

- Teplov, B. M., 110  
 Titchener, E. B., 8, 29  
 Tolman, Edward, 7  
 Tolstoy, Lev, 152, 154, 197, 199  
 Trousseau, A., 177  
 Trubetskoy, N. S., 166  
 Tsvetkova, L. S., 158  
  
 Vagner, V. A., 205  
 Verworm, Max, 174  
 Vinogradov, V. V., 167  
 Vinogradova, Olga, 158, 161  
 Virchow, Rudolf, 175  
 Von Humboldt, Alexander, 39  
 Von Monakow, C., 122, 123  
 Vygotsky, Lev Semionovitch, 9, 37, 38-  
 57, 58, 60, 67, 104, 105, 109, 111,  
 120, 126, 127, 129, 130-131, 137,  
 156, 165, 169, 172, 175, 190, 194,  
 196-197, 198, 200, 203-213, 216,  
 219, 220, 222, 223, 224  
  
 Wagner, V. A., 41, 42  
 Watson, John, 8  
 Wechsler, David, 54  
 Werner, Heinz, 42, 58, 208  
 Wernicke, Carl, 121, 133, 170, 171, 177  
 Wertheimer, Max, 36  
 Windelband, Wilhelm, 22, 197  
 Wundt, Wilhelm, 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 21, 29,  
 40, 41, 200, 209  
  
 Yudovich, F. Y., 103, 216  
  
 Zankov, L. V., 31  
 Zaporozhets, Alexander V., 49, 190,  
 195, 206, 207, 212  
 Zassetsky, 184-187  
 Zeigarnik, Bluma, 54  
 Zinchenko, P. I., 212

## LURIA IN RETROSPECT

### Luria in Social Context

*May you not live in interesting times*  
—Chinese saying

While Chapter 1 of the autobiography provides the fullest account of Luria's personal orientation to the events that swirled around him as a youth, readers may find it difficult to credit his claims about the rapidity with which he completed his gymnasium<sup>1</sup> and college education. But the circumstances and opportunities he describes were, in fact, commonplace owing to the virtual vacuum of power that immediately followed the revolution(s) of 1917.

Russia had been at war with Germany as an ally of England and France but was so unprepared for war that it had far more men in the armed forces than armaments for them to use and consequently the Russian armies suffered horrendous losses. Manufacturing and agricultural production were inadequate even without the burden of war, and were totally inadequate to serve a huge nation at war on several fronts simultaneously.

This disastrous situation led to strikes in the capital, St. Petersburg, which became more and more severe. Finally, on March 15, 1917, the Tsar abdicated his throne. But there was no agreed upon successor. The Russian parliament was divided among members with a range of political views. A provisional

<sup>1</sup>Gymnasium is a widely used term in Europe that corresponds to secondary education in the United States and other countries.

government was set up by the most powerful parties, but an internal power struggle ensued in which the most radical group, the most radical socialist Party, the Bolsheviks, headed by Vladimir Lenin, won out. The Bolsheviks led a successful coup against the Provisional Government on October 25, later named the Great October Revolution in Soviet historiography.

Over the next several months, many of the traditional arrangements upon which the society had been based were totally transformed. Workers councils (soviets) were authorized to supervise factory production and an 8-hour day was instituted. The power of the Russian Orthodox Church was reduced by seizing its extensive land holdings and denying it authority over marriage. Banks were nationalized. In March of 1918, the new government concluded a peace treaty with the Germans at great loss in the territory over which Russia had ruled. Poland, Finland, large areas of Byelorussia and Ukraine as well as the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were removed from Russian control—a total of 1,300,000 square miles and 62 million people. The losses along Russia's western borders were so great that the capital was moved from St. Petersburg to Moscow.

Russia's withdrawal from the war and its domination by a radical socialist—soon to be communist—government, was viewed as a betrayal by the Allies ranged against Germany. By the time Luria began attending Kazan University, from which Vladimir Lenin had graduated less than two decades earlier, a civil war was raging in many parts of the country, plunging an already staggering economy and political system into further chaos.

In the late summer of 1918 a large number of Czechoslovakian troops, who had fought with the Russians against the Germans, sought to return to fight in the West. The Soviet government refused. In response, the Czech troops seized a large segment of the trans-Siberian railway and occupied several cities in central Russia, including Kazan.

Leon Trotsky had only recently been made commander of the fledgling Red Army. He quickly organized troops to take Kazan,

and on September 12, 1918, the city once again fell into Soviet hands. Documents from Trotsky's archive indicate the chaotic situation that existed in and around the city. For example:

#### WARNING TO THE WORKING POPULATION OF KAZAN

You must get out of the city for the time being. After the seizure of Kazan by the Czech-White-Guard bands, the city has become a nest of counter-revolution. This nest has to be destroyed .... It is necessary to remove your children from the town as soon as you can. We advise the working population of Kazan to seek refuge on Soviet territory. We offer fraternal hospitality to all working and needy people. Within a few days the working population of Kazan will be able to return to a city cleansed of vermin, along with the Soviet troops

A second document refers to an event, which occurred quite close to the Lurias' house:

#### ABOUT THE BURGLARS WHO SEIZED IN KAZAN PART OF THE GOLD RESERVE OF THE RUSSIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC

In Kazan the White Guards and Czechoslovaks seized part of the gold which is the public property of the Russian Soviet Republic .... In order to extract their profits from the Russian workers and peasants, the foreign beasts of prey, acting through the Czechoslovak mercenaries and White Guards, seized part of the gold which belongs to the Russian people.

(From: LEON TROTSKY'S MILITARY WRITINGS, Volume 1, THE CIVIL WAR IN RSFSR IN 1918. THE FIGHT FOR KAZAN)

There is no doubt that these events affected the Luria family, but just how severely is uncertain. Although Alexander Romanovich had kept a detailed diary since April 15, 1915 and carefully saved it to the end of his life, the dark blue notebook named "The Great Revolution" lacks many pages. They could have been torn out by his parents, or perhaps it was a kind of



auto-censorship carried out in subsequent years. But the surviving entries of August 1918 give us some picture of what was going on around him at that time:

The morning of the 6th was quiet. We even visited the market, but most shops were closed. But after 5 o'clock a terrible firing began. Before 8-9 it turned into bombardment of our place. There was a skirmish and shelling adjacent to the bank. We hid ourselves in the pantry and only from time to time looked out of it. The cannonade was unimaginable. Some of us slept in the pantry, the others in the corridor.

On the 7th we heard shooting around 3 pm. There were rumors that Czechoslovaks were approaching. At 9 pm panic began, because the firing became very heavy. Everybody hid in their homes. At 11 pm in the evening shouts were heard from the bank. The gold kept there was taken away (and, evidently, the bank was ransacked).

On the 8th I awoke very early. There were absolutely no people in the street. But later people began to gather. They said that our town had been already taken by the Czechs. Suddenly two horsemen appeared, who, without reaching our place, looked around and rode back. Very soon we saw a detachment, the soldiers were in Serbian (or Czechoslovakian) uniforms, with big arm-bands. This was the first time that I saw White Guards. The soldiers lined up near the bank. Soon a weapon was carried out of the bank, then the Bolshevik guard who had been there was taken away somewhere. This is how the bank with the gold reserve from the whole of Russia was "taken."

In the morning my father was arrested because he was mistakenly thought to be a Bolshevik. Very soon he got free. Everywhere in the town executions are held: they are searching and killing the Bolsheviks. In this connection the most horrible anti-Semitic mood is developing. There was already a provocation in the Synagogue: somebody reported that the Bolsheviks and the Jews keep bombs there. The search showed it was a lie. Nevertheless everyone is in fear of a pogrom. All of us are in low spirits.

It's a nightmarish time!!

Clearly the chaos and bloodshed impacted the Luria family, although we have only this scant record of their experience of the events. At the very least, the fact that fighting went on not only in their neighborhood but all over the city, and that the city was the site of struggle between pro- and anti-Soviet regimes, gives a somewhat clearer notion of the conditions that allowed Luria to finish high school so quickly, and that destabilized conditions at the University of Kazan.

In fact, despite the dangers, these events had a variety of positive impacts on the Luria family. As Cole wrote in his initial epilogue, the Tsarist policies that tightly restricted Jewish access to higher education and denied Jews access to professional life in the large metropolitan centers were removed.

Here is an extract from Semen Dobkin's memoirs about his childhood friend, Lev Vygotsky, Alexander Romanovich's mentor, which indicates how restrictive Tsarist policies were:

In the summer of 1913 Lev was finishing the gymnasium and was already taking the so-called "deputy exams," i.e., exams attended by a "deputy," a representative of the educational authority of the province who had the decisive say in giving marks. More often than not, the official appointed was a teacher from the public gymnasium, most of whom looked down on the teachers and pupils of the private gymnasium and were often extremely anti-semitic. Lev, however, did brilliantly at these exams and was almost certain to get an honors certificate. But midway through examinations a directive from the Minister of Education, Kasso, appeared. In Tsarist Russia there was a quota for the admission of Jews to institutions of higher education. This quota was three per cent at Moscow and Petersburg universities. In practice it meant that gold medalists were assured of admission, silver medalists had a fifty-fifty chance, while anyone who finished school without honours had no chance at all. While preserving the quota, the Kasso directive introduced a new rule whereby Jewish applicants were to be enrolled by cast-



ing lots. The idea was very simple: a university education should be received not by the most gifted but by average young people who were unlikely to be high achievers in the future.

Vygotsky showed me the newspaper with the report about the new directive, which meant a great misfortune for him personally and for his whole family since it dashed his career plans and hopes of getting a university degree.

"There," said Lev, "Now I have no chance."

The news seemed so monstrous to me that I replied quite sincerely:

"If they don't admit you to the University it will be a terrible injustice. I am sure they'll let you in. Wanna bet?"

Vygotsky, who was a great bettor, smiled and stretched out his hand. We wagered for a good book.

He did not make a single mistake on his final exams and received a gold medal. At the insistence of his parents, he applied to the medical department that was considered most suitable because it guaranteed a modest but secure future.

True, Vygotsky was more interested in the humanities, but what were his options? The history and philology departments were ruled out because they trained mainly secondary-school teachers, and Jews were not allowed to be government employees in Tsarist Russia. And the law department, too, generally turned out court officials, although it also opened opportunities to become an attorney.

And the incredible happened: late in August, the Vygotskys (the standard spelling of the family name, MC, KL) received a cable from their friends in Moscow telling them that Lev had been enrolled at the University by winning the lottery. On the same day he presented me with a volume of Bunin's poetry inscribed "To Senya in memory of a lost bet." I don't think anyone was ever so happy about losing a bet." (Levitin, 1982, pp. 28-29)

A university diploma for a Jew meant the right of living in big Russian cities. It was so vitally important that even schoolchildren tried to do what they could to help Jews to leave the humiliating Pale. Here is a fragment from another memoir, this time of the prominent Russian writer Konstantin Paustovsky, that refers to his gymnasium experience in Kiev a year or two before WWI:

Before the exams a get-together was organized in the city park. All the pupils of our class were invited, except Jews. The Jews should not know about this meeting. It was decided, that the best Russian and Polish pupils should get at least one "good" instead of "excellent" mark, so as not to get a gold medal. We agreed to leave all the gold medals to our Jewish class-mates, since without these medals they were not admitted to the university. All of us vowed to keep this decision in secret. (Paustovsky, 1955, p. 242)

If it were not for the revolution, Alexander Romanovich would have had limited chances to enter the university and practically no chance to move to Moscow. But as we know, he not only completed university in Kazan, but both he and his family took up residence and pursued their work in Moscow. The reason for this change of fate was very pragmatic: change of the national manpower policy. In Tsarist Russia people belonging to the nobility or clergy got all the preferences. Naturally, after the revolution the new state would discriminate against these two categories. By an irony of history the Bolsheviks proclaimed it their policy to destroy the state machine of the past, but the social-cultural roots of the Russian mentality made them copy the Tsarist bureaucratic system of preferences and discriminations according to national origin and religious affiliation. Being a Jew became a kind of a passport to any position because it automatically meant that a person could never have belonged to nobility or clergy, and a manpower officer need not spend time and effort checking up on his background and family connections. The Jews, whose dream always was to leave the Pale of forced,



segregated, settlement, rushed to the big cities, mainly to Moscow, and were offered many opportunities in social life. This policy led to disproportionately greater numbers of Jews among the representatives of the new state, in particular in the secret police (variously referred to as the VCHK-NKVD-KGB) that later, in the seventies, gave birth to a trend of self-accusation among the Jewish intelligentsia. For example, the well known historian Mikhail Kheifets, who was imprisoned in 1974 for writing a preface to Josef Brodsky's collection of verses, even while he was imprisoned, wrote a book *I Am a Jew*, telling about his guilty feelings for the sins of Jews in organizing and governing the numerous Soviet punitive organs.

Gradually the threat of civil war receded. The last major threats from Russian counter-revolutionaries ended in late 1920, although it was not until October of 1922, when Alexander Romanovich was beginning his career in Moscow, that the last foreign troops were pushed out of the Far East. The country was in terrible economic trouble. It has been estimated that in 1921, 20% of the Russian population was suffering from famine and cholera. (Craig, 1971). This situation forced Lenin's government to compromise some of its socialist principles and allow a partial return to capitalism by permitting the revival of private industry and allowing peasants to produce and trade food for profit. This policy appeared to be successful. By 1927, farmers were more prosperous and factory production had risen to the level it had attained in 1913.

The early 1920s were a period of experimentation in all aspects of Russian society. Increased moderation in agricultural and industrial policies was accompanied by unprecedented freedoms in the nation's intellectual life. Isaiah Berlin, who spent a brief assignment as a cultural attaché at the British embassy in Moscow immediately following the Second World War summarized the early years of the Soviet Union in these terms:

There was a genuine renaissance, different in kind from the artistic scene in other countries, in Russia during the 20s. Much

cross fertilization between novelists, poets, artists, critics, historians, and scientists took place, and this created a culture of unusual vitality and achievement, an extraordinary upward curve in European civilization. (Berlin, 1949, p. 158)

Berlin's views concerning cross-fertilization of intellectual life during the 1920's were based upon his knowledge of Soviet life and letters studied from abroad. But they were confirmed in a manner of special interest to understanding Luria at an official embassy dinner where Berlin sat next to Sergei Eisenshtein. The film director told him "the early post-revolutionary period was far and away the best in his own life as a creative artist, and in the lives of many others. It was a time, he said wistfully, when wild and marvelous things could be done with impunity" (1949, p. 164).

Berlin did not know, it appears, that the collaboration between Eisenshtein and Luria provided an excellent example of the cross-fertilization he was writing about. This collaboration extended beyond what Cole was able to write about in his initial epilogue; Eisenshtein's formulation of the principle of montage, in particular, his invocation of the idea that what emerges in the juxtaposition of images is a "generalized image" resonates strongly with Luria's and Vygotsky's notions of word meaning, for which they also invoked the notion of a "generalized image." From Eisenshtein's own essays, we know that he was present at least once during a research session with Luria's patient and the protagonist of his book *The Mind of a Mnemonist*, Shereshevsky, the person about whom it could be said that the lack of ability to effortlessly create generalized images served as the basis for his unusual memory and personality (Eisenshtein, 1942, pp. 148-149).<sup>2</sup>

In turn, Luria's activities during the early 1920's richly illustrate the idea that it was a time when wild and wonderful things

<sup>2</sup>Further evidence of their friendship was to be found in the Luria household where Eisenshtein's brain resided in a bottle in Luria's office, and original sketches for scenes in several of his films were kept.



could be done with impunity, a phrase which nicely captures Alexander Romanovich obtaining paper from a soap factory to print a journal or hauling students out of line to test his ideas about the nature of hidden psychological processes, or inviting Vygotsky, then an obscure educational psychologist whose dissertation was devoted to an analysis of *Hamlet*, to join a research group at the prestigious Institute of Psychology in Moscow.

It was, as Cole wrote in his initial epilogue, a time when a variety of attempts were made to develop the principles of Marxism in many intellectual fields. Alexander Romanovich's comments on his own efforts to combine Marx and Freud were part of this much larger field of similar explorations. Cole was correct in noting criticism directed at his efforts in this field, but subsequent scholarship has shown that it was more extensive and serious than he knew. Both Voloshinov (1986) and Vygotsky, neither of whom could be considered instruments of the Party, weighed in with their criticisms in print (see van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991, ch 5).

Perhaps most important, it was during this time that Vygotsky, Luria, and Leontiev undertook the wholesale reformulation of psychology along Marxist lines. As a result, cultural-historical psychology as a self-conscious solution to the "crisis in psychology" was born. Perhaps because of their current popularity in world psychology, it is sometimes thought that cultural-historical psychology was either *the* leading school of psychology in the USSR during and after the 1920s or at least *a* leading school, outshone, perhaps, only by Pavlov. In fact, Pavlov did not consider himself, and was not considered to be, a psychologist by his Russian colleagues. Moreover, several approaches in psychology, notably Kornilov's reactology, were more influential than the cultural-historical approach (Joravsky, 1989; van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991).

It is unclear to us how the impression of cultural-historical psychology's preeminence arose among non-Russian psychologists. Perhaps it resulted from Luria's membership on the board

of the *Journal of Genetic Psychology* that published a set of three articles about the school between 1928 and 1930. Or it may have been because of the popularity of *The Nature of Human Conflicts*, the last section of which provides an introduction to cultural-historical psychology as if these ideas had provided the structure for the entire book, which they most certainly did not.<sup>3</sup>

In any event, the truth of the matter was that all manner of psychological theories laying claim to Marxist origins were stronger institutionally than cultural-historical psychology, which was widely criticized within the USSR (an excellent compendium of critical articles has been published by Renee van der Veer, 2000). A simple, but clear, example of such criticism can be found in Alexei Leontiev's doctoral thesis. Although the thesis was published as a book in 1929, it was published with a foreword from the publishers denouncing the ideas it contained as inappropriate use of Marxism in psychology!

Isaiah Berlin's comments on this period are again especially appropriate to characterizing how the social context impacted Alexander Romanovich's intellectual life.

After a relatively relaxed period during the years of the New Economic Policy, Marxist orthodoxy grew strong enough to challenge and in the late 20s, crush all this unorganized revolutionary [intellectual] activity ... but since it was not always possible to predict which side would win, this alone, for a time, gave a certain grim excitement to literary life. (1949, p. 158–159)

The same remark appears to have been true of Luria and his colleagues. Their response to the editorial foreword was to hold a Party for Leontiev during which they mocked the criticism in music and poetry.

We now know that although the 1920s began as a period of relative openness and experimentation in all spheres of Russian

<sup>3</sup>This book, which constituted Luria's first doctoral thesis, was not published in Russia during his lifetime. It was only in 2002, 70 years after its publication in English, that the book appeared in Russian.



life, the foundations of the efficient totalitarian state to come were being gradually created by Lenin and his colleagues. On the surface, it might appear (and did so appear to many non-Russians) that the Bolsheviks had constructed a hierarchical system of government based on local democracy: that is, people from local Soviets were elected to represent their constituents. When the country adopted the constitution that marked the formal beginning of the USSR in 1924, a member of each local Soviet sent a representative to a regional Soviet, and so on up the line to the Supreme Soviet that elected those who governed on a day-to-day basis. But the appearance was built upon a carefully crafted illusion. As Leonard Schapiro, a well-known historian of the Soviet Communist Party, perceptively wrote many years ago, Lenin's form of government had

the unique quality that it brought into being what were ostensibly independent political institutions—soviets, courts, trade unions and the like—but ensured from the first that every one of these institutions should function only under the control of a single Party and by strict discipline. (1959, p. viii)

Lenin suffered the first of a series of strokes in May 1922, and between this time and his death in January 1924, the leadership of the Politburo (the top-most organization in the governmental hierarchy) was shared, and disputed, among three men, one of whom was Joseph Stalin. By 1927, Stalin had manipulated the situation so that only he remained at the top of the pyramid of power. And he began to wield that power both to transform the economic foundations of the country and to eliminate any remaining opponents. The first of these transformations made itself felt to the population in the form of the first Five-Year plan, which called for collectivization of agriculture and direct state control over industry, but the implications of these events extended into the intellectual life of the country as well.

Collectivization met with stubborn resistance from millions of peasant farmers and this resistance brought ruthless imposition of state authority, carried out by the army. Villagers who re-

sisted were deported to Siberia or simply shot. But resistance there was. Many peasants burned their crops and destroyed their livestock to keep them from passing into the hands of the government. By 1933, a large proportion of the houses in the Soviet Union had been destroyed and many millions of people had been killed (Craig, 1971). But collectivization was successfully imposed, and with it, increased state power, concentrated in Stalin's hands.

A similar fate befell the industrial sector, where those who resisted state control were accused of being saboteurs or foreign agents. Subsequent trials and executions of both Russian citizens and foreign experts who had been brought in to speed industrialization frightened people into line.

In intellectual life, as already noted, the Party began to exert more and more of an influence as well. But in this sphere, the Party was not as strong and the debates were not (yet) decided by force.

These events had direct effects on Luria's career, both positive and negative. On the positive side, it was the fact that collectivization was carried out in the Soviet republics of Central Asia (which he like many other Russian intellectuals viewed as a policy promoting modernization of the peasantry) that provided the conditions for his cross-cultural research in Uzbekistan.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, increasing Party influence also made it more and more difficult openly to show one's sympathy to ideas from outside of Russia. Revealing in this regard was Luria's very sparse use of citations to Freud and Jung in *The Nature of Human Conflicts*, and increasing attacks on Vygotsky, Luria, and Leontiev for the close attention they paid to non-Russian psychology.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup>As James Wertsch has emphasized, from Luria's perspective, these studies were more properly thought of as cross-historical, since the advent of collectivization which brought modern bureaucratic institutions and literate practices into the everyday lives of peasant herdsman were considered a new and higher historical stage as well as a cultural change (Wertsch, 1985).

<sup>5</sup>Not only did these men refer to Western psychologists in their published work, they actively promoted translations and wrote prefaces to the leading research being carried out in Europe and the United States at the time.



It was almost certainly in response to the increasing criticism that their work was evoking, and the increasingly strident political tone of that criticism, a tone that even then had ominous overtones, that motivated the move of the group to Kharkov and out of the political limelight. But, as Cole noted in the initial epilogue to the autobiography, despite the élan with which the move to Kharkov began, this period also marked the beginning of fractionation within the group. Vygotsky commuted between Moscow, Leningrad, and Kharkov while Luria spent a good deal of his time in Moscow. Moreover, Alexander Romanovich did not remain out of the spotlight. The work in Central Asia carried out in 1931–32 was harshly criticized in visible print media (Razmyslov, 2000). The work at the Institute of Medical Genetics, which began in 1934, was, if anything, even more dangerous.

One of the episodes illustrating these dangers that was deleted from the initial epilogue had been related to Cole by Luria's wife, Lana Pemienova. It occurred in 1935–36. Alexander Romanovich had been away from the Institute for some time. He returned to encounter a large, heated meeting in progress. The subject of the meeting was its director, S. G. Levit, who was being denounced for his supposed anti-Soviet views and his collaboration with foreigners. The evidence? He had hosted the well-known American geneticist, H. J. Mueller and corresponded with American colleagues. Initially, Alexander Romanovich sought to speak out in Levit's defense but a friend who had been observing the meeting dragged him away, aware that Levit had been marked for extermination. Levit was subsequently killed and the Institute closed.

The increase in Party-controlled state regulation of all spheres of life that accompanied the first Five Year Plan and collectivization, despite the opposition they met, were not without successes. After an initial period of chaos in agriculture and industry, production did increase, putting the Soviet Union on the path to becoming a major industrial power, although progress in agriculture was not as marked as in industry.

Having further consolidated his power, Stalin now turned the instruments of terror that had been used to control agriculture and industry against the Bolshevik elite itself. The key event that started the great purges of the 1930s began with the murder of Sergei Kirov, who was Party head in Leningrad in December, 1934. Although there is no definitive proof, it is widely believed that Stalin himself ordered the murder of Kirov. Whether he was directly responsible or not, Stalin used the murder to begin to liquidate a large proportion of the people who had formed the backbone of the Communist Party since the Revolution, including its top leadership. His method, as described by Nikita Khrushchev in 1956, was to sign a decree, endorsed by the Politburo, that deprived anyone accused of "preparing to engage in terrorist acts" of any legal rights. Even when individuals survived torture designed to extract confessions and provided convincing proof of their innocence, they were killed.

It is impossible at this distance in time and culture to imagine the extent of the terror waged against the country's political and intellectual elite. According to various accounts, as many as 800,000 Party members were killed, including 6 of the 13 members of the Politburo, all but a few of the 138 members of the Central Committee, almost all of the premiers of the various people's republics and high ranking members of the army, and about half of the army's officer corps.

One can only imagine the effect these events had on people like Luria and his colleagues. Friend turned against friend, children against their parents, husband against wife. No family among those in Luria's circle of acquaintances, including members of his own family, escaped unscathed.

Vygotsky apparently saw the direction in which matters were headed before the purges began. In another segment excised from the initial epilogue, Lana Pemienova told Cole that not long before he died, Vygotsky visited Roman Albertovich, Luria's father, to urge him to find a way to get his son out of the public eye as rapidly as possible. It was as a direct result of this conversation, she said, that Luria entered medical school on a



full time basis. There was, of course, ample intellectual reason for entering medicine, but in this case, the major purpose was to become a non-person in order to survive. Vladimir Zinchenko once told Karl Levitin a story he had heard from his father, Peter Zinchenko, the prominent Soviet psychologist. Alexander Romanovich, being at that time responsible for distributing free permits ('putyovky') to sanatoria and hospitals, was lucky to get the best one for Vygotsky, but when he happily brought it to his friend and teacher, Vygotsky silently tore it to pieces: he could foresee the future events in Soviet politics and did not want to survive to become the cause, though obliquely, for his colleagues' tortures. As we would now say, he possessed a very high level of reflexivity.

The terror lasted into 1938. The decree against psychological testing came in the middle of this devastation, with Luria as one of its targets. Despite the fact that he did not succeed in making himself entirely into a non-person, the move into medical school achieved its aim. But at what costs to him and others who survived the terror we will never know. Isaiah Berlin's comments reflect our own impression of the scars left upon the psyches of the survivors:

The activities of informers and false witnesses exceeded all previously known bounds; self-prostration, false and wildly implausible confessions bending before, or active cooperation with authority, usually failed to save those marked for destruction. For the rest it left painful and humiliating memories from which some of the survivors of the Terror were never to completely recover. (1949, pp. 159-160)

Those scars were clearly evident in the surviving members of Vygotsky's circle of close colleagues. While they were able to forge coalitions that brought them a few years of institutional power in Moscow following Stalin's death and the revival of psychology, residual suspicions and resentments from that earlier time were evident in what should have been purely intellec-

tual arguments about matters of psychology, and they have not entirely disappeared to this day.

Luria and several other prominent cultural-historical psychologists survived the war, during which they were able to use their theoretical acumen to conduct outstanding research on basic and applied issues associated with restoration of people who had been wounded. Luria, of course, focused on restoration of brain function, but Leontiev and Zaporozhets, for example, carried out equally interesting work on the restoration of people who lost limbs and motor function (Leontiev & Zaporozhets, 1960).

The agony of Stalinism, unfortunately, did not end with victory in the war. As indicated in the earlier epilogue, Luria was dismissed from his position in the Institute of Neurosurgery in 1950. Not included in the epilogue, because VAAP would not allow it to be included, was the fact that his dismissal came at a time when the Party was seeking to increase its control over intellectual life. When this policy was first introduced in 1946, a disproportionate number of the people singled out for criticism were Jews who were criticized in the newspapers using the code term "rootless cosmopolitans."

Luria was devastated by this turn of events. According to Lana Pemienova, it was the only time she had seen him feeling, and acting totally defeated. She had never before seen this optimistic man cry. But she did then.

While matters improved as Luria put back together his work life at the Institute of Defectology, anti-Semitism in government/Party circles continued to increase. It reached its apogee in 1952 at approximately the same time that Luria and his colleagues were under attack for being insufficiently Pavlovian. The key event in this new assault was the announcement that a plot had been discovered among high ranking physicians with responsibility for care of the Kremlin elite, and, of course, of Stalin himself. Seven of the nine men indicted were Jewish. The announcement of this new conspiracy was widely interpreted as a replay of the initiation of the Great Purges of the 1930's and at