. Academician Volgin, for example, has for many years been carrying out research in this field. In his works he has analysed the ideological heritage of the leading representatives of Utopian socialism, primarily the French and the English.

Many investigations are devoted to the rise of Marxism and the activities of its founders, Marx and Engels. These works show that there is a direct link between Marxism and the entire preceding development of advanced social thought—such outstanding achievements as German classical philosophy of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, English political economy of the Adam Smith and David Riccardo school, and French Utopian socialism. Marxism, however, does not merely continue the ideas of its predecessors. It is a qualitatively new stage in the progress of social knowledge.

The study of the Paris Commune of 1871 has a prominent place in Soviet historiography. Among the general works on the Commune, I. I. Stepanov-Skvortsov’s absorbing book The Paris Commune and P. M. Kerzhentsev’s monograph History of the Paris Commune of 1871 deserve special mention.

After the Paris Commune, a new period in the history of the labour movement began, characterised by the extensive spreading of Marx’s teaching and the appearance of mass social-democratic parties.

One of the main problems on which Soviet historians are working is that of the formation of the proletariat and the development of the labour movement in Russia. This work is being carried on by a group of researchers and archivists headed by Academician Pankratova. A large series of documents on the history of the labour movement in the nineteenth century was published in 1951–2.

Numerous collections of documents throw light on the history of the 1905-7 revolution. Soviet historians have studied the year 1905, the period of the onset of the revolution—the mounting strike struggle, the creation of Soviets of Workers’ Deputies, the peasant movement, the ferment in the army and navy, the armed rising in Moscow and other working-class centres—with great thoroughness. The struggle in the non-Russian parts of the country has also been extensively investigated. A collective work, The 1905-7 Revolution in the Non-Russian Areas, has already gone into a second edition. Soviet historians have, in conjunction with progressive colleagues in other countries, prepared a large collective work on the international significance of the 1905-7 revolution.

The history of international relations, diplomacy and wars is a major branch of current Soviet historiography. A three-volume History of Diplomacy, edited by the late Academician V. P. Potemkin, was published in the USSR in 1941-5. This deals with international relations from ancient times down to World War II. Although not without shortcomings, this work is still of value.

The history of the Russo-Turkish wars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, of the Crimean War, and of other wars, has been comprehensively studied and richly documented in a number of Soviet works.

Three tasks of immense importance confront Soviet historians of recent times: first, that of studying the history of the great Russian revolution, and of showing it as a law-governed phenomenon prepared by the whole course of the preceding historical development of Russia and of the world capitalist system as a whole; secondly, that of generalising the results of socialist transformation in the spheres of economy, culture and the building-up of the multinational Soviet State; thirdly, that of showing the international influence of the revolution, the aggravation of the crisis of modern capitalism, the position of the labour movement in the capitalist countries and of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries.

From the very first days after the revolution, work was started on the
organisation and accumulation of archive materials on the history of Soviet society. Special archives were instituted, in which are preserved the materials of all central and local administrative organs, departments and institutions. The largest of these archives are the Central State Archive of the October Revolution and of Socialist Construction, and the Central State Archive of the Soviet Army. In addition, there are local archives in every city and region. Much, though still far from enough, has been done in publishing archive documents.

The history of socialist construction in the USSR, and of the profound economic changes that have been effected, is being extensively studied. Documents and investigations are published showing the historical results of the socialist industrialisation policy, and the decisive role of modern heavy industry and machine-building in the reconstruction of the country's whole national economy.

The solution of the national problem, the creation and consolidation of the multi-national State, the development of friendship between the peoples, and their socialist mutual aid in the process of economic and cultural construction, form another group of questions treated in a number of works by Soviet scholars on the basis of studying and generalising concrete historical material.

We consider that in studying current history it is important to focus attention not on superficial, incidental, transient events and facts, but on the deep fundamental processes which determine the course of social development.

It is on this firm and unshakable foundation that our historians raise and elaborate the basic problems of recent times. Soviet historians pay great attention to the study of the disintegration of the colonial system, the mass movement against colonialism, and the establishment of sovereign states in Asia which have taken or are taking the road of independent development.

We have dwelt on a number of historical problems, by no means exhausting them, and merely citing investigations and publications characteristic of the general development of Soviet historiography. These give a certain idea both of the method of our work and of some of its results. In spite of our achievements in a number of historiographical fields, we fully realise that there are still many unsolved problems, and we are aware of the difficulties historical science has to overcome in tackling its complex tasks. Soviet historians consider it their prime duty to extend their work on the history of Soviet society as well as on the history of recent times in the people's democracies, in the capitalist countries and in the non-Soviet East.

We believe that differences of view on the tasks of historical research, on method, and on the evaluation of various phenomena of the past, need be no obstacle to scientific collaboration, to the exchange of ideas and experience between scholars from different countries, to strengthening the spirit of collaboration between Soviet scholars and their colleagues in western Europe, Asia, America and Africa. We are hopeful that this congress will strengthen relations between historians in different countries and will encourage scientific research in every branch of history.
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