

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31640/LS-2023-2-07>

UDC 159.9:612.821]:316.75 (09) "194/195"



L. O. Klymenko, Ph.D. in Historical Sciences, Associate Professor,
 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0591-9265,
rfpbvrj@ukr.net

I. G. Strokina, Ph.D. in Biological Sciences, Associate Professor,
 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3873-1111, Scopus Author ID: 6507317830,
irene-strokina@ukr.net

O. O. Bogomolets National Medical University <https://nmuofficial.com>, Kyiv, Ukraine,
 Department of Physiology <https://nmuofficial.com/zagalni-vidomosti/kafedri/kafedra-fyzyologyy/spivrobotnyky-kafedry>

THE HISTORY OF THE ACTIVITY OF THE "PAVLOVIAN COUNCIL" AND ITS NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE IN 50s OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Abstract. Further development of the history of science including history of physiology requires the analysis of a number of methodological problems which related to the history of the development of science in Ukraine during the dramatic times of the rule of the communists in Soviet Union. The article considers the ideological distortion of achievements and teachings of I. Pavlov by party structures. It is talking about the events that took place in the early 50's XX centuries. The scientific community of the world should remember the negative events that resulted from the decisions of the joint meeting of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in June-July 1950 ("Pavlovian session"). It is shown that the Moscow authorities forced scientific community of many union republics, including Ukraine, to carry out similar meetings. The results of this conference had a long-term negative impact on physiology, psychology, and medicine. In fact, at the meeting, the work of world-famous scientists and the scientific directions of some institutions were criticized, although the organizers of the meeting declared the main problem of the discussion the physiological teaching of academician I. Pavlov. They aimed to establish the methodology of conditioned reflexes and the doctrine of the leading role of the cerebral cortex in considering all physiological and psychological processes. Some of Pavlov's students, who had their own concept were labeled as "anti-Pavlov". "Anti Pavlov" scientists were forced to admit their mistakes. Organizers of session recommended them to work within the framework of the Pavlov's theory of higher nervous activity and to avoid Western influences. To control the implementation of Pavlov's teachings, the "Pavlovian Council" was created. The article presents the results of the activity of this committee. On the basis of archival documents, the author describes how, at these meetings, council members put pressure on physiologists and persist new topics on research institutes. It has been proven that the task of the council was to destroy physiology under the guise of developing the teachings of I. Pavlov. According to the author of the article, the resolutions of the Pavlovian Committee provided only the methodology of the experiment on the physiology of higher nervous activity. The positive effect for some scientists was usually related to the official doctrine. However, the decisions of the Pavlovian Committee inhibited the development of those studies that did not relate to the official doctrine. These scientific investigations were

© Л. О. Клименко, І. Г. Строкінна, 2023

branded as "hostile". The aim of the article is to show the negative impact of the "Pavlovian Session" and the activities of the "Pavlovian Council" on the development of physiology, medicine, and psychology. The author proved that physiologists of Ukraine, having experienced the consequences of the joint session, were able to defend their science thanks to the organization of the All-Union Congress of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists in Kyiv in 1955. At this congress, the scientists were rehabilitated and the activity of the "Pavlovian Council" was stopped.

Keywords: *physiology of HNA; ideology; Pavlovization; Pavlovian Council.*

INTRODUCTION

Today, when Ukrainians are forced to defend their freedom, the topic of communist totalitarianism is quite relevant. That is why a retrospective analysis of certain historical events in science, which became a manifestation of the totalitarian regime and had a negative impact on the development of science, is necessary. Therefore, it seems appropriate to mention the infamous page in the history of Soviet physiology, when authorities and some organizers of Soviet physiological science tried to use the bright name of I. Pavlov in the ideological struggle. It was for this purpose joint meeting of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and the USSR Academy of Sciences ("Pavlovian session") was organized by the Soviet Government. The Joint Scientific Session took place from June 28 to July 4 1950 in Moscow in the House of Scientists [1]. By the decision of the session, the "Pavlovian Council" was established.

These events have been widely discussed in the literature. The first mentions of negative consequences of this session and critique of the politicization of science in Soviet Union we can find in foreign literature of 50s. The contradictory nature and incompleteness of concepts of the session in the historical-and-psychological works of foreign researchers those year we can read. Thus, the Bulgarian scientist T. Pavlov [2], giving a negative assessment of the decision of the "Pavlovian session", considered that criticism of the views of famous Soviet scientists was undeserved. Also he believed that it wrong to blame them of underestimating the Pavlov's teaching about role of the cerebral cortex. The Pavlovization in psychology and psychiatry was largely criticized by Ivan D. London [3]. He commented that the attempted Pavlovization of the mental sciences could cause the same fate that befelled genetics. Soviet psychology and psychiatry had been for many years in a sad state. But he also saw the positive. Introduction Pavlovian conception and methodology into psychology made Soviet psychologists interdisciplinary minded, experimentation-conscious, and problem-sensitive in new directions.

The scientists of 60s, estimating the consequences of the Joint Scientific Session, point out its negative effects, namely, the decline in morale of some Soviet physiologists and psychiatrists, who were pressured to accept a dogmatic ideology, the lowering of the quality of research in physiology and psychology, and the self-imposed exclusion of Soviet physiology from the worldwide scientific community [4, 5].

In the Soviet Union, it was possible to honestly say about the consequences of the session only in the 80s of the 20th century. So, in 1987, the journal Questions of the history of natural science and technology organized discussion "Pavlovian session" of 1950 and the destiny of Soviet physiology" [6]. The participants of the discussion expressed a negative assessment of the resolution of the session. In 1989, the Third All-Union Conference on the History of Physiological Sciences (Gurjaani) took place, that devoted to the discussion of the 1950 Joint Scientific session [7]. At this conference, the reports of A. Hayrapetyana, L. Leibson, A. Roitbak, Yu. Duplenko and others were presented.

Speeches related to various aspects of the this session, peculiarities of the development of some scientific areas as well as destiny of scientists. The participants of the conference expressed a single opinion that the authorities organized a campaign against scientists, under the guise of development of teaching of a great physiologist.

It should also be noted the treatise of the famous professor V. Alexandrov "Difficult years of Soviet biology", published in 1992, in which the author gives a negative assessment of events in biology 40-50 years of the twentieth century [8].

The influence of "pavlovization" on the development of psychology is partially described in the monograph by L. R. Graham "Science, physiology, and human behavior in the Soviet Union"[9]. Also foreign scientific sources of 80s contain articles that reveal the negative consequences of Pavlovization in psychology in the countries of the Soviet bloc. Thus, wide adoption of Pavlovization in psychology was also observed in Poland and Czechoslovakia that changed the subject of psychology in a certain way. As a result certain psychological phenomena were given a neuropsychological interpretation. Following of period of Pavlovization endeavours were made in Poland too to develop psychology on Marxist basis [10].

The Joint Session affected psychology in such a way that became a manifestation of ideological struggle against dissidents. Only few scientists managed to overcome ideological influences. Thus, Nikolai Bernstein, who was one of the few Russian psychologists to challenged the Pavlovianization of Russian psychology [11]. So, the decisions of the Pavlovian Session were implemented within the context of the complex relationship between politics and science. The Pavlovian committees formed as a result of the session were designed to fulfil a particular political role in the scientific world [12]. Such committees had a negative impact on the life of many scientific institutions, for example, on the development of the Institute of Physiology of the Academy of Sciences in Yerevan. The experimental physiological works became subordinated to the "Pavlovization" of physiology and political tasks were added. Although the institute staff and activities grew, but institutional life was traumatized by the persecution of Levon Orbeli's school [13, 14, 15].

Contemporary researchers of the history of science recall the Pavlovisation in the context of the development of psychiatry. After the joint meeting, pathophysiology of higher nervous activity (HNA) was established as a new discipline mandatory for all of the USSR psychiatrists. When making a diagnosis, psychiatrists had to be guided only by the postulates of the pathophysiology of HNA. Psychological approaches during diagnosing, treating and explaining the mechanisms of mental disorders have been banned and virtually excluded from the practice of psychiatrists. Certainly, Pavlov's teaching implied a definite standpoint on the problem 'brain and psyche', but psychiatrists should not ignore purely psychological problems, in particular, personality psychology. These concepts were considered as reactionary and idealistic. Among psychiatrists it partly included the misuse of the profession for political ends, the wholesale rejection of Freud, and a stress on work as the primary means of therapy. The decision of Pavlovian session gave possibility to set monopoly over psychiatry to the some psychiatrists of Pavlovian school. It was one of crucial factors of the onset of political psychiatry [16, 17, 18].

Consequently, the meaning of all sessions lay outside of science and was destructive for science, and the renewal of personnel was accompanied by a decrease in their level. Low level people are easier to manage [19].

H. Steinberg asserted that in 1950-1960 the number of emigrant doctors from East Germany in West Germany increased because there was an enlarge in communist party-ideological influence and harassment as well as aligning scientific views and research with Soviet paradigms (Pavlovization) [20]. This has affected the quality of treatment for the mentally ill. So, we see that "Pavlovization" as a

Soviet paradigm originated in Moscow, spread outwards and reached other European countries of Soviet bloc. This had negative consequences not only in physiology, but also in medicine, especially in psychiatry.

In the other countries of the Soviet Bloc partial attempts at the Pavlovisation and Sovietisation of psychiatry also resulted in predominantly biological and hereditary conceptual frameworks, and also only somatic research and treatment orientations in psychiatry [21].

The analysis of the literature dedicated to the role of the "Pavlov" session in the development of medical sciences showed that a certain mass of historical articles has been accumulated on the researched topic, which illustrates some aspects of politicization and Pavlovization in the development of physiology, medicine, psychology. But, more of them formed in the 1960s and 1980s, during the Soviet period, and contains specific features of the scientific literature of that era. Contemporary researchers of the history of science recall the Pavlovian session of 1950 in the context of the development of psychology and psychiatry. The activities of the "Pavlovian Council", as well as the events that took place in Ukraine during these years, remained out of the attention of historians of physiology. The research of the author of the article is devoted to these problems [22, 23].

In addition, contemporary Russian historians of science are trying to justify the decision of this session. In particular, the authors of the article "Pavlovian session: new reading" did not find anything negative for psychology in the decisions of this session, because they did not find the word "close" a psychology [24]. This statement looks quite strange. Perhaps the authors of the article do not understand that total absolutism of Pavlovian theory in psychology impossible, or the totalitarianism of modern Russia had a detrimental effect on the thinking of modern Russian psychologists. Therefore, the author of this article decided again to mention the problem of "Pavlovization" on the basis of archival documents and researches of foreign scientists.

The aim of the article is determined in accordance with the relevance of the chosen topic and is a comprehensive study and historical reconstruction of consequences of decision of "Pavlovian session" and activity of "Pavlovian Council". Moreover, it is not so much an attempt to answer question about negativisms of pavlovisation, but rather it is meant to stir debate and remind readers that it is a issue well worth discuss.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The 1950 Joint session of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences ("Pavlovian session")

Two academies – the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR – became hostages of the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Physiologists K. Bykov and O. Ivanov-Smolensky consciously implementing the instructions of Stalin's "retinue", played a prosecutorial role in assessing the state of development of the main ideas of I. Pavlov at that time. To be honest, some scientists such as L. Orbeli, P. Anokhin, L. Stern, I. Beritashvili, O. Speransky, E. Babsky, D. Vorontsov et al. were very surprised by the events that happened at the session. These were extremely unexpected for them while they were preparing to discuss Pavlov's concept and prospects in science, but they were accused of activities against Pavlov. These talented scientists had to admit publicly to their wrong beliefs and promise to go in for only Pavlov's teaching. All "anti-Pavlov" were accused of "dissent" as the main fault. The organizers of the session claimed that the blame of the "anti-Pavlov" was manifested in the development of independent, original research, in the establishment of their own scientific schools, in worship of the West and of lacking in their

theaching the methodology of dialectical materialism. K. Bykov, as a keynote speaker, declared that physiology, medicine and psychology must be restructure on the foundation of Pavlov's teachings [1]. He named the scientists, who deviated from the right path: L. Orbeli, P. Anokhin, A. Speransky and other. I. Razenkov and A. Ivanov-Smolensky accentuated the importance of opposing the “reactionary idealist trend” in physiology. They also blamed Pavlov's immediate disciples: L. Orbeli, P. Anokhin, A. Speransky and other. Then number of speakers continued to attack the “anty-Pavlov” scientists.

This public humiliation of scientists prompted the accused to justify themselves. So, the “Anti-Pavlov” scientists were forced to admit the partial erroneousness of their positions. But, unfortunately, some participants of the session showed the inability to objectively realize their own shameful role in the harassment of talented researchers.

The studying of the archival documents show the haste of the measures that had taken by the organizers of the session. Thus, E. Airapetyants made sure that the transcript of the session was published immediately after the session, although S. Vavilov, who was a chairman of the organizing committee, tried to argue. This is evidenced by Babylon's speech at the meeting of the organizing committee on June 19, 1950. S. Vavilov accented that this is a discussion session, so “statements can be quite polemical, sharp in one direction as well as in the other”, so, there is no need to hastily print a shorthand report [25]. Nowadays we realise that S. Vavilov was be able to comprehend at least partially that a historical document would been published. S. Vavilov had understood that the session organizers used Pavlov's theory only for the screen, but, in fact, this was a political action directed against some students of I. Pavlov, and it could impact on their fortune negatively.

The scientists of history of science of the 80s as N. Hryhoryan, M. Yaroshevsky, M. Mirsky tried to seriously make sense of the events in science in the 1950s and show a scientific and public approach in estimation of the “Pavlov' session”. They unanimously condemned this session as a tragic page in the history of physiological science, which caused great harm to the development of physiology, medicine, psychology as well as biological and medical education, and the practice of medicine and health care [26, 27].

The Communists tried to deal a devastating impact to Soviet physiology because it was the period in science when many Soviet scientists began to receive international prestige [11]. The haste of publishing the decisions of the session in scientific journals indicates that the leaders of the administrative and command management of science were afreide were afraid of the intervention of the world scientific community. Without wasting time, they wanted to publish the serious accusations in order to strengthen their power over the field of physiology, medicine, psychology.

The humiliation of leading physiologists led to the loss of advanced areas of research in the physiology of the nervous system, electrophysiology, endocrinology, and others. As a result, heavy boomerang hit the teaching of I. Pavlov. It caused a negative attitude towards this doctrine among scientists. As a result of the so-called struggle for the “cleanness of Pavlov's teaching”, there were the lowering of the quality of research in physiology, and the self-imposed exclusion of Soviet physiology from the worldwide scientific community. It was “a defeat of physiology” [13, 15]. As S. Boltivets notes the proclamation at the session of the cult of personality of Pavlov was actually a means of devaluing his doctrine, as it limited the further development of physiological knowledge as well as psychological, genetic, medical knowledge in the former USSR [15]. In the speeches of the participants of the Gurjaan conference, which was mentioned above, it was noted that the session was the result of the process of politicization of science, a manifestation of party and state dictates in conditions of suppression of democratic principles, lack of freedom of criticism [7]. The participants of the Gurjaan conference strongly condemned the decision of the session of the two academies.

The decision of the Joint Session destroyed the fate of many scientists. Especially for scientists, whose views were not exactly in line with traditional Pavlovian ideas, the Joint session was a disaster. They were even fired from their position. Thus, neuroscientists of the time, such as academicians P. Anokhin, A. Speransky, L. Stern, I. Beritashvili, L. Orbeli, I. Rasenkov, O. Ginetsinsky, E. Babsky, who headed various scientific directions at that time, were discharged from their positions [13, 15, 23]. Also director of the Institute of Physiology Ararat Alexanyan was pressed by authorities to leave the position in 1953 [14].

Activities of the “Pavlov’ council”

The 1950 Joint Session affected medical and biological education, sciences, medical practice and institutions in such a way that the teachers, scientists and physicians were forced to work within the framework of Pavlov’s theory of higher nervous activity, and they should avoid Western influence. Scientific Council under the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences was established by the decision of the Joint Session to realise this reorganisation. This Council was called “Pavlovian Council”. In the Union republics were created Pavlovian committees to realise resolution of session. The members of the Council were instructed to defeat outstanding physiological scientific schools to cut off all possibilities of cooperation with Western scientists. At its meetings scientists, who had been victimised in previous political conference, were continued to be humiliated. Contrary to common sense, a lot of time was spent on nonsensical and unprofitable meetings, at which the organizers did not say any scientific idea. In this sense, however, we can agree with Serhii Boltivets regarding the peculiarity of the mentality of Russians. It was not just communist propaganda. It was a policy of imposing the opinions of Russian figures as the only correct ones necessary for the people of other union republics [15].

The study of archival documents showed that only demagoguery, covered with slogans about the exclusive role of the Communist Party in building a bright future, was a tool of the council members in the fight against “anti-Pavlov” scientists. The Scientific Council actually lasted 4 years: from October 1950 to June 1954, legally until 1955. In 1955 the activities of the Scientific Council ended. This was promoted by the decision of the VIII All-Union Congress of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists, which took place in Kyiv on May 19–28, 1955. The resolution of this congress became decisive for the restoration of the advanced directions of physiological, medical, and psychological science after the infamous decisions of the “Pavlovian Session” and the “Pavlovian Council”.

Academician K. Bykov headed the “Pavlovian council”, O. Ivanov-Smolensky became head’s assistant, E. Airapetyants was the scientific secretary. From the first days of its existence, the members of this council focused their attention on controlling the plans and programs of research work in the system of the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR in the field of physiology, medicine, psychology, biochemistry and pharmacology. In fact, they only misled the scientific community by declaring their loyalty to Pavlov’s teachings. It was for reputation and Stalin’s awards.

It should be noted that at that time, there were discussions in the scientific community between representatives of different schools, for example, between the D. Vorontsov’s schools and I. Beritashvili’s schools on the problems of the genesis of the excitation process. But, there was a healthy, creative atmosphere at such discussions, it aimed to clarify scientific truth. This is a sign of the normal life of science. Unfortunately, in the early 50’s in physiology prevailed fruitless and hopeless unanimity due to the activities of the “Pavlovian Council”, it was contributed to the creation of an abnormal situation in the scientific community.

So, as noted earlier, all scientific institutions, including departments, laboratories of medical, pedagogical and agricultural universities of the country were subject to control by this Council. Even the Department of Biological Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences had no right to control the activities of the "Pavlovian Council". Thus, the new "leaders" of physiological science created a structure, which was not controlled by a scientific society, and even the All-Union Congress of Physiologists had no right to discuss the activities of the Council. Scientific congresses were banned. Therefore, the "Pavlovian Council" had the function of permanently exposing the so-called "dissenters".

Sessions became the main form of work of the Scientific Council. In the first and second sessions K. Bykov, O. Ivanov-Smolensky, E. Airapetyants decided the organizational issues. "Pavlovian Council", which took place on April 10-12 1951, has historical interest. In this meeting the I. Beritashvili's concept about mental activity was discussed. I. Beritashvili's monograph "The main forms of nervous and psycho-nervous activity" (1947) was subjected to enormous criticism. The meeting began with K. Bykov's instructions. In his speech, he reviewed of Pavlov's achievements in the development of the doctrine of reflex, then he addressed the participants with an appeal to focus their attention on the methodological error of Beritashvili's theory. Also Bykov noted I. Beritashvili could express his incorrect attitudes, so, they should critically identify its. (AASG, F.12, d.1, No. 77/1, pp. 2-3). After such an instruction were given by K. Bykov, no one listened the Beritashvili arguments. This is evidenced by the nature of the questions asked by council members. Although the scientist's report was quite informative and it was full of factual material, Beritashvili had many questions from K. Bykov, H. Koshtoyants, M. Usievich, L. Fedorov, A. Abrikosov, M. Zhukov-Verezhnikov, E. Asratyan and others. The main question was the following: "Does Academician Beritashvili abandon his "anti-Pavlov" doctrine of psycho-nervous activity?" The meeting lasted three days. These were exhausting days for the scientist. Beritashvili was subjected to strong psychological pressure from the council members. They were not interested in the scientist's arguments. Council members were outraged by Beritashvili's success at the 17th International Physiological Congress (Oxford, 1947). They could not accept that in Oxford Beritashvili's concept of psycho-nervous activity was supported by American physiologists. Reading archival documents, you understand all the absurdity of the council members' statements. For example, they pointed out that praising of Ivan Solomonovich by enemies proved that he went with them against Pavlov. In particular, L. Fedorov said: "Ivan Solomonovich does not do so by accident; obviously, he does not consider that there are two sciences: one science that serves the bourgeoisie, the other science that serves socialism... He shows cosmopolitan tendencies" "Иван Соломонович не случайно так поступает; видно он не учитывает, что есть две науки: одна наука, которая служит буржуазии, другая наука, которая служит социализму... Он проявляет космополитические тенденции" [28]. It is worth noting that in Tbilisi the Physiological Scientific Society ignored the discussion of the results of the "Pavlovian session". L. Fedorov had called this fact a struggle against the instructions of the "Pavlovian session", and a political act directed against general political development of USSR. So, we can see that party figures knew how to choose hurtful words for psychological pressure on a person to intimidate. Furthermore, the members of the council unreasonably stated that I. Beritashvili has been fighting against I. Pavlov for many years. E. Airapetyants accented that Beritashvili became an idealist under the influence of Sherrington, so he developed the doctrine of zoopsychology. In USSR zoopsychology was considered as a bourgeois science. Incidentally, today zoopsychology is not only developing together with other psychological sciences, but it is also a obligatory subject in the training of psychologists.

The Scientific Council condemned I. Beritashvili's contemptuous attitude to the achievements of

domestic science and cosmopolitan enthusiasm for the West. Members of council decided to send an authoritative commission to Tbilisi to organize and discussion of the mistakes of Academician I. Beritashvili [29].

In this situation, there was only way to admit mistakes. I. Beritashvili agreed that his concept of psycho-nervous activity was not materialistic, as it operated with psychological concepts. As a result of the persecution, Beritashvili was dismissed from the post of director of the Institute of Physiology. Historians of science the 80s and 90s believed that the dramatic fate of Beritashvili's concept of psycho-nervous activity indicates an unhealthy general political situation in the country – the session was only a reflection of this situation [8, 9, 26, 27]. But contemporary Ukrainian scientists consider this situation from a different angle. As S. Boltivets noted, this happened and will always happen when people with low moral qualities defend the right to control over others. And this is not only communist's principles, this is the Russian way of thinking, as a way of ideological pressure [15].

The fourth session of the Scientific Council took place on June 6–8, 1951. At this meeting, two issues were considered: 1. Discussion of plans for research in the laboratory of physiology of the P. Lesgaft Institute of Natural Sciences and works of physiological groups led by L. Orbeli; 2. Discussion of the plan of research works of the Institute of Clinical Physiology of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

L. Orbeli told about his program for studying the functions of nervous system of a children, starting with simple hereditary reflexes and ending with the formation of the second signaling system. Plot was repeated. A hostile atmosphere prevailed at the meeting, as in the previous session. In the debate, members of the council again opposed L. Orbeli. All recognized the plan of L. Orbeli is unsatisfactory. They strongly required radical processing. In the resolution of the Scientific Council it was noted that Academician L.A. Orbeli only formally recognized the wrong of his views at the Joint Session, he while was remaining in his "anti-Pavlov" stance [30]. As a result, Orbeli was removed from the position of head of the department. The scientific life of Orbeli's adherents was traumatized due to the persecution of Levon Orbeli's school [14].

These facts are clear evidence of unwillingness to develop physiological science by members of council. The actions of the "Pavlovian Council" contributed to stagnation in science and demoralization in the scientific community.

Regarding the second item on the agenda of the IV session, the Scientific Council also found some errors in works of Ukrainian physiologists. In they opinion, in Ukrainian scientific plan there were lack of clarity in the formulation of such concepts as fatigue, exhaustion, inhibition. Also members of council were didn't satisfied by ambiguity of the statements of professor V. Protopopov about the problem of skills and habits. In their view, Protopopov did not understand Pavlov's doctrine [30]. Protopopov was recommended to strengthen his work in the study of higher nervous activity. Also, the Scientific Council proposed to expand the development of "Pavlov's doctrine in Ukraine. As we can see, the council members saw "Pavlov's enemies" everywhere.

The state of the teachings of I. P. Pavlov in Rostov-on-Don was considered in the fifth session of the "Pavlov' Council" due to the methodological errors of M. Rozhansky's concept. As in previous meetings, the council strongly condemned Rozhansky's views, because they coincide with Orbeli's and Beritashvili's views about the studing of behavior [31].

At the next session, the work of the departments of physiology of Kazan and Tartu universities was criticized. It should be noted that the Department of Physiology of the Tartu University was the only one department among other departments of physiology in the USSR, which did not reorganize its work according of Pavlov's teachings. The Council estimated this as a terrible shortcoming [32].

So, the chain continued. Enemies of Soviet science were sought out in many institutes. Ideological

campaigns, which became an agent of establishing ideological order in research institutes and universities, had a negative impact on the objective state of science, on the moral atmosphere in the scientific community. Negative consequences were expressed in the limitation of the scientific independence of research of the university intelligentsia, as well as the resignation of highly qualified specialists [17].

I would like to stay in more detail on the seventh session of this Scientific Council, because the main issue of this session was discussing the development of physiology and pathophysiology according Pavlov's doctrine in Ukraine research institutes. This session took place on June 5–7, 1952 in Kyiv. The members of the council decided to criticize Olexandr Bogomolets' concept of connective tissue. It was at a time when Bogomolets was dead. This concept was found as erroneous by council because it allegedly underestimated the role of the cerebral cortex and contradicted Pavlov's doctrine of higher nervous activity. The Scientific Council admitted the concept of O. Bogomolets as “anti-Pavlov”. The meeting lasted three days. It was cynical that the first meeting took place in the office, where O. Bogomolets worked. The attempt of professors Oleg Bogomolets, M. Syrotynin, Y. Spasokukotsky to protect this original concept was rejected. The defend this doctrine was called as a desire to adapt to Pavlov's doctrine. Of course, the Council strongly condemned these “attempts”.

The council members again criticized the allegedly erroneous methodological views of some Ukrainian physiologists. In particular, D. Vorontsov was criticized for not completely freeing himself from his scientific statements. At this session, the works of the Institute of Clinical Physiology and Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology, which were founded by Olexander Bogomolets, also was discussed in detail. A serious mistake in the work of the Institute of Clinical Physiology was called the lack of connection between investigations and health care practice. The plans of Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology also do not correspond to Pavlov's doctrine.

The Scientific Council recommended the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine to revise the research plan of the Institute of Clinical Physiology, also Scientific Council recommended the Ministry of Health of the Ukrainian RSR to review the research plan of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology. It is worth noting that since 1951 the leading problem of these institutions had been the problems of physiology and pathology of higher nervous activity. The development of topics related to the concept of the physiological system of connective tissue was not planned by the management of the institute. Nevertheless, the Council saw that some issues of the thematic plan of these institutions are considered with the standpoint of Bogomolets' concept. It was seen as a big fault [33]. The editorial board of the Medical Journal was also criticized. The Scientific Council recommended the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine to revise the research plan of the Institute of Clinical Physiology, also Scientific Council recommended the Ministry of Health of the Ukrainian RSR to review the research plan of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology. It is worth noting that since 1951 the leading problem of these institutions had been the problems of physiology and pathology of higher nervous activity. The development of topics related to the concept of the physiological system of connective tissue was not planned by the management of the institute. Nevertheless, the Council saw that some issues of the thematic plan of these institutions are considered with the standpoint of Bogomolets' concept. It was seen as a big [33]. The editorial board of the Medical Journal was also criticized. The Scientific Council recommended the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine to revise the research plan of the Institute of Clinical Physiology, also Scientific Council recommended the Ministry of Health of the Ukrainian RSR to review the research plan of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology. It is worth noting that since 1951 the leading problem of these institutions had been the problems of physiology and pathology of higher

nervous activity. The development of topics related to the concept of the physiological system of connective tissue was not planned by the management of the institute. Nevertheless, the Council saw that some issues of the thematic plan of these institutions are considered with the standpoint of Bogomolets' concept. It was seen as a big fault [33]. The editorial board of the Medical Journal was also criticized. The Scientific Council recommended the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine to revise the research plan of the Institute of Clinical Physiology, also Scientific Council recommended the Ministry of Health of the Ukrainian RSR to review the research plan of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology. It is worth noting that since 1951 the leading problem of these institutions had been the problems of physiology and pathology of higher nervous activity. The development of topics related to the concept of the physiological system of connective tissue was not planned by the management of the institute. Nevertheless, the Council saw that some issues of the thematic plan of these institutions are considered with the standpoint of Bogomolets' concept. It was seen as a big fault [33].

The editorial board of the Medical Journal was also criticized. The editors of the journal were accused of insufficient propaganda of I. Pavlov's scientific heritage.

The council recommended publishing all the mentioned shortcomings in the press. So, on November 2, 1952, article entitled "It must persistently implements and develops of Pavlov's physiology (About the serious disadvantages of the Medical Journal)" was published by the newspaper "Pravda Ukrainy". In this article the Editors of Medical Journal was accused of incomplete implementation and development of Pavlov's physiology in Ukraine. It was noted that for the last 1.5 years only three articles that promote Pavlov's physiology was published. The director of the Institute of Clinical Physiology and the director of Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology also were criticised for uncritical attitude to his work.

It should be noted that the scientific community tried to oppose the undeserved criticism of the O. Bogomolets' teaching. So, at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine on February 27, 1953, E. Korniychuk forced to declare that in Kyiv the intellectuals, who was talking about O. Bogomolets, quite "strange". He accented O. Bogomolets had been a famous person, therefore, it was necessary to tell honestly about his contribution to science at lectures, conferences, in publications to prevent gossip about the doctrine of the physiology of connective tissue. "... This is a question of ideology, because around this, around such acute issues immediately various scoundrel come out as rats, they immediately create various gossips, taking advantage of the fact that we stood aside" "... Это вопрос идеологии, потому что вокруг этого, вокруг таких острых вопросов сразу вылезают крысы всякая нечесть, тут же сплетничают разные, пользуясь тем, что мы стояли в стороне" [34].

Oleg Bogomolets recalls these times: "The script of this so-called scientific session had nothing to do with science. It was a intricately organized act of vandal mockery of the scientific heritage of Bogomolets" "Сценарий этой, так называемой, научной сессии, никакого отношения к науке не имел. Это был хитро организованный акт варварского издевательства над научным наследием Богомольца" [35]. Oleg Bogomolets underscored, the atmosphere at the meeting of the scientific council had been terrible. People, who deserved respect, were mocked. Again, for some reason, geneticists were criticized. Oleg Bogomolets could not stand it and left the meeting. He had an heart attack. How can we estimate this? Psychologists call it mobbing. Yes, this is mobbing that was carried out by people in power.

Slandorous denunciations had been wrotes against Oleg Bogomolets. As they were not confirmed during the inspection of the commission, this was, probably, why Oleg Bogomolets' enemies began

to ask the Pavlov's Council to reorganize two institutes. He reminisces that immediately after the death of Olexander Bogomolets, O. Palladin proposed to joint two institutes: the Institute of Clinical Physiology of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology of the Ministry of Health of the USSR. Oleg Bogomolets, of course, refused. He wrote that in these difficult times he was supported only by scientists V. Tkachuk and M. Gurevich [35].

After the VII session of the Scientific Council Oleg Bogomolets was removed from his position as a research associate at the Institute of Clinical physiology. Subsequently, he was forced to leave the position of director of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology. In 1953 on the basis of two institutes - the Institute of Clinical Physiology of the Academy of Sciences of USSR and the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology of Ministry of Health of the USSR – the new Institute of Physiology of Academy of Sciences was established. Scientists tried to resist this action. For example, Academician V. Filatov addressed L. Melnikov, who was the Secretary of the Central Committee, with a request to prevent the association of two institutes. He was arguing that the subject of research work of these institutes was quite different. This would have created prospects for more spectrum of biological research [34]. Also Oleg Bogomolets made a lot of efforts to preserve the achievements of the school of the famous pathophysiological O. Bogomolets [13].

To be honest, it should be noted that the Bogomoletz Institute of Physiology, despite the ideological pressure during its creation, became a leading scientific institution in Ukraine. Late the researches carried out in this institute in the field of electrophysiology have gained world significance. Famous electrophysiologists D. Vorontsov, P. Kostyuk, V. Skok, P. Serkov, M. Shuba, and others worked within its walls. But the destruction of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Pathology of the Ministry of Health of the Ukraine was inexpedient, as the Ministry of Health lost experimental institute in the field of pathological biology. The original research carried out in this institute was necessary for the medicine. This proves again that the totalitarian leadership was guided not by good sense but by absurd ideas.

In December 1952, the eighth session of the Scientific Council took place. For the second time, Academician L. A. Orbeli became as a defendant in a court of Council. Despite mobbing, Levon Orbeli didn't admit his "anti-Pavlov" mistakes. The Careerists didn't managed to break him will and to forced him to recognize "anti-Pavlov" activity. Therefore, the Scientific Council recommended the editors of physiological, biological, medical and pedagogical journals to systematically publish articles that would criticize L. Orbeli teaching as an idealistic [37].

In May 1953, the ninth session of the Scientific Council was participated. In the historical sense, it does not matter, because members of council tried again to proclaim the need to restructure science on the basis of Pavlov's teachings. No new ideas were voiced

The Importance of VIII All-Union Congress of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists

The history of civilization constantly proves the unsustainability of the totalitarian regime, the inevitability of its crisis. The system of leadership of natural sciences suffered a hit at the VIII All-Union Congress of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists, which took place in Kyiv in 1955. The All-Union Physiological Society met after an eight-year break (the last, VII Congress participated in 1947 in Moscow). The initiators of this congress were Ukrainian scientists, including members of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. The activity of the "Pavlovian Council" stopped after this congress. Because, participants of this Congress qualified that the 1950 Joint session and the activities of the Scientific Council as illegal. The rehabilitation of L. Orbeli, I. Beritashvili, P. Anokhina, M. Romansky, D. Vorontsov and others was started. It should be noted that in contrast to the immediate publication

of the decisions of the "Pavlov session" and the Scientific Council, the publication of the resolution of this congress was delayed for a year and a half [38]. Party officials and careerists were afraid of exposing their destructive actions.

An important point was fact attending of scientists from other countries, including Austria, England, Bulgaria, Hungary, Germany, Denmark, India, China, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Sweden and others. Ukrainian scientists acted wisely. They understood that in the presence of foreign colleagues Bykov and his supporters would had been afraid to oppose physiology. In addition, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine tried to unite physiologists from different countries, by inviting foreign scientists to the congress, as well as to rehabilitate physiological science in the eyes of the world scientific community.

Thus, the VIII Congress of the All-Union Society of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists put an end to the activities of the Pavlovian Council and the totalitarian regime of Bykov in the physiological environment of the USSR.

CONCLUSION

From the discussion, it is evident scientists had to overcome several major difficulties after Joint session. The most important of these difficulties are:

- 1) The senseless decision of the 1950 Join session, which made it impossible to develop physiology, psychology, medicine
- 2) Administrative influence from Pavlovian Council on scientific society
- 3) Department of Biological Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences had no right to control and direct the activities of the Scientific Council.

Consequently, the "Activity" of the Scientific Council had no positive meaning for the development of science, it only created an abnormal situation: it produced selfish people, it delayed the reaserch of some promising areas of physiology, psychology and medicine which led to lagging behind world achievements. However the situation in physiological science was not as dramatic as in genetics after the VASGNIL session.

Drawing upon the many sources the author confirmed that the situation in physiological science was not as dramatic as in genetics. The creative nucleus of physiologists managed to give a decisive resistance and won on VIII Congress of the All-Union Society of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists as it demonstrate author of article.

REFERENCES

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ ТА ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Научная сессия, посвященная проблемам физиологического учения акад. И. П. Павлова. Стенографический отчет [Scientific session devoted to the problems of the physiological doctrine of Acad. I. P. Pavlov. A shorthand record]. М. 1950. 734 p. [in Russian].
2. Pavlov, T. (1958). Основное в учении И. П. Павлова в свете диалектического материализма [The main thing in the teachings of I. P. Pavlov in the light of dialectical materialism]. М. 224 p. [in Russian].
3. London, I. D. (1957). Toward a realistic appraisal of Soviet science. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. P. 169–174.
4. Blakely, T. J. (1964). Soviet Philosophy, Dordrecht, Holland. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-3606-1>

5. Payne T. R. (1968). S. L. Rubinštejn and the Philosophical Foundations of Soviet Psychology. Dordrecht, Holland. <https://books.google.com.ua/books>
6. “Павловская сессия” 1950 и судьбы советской физиологии [“Pavlovian session” of 1950 and the fate of Soviet physiology]. *Вопросы истории, естествознания и техники [Questions of history, natural science and technology]*. 1988. No. 3. [in Russian].
7. *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1990. V. 76. No. 12
8. Alexandrov, V. Ya. (1992). Трудные годы советской биологии: Записки современника. [Difficult years of Soviet biology: Notes of a contemporary]. St. Petersburg, 262 p. [in Russian].
9. Graham, L. R. (1987). [Science, physiology, and human behavior in the Soviet Union] Естествознание, философия и наука о человеческом поведении в Советском Союзе. Пер. с англ.
10. Madsen, K. B. (1988). A History of Psychology in Metascientific Perspective, North-Holland Amsterdam North-Holland. 605 p. <https://books.google.com.ua/books>
11. Lawson, R. B., Anderson, E. D., Cepeda-Benito, A. (2017). A History of Psychology: Globalization, Ideas, and Applicatio. 442 p. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315225432>
12. Popova, K. (2020). The “Curative-Protective Hospital Regime” Concept in the Medical and Nursing Practice of 1950’s USSR. *European Journal for Nursing History and Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.25974/enhe2020-4en>
13. Vilenskyi, Yu. (2018). Павловская сессия по кремлевскому сценарию: гонители и гонимые [Pavlovian session according to the Kremlin scenario: the persecutors and the persecuted]. *Медична газета “Здоров’я України 21 сторіччя” [Medical newspaper “Health of Ukraine of the 21st century”]*. No. 3 (424). <https://health-ua.com/article/35330-pavlovskaya-sessiya-po-kremlevskomu-stcenariyu-goniteli-i-gonimye>
14. Popova K. (2021). “Pryspanite zayitsy ostavat zhivi dve sedmitsii poveche ot drugite”: Institut po fiziologia v Erevan sled “Pavlovskaya sessia” pres 1950 g. [“Sleeping rabbits stay alive two weeks longer than others”: The Institute of Physiology in Yerevan after the “Pavlov’s Session” in 1950]. *Balkanistic forum*. P. 104–124. [in Bulgarian]. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=988412>
15. Boltivets S. I. (2021). Павлівська сесія триває: роковини семи десятиліть для психології в Україні [The Pavlov’s session continues: The anniversary of seven decades of physiology in Ukraine]. *Psychology & Society*. No. 1. [in Ukrainian]. <http://pis.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/enpis/article/download/1127/1132>
16. van Voren, Robert. (2010). Cold War in Psychiatry: Human Factors, Secret Actors. *Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi*. P. 101. ISBN 978-90-420-3048-0.
17. Helmchen, Hanfried; Sartorius, Norman. (2010). Ethics in Psychiatry: European Contributions. *Springer*. P. 494. ISBN 978-90-481-8720-1
18. Marks, S., Savelli, M. (2015). Communist Europe and Transnational Psychiatry. *Psychiatry in Communist Europe*. P. 1–26 https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-137-49092-6_1
19. P. T. Petryuk, A. P. Petryuk. (2016). Некоторые рассуждения о 65-летию Павловской сессии [Some Reflections on the 65th Anniversary of the Pavlovian Session]. *Вестник Ассоціації психіатрів України [Bulletin of the Association of Psychiatrists of Ukraine]*. No. 1–2. P. 129–137. [in Russian]. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1hLyrKtBwT3rxHW5nsVkg0IBajFutHtSq/view>
20. Steinberg, H. 25 Years After Re-Unification of Germany: An Overview on Eastern German Psychiatry. Part 1: Post-War Era, Pavlovization, Psychopharmacological Era and Social Psychiatric Reform Movement. *Fortschritte der Neurologie · Psychiatrie*. 2016. Vol. 84. No. 4. P. 196–210. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-105515>

21. Ana Antić. (2021). Non-Aligned Psychiatry in the Cold War: Revolution, Emancipation and Re-Imagining the human psyche. P. 456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89449-8>
22. Klymenko, L. O. (2005). Розвиток фізіології нервової системи в Україні в 40-60-х роках XX століття [Development of the physiology of the nervous system in Ukraine in the 40s and 50s of the 20th century]. Dissertation abstract. Kyiv, 20 p. [in Ukrainian].
23. Klymenko, L. O. (2017). Історія формування і розвитку Київських фізіологічних шкіл (кінець XIX–XX ст.) [History of formation and development of Kyiv physiological schools (end of XIX–XX centuries)]. Kyiv, 271 p. [in Ukrainian].
24. Stoyukhina, N. Yu. Zhuravlev, A. L. (2021). Павловская сессия: новое прочтение [Pavlovian session: new reading]. *Психологический журнал [Psychological Journal]*. V. 42. No. 5. <https://www.doi.org/10.31857/S020595920017073-6>
25. Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. F. 2., d. 7, No. 76.
26. Grigoryan, N. A., Yaroshevsky, M. P. (1989). Попытка реабилитировать одну из позорных акций в науке [An attempt to rehabilitate one of the shameful actions in science]. *Communist*. No. 3. P. 121–124. [in Russian].
27. Mirsky, M. (1990). Холодным летом 50-го... Как громили физиологию на “Павловской сессии” [In the cold summer of the 50th ... How physiology was smashed at the “Pavlovsk session”]. *Медицинская газета [Medical newspaper]*. No. 21. P. 3. [in Russian].
28. Archive of the Academy of Sciences of Georgia. F. 12. d. 1., No. 77/1., P. 2–3.
29. Постановление научного совета по проблемам физиологического учения И. П. Павлова при Академии наук СССР 12 апреля 1951 г. [Resolution of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on April 12, 1951] *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1951. 37. 1. P. 530. [in Russian].
30. Постановление научного совета по проблемам физиологического учения И. П. Павлова при Академии наук СССР 8 июня 1951 г. [Resolution of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on July 8, 1951]. *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1951. 37. 2. P. 259–260 [in Russian].
31. Постановление научного совета по проблемам физиологического учения И. П. Павлова при Академии наук СССР 26 сентября 1951 г. [Resolution of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on September 26, 1951] *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1951. 37. 4. P. 514–515. [in Russian].
32. Постановление VI сессии научного совета по проблемам физиологического учения И. П. Павлова при Президиуме Академии наук СССР 24 ноября 1951 г. [Resolution of VI session of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on November 24, 1951]. *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1952. 38. 1. P. 124–129. [in Russian].
33. Постановова VII сесії наукової ради по проблемам фізіологічного вчення І. П. Павлова при Президії Академії наук СРСР 7 червня 1952 р. [Resolution of VI session of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on June 7, 1952]. *Медичний журнал [Medical journal]*. 1952. Vol. 22. No. 4. P. 3–4 [in Ukrainian].
34. Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine. F. 1, d. 24, No. 1568.
35. Bogomolets O. A. (1992). Научная школа Александра Александровича Богомольца. [Scientific school of Alexander Alexandrovich Bogomolets]. *Математическое естествознание. Фрагменты истории [Mathematical science. Fragments of history]*. Kyiv. P. 247–291.
36. Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine. F. 1, d. 24, No. 780.

37. Постановление VIII сессии научного совета по проблемам физиологического учения академика И.П. Павлова при Президиуме Академии наук СССР 27 декабря 1952 г. [Resolution of VI session of the Scientific Council on the problems of physiological doctrine I. P. Pavlova at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on December 24, 1952]. *Журнал высшей нервной деятельности имени И. П. Павлова [Journal of Higher Nervous Activity named after I. P. Pavlov]*. 1953. 3. 1. P. 157. [in Russian].
38. Постановление VIII съезда Всесоюзного общества физиологов, биохимиков и фармакологов [Resolution of the VIII Congress of the All-Union Society of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists]. *Физиологический журнал [Physiological Journal]*. 1956. 42. 6. P. 530. [in Russian].

Отримано [Received] 23.05.2023

Л. О. Клименко, кандидат історичних наук, доцент,
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0591-9265,
rfpbvrj@ukr.net

І. Г. Строкіна, кандидат біологічних наук, доцент,
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3873-1111, Scopus Author ID: 6507317830,
irene-strokina@ukr.net

Національний медичний університет імені О. О. Богомольця <https://nmuofficial.com>, Kyiv, Ukraine,
Кафедра фізіології <https://nmuofficial.com/zagalni-vidomosti/kafedri/kafedra-fyzyologyy/spivrobitnyky-kafedry>

ІСТОРІЯ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ “ПАВЛОВСЬКОЇ РАДИ” І ЇЇ НЕГАТИВНИЙ ВПЛИВ НА РОЗВИТОК НАУКИ В 50-Х РОКАХ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ

Анотація. Подальший розвиток історії науки, в тому числі історії фізіології, потребує аналізу ряду методологічних проблем, які стосуються історії розвитку науки в Україні в драматичні часи правління комуністів у Радянському Союзі. У статті розглядається ідеологічне спотворення здобутків і вчення І. Павлова партійними структурами. У статті описуються події, що відбулися на початку 50-х років ХХ століття. Наукове співтовариство світу має пам'ятати про негативні події, які стали наслідком рішень спільного засідання АМН СРСР і АН СРСР у червні–липні 1950 р. (“Павловська сесія”). Показано, що московська влада змусила провести подібні засідання в багатьох союзних республіках, у тому числі й в Україні. Результати цієї конференції мали довгостроковий негативний вплив на фізіологію, психологію, медицину. Власне, на зустрічі критикувалась робота всесвітньо відомих вчених та наукові напрямки деяких установ, хоча організатори зустрічі проголосили головною проблемою обговорення саме фізіологічного вчення академіка І. Павлова. Вони мали на меті встановити методологію умовних рефлексів та доктрину про провідну роль кори головного мозку в розгляданні усіх фізіологічних та психологічних процесів. Деякі з учнів Павлова, які мали власну концепцію, отримали ярлик “антипавловці”. “Антипавловців” змусили визнати свої помилки. Організатори сесії рекомендували їм працювати в рамках теорії вищої нервової діяльності Павлова і уникати західних впливів. Для контролю за виконанням вчення Павлова була створена “Павловська рада”. У статті представлені результати діяльності цього комітету. На основі архівних документів автор описує, як на цих засіданнях члени ради тиснули на фізіологів і нав'язували науково-дослідним інститутам нові теми. Доведено, що завданням ради було розгромити фізіологію під виглядом розвитку вчення І. Павлова. На думку автора статті,

резолуції Павловського комітету передбачали лише методологію експерименту з фізіології вищої нервової діяльності. Позитивний ефект для деяких вчених був звичайно пов'язаний з офіційною доктриною. Однак рішення Павловського комітету гальмували розвиток тих досліджень, які не стосувалися офіційної доктрини. Ці наукові дослідження були затавровані як "ворожі". Мета статті показати негативний вплив "Павловської сесії" та діяльності "Павловської ради" на розвиток фізіології, медицини та психології. Автор довів, що фізіологи України, маючи досвід наслідків об'єднаної сесії, змогли відстояти свою науку завдяки організації Всесоюзного з'їзду фізіологів, біохіміків та фармакологів в Києві в 1955 році. На цьому з'їзді було реабілітовано вчених та призупинено діяльність "Павловської ради".

Ключові слова: фізіологія ВНД; ідеологія, павловізація; Павловська Рада.

The authors declare no conflict of interest. Автори заявляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів.

Цитування (ДСТУ):

Клименко Л. О., Строкіна І. Г. Історія діяльності "Павловської ради" і її негативний вплив на розвиток науки в 50-х роках ХХ століття. *Лікарська справа*. 2023. № 2. С. 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.31640/LS-2023-2-07>

Citation (APA):

Klymenko, L. O., & Strokina, I. G. (2023). The history of the activity of the "Pavlovian Council" and its negative impact on the development of science in 50s of the 20th century. *Likars'ka Sprava*, (2), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.31640/LS-2023-2-07>