

Canada serving as a research assistant in Chinese archaeology at the University of Toronto. In 1942 he was awarded the degree of Ph.D., submitting a dissertation entitled "Shang Ko: a Study of the Characteristic Weapon of the Bronze Age in China in the Period 1311-1039 B.C."

During the war years (1942-46) he acted as a Chinese consultant with the U. S. Office of War Information in San Francisco and Washington, and then retired to Toronto because of a heart attack.

Dr. Menzies passed away on March 16, 1957.

It is worth remembering, in conclusion, that his is one of the few Western names, sometimes the only Western name, mentioned by Chinese scholars in connection with work on Shang inscriptions.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

In English:

*Oracle Records from the Waste of Yin* (Shanghai, 1917).

"The Culture of the Shang Dynasty," *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1931, pp. 549-558.

"Early Chinese Ideas of God," *The Honan Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (April 1935), pp. 2-4.

In Chinese:

"The Culture of the Shang Dynasty," *Ch'i-ta chi-k'an* (Tsinan), No. 1 (1932), pp. 1-7.

"A Comparative Study of the New and Old Editions of Lo Chen-yü's Earlier Compilation of Written Inscriptions from the Waste of Yin, and the Resultant Newly Discovered Historical Materials," *ibid.*, No. 2 (1933), pp. 119-132.

"F. A. Nixon's Collection of Nestorian Crosses," *ibid.*, Nos. 3 and 5 (1934), pp. 1-185.

"Chinese Oracle Bone Characters—the Paul D. Bergen Collection," *ibid.*, No. 6 (1935), pp. 1-28; No. 7 (1936), pp. 17-74. (This also appears as a separate pamphlet, published in Tsinan, 1936, with some substantial changes.)

(Several other manuscripts dealing with the Shang, complete and incomplete, remain unpublished.)

L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH

*Columbia University*

May 1957

#### Some Important Soviet Organizations and Periodicals Devoted to the Study of the Modern History of Asia

(Contributed by Professor James W. Morley, Columbia University)

With the expansion of Soviet interest and influence in Asia, the increase in the number of western students able to use the Russian language, and the possibility eventually of opening up some kind of intellectual exchange with Soviet scholars in the Asian field, it may be helpful to review some of the important organizations of Soviet scholarship in modern and contemporary Asian history and to cite some of their significant serial publications.

In the wake of the disruption caused by the revolution of 1917 and its attendant civil war and intervention, the older Russian scholars, notably at the College of Orientalists (Kollegiia Vostokovedov) of the Asiatic Museum in Leningrad (Aziatskii Muzei) were sharply criticized for devoting too much attention to the

ancient cultures of the Near East. In the Asian field as in other studies the Soviet government and the Communist Party demanded a new "Soviet scholarship." The present, not the past, must be the subject, they ordered; political, social, and economic analyses must replace philological inquiries; and the interpretation must follow the formulas of Marx and Lenin. To bring about this conversion, the government directed the new Socialist Academy (Sotsialisticheskaia Akademiia, organized in 1918 and renamed the Communist Academy in 1923) to assign Asian studies to its subordinate institutes and sections. Chief among these were the Institute of World Politics (Institut Mirovoi Politiki), the Agrarian Section (Agrarnyi Otdel), and the Eastern Section (Vostochnyi Otdel) of the Society of Marxist Historians (Obshchestvo Istorikov-marksistov). Some of the results of their studies are to be found in *Vestnik kommunisticheskoi akademii* (1922–35), *Mirovye khoziaistvo mirovaia politika* (1926–47), and *Istorik-marksist* (1936–41).

Similarly, the Soviet Government made an early start to meet what it felt was a second great need, the training of practical specialists in Asian affairs for service in the Commissariats of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade. Something akin to area programs, in which language courses were supported by work in economics, history, geography, ethnography, politics, and law, were developed at two centers: the newly established Petrograd Institute of Living Eastern Languages (Petrogradskii Institut Zhivvykh Vostochnykh Iazykov) and the Moscow Institute of Orientology (Moskovskii Institut Vostokovedeniia), successor in 1920 to Moscow's Institute of Living Eastern Languages.

A third need was to train Russian and foreign students for work in the revolutionary movements throughout Asia. Various special schools were established partly for this purpose. Notable among them were the Sun Yat-sen University of the Toilers of China (Universitet Trudiashchikhsia Kitaitssev imeni Sun Yat-sena), which published *Materialy po kitaiskomu voprosu* (–1928), the Communist University of the Toilers of the East (Kommunisticheskiĭ Universitet Trudiashchikhsia Vostoka), which published *Revoliutsionnyi Vostok* (1927–37); the Leningrad Eastern Institute (Leningradskii Vostochnyi Institut), the Eastern Department (Otdelenie Vostoka) at Moscow University, and the Eastern faculties at Leningrad University, the Middle Eastern University at Tashkent, the Azerbaijan University at Baku, and Tbilisi University.

The proliferation of institutions continued. In Moscow, for example, there were established the Museum of Eastern Cultures (Muzei Vostochnykh Kul'tur v Moskve), the Institute of Ethnic and Linguistic Cultures of the Peoples of the East (Institut Etnicheskikh i Iazykovykh Kul'tur Narodov Vostoka), and the Institute of History (Institut Istorii) at the Moscow State University.

The scholarly results of all these efforts were, however, by no means satisfying, for the older scholars were reluctant to co-operate, and new scholars could not be trained without their help. The government made strenuous efforts to bring these two groups together by drawing them into various large academic associations. The All-Ukrainian Association of Orientology (Vseukrainskaia Assotsiatsiia Vostokovedeniia), which published *Skhidni svit* (1927–31); the Society for the Study of the Urals, Siberia, and the Far East (Obshchestvo Izu-

cheniia Urala, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka), which published *Severnaia Azia* (1925–31); and the Russian Association of Research Institutes in the Social Sciences (Rossiiskaia Assotsiatsiia Nauchno-issledovatel'skikh Institutov Obshchestvennykh Nauk) are examples.

The most important of these early scholarly associations was the All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientalology (Vserossiiskaia Nauchnaia Assotsiatsiia Vostokovedeniia), often designated by its initials, VNAV. Organized by Stalin in 1922 under the People's Commissariat of Nationalities of the RSFSR, its direction was transferred in 1924 to the Central Executive Committee, and its name changed to the All-Union Scientific Association of Orientalology. The work of the Association was divided between its politico-economic section and its historico-ethnological section, both of which published in the Association's journal, *Novyi Vostok* (1922–30). Separate branches and sections were set up in the Russian Far East, notably at Chita and Vladivostok.

Gradually, as younger scholars came to the fore and experience was gained in administering research, it became possible to go beyond these associations to bring Soviet scholars under more centralized direction. In the 1930's, four institutes came to dominate Soviet scholarship on Asian history: the Institute of Orientalology, the Pacific Institute, the Institute of World Economy and World Politics, and the Institute of History. The Institute of Orientalology (Institut Vostokovedeniia) was formed in Leningrad in 1930 under the direction of Academician V. V. Struve. This brought together the Asiatic Museum and its College of Orientalists, the Institute of Buddhist Culture (Institut Buddiiskoi Kul'tury), and the Turkological Office (Turkologicheskii Kabinet). One of its most important accomplishments was the serial publication *Bibliografiia Vostoka* (1932–39), containing reviews and bibliographical articles of Soviet and other publications on Asia.

The Pacific Institute (Tikhookeanskiĭ Institut) was organized in Moscow under the direction of Professor V. E. Motylev in 1934 as a national council of the Institute of Pacific Relations in response to an invitation from the I.P.R. Conference in Shanghai in 1931. The Institute was sponsored by a number of Soviet geographical, economic, and cultural organizations. Chief among them was the Institute of World Economy and World Politics (Institut Mirovogo Khoziaĭstva i Mirovoi Politiki) of the Communist Academy, which at this time set up a special Pacific Office (Tikhookeanskiĭ Kabinet), charged with studying the contemporary developments in Asian countries, especially in the fields of politics, economics, colonial policy, and mass movements. As a vehicle for its research, critical reviews, documents, and chronologies, the Pacific Office published the quarterly, *Tikhii Okean* (1934–38).

The Institute of History had earlier been moved from Moscow State University to the Communist Academy. When the Communist Academy was abolished in 1936, the Institute was transferred to the Academy of Sciences. Here it was combined with the Historical Commission (Istoricheskaiia Komissiia, formed in 1934) and the Historico-Archeographical Institute (Istoriko-arkheograficheskii Institut) to form a new Institute of History under the direction of Academician

B. D. Grekov. Asian work was assigned to its Sector of the History of Colonial and Dependent Countries. In this sector, scholars like Corresponding Members S. V. Bakhrushin and I. I. Mints have gathered source materials, written independent volumes, participated in writing the combined histories, and published articles in the Institute's journals, which have included *Istorik-marksist* (1926–41), *Bor'ba klassov* (1931–36), *Istoricheskiĭ zhurnal* (1937–45), and *Voprosy istorii* (1945– ). The Institute has also published individual works on Asia, such as B. A. Romanov's studies in diplomatic history.

All four institutes were soon brought under the Academy of Sciences. With the reorganization of the Academy in 1938, the Institute of History was assigned to its Branch of History and Philosophy. To the same branch in 1942 was assigned the Pacific Institute, which was then given an expanded role. Under the direction of E. M. Zhukov and with the participation of such Far Eastern scholars as Academician L. N. Ivanov, a specialist on naval armament and transport, and Corresponding Member N. I. Konrad, a student of the Japanese language and literature, the Pacific Institute was directed to study, from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, modern and contemporary international relations in the Pacific area. Following World War II and before it was consolidated with the Institute of Orientalology, the Pacific Institute published three volumes of research articles, entitled *Uchenye zapiski Tikhookeanskogo Instituta* (1947–49). Volume I (1947) was miscellaneous, Volume II (1948) was devoted to China, and Volume III (1949) was devoted to India.

The Institute of Orientalology was likewise brought into the reorganized Academy of Sciences in 1938, being placed under the Branch of Literature and Language. To it were assigned problems in the history, economy, literature, and languages of the Soviet and foreign East from ancient times to the present, with particular emphasis on cultural relations between Russia and the East. At last the older participants from the Asiatic Museum group, Academicians Kh. D. Fren, S. F. Ol'denburg, F. I. Shcherbatskoi, P. K. Kokovtsov, and B. Ya. Vladimirtsov were joined to the other groups of scholars, including Academicians V. M. Alekseev, S. A. Kozin, and V. V. Struve, and Corresponding Member N. I. Konrad. Besides translating sources and compiling Russian-Asian language dictionaries, members participated in the writing of combined histories and contributed research articles to a new journal of the Institute, *Sovetskoe vosto-kovedenie* (1940– ).

To complete the integration of the most important scholarly organizations concerned with modern Asian history into the Academy of Sciences, the Institute of World Economy and World Politics, then directed by E. S. Varga, was transferred to the Academy in 1936 and was assigned to its Branch of Economics and Law in 1938. The Institute's field of study was defined as the economic, domestic, and foreign policies of foreign countries, particularly the analysis of the "crisis of capitalism" since World War I.

The most recent significant change in the organization of Asian historical studies in the Soviet Union occurred in 1950. In July of that year the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences criticized Soviet scholars for failing to take up the

“real questions of Orientology,” that is, the questions which concerned the heads of the Party and the State, and for failing to carry out their work according to the “methodology” of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. To remedy these defects, the Academy consolidated the Pacific Institute with the Institute of Orientology, which was moved to Moscow. The expanded Institute of Orientology was presented with a five-year research program, emphasizing the languages, literatures, economies, and modern and contemporary histories of the peoples of China, Mongolia, North Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Vietnam, India, and Turkey. To carry out these projects the Institute was divided into sections according to discipline and into country or regional sectors. Several valuable books have been published and two important journals have been started: *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta Vostokovedeniia* (1951– ), which has come out several times a year and includes short research articles, abstracts of dissertations, bibliographical notes, personnel news, and reports on the work of the Institute; and *Uchenye zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniia* (1950– ), an annual volume of longer articles.

Soviet scholars were again criticized at the twentieth Party Congress in February 1956, this time for failing to study adequately Asian economic problems as well as the anti-colonial, national independence movements; however, no changes in organization were decreed. At the present time leadership in modern Asian historical studies in the Soviet Union continues to be exercised by the Institute of Orientology, with the co-operation of the Institute of History and the Institute of World Economy and World Politics, all within the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

#### Organization of the Soviet Institute of Chinese Studies and Its Tasks

(Translated by Ivar Spector, University of Washington, from *Vestnik Akademii Nauk, SSSR*, No. 12 [1956], pp. 98-99)

With the object of a thorough and all-embracing study of the accomplishments and experience of socialist construction in the Chinese People's Republic, as well as of the history, economics, language, literature, and culture of China, the Presidium has resolved to organize an Institute of Chinese Studies as an integral part of the Branch of Historical Sciences.

The Institute is to carry out scientific research and the preparation of scientific works on the problems of political, economic, and cultural construction, as well as on the history, language, literature, and international relations of the Chinese People's Republic; the translation and preparation for publication of historical and literary monuments, as well as of the contemporary historical, economic, and socio-political literature of China; the implementation of a broad, working collaboration with scientific institutions and scholars of the Chinese People's Republic in carrying out scientific research work, and the preparation for publication of scientific literature pertaining to Chinese studies.

The structure of the Institute is as follows: sections on Chinese history,