

WERE THERE ANY PHILOSOPHY SCHOOLS IN LITHUANIA DURING SOVIET PERIOD?

Introduction

In this article¹, an attempt is made to answer a question, whether, in the philosophy of Soviet period, there were the formations that, according to the contemporary conceptions of sociology of science, could be called (and considered) scientific school (further abbreviation SS will be used). One of the key results of this research is an identification of master-pupil groups of relationships that allows treating the detected groups in terms of SS conceptions. If the interpretation reveals an existence of SS, further conceptual research (by the methods of the historiography of philosophy) of this important phenomenon of the sociology of science will be possible. In a community of scientists, the notions of master and pupil are primarily applied to a supervisor of the doctoral thesis and his doctorate student. Hence, in order to detect all master-pupil ties and to reconstruct their intricate network, first of all one must to list and to classify all doctoral theses in a particular science that were defended during a particular period of time (in other words, to conduct a bibliometric analysis of a flow of the theses). In this article, such an analysis has been completed: all the defended theses in philosophy of the Soviet period (then called “candidate dissertations”) have been listed and classified according to the years of their defence, authors, supervisors, and scientific institutions. The classification reveals the above-mentioned groups of master-pupil ties. The article summarizes the main features of SS, found in the sociology of science, and finally attempts to answer a question which is raised by its heading. It should be noted that, in Lithuania, the flows of the dissertations in exact sciences have been bibliometrically analysed by Ona Voverienė and her pupils². However, here

¹ This research was funded by a grant (No. LIP-084/2016) from the Research Council of Lithuania.

² BIRUTĖ RAILIENĖ, *Lietuvos chemikų mokslinės mokyklos: Bibliometrinė analizė*. Daktaro disertacija. (Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas 1996); GIEDRĖ SASNAUSKAITĖ, ‘Disertacijų srauto analizė – bibliometrijos metodai’ (1998) I *Mokslotyra* 79–87; GIEDRĖ SASNAUSKAITĖ, *Lietuvos techniškujų mokslinių mokyklų bibliometrinis tyrimas*. Daktaro disertacija. (Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas 2001); VAIDA VANAGAITĖ, ‘Lietuvos matematikų mokslinės mokyklos’ (2000) I (5) *Mokslotyra* 26–39; ONA VOVERIENĖ (ed.), *Lietuvos mokslinės mokyklos (1945–1990)* (Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla 2002).

this approach is applied to the flow of dissertations in philosophy (and in humanity in general) for the first time.

Structure of the flow of dissertations

In Lithuania, the overall number of defended doctoral theses in philosophy in Soviet period was 100. The main institution of doctoral studies was Vilnius University: 52 doctoral theses were defended at this university. 17 doctoral theses were defended at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. About one third of the theses were prepared at the central scientific institutions of Soviet Union: Lomonosov Moscow State University (11), Institute of Philosophy of SSSR Academy of Science in Moscow (7); Zhdanov Leningrad State University (3). It should be noted that the impact of the Academy of Social Sciences in Moscow, responsible for the qualification of the party-ideological personnel, was tenuous: only 7 Lithuanian philosophers defended their theses at this institution. Incidentally, one thesis (by Rolandas Pavilionis) was prepared and defended at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Science of Ukraine.

	SUPERVISOR	No. of thesis supervised
1.	ROMANAS PLEČKAITIS	11
2.	EUGENIJUS MEŠKAUSKAS	9
3.	BRONISLOVAS GENZELIS	8
4.	IRMIJA ZAKSAS	7
5.	JONAS REPŠYS	6
6.	BRONISLAVAS KUZMICKAS	5
7.	ALBINAS LOZURAITIS	4
8–9.	JUOZAS BARZDAITIS	3
8–9.	JONAS MACEVIČIUS	3
10–13.	KRISTINA RICKEVIČIŪTĖ	2
10–13.	VOSYLIUS SEZEMANAS	2
10–13.	KRESCENCIJUS STOŠKUS	2
10–13.	GYTIS VAITKŪNAS	2

Table 1. *The scientists who supervised more than one doctoral thesis in philosophy in Soviet period.*

GROUP	No. of members
GROUP OF EUGENIJUS MEŠKAUSKAS	24
GROUP OF VOSYLIUS SEZEMANAS	17
GROUP OF JONAS MACEVIČIUS	14
GROUP OF IRMIJA ZAKSAS	11

Table 2. *The biggest groups of master-pupil ties in Lithuania in Soviet period.*

It should be noted that no more than half of the philosophers who then prepared and defended their theses were Marxists; some of them, together with their pupils, formed a group bind by master-pupil relationships that was led by Eugenijus Meškauskas, and some made several less consolidated groups. Meškauskas's group was the largest constellation of master-pupils relationships in Lithuania; it comprised Meškauskas's own pupils and the pupils of his pupils.

The groups of master-pupil ties

Further the explications of these groups are presented. On the top of a group the surname of its leader is written; below the pupils of the leader are designated by the Roman numerals. The pupils of the latter, if there are some, are designated by Arabic numerals and put beside each master's surname; if they, in turn, had their own pupils, their names are designated by the first letters of the alphabet; a surname of a member of the group who has pupils is written in capital letters in bold. Beside each surname the date of the thesis defence is written in brackets.

GROUP OF EUGENIJUS MEŠKAUSKAS

EUGENIJUS MEŠKAUSKAS (1955)

I. J. REPŠYS (1961)

1. R. Gudaitytė (1969)

2. K. STOŠKUS (1972)

a) J. Sasnauskienė (1980)

b) V. Valentinavičius (1989)

3. A. Kvaraciejus (1973)

4. B. Luneckas (1977)

-
5. L. Jekentaitė (1977)
6. Ž. Jackūnas (1981)
II. V. Lazutka (1962)
III. A. LOZURAITIS (1963)
1. E. Gendrolis (1969)
2. J. KAROSAS (1969)
 a) R. Šerpytytė (1988)
3. B. Černienė (Vaitkutė) (1971)
4. A. Poviliūnas (1989)
IV. E. Krakauskas (1968)
V. V. RADVILAVIČIUS (1969)
1. V. Valevičius (1987)
VI. J. V. Vinciūnas (1971)
VII. J. Skersytė (1972)
VIII. Č. Kalenda (1972)
IX. D. Kapačiauskienė (1976)

GROUP OF VOSYLIUS SEZEMANAS

VOSYLIUS SEZEMANAS (–)

- I. K. RICKEVIČIŪTĖ (1962)**
1. N. Juršėnas (1971)
2. A. Nesavas (1975)
II. R. PLEČKAITIS (1962)
1. G. M. Padolskienė (1969)
2. E. NEKRAŠAS (1971)
 a) A. Plėšnys (1987)
3. A. Varanavičius (1973)
4. A. Šliogeris (1973)
5. A. Vaišvila (1977)
6. A. Degutis (1980)
7. T. Sodeika (1983)
8. E. Kriščiūnas (1985)
9. J. Baranova (1985)
10. J. Balčius (1986)
11. K. Masiulis (1989)

GROUP OF JONAS MACEVIČIUS**JONAS MACEVIČIUS (1952)****I. B. GENZELIS (1964)**

1. J. Ažubalis (1969)
2. F. Mačianskas (1970)
3. L. Degėsys (1983)
4. L. Zasimauskas (1985)
5. A. Juozaitis (1986)
6. S. Arlauskas (1986)
7. V. Radžvilas (1987)
8. K. Gudonis (1988)

II. G. VAITKŪNAS (1967)

1. V. Gumauskaitė (1981)
 2. P. Veljataga (1986)
- III. V. Kazlauskas (1968)

GROUP OF IRMIJA ZAKSAS**IRMIJA ZAKSAS (1955)****I. J. BARZDAITIS (1960)**

1. A. Darginavičienė (1968)
 2. P. Mikuckas (1977)
 3. Z. Liubarskienė (1983)
- II. E. Karakozova (1963)
- III. S. Baležentienė (1971)
- IV. V. Pikutis (1974)
- V. Alg. Poška (1981)
- VI. A. Dobryninas (1985)
- VII. V. Pruskus (1985)

Conceptions of a scientific school

In order to determine whether we can regard at least one of the indicated groups (and at least partly) a school of philosophy, further on we will briefly introduce conceptions of a SS in the sociology of science. There are still ongoing debates about the definition of an SS, its structure and main features as well as ways of

defining the features. An SS has become the focus of research of researchers from a number of science branches – science historians, sociologists, psychologists, and science theoreticians. Every group of researchers assess an SS according to their research interests. Science theoreticians, building on classical SS research traditions, pay most attention to the development of ideas of an SS and personalities of their leaders. Science theoreticians solve such issues as identification of an SS, assessment of their typologies, structures, efficiency of functioning as well as objective depiction of their role in science; an SS is assessed as one of the forms of organising scientific activities. Sociologists of science are concerned with defining social communicative relations of a leader of an SS and its members, as well as its relationship with the outside world, subjective and objective factors impacting formation and dissolution of an SS. Psychologists of science are concerned with the psychological environment created by a leader and members of an SS, influence of various human characteristics on creative processes, and similar things³.

A leader of an SS (its founder, teacher) is regarded as one of the main structural factors; field literature distinguishes between conceptions of SSs with and without leaders. The first maintain that an SS is a scientific structural unit, a collective (group) of scientists led by a prominent scientist, a founder of an original scientific branch and fruitful research programme who has achieved excellent results. Proponents of SSs without leaders believe that an SS is an exclusive style of thinking and working encompassing multiple scientists united by ideas of one world view, specific spiritual atmosphere, ethical, moral and virtuous attitudes. A leader's exceptional role and its necessity overall is rejected here, and an impersonal origin that unifies members of a school is especially stressed that is often referred to as "a style of thinking", "commonality of viewpoints" and similar terms. Besides, such conception allows discerning an aspect of newness in the development of an SS, i.e., conceptual changes in the problems solved and methods; meanwhile, theories maintaining a school's leader's exceptional status make an impression as if the goal of an SS' activities is a constant and unchanging adoration of ideas and truths formed by its leader.

Lithuanian science theorist O. Voverienė proposes the conception of an SS with a leader: according to her, the status of an SS and its contribution to a certain branch of science is mostly dependent on the SS leader who unifies a group of like-minded people without force and administration and who foresees one scientific strategy⁴. O. Voverienė states that she and her colleagues have developed one of possible versions of a social communicative model that allows to identify contemporary SSs in the beginning of their formation and to foresee their potential

³ See ONA VOVERIENĖ (ed.), *Lietuvos mokslinės mokyklos (1945–1990)* (Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla 2002) 8–9.

⁴ See *ibid.*, 19.

emergence. This approach is a simplified version of the conception developed by an American sociologist of science N. Mullins (we will further on build on his conception). The latter conception is especially important because it distinguishes several stages of scientific communication. That means that it allows to analyse an SS phenomenon not only statically (as most of sociological theories do), but also dynamically, revealing its pre-history and potential tendencies of end. In other words, the discussed conception shows those forms of scientific communication that existed before and exist after an SS and from which the social formation that we are interested in here can develop. N. Mullins distinguished several developmental stages of scientific groups: 1) *normal stage*, when a community is defined by a low level of organisation: scientists are dispersed across diverse research institutions, and teacher-pupil relations are almost non-existent. Solution of specific problems is not coordinated, prospective members of a potential SS and their small groups (often doctoral students with their supervisors) separately analyse similar problems. These scientists do not think that they are in any way related. The duration of this stage and the number of its members are practically unlimited. It ends when a work is published which presents in general features a programme of problem research and its prospective potential is assessed. 2) *Network stage*, when attention of one or several researchers is drawn by a huge discovery or new idea. A group of like-minded researchers gather for common work, and their communication is informal. In this way, group members form a permanent network of relations that supplements formal channels of information exchange. Teacher-pupil relations start emerging. The number of members is up to 40. 3) *Coherent group stage* (the number of members spans from 7 to approximately 25). 4) *Specialisation stage*.

N. Mullins himself used the term “coherent group” (CG) instead of SS, and he distinguished the following composite elements of it: 1) *theoretical orientation*: intellectual leader implements the orientation and presents it in a manifesto, it is supported by scientific achievements; 2) *organisational leader*: it means that a scientific leader does not necessarily have to be involved in organisational tasks, they can be allotted to another CG member; 3) *a research centre*; 4) *a centre for preparation of specialists*; 5) *intellectual material* – a collection of publications necessary for group orientation; it can consist of critical papers, reviews and secondary literature⁵. A CG normally consists of three or more professional researchers (doctors), who reinforce each other’s research interests, and several doctoral students. A CG focuses its attention on all problems highlighted in the manifesto. During this period, a big amount of research emerges; part of it is of huge scientific value. Theoretical relationships between separate works become tighter due to co-authorship that becomes exceptionally important in this stage.

⁵ See NICHOLAS C. MULLINS, *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology* (New York, Harper and Row 1973) 266–271.

Noteworthy, N. Mullins views the change of communicative stages particularly liberally. He believes that transition from one stage to another is not necessary: groups can disappear because of multiple reasons at any developmental stage (for instance, small groups “die out” before the specialisation stage and few of network stage groups manage to grow into a CG). Lack of achievements can destroy a group; conversely, abundance of achievements leads to differences in opinions and split. Teacher-pupil relationships and relationships among colleagues are necessary for the development and life of a group. If such relationships do not exist, then certain forces (changes in interests and exhaustion that destabilise active group members) come to the fore which flings the group back to the normal stage. This can happen at any stage of scientific communication. The image of an SS created by this conception is very labile and short-term: An SS is not a group of researchers or thinkers which builds on fundamental principles and which has grown out of a long-standing thinking tradition; rather, it is a coincidental and comparatively short-term phenomenon in the history of science.

A Russian scientist V. Gasilova has formulated a particularly exact and short definition of an SS, similar to N. Mullins’ conception. According to her, an SS is a community of researchers of different statuses, competences and specialisations, which is coordinated by a leader and which is aimed at the development and defence of a programme’s aims and objectives. This community is fixed as a relevant group of authors of a certain body of publications that is either accepted or ignored as a unified whole by its proponents or opponents. The duration of an SS’s existence spans from the moment when active researchers start joining the leader’s declared research programme to the moment when joint research is discontinued either because the programme has been implemented or transformed into a branch of science or because the programme has started losing its relevance, its leader dies, etc.⁶ This researcher highlights one important element of an SS: the acknowledgment by other researchers’ community of the fact that some school indeed exists. It should be explicated in more detail: such acknowledgement is not always clear and unambiguous; sometimes some members of a researchers’ community admit and others reject the existence of an SS or they differently assess the importance of work done by an SS. Presumably, the entire reactions towards an SS that resemble the field of scientific communication can serve as one of a criteria of determining an SS. The aspect of acknowledgment by a scientific community should be supplemented by the factor of an SS’s self-consciousness, i.e. reflection of an SS members’ belongingness to a school which a researcher, who is investigating an SS, should also approach with a dose of rather strong “hermeneutic suspicion”: a researcher can unconsciously or due to various reasons deny his or her belonging

⁶ See В. ГАСИЛОВА, ‘Научная школа – феномен и исследовательская программа науковедения’ в *Школы в науке*, ред. С. Микулинский и др. (Москва, Наука 1977) 127.

to an SS though all evidence may indicate the opposite; or a researcher (usually seeking academic prestige) can unduly regard himself or herself as belonging to an SS or see himself or herself as a pupil of a prominent founder although neither facts of scientific communication nor the content of the work done substantiate that.

Thus, in determining potential existence of an SS as it is seen in the above-mentioned conceptions, we will mostly build on the essential features suggested in N. Mullins' theory: 1) a leader of an SS; 2) teacher-pupil relationship; 3) a nucleus of researchers; 4) a research manifesto that defines; 5) common intellectual orientation (or common methodological and epistemic foundation); 6) SS consciousness (recognition of scientific community) and self-consciousness (acknowledging by the SS members themselves of their belonging to the school). It is worthwhile stressing once again that here we are dealing with theories of sociology of science that are first and foremost concerned, as it has already been pointed out, with the aspect of social expression of scientific creation, scientific communication (an SS is one of its forms); therefore, we have singled out sociologically identifiable elements. Besides, features 4–6 step outside of the scope of this paper – we will merely state them following general knowledge of the philosophical context of the researched period without deeper analysis. Meanwhile, investigation of an SS from the content perspective (assessment of the nature of the theories it developed) requires a separate specific problematic research.

Did schools of philosophy exist in Lithuania?

It is not uncommon (especially in Lithuanian philosophy) when a supervisor of a doctoral student and the doctoral student are not true teacher and pupil but, due to some bureaucratic or other coincidence, they are temporarily and formally related by subordination and do not have anything (or have little) in common from the scientific perspective. Another reason why we cannot regard pupils of one teacher an SS or a communicative field resembling an SS is that more often than not such pupils form “a community of people who have nothing in common”. This means that their being doctoral students of one supervisor is also coincidental: their dissertations are divided by long periods of time, different research institutions, and often absolutely different problematic scope (both from the perspective of the research object and thinking style). One of the reasons for that is teacher's inability to formulate a research programme that attracts and unifies pupils. The statements firstly apply to the above-mentioned groups of J. Macevičius, I. Zaksas and partly V. Sezemanas. The latter prepared two pupils of different scientific viewpoints, K. Rickevičiūtė and R. Plečkaitis. If we partially could talk about the influence of V. Sezemanas' philosophical principles on these direct pupils of his, then such influence on the pupils of K. Rickevičiūtė and R. Plečkaitis is not identifiable at all. Besides, the major part of this group is made of R. Plečkaitis' pupils (of which one also prepared one doctoral student in the Soviet period); thus, it is more exact to talk about R. Plečkaitis' group.

The above-mentioned statements only partially apply to the latter group: indeed, among the professor's pupils there also are proponents of analytical philosophy, researchers of logical empiricism in the science of philosophy, Marxist historians, phenomenologists and pragmatists or proponents of existential philosophy. In such a mosaic of philosophical interests and ways of philosophising, it would be difficult to find some unifying research programme or methodological style. However, a larger part of the pupils (A. Šliogeris, A. Vaišvila, J. Balčius, K. Masiulis, A. Varanavičius, E. Kriščiūnas) defended their theses in the historiography of Lithuanian philosophy, i.e. the research field intensively investigated by R. Plečkaitis himself. What is more, at least four out of six adopted their teacher's methodological principles (to research the history of philosophy as a history of problems firstly revealing the problematic context and the reasons for the emergence of a researched theory and its impact on the subsequent development of philosophy) and, following defences of their dissertations, they further continued research onto the history of Lithuanian philosophy. Thus, R. Plečkaitis' group can be regarded as the initial stage of an SS' formation, what N. Mullins called the "network stage". Later on, after the Restoration of Independence, R. Plečkaitis will formulate his own research manifesto that will be the beginning of an even tighter form of scientific communication (development of an SS)⁷.

Application of the SS communicative model formulated in the sociology of science to E. Meškauskas' group could allow to determine the following major SS features: 1) a clear leader (E. Meškauskas in this case) developing significant research that is acknowledged by colleagues and 2) forming a common style of thinking of his own school – certain methodological principles (in this case, firstly Marxist philosophy as a common conception of research methodology and the application of the principle of development to the interpretation of knowledge acquisition process, etc.) that pupils apply to solve various problems; 3) a rather wide network of teacher-pupil relationships uniting 24 philosophers⁸; 4) there is a nucleus of SS researchers – they have achieved significant results and prepared their own pupils (firstly, J. Repšys and A. Lozuraitis); 5) sufficiently and amply documented the abovementioned SS consciousness and self-consciousness.

⁷ More on this see GINTARAS KABELKA, *Lietuvos filosofijos istoriografija* (Vilnius, Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas 2016) 46–56.

⁸ This number is to be regarded as a contemporary SS of normal size; for instance, N. Mullins states that the optimal number of members is 7–25. It has to be noted that here we analyse only dissertations of philosophical thematic scope and search for a scientific school of philosophy, while E. Meškauskas and his pupils have prepared seven more (A. Lozuraitis – three, E. Meškauskas – two, J. Repšys – one, J. Karosas – one) doctoral students who investigated sociological problems (V. Rybakov (1965), A. Gasiūnas, R. Dabkus, Z. Morkūnas (all three in 1971), S. Venskevičius (1975), V. Andrejauskas (1975) and V. Martinkus (1981)) who, as it has already been mentioned, were formally seen by the scientific nomenclature of that time as belonging to philosophical discipline. Therefore, if the "sociological branch" is also taken into account, the group would be made of 31 members in total.

In the discussion of the identified features it has to be noted that we miss among them the leader's proclaimed manifesto; however, just as well we can make an exception stating that such a research programme described in a concrete published text is more characteristic of schools in the natural sciences. In the case of humanities, philosophy in particular, such a programme can be expressed in other less defined ways: informal communication, lectures, seminars, and the major theoretical principles are formed in separate texts. The absence of such a manifesto in no way denies the existence of the common conceptual foundation of E. Meškauskas' group.

Speaking of the second feature of SS (common style of thinking) one should discriminate between its two aspects: the environment of thought created by SS in the ideologized context of the time, and the conceptual base of research of the school in question. There the member of Meškauskas's school Danutė Kapačiauskienė describes its common style of thinking as

“scientific and rational: its guiding principle proposes to commit each theory (and Marxist philosophy as well) for trial by sovereign reason; a judgement deciding – “true or false” – is the only legitimate sanction approving a theory's validity. All other criteria – pragmatic or ideological – for evaluation of a theory must be considered secondary: ideology would discredit itself if build upon a philosophical theory that trial by sovereign reason judged to be false. <...> Rational style of doing philosophy was completely inconsistent with so-called “Marxist” philosophy, written in Soviet textbooks by former students of the “red professors” and thrust into our schools along with teaching programmes meant for the whole of Soviet Union”⁹.

According to D. Kapačiauskienė, E. Meškauskas considered a category of practice to be the core of Marxists philosophy, its main premise (no coincidence that he began his academic career by writing a thesis on this category) and he aimed at treating it not in the context of ideologemes constructed by Soviet Marxists but in that of the whole Western philosophical tradition. Practice is practically acting human beings, society, and social environment. Hence for Meškauskas it was most important to show that Marx's social philosophy is a science – general sociology, and therefore it is open to criticism, could be questioned, verified, and falsified, that is, treated as every scientific theory. It has no need of unquestionable authorities; moreover, such authorities would in fact go counter its very nature. When treating Marxist philosophy as a science, it had to be scraped off, purged from a heavy layer of the ideological varnish and conjunctural estimations, in order to determine such a content to which truth criterion could and must be applied, at the same time maintaining its authentic meaning (proper to Marx himself). This task was not

⁹ DAUTĖ KAPAČIAUSKIENĖ, ‘Profesorius Eugenijus Meškauskas ir Lietuvos filosofija’ (1990) 44 *Problemos* 28–29.

only theoretical but also didactic one: to nourish and to educate students, aspirants [graduates], and young colleagues to think critically, to guard them from the truth monopoly temptation, from expanding the boundaries of ideology at the expense of objective truth¹⁰. Hence one can generalize the SS common style of thinking developed by Meškauskas as one that essentially resists whatever dogmatizing its content.

Another distinguished representative of Meškauskas's school, Krescencijus Stoškus, also first of all emphasizes the importance of the atmosphere created by the school, of the living communication at the seminars, lectures, and meetings, not the content of theories evolved.

“Against a background of apologetic and conformist Marxism, Meškauskas appeared to be someone barely conceivable, some lucky misunderstanding, a living mind within the framework of ossified dogmatism and Draconian surveillance of minds. But when the entire colourful panorama of 20th century philosophy was unclosed, and idiocy of the time sank into the past, Meškauskas's stature could not but lessen. <...> When speaking he allowed himself much more [than in writing], meanwhile in publications he was quite cautious, that is why today one can hardly estimate the power of his thought from his published texts. Sometimes one can even get an impression that these texts belong to fairly orthodox Marxism, i.e. to this particular stain of it which was inculcated [implanted] at the higher schools of Soviet Union. In fact, the thematic of his publications does not go beyond the limits of a school programme; furthermore, it distinctly splits into two parts – dialectical materialism and historical materialism, in strict accordance with curriculum requirements”¹¹.

At the same time, the importance of the category of development in the school's methodological frame has been emphasized: when evolving the consistent theory of development there was an attempt to substantiate Marxist category of practice. Meškauskas ascertained that Marx and Engels did not systematize the theory of development. When emphasizing the peculiarity of his view, Meškauskas began to avoid the very notion of “dialectical laws” which had been gained the status of canonical formula in school philosophy. He began to consider three topical to present-day science “aspects of the explanation of development processes” instead: a) change of structure, b) continuity, and c) spontaneity. While Marx and Engels spoke about dialectical laws found in Hegel's *Logic*, Meškauskas spoke only about “topical” aspects and “problems”. It means that the very conception of development was made historical. By putting special emphasis on the methodological purpose of dialectic Meškauskas affirms that dialectic emphatically regains its philosophical status and becomes a general theory of development and relation. Dialectic is a

¹⁰ DAUTĖ KAPAČIAUSKIENĖ, ‘Profesorius Eugenijus Meškauskas ir Lietuvos filosofija’..., 33.

¹¹ KRESCENCIJUS STOŠKUS, ‘Interpretacinė filosofija ir E. Meškausko metodologija’ (1998) 54 *Problemos* 15.

theory of threefold development: firstly, it is a theory of world change; secondly, a theory of progress of knowledge; and thirdly, it is a theory of development of dialectical philosophy itself. Being a general theory of development of the material world dialectic becomes ontology of universal relations: objective reality exists independently of the process of knowledge which itself is explained by the development of this reality. Being a theory of progress of knowledge dialectic is the philosophy of science that unfolds the logic of development of science, and through it – human world image. According to Meškauskas, these two dialectics can be neither fully superpose in form of some Hegelian absolute idea nor separate in Positivist way saying that science must deal with reality, and philosophy – only with the description of science. Dialectical philosophy is based on the supposition of material reality, and the content of this reality shows itself in the process of knowledge¹².

Here Meškauskas's own SS style of thinking was briefly presented. The analysis of its transformation in the thought of each particular representatives of the school would be the subject of further investigation.

It is worthwhile highlighting the importance of the fourth feature – the nucleus of SS researchers – in the analysed group: in it, 23 doctors of philosophy were prepared (excluding E. Meškauskas himself, who defended his dissertation before the formation of this group); of them, only 9 were supervised by the leader, the other 14 were supervised by the pupils raised by this leader who (firstly, J. Repšys and A. Lozuraitis) who together with E. Meškauskas make the nucleus of this school. It is even possible to state that, from the perspective of preparation of new doctors, the importance of the leader's pupils outreaches the role of the leader himself: the abundance of pupils of the second generation (in some sense, "persons maintaining a thesis, kind of grandsons") (and even the existence of pupils of the third generation – "great-grandsons") obviously substantiate the intensity of communication in this group and reality of the teacher-pupils network of relationships (and not some kind of a coincidence that is characteristic of the previously discussed groups).

As regards the fifth feature (SS consciousness and self-consciousness), it is worth noting that, in the Lithuanian philosophical discourse, there are quite a few texts of diverse nature which relay the outlook of E. Meškauskas' pupils and a community of philosophers not belonging to the group on the analysed phenomenon: investigation and reviews of the texts are not the aim of this paper. Here we will only state the existence of the feature as a supplementary argument in identifying E. Meškauskas' school. Overall, this consciousness and self-consciousness are not monolithic; it is possible to come across controversial opinions in them: for instance, most of E. Meškauskas' pupils recognize him as their teacher and refer to his philosophical school; however, the confession of E. Meškauskas himself is

¹² KRESCENCIJUS STOŠKUS, *Op. cit.*, 16–17.

also quoted where he admits never creating any kind of school. Other philosophers also react to this phenomenon differently: we find a rather radical negation of the existence of E. Meškauskas' school (L. Donskis).

If we look at E. Meškauskas' group from the chronological perspective, we can maintain that it existed for approximately 20 years: it started developing in the beginning of the sixties when the first and most important pupils defended their dissertations (J. Repšys in 1961 and A. Lozuraitis in 1963), and it was completely formed around 1970 when these pupils have prepared their first pupils and the group united 9 members; in the following other two years, five more pupils were nurtured.

The group ceased to exist together with the end of the Soviet era: after the Restoration of Independence, Marxism subsided, some members of the group (E. Meškauskas, A. Lozuraitis, J. Karosas, and some other less known) stopped their academic activity, J. Repšys was dead by that time, and the remaining members (the last doctoral students who had little in common with E. Meškauskas' methodological principles and who defended their thesis at the end of the Soviet era, and also older members K. Stoškus, Č. Kalenda) continued working as individual researchers untied by any conceptual commitments. "The good old times" of the school were periodically remembered in special publications. Such period of existence of the school completely



Eugenijus Meškauskas (1909–1997)

corresponds to the standard duration a modern SS; we can only guess now how long the period would have lasted if the Soviet era existed longer. It is probable that, despite of the political situation that was favourable to Marxism, the previously mentioned dissolving forces would have started acting.

Thus, judging from the dissertation flows and the features singled out from SS conceptions, we can firmly state the existence of E. Meškauskas' school. An SS means that significant ideas and methods exist in a certain discipline that are aimed at collectively solving theoretical problems. In a community of SS researchers, it resembles an empire in an international political system. The importance of an SS was understood and stressed in the Soviet period: for instance, the then president of the Academy of Science J. Matulis maintained in one of his articles of general

interest that no institution involved in scientific research can justify its existence if it is not capable of forming an original scientific work school. If we agree with this idea, then, of all institutions and academic units that were engaged in philosophical research during the Soviet period, only the Department of Philosophy at Vilnius University can justify its existence as it was the only one that managed to create an SS. Also, this fact distinguishes philosophy from other Lithuanian fields of Humanities (A. Švedas, who researched the Soviet science of history and the community of historians, believes that an SS does not exist in Lithuanian historiography and only sees its beginnings¹³); however, an in-depth assessment of E. Meškauskas school's conceptual results (establishment of the mentioned originality) remains an objective of future research.

Conclusions

Research reveals the institutional structure of the flow of dissertations: the most significant scientific institution was Vilnius University, approximately one third of dissertations were defended in Moscow and Leningrad. The groups of master–pupil ties were identified and explained from a point of view of scientific schools theory. The group of E. Meškauskas was the most numerous constellation of master–pupil ties in Lithuanian philosophy. Application of the SS communicative model formulated in the sociology of science to E. Meškauskas' group could allow to determine the following major SS features: 1) a clear leader (E. Meškauskas in this case) developing significant research that is acknowledged by colleagues and 2) forming a common style of thinking of his own school – certain methodological principles (in this case, firstly Marxist philosophy as a common conception of research methodology and the application of the principle of development to the interpretation of knowledge acquisition process, etc.) that pupils apply to solve various problems; 3) a rather wide network of teacher-pupil relationships uniting 24 philosophers; 4) there is a nucleus of SS researchers – they have achieved significant results and prepared their own pupils (firstly, J. Repšys and A. Lozuraitis); 5) sufficiently and amply documented SS consciousness and self-consciousness.

¹³ See AURIMAS ŠVEDAS, *Matricos nelaisvėje: Sovietmečio lietuvių istoriografija (1944–1985 m.)* (Vilnius, Aidai 2009) 52–56.