**Introduction** **[SLIDE 1]**

The Darwin Museum in Moscow was, from its foundation in 1907, committed to using art works to support stories of evolution. Nationalised in 1917 as an adjunct of Moscow State University, and open to the public also from 1924, the museum remained under the direction of its founder, Professor Aleksandr Kots, a zoologist, ornithological expert and amateur taxidermist, and his wife Nadezhda Ladygina-Kots, a zoopsychologist and ape-researcher. Aleksandr Kots mainly directed and supervised the creation of paintings and sculptures, principally made by Vasilii Vatagin, an artist and zoologist, to support the versions of Darwinism being projected. From the October Revolution to his death in 1964, Kots ensured that the displays at the Museum were always politically correct and corresponded closely with the shifting currents of Soviet ideology. [[1]](#footnote-1)

This paper explores the potential contextual resonances of certain works by Vatagin and others in the early Revolutionary period. The discussion starts with an examination of a pair of monumental sculptures by Vatagin entitled *Age of Life* (1926) **[SLIDE 2]**, depicting the variations of role, behaviour and appearance of, on the one hand Orangutans (the beast), and on the other hand, human women (beauty) at different stages of their lives. The paper then goes on to consider how the modes of imaging, both in these sculptures and in other works representing human evolution in this period, connected with contemporary discourses on, and visualisations of Darwinian evolutionary theory, both in the Soviet Union and in Western Europe. What emerges, I argue, is a complex relationship between the images and the dialectic between contemporary Bolshevik anxieties about degeneration within the Soviet population, and utopian dreams of the Revolutionary production of a new, human biologic type.

***Age of Life* 1926**

Vatagin’s *Age of Life* (1926) sculptures are remarkable, very large, carved plaster bas-reliefs, which are still on display at the Moscow Darwin Museum. Both are 0.8m deep at the base and 1.3m wide. The orangutan piece is 3.1m high and the other slightly shorter at 2.6m high. What makes them particularly remarkable is the fact that, although they are a pair and represent narratives of reproduction, development and ageing, they differ considerably not only in their subject matter – women and Orangutans – but in the way that the subject matter is represented, and also in their physical facture.

In this sense it seems evident that they are meant to be read as representing different sorts of narratives in relation to Darwin’s ideas of evolution. The latter level of interpretation, at least, is a given, in relation to their specific production for the Darwin Museum’s display in 1926. At this very basic level, the sculptures may at least be seen to refer to Darwin’s theorisations about the descent of humankind from primates. There is some differentiation going on between the human and the primate within the sculptures. But, what may have been the message/s about contemporary Darwinism that the Museum wanted to convey through these art works?

***Age Variability in Humankind***

In the representation of the women – subtitled *Age Variability in Humankind* - there are smooth idealised bodies. The mass of figures are clearly delineated, ordered, healthy-looking, slender, and seem to be represented as co-operating across the generations. There is no famously Darwinian ‘struggle for existence’ represented, and it seems easy to read the life-cycle narrative from baby to child, to nubile woman, then from mother to mature woman and crone. The nudity of the youngest figures might be associated with childhood innocence. The pose in which the nude, nubile young woman is depicted seems to offer a fairly stereotypical arty image of sensuous body-consciousness. **[SLIDE 3]** The pose may even have some reference back to sculptural depictions of female nudes by the French sculptor, Rodin, such as the very popular *Toilette de Venus* (1885), with which Vatagin may have become acquainted during his pre-Revolutionary visits to Paris [DATES??].

While Vatagin’s sculpture *Age Variability in Humankind* is a bas-relief, most of the figures offer the illusion of three-dimensionality, with the exception of the topmost image of the mature woman in contemplative pose, which does not project far and merges fluidly with the material. The other figures’ attention seems focused on the image of the infant. The topmost figure is the only one that appears to gaze out at the viewers, as if inviting them to consider her ‘vision’ of the life cycle. In relation to the context of production as part of the display at the Darwin Museum, this seems a deliberately stagey ploy to engage the viewers with the presented educational narrative. After all, within the post-Revolutionary context after 1924, the function of the museum displays was to tell the evolutionary story not only to undergraduate women students, but also to people who were probably illiterate. [The work appears symbolic in intent, but is also possibly Symbolist in the way it has been devised – since Vatagin studied painting in the atelier of the Russian Symbolist painter, Konstantin Yuon.]

Despite the fact that the title of the piece refers to ‘humankind’, there are no men represented. But, the infant depicted at the bottom of the sculpture appears to be male [could not, unfortunately, get a viable shot of his willy]. Now, this might be, of course, simply for convenience – even illiterate peasants and workers would have had experience of the basic parameters of female reproductivity/fertility, whereas, perhaps, it was not as easy to represent a symbolically chronological representation, through known stereotypes of male ageing in relation to the reproductive cycle. The key issue here relates to the apparent definition of the evolution of humankind as particularly connected to women/reproduction. This is important and something that I will return to later on in the paper.

***Age Variability in Orangutans***

**[SLIDE 4]** But, going back to Vatagin’s sculptures: how different, then, is the representation of the orangutans in the other *Age of Life* bas-relief – subtitled *Age Variability in Orangutans*. Instead of the smoothness of execution, there is a roughness of surface on the animal figures and the background. **[SLIDE 5]** As if to emphasise that the creatures are part of nature – as opposed to the contemporary Darwinian, and indeed Marxist-Leninist assumption, that humans do and should dominate nature, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish where the background ends and the figures begin. This is especially so in relation to the baby orangutans depicted as scrambling about above the heads of the two central characters.

**[SLIDE 6]** The largest of these two figures may be a representation of a dominant male. It seems, for instance, to have some similar physical characteristics to the photograph of Dyok the dominant male at Pondok Tanggui, Borneo, taken in 2011 by Jenny Aundrews. The other figure with arm upstretched to a baby orangutan, may represent a dominant female or a younger male. The problem is that no nipples or breasts are depicted. It is equally unclear what sex the other figures are supposed to be, unless, perhaps, you are a zoologist – so the life cycle shown is more generic for the general public than that of the other sculpture. But, like the women in the other sculpture, the creatures are depicted as healthy-looking, and able to engage in cooperative behaviour – which could be interpreted as referring to Darwin’s discussion of cooperation in *Origin of Species* - and again, there is no sign of the Darwinian ‘struggle for existence’. **[SLIDE 7]** Even the poses and facial expressions seem anthropomorphised, much like the sketches of an orangutan’s head made by Vatagin in 1920, making not only a visual link to Darwin’s *Descent of Man date*, but also a conceptual one to his study of the *Expression of the Emotions date*.

The expression of emotion in primates was of central interest at the Darwin Museum in this period, in relation to Nadezhda Ladygina’s studies of the macaques at Moscow Zoological Gardens, and most importantly, her first-hand but incomplete research on chimpanzee behavioural development in relation to Joni, a young chimpanzee that she had acquired when he was about one year of age in 1913, and studied until his death in 1916. **[SLIDE 8]** Vatagin worked on this project with her, providing composite drawings and paintings. When her son Rudi was born in 1925, and she began a comparative study of *Infant Chimpanzee and Human Child*,Vatagin again collaborated. Indeed the human infant in *Age of Life* 1926, may have been modelled on one-year-old Rudi and the women on Ladygina-Kots.[[2]](#footnote-2) The published version of Ladygina-Kots’ study, which came out in 1935, ultimately concluded that contemporary chimpanzees were an evolutionary dead end – not ‘almost human’, but ‘by no means human’,[[3]](#footnote-3) and that unlike humans they had no will or incentive towards ‘self-improvement’.[[4]](#footnote-4) While they could be trained or educated to a certain extent, they could not be environmentally ‘evolutionised’. They remained beasts.

This, however, may not have been the conclusion that Ladygina-Kots or Vatagin pictured in 1926. At this point, historically, on the one hand Soviet ape-research was poised to experiment genetically with ‘evolutionising’ primates – to test out Darwin’s theories - through Professor Ivan Ivanov’s state-funded project to hybridise them with humans by artificial insemination. On the other hand, the brand of Russian Darwinism favoured by the Bolsheviks held out the Lamarckian-style possibility that evolutionary change could be triggered by training, habit, and environment. Given the inclination of Aleksandr Kots towards this interpretation of Darwin and his lack of conviction in the early 1920s concerning the purely genetic basis of evolution, and the shortness of Ladygina-Kots’ study of Joni, it is highly possible that within the Darwin Museum such an interpretation still prevailed in 1926. If so, then the pair of sculptures by Vatagin might be seen to present the viewer with a relatively benign and even hopeful vision of the ‘beast’ itself as still transmutable, given civilising influences, to attain the status of human. Yet, this interpretation may need to be tempered somewhat, in relation to the environment in which the sculptures were displayed.

**[SLIDE 9]** Significant dramatic elements of that environment were large paintings and sculptures, mainly by Vatagin, that imagined the lives of early hominids as nasty, brutish, and presumably, short. **[SLIDE 10]** Many of them still can be seen in the current display at the Darwin Museum. **[SLIDE 11]** Two sculptures by the renowned death-mask maker, Kurbatov – commissioned by Aleksandr Kots, while Vatagin was away at the Russian front during the First World War – seem to have set up *Homo Neanderthalis* and *Pithecanthropus* particularly to emphasise the sinister brutishness of these very early hominids.[[5]](#footnote-5) **[SLIDE 12]** Perhaps as balance to these, after 1917 Vatagin produced two images of Cro-Magnon man, a plaster sculpture [painted with metallic bronze paint] c1918, and a painting c1921.

**[SLIDE 13]** Cro-Magnon man was an early version of homo sapiens – often billed as ‘the first artist’ – and certainly viewed by evolutionary scientists and paleoanthropologists in the 1920s as the first hominid to show recognisable signs of ‘civilisation’. Vatagin’s sculpture seems to celebrate Cro-Magnon’s personal triumph over an elk as an evolutionary step forward for human control of nature. The features of the hominid figure are regular, the musculature immense, the hair appears to have been cut – if not styled – and the face is unbearded. [Schwarzenegger could have posed for this..!].

There is actually nothing in the representation to suggest that this sort of figure might not be still seen in the populations of contemporary western Europe. The more recent interpretations of fossil data, however now suggests, that the cranium of Cro-Magnon man was bigger than contemporary humans, with a long low skull and a wide face. This more recent research also indicates that Cro-Magnon may have been brown-skinned. However, in the larger than life [3m x 1m] painting Vatagin represents him, with his bows and arrows and tamed wolfy mate, as white-skinned, blue-eyed and fair-haired, with an aquiline, and again beard-free, physiognomy – **[SLIDE 14]** rather than bearded, with dark hair and more prognanthous features as Viktor Vasnetsov depicted him in 1883. [Why? This is a point I will come back to later...]

**Degeneration Extiction and the Beast**

The images of early hominids – whether ostensibly sinister and brutish, or not - indicated the passing of unquantifiable geological and evolutionary time between the unidentified point when early hominids evolved from apes, and when so-called ‘civilised’ humankind – exemplified by Cro-Magnon man – emerged. **[SLIDE 15]** Looking back to the two sculptures from 1926, the environment would suggest that, while apes still might be open to ‘evolutionisation’ – via human impetus – this might still take an extraordinarily long time, as, indeed, it had done in the first place. Ultimately, the Darwin Museum’ s representations of human evolution, maybe, was hedging its bets between Lamarckism and genetics. A wise decision as it turned out, since during the ‘cultural revolution’ 1929-32, genetics simultaneously won and ultimately lost, its battle against crypto-Lamarckian concepts of evolution.

**[SLIDE 16]** The ‘beast’ was a dangerous random-factor in the Russian Darwinian equation. Vatagin, for example, had clearly had a Fremiet ‘moment’ in his creation of sculptures for the Moscow Darwin Museum 1917-18. This was unsurprising, since he had visited the Paris Jardin des Plantes before the Bolshevik Revolution, and so had his mentor, Aleksandr Kots. **[SLIDE 17]** Both would have been well aware of Fremiet’s imaginative and somewhat risqué sculpture of a male gorilla abducting a female Cro-Magnon [shades of *King Kong*?].

**[SLIDE 18]** Vatagin’s plaster sculpture [painted with bronze paint] of the *Gorilla in Heat*, not only recalls Fremiet’s work – but, in relation to Vatagin’s representations of Cro-Magnon man, calls up a vision of the fragility of the ‘proto-civilised’ existence of early humans. The body, apparently trampled by the gorilla/beast has aquiline features, which in relation to the 1921 painting and c1918 sculpture, may signify that even Cro-Magnon man was not immune either to extinction, or to the forces of brute nature in his ‘struggle for existence’. If life in the prehistoric past was so demonstrably fragile and precarious, what, then, was the prognosis for the future of contemporary ‘civilised’ humankind?

Around the time when Vatagin made this sculpture, the empire inherited by the Bolsheviks had been extracted from participation in the carnage of World War I, only to be plunged immediately into civil war. This was accompanied by trade blockades, and a brief, unsuccessful war of intervention from the West. The new state had a very low level of industrial development, massive illiteracy, a disastrously low birth-rate in relation to the war losses and post-Revolutionary emigrations, high levels of alcoholism, poor sanitation and rampant epidemic diseases such as typhoid, dysentery, malaria, syphilis and typhus. **[SLIDE 19]** Just as an example, typhus, most commonly spread by lice, affected over 6.5 million people between 1918 and 1920.[[6]](#footnote-6) Hence the famous phrase attributed to Lenin: ‘if socialism cannot conquer the lice, then lice will conquer socialism’.[[7]](#footnote-7) Lenin wasn’t joking. Disease and depopulation potentially spelt extinction for the nascent, new, socialist form of socio-economic organisation. Of course, all of the current post-revolutionary problems could be/ and were blamed on the Tsarist regime, World War I, the civil war with the ‘Whites’ etc. But, there also needed to be a positive offering from the new rulers right from the start.

**Regeneration and the New Person**

Clearly, the post-Revolutionary prognosis for future development, at least for humankind, had to be good, and it had to be seen to confront decisively the forces of brute nature, and, indeed, to assert the certain dominance of humankind over it. What seemed to have been commonly believed both before and after 1917, and partly rooted in Engels’ discourse on Darwin, was that the revolutionary change of the socio-economic system, could potentially lead to evolutionary change in those members of the human race involved with it. Within the new society, the ‘struggle for existence’ would be replaced by socialist cooperation – hence perhaps, the emphasis on cooperative behaviour in Vatagin’s *Age of Life*, made when war, famine and disease had abated somewhat. Leading theoreticians such as Nikolai Bukharin and Leon Trotsky prophesised the coming of a new genus of humankind – the New Person – that would inevitably follow and/or be generated by the social and environmental changes triggered by the October Revolution of 1917.

With this goal in view, central to Bolshevik concerns in the early Revolutionary period, was the need to conquer the ‘beast’ both literally and metaphorically. This had to be shown, not just in the sense of displaying mastery and superiority over ordinary creatures, both wild and domestic, something which could be encompassed by the displays and lectures at the Darwin Museum**. [SLIDE 20]** For instance, in this photograph from the mid 1920s, Kots is shown apparently demonstrating the superior size of the human brain to that of an ape, to an apparently rapt and disciplined audience of Red Army soldiers – who effectively represented the – disciplined, deloused and de-bearded - advance guard of the New Person in relation to contemporary Soviet propaganda.

The more difficult task was to vanquish the metaphorical, ‘beast within’, comprising the major forces of social and physical degeneration – disease and depopulation – amongst the masses. Almost all of the structures, organisations, institutions and legislation that were put in place during the 1920s, can be argued to have been directed in some way towards this conquest. In relation to this paper, however, two things stand out as particularly significant, for their focus on the task of ‘engineering’ the central figure of the utopian dream - the New Person. One of these was the promotion of hygienic maternity and infant care within the free medical health service set up in 1918. The other was the state supported institution of eugenics research between 1920 and 1930. Both fell under the aegis of the Commissar for Health, Nikolai Semashko.

**[SLIDE 21]** As a ‘social hygienist’ Semashko was particularly concerned with prophylactic medicine and health education, with particular emphasis on the health of women and children in relation to the disastrous birth and infant mortality rates. By the mid 1920s the Department for the Protection of Mothers and Children (*Okhrmatmlad*)[[8]](#footnote-8), within the Commissariat for Health (*Narkomzdrav*), was issuing thousands of ‘sanitary enlightenment’ (*Sanprosvet*) posters, aimed at educating both urban and peasant women about hygienic maternity and childcare, stressing the need to take infants to clinics for health checks, and to have babies in hospital rather than at home. As I have argued elsewhere, this can be seen in Foucault’s terms as a medicalization of women’s bodies to bring them more closely under the surveillance and control of the state – in effect to create, what Foucault called ‘docile bodies’.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The medicalization of women’s bodies was also a central theme of international and Soviet eugenics discourse, concerned as it was, with the improvement of populations. Semashko himself defined the strategies of ‘social hygiene’ as a necessary preliminary to the adoption of ‘eugenics as the science of making the human race healthy’. [[10]](#footnote-10) **[SLIDE 22]** Between 1920 and 1921, eugenics research laboratories were set up in Petrograd under Yuri Filipchenko, and in Moscow by Nikolai Kol’tsov – who also founded and edited the *Russian Eugenics Journal*. From 1920, eugenics societies sprang up in the major cities of the Soviet Union.

In relation to my use of the term ‘eugenics’, it needs to be emphasised that Soviet eugenics discourse was somewhat different to its counterparts elsewhere in the world. For the most part, it blurred the boundaries between eugenics – genetic control of the population - and euthenics - improving the population by improving their living conditions. This inclination was linked to the level of credence given to Lamarck’s notion of the inheritability of acquired characteristics within Soviet Darwinism. That said, there is also no doubt, that issues of eugenic sterilisation were raised, notably by the leading anthropologist, Mikhail Volotskii in 1925.[[11]](#footnote-11) There were also elements of racial prejudice, particularly against Jews, within Soviet eugenics discourse as edited by Kolt’sov in the *Russian Eugenics Journal*,[[12]](#footnote-12) accompanied by some inclination towards the theory of ‘nordic’ racial superiority – with the emphasis on blond hair, blue eyes, aquiline features and fair skin that would seem to be celebrated in Vatagin’s painting of Cro-Magnon man in 1921.

Coming back to the Darwin Museum: although I have not yet found any explicit historical publications by the Museum engaging with eugenics *per se*, there are any number of implicit indications within the archives of the Darwin Museum, that Aleksandr Kots, Nadezhda Ladygina-Kots and potentially also Vasilii Vatagin [- as a recipient of instructions and a close friend of both-] were all acquainted with both international and Soviet discourse on eugenics. These data include correspondence with leading international eugenicists such as Henry Fairfield Osborn – the Director of the American Museum of Natural History in New York – Julian Huxley, William Bateson, Robert Yerkes, and Paul Kammerer.[[13]](#footnote-13) In relation to the possible conversations about eugenics at the Darwin Museum it needs to be noted that Soviet eugenicist Nikolai Kol’tsov , was Aleksandr Kots’ scientific colleague at Moscow State University, and Vasilii Vatagin was acquainted with sculptor Vera Mukhina’s husband, Aleksandr Zamkov, who worked on eugenics with Kol’tsov at the Moscow Institute for Experimental Biology. The archival data at the Darwin Museum also records the presence of significant texts about eugenics in Kots’ and Ladygina-Kots’ personal libraries, including copies of the *Russian Eugenics Journal*. Moreover, in the range of sculpture busts at the museum constructed during the 1920s, amongst the international heroes of evolutionary science commissioned from Vatagin between 1917 and the late 1920s, there are few figures who did not have some involvement with eugenics. This does accurately represent the situation – there were few genetic or population scientists of the era who did not engage, apparently necessarily, with eugenics. In relation to this, with regard to the Darwin Museum in the mid 1920s, it is difficult to say categorically what sort of eugenics the directorate embraced – but it is a very good bet that they were into eugenics, and that this may have had an effect on Museum policy and display.

**Conclusion**

**[SLIDE 23]** Finally, returning to Vatagin’s sculptures of the *Age of Life*, I would argue that the context of production in 1926 may suggest that these were a rather complex pair of representations. This context was of an emerging, new, socialist society being brought under increasing state control under Stalin, in which there was an enormous emphasis on scientific control over nature as the paramount means to achieve the utopian dream, and a particular stress on medico-scientific issues concerning the improvement and increase of the population. [[14]](#footnote-14) As a state scientific, educational and research institution, the Darwin Museum was necessarily implicated in this to some extent, in order to survive.

In the new Soviet society of the mid-1920s, unlike that of Vatagin’s Cro-Magnon man, primates were no longer positioned as the beasts that threatened civilisation. Extinctions would not, therefore, necessarily follow, and in relation to Lenin’s warning it would seem that socialism had conquered the louse. The orangutans as depicted by Vatagin, were not representations of a threatening beast. Rather they arguably signified - possibly evolutionisable - objects for scientific scrutiny and experimentation, which, because of their scientifically observed and theorised proximity to humankind, might serve to provide valuable data for the purposes of improving the Soviet population to engineer the evolution of the New Person.[[15]](#footnote-15)

In the new Soviet society, the contemporary propaganda stressed the pursuit of hygienic maternity as a highly significant part of this evolutionary process. Regarding the representations of productive and reproductive women, there is little doubt that Ladygina-Kots’ pregnancy and the birth of Rudi would have brought awareness of this propaganda theme into the discussions within the Darwin Museum in the mid 1920s, alongside her own zoopsychological concerns with observing her son. Given the significant circumstantial evidence for some level of engagement with eugenics discourse within the museum it does not seem far-fetched to imagine the sculpture as referring to the current bio-medical ideal of hygienic and eugenic motherhood, with the representation of the infant signifying the emergence of the New Person.

1. This is strongly exemplified in the divergences regarding the value of Lamarck’s ideas in relation to those of Darwin, between certain of Kots’ unpublished writings and lecture notes 1909-1963, which correspond closely to the shifts, post-1917, of dominant, party-approved views on Lamark in particular historical contexts. Most obviously it is exemplified by the documentation, within the Darwin Museum archives, of Kots’ lightning reaction to the outlawing of genetic science, and absolute imposition of Lysenko’s ‘Michurinism’ within the Academy of Sciences in 1948. This is the focus of a paper to be given in July 2012 at the 2nd International Workshop on Lysenko, in Vienna. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. It is clear from the archival evidence, that Vatagin preferred to work from life – or failing that, from photographs. Ladygina-Kots may also have posed for Vatagin as she is photographically recorded doing for his big sculpture of *Lamarck and his Daughters.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. N.Ladygina Kots, Infant Chimpanzee and Human Child, (Moscow 1935)tr. p.393. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. N.Ladygina Kots, Infant Chimpanzee and Human Child, (Moscow 1935)tr. p.397. NB Voluntarism, training and self training was an important element of the route to self-evolution as new people proposed in the USSR in the 1930s. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. A.F. Kots, ‘Darvinovskii muzei do oktyabrskoi revoliutsii 1907-1917’ (no date) in *Trudy gosudarstvennogo darvinovskogo muzeya. K 100-letiu muzeya*. 2007, issue 11, pp.60-62. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Roger I. Glass, ‘The SANEPID Service in the USSR’, *Public Health Reports*, 1976, vol.91, no.2, p.155. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. J.E. Muller et al, ‘The Soviet health system: aspects of relevance for medicine in the United States’, New *England Journal of Medicine* , 1972, vol.286, p.700. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1438525/pdf/pubhealthrep00155-0056.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Initially set by Alexandra Kollontai during her brief time as Welfare Commissar. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Kollontai had clearly defined motherhood as the social duty of women in the new state. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See for example T.I. Iudin, *Evegenika* (Moscow, 1925), p. 6; Bernstein, *The Dictatorship of Sex*, pp. 171-5.

    . Semashko, *Nauka o zdorov’e*, Obshchestva sotsial’naia gigiena (Moscow, (1922) 1926), pp. 53-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. M.V. Volotskii, *Klassovye interesy i sovremennaia evgenika*, Moscow: Zhizn’ i znanie, 1925. E.I. Kolchinskii, ‘Chem zakonchilas’ popytka sozdat’ proletarskuiu biologiiu’, <http://www.reusscience.euro.ru/papers/kol00vr.htm> accessed 03/11/11. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. It was noted in the American publication *Eugenics News*, 1925, pp.146-147, that Kol’tsov had recently contributed information on the Soviet eugenics movement to the *Archiv für Rassen und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, and that the 2nd and 3rd parts of the *Russian Eugenics Journal* 1924 contained two articles on ‘data for comparative characteristics of physical conditions of Jews’ (EN, p.147): Kol’tsov, N. ‘New attempts to prove the inheritance of acquired characteristics’ and Wermel, S. ‘Criminality of Jews’. AMNH archives photos 238, 239. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Aleksandr Kots’ handwritten personal library catalogue, while containing numerous scientific books and papers by an array of American, German and British scientist/eugenicists [for example: USA – Vernon Kellogg, C.B. Davenport, H.F. Osborn, W.K. Gregory, H.J. Müller; German – Weisman, Haeckel, Kammerer; Britain – R.C. Punnett, W. Bateson], shows a preference for British writings on eugenics, by Galton, Karl Pearson, Reginald Ruggles-Gates, Julian Huxley and H.G. Wells. Galton *Hereditary Genius* in German, Galton, *Natural Inheritance*, K. Pearson, *Life and Letters of Francis Galton*, 2 vols, 1914 & 1924, Ruggles-Gates, *Inheritance and Eugenics*, 1923, translated into Russian. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Science was important for the Bolsheviks – the Marxism they espoused was considered materialistic and therefore scientific. Darwinism, as a generic theoretical position that was materialistic and non-teleological was considered a central part of Bolshevik ideology - an intrinsic part of ‘scientific materialism’. It was for this reason, arguably, that the Darwin Museum initially gained Bolshevik support, and what helped to keep it alive over the years. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Such study was commonly legitimised by scientists to funding authorities in the 1920s, not only in the USSR but in western Europe and America, by reference to the close relationships of primate and human. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)