

From Early Utopias to the Conflicting Nature of Sex: Debating Sexuality in the Late USSR

by Ella Rossman

Introduction

In 1967, a small event took place in the USSR that was important for the history of late Soviet sexuality. A book on sex counselling, or, as it was called in the USSR, “polovoe prosveshcheniye” (venereal enlightenment), was published in a circulation of 250 000. It was a translated volume of “A New Book on Marriage” by a GDR hygienist, Rudolf Neubert.¹

“A New Book on Marriage” was not the first book on sex counseling in the Soviet press. In 1960, another book of Neubert’s, “Questions of Sex”, had already been published in Russian. Around the same time, during the Khrushchev Thaw, articles, books and brochures by Soviet authors on sex counseling and sex education for the young began to appear, which, however, were less concerned with family relations and concentrated more on human physiology.² In general, the discourse on sexuality in the late USSR was rather bashful and normative, omitting topics such as sexual pleasure and concentrating more on morality or hygiene. Its proponents rarely wrote about the peculiarities of romantic relationships and family life in general: many late Soviet books on sex counseling and education read as extensive warnings about sexually transmitted diseases, such as syphilis and gonorrhoea.³

Neubert’s book was one of the first concerned specifically with the relationship in marriage,⁴ although even here we can see the specifics of the late Soviet sexuality discourse. As Igor Kon, a specialist in the history of Russian sexology, wrote about Neubert’s texts, “from the vast and rather good GDR literature, the most ‘harmless’, primitive, moralistic books were deliberately selected, [and they] immediately became bestsellers”.⁵ However, even this harmless book seemed dangerous. To make the content of the book appear less provocative,

- 1 Rudolf Neubert: *Novaya kniga o supruzhestve: Problema braka v nastoyashchem i budushchem* [New Book about Marriage: Problem of Marriage in the Present and the Future], Moscow 1991 [1967]. This book was published by the prestigious publishing house Progress.
- 2 See e.g. Elizaveta Shinoeva: *Gigiena Devushki* [Girl Hygiene], Kyzyl 1966; Mariya Piradova: *Yunosha i devushka: ocherk anatomii i fiziologii* [Boy and Girl: Anatomy and Physiology], Moscow 1965.
- 3 See Robert Khmelnickij: *Pora vozmuzhaniya* [It’s Time to Mature; the Russian word vozmuzhanie means mature manliness], Moscow 1968; Lidia Chashina, Lidia Gavriliva: *Zdorov’e – smolodu. Osnovy gigieny devushki* [Be Healthy from a Young Age. Hygiene Basics for Girls], Kaliningrad 1985.
- 4 Although discussions about marital life appeared not only in books, but also, for example, in the press, and already in the 1950s. See e.g. Brendan McElmeel: *From Don Juan to Comrade Ivan. Educating the Young Men of the Urals for Love and Marriage, 1953–1964*, in: *Aspasia* 15 (2021), no. 1, pp. 21–40.
- 5 Igor Kon: *Klubnichka na berezke. Seksual’naya kul’tura v Rossii* [Strawberry on a Birch. Sexual Culture in Russia], Moscow 2010, URL: https://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/1039713/14/Kon_-_Klubnichka_na_berezke_-_Seksualnaya_kultura_v_Rossii.html [last accessed: 8 October 2020], unless otherwise stated all translations are by the author.

the Russian edition was opened with an introduction “Sexual Love as a Public Issue” by the established Soviet medical doctor and professor of psychology, Victor Kolbanovskij.⁶

What interests me in this article is precisely this preface and the ideas contained herein. Below I argue that the specific late Soviet discourse on sexuality, which can be found in this introduction, has several inspirations. It combines early Soviet utopian projects of the new revolutionary partnership, like the ideas of early Marxist feminist Alexandra Kollontai, with psychoanalysis, that was popular in the USSR in the 1920s but was later banned, and with 1930s interpretations of Kollontai’s and Freud’s ideas by the classic exponent of Soviet pedagogy, Anton Makarenko, whose ideas were already formed under the influence of the conservative turn of Stalin’s family policy. The resulting exotic mixture of all these sources is present in post-Stalinist Russian texts on sex and family life – often without direct references or with only very few.⁷ The text of Kolbanovskij, where this mixture is present in all its complexity, can help to bring its key components to the fore.

In the literature on the transformations of the discourse about sexuality in the USSR there is rarely a discussion about how different periods are related to each other and how continuity was constructed between them. To balance such a view of different periods as containers without transfers and continuity, I want to inquire into what the transfer of knowledge and, in particular, expert positions among professionals in sexuality and sexual education looked like. In particular, I want to demonstrate how knowledge was preserved and transmitted through the Stalinist period, when there were almost no public discussions about sexuality and no images of sex in literature and films. With this rift in mind, some researchers believe that early Soviet sexuality debates had no apparent influence on late-Soviet or current Russia’s discussions on this topic.⁸ Below I will counter this position and argue that the early Soviet discussions were preserved in writings of Soviet authors, outlived the Stalinist period and were appropriated into late Soviet and even into post-Soviet discussions.

In my case study, I not only indicate the origins of late-Soviet ideas on sexuality, but also show how knowledge about it could be preserved and transferred through the professional biography of Kolbanovskij. I also describe the latter’s path to becoming an author on the subject of sex education and counseling. As I will argue, not only was interest necessary to be able to write on this topic, but specific cultural and social capital, that enabled the author to deal with controversial topics.

It is important to stress that in my article I focus on professional knowledge about sex and the discourses within it. I analyze the texts of the two official educators (Makarenko and Kolbanovskij), as well as the early Soviet political manifesto, both of which referred to Kollontai’s text. There are separate works about everyday ideas on sex and sexuality that seemed to be very different both from official manifestos and from research, espe-

6 Viktor Kolbanovskij: *Polovaya lyubov’ kak obshchestvennaya problema. Vstupitel’naya stat’ya* [Sexual Love as a Public Issue. Introductory Article], in: Neubert, *Novaya kniga o supruzhestve* (see note 1), pp. 7-23.

7 See Piradova, *Yunosha i devushka* (see note 2); Kolbanovskij, *Polovaya lyubov’* (see note 6); Khmel’nitskij, *Pora* (see note 3); Mikhail Khoroshin: *Polovoye vospitaniye*, Moskva 1971.

8 See Elena Zdravomyslova: *Hypocritical Sexuality of the Late Soviet Period: Sexual Knowledge and Sexual Ignorance*, in: Stephen Webber, Ilkka Liikanen (eds.): *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries*, London 2001, pp. 151-167, here p. 154.

cially in the late Soviet period.⁹ I hardly touch upon these in my text, concentrating on features, transformations and transfers of knowledge in officially permitted and released expert writing.

Soviet official discourse about sex

Researchers usually divide the history of Soviet sexual education and sexuality discourse into three or four stages. The first stage – the early Soviet period (1917–1920s) – was the time of active anti-religious propaganda, secularization of Soviet society and the beginning of social engineering in private life.¹⁰ Some authors describe this time as the first sexual revolution in the USSR.¹¹ Abortion was legalized, divorce was simplified, and homosexuality was decriminalized. These were the times of experiments and open debate on sex and new types of partnerships and families. The experiment, however, was already quite ambivalent in its essence.

Eric Naiman has argued that sex and relationships were indeed publicly discussed in the 1917–1920s, but already in early Soviet times, open sexuality was portrayed in literature and periodicals as bourgeois and at the same time feminized.¹² The discourse about sex was misogynistic, the female body was associated with capitalism and both were demonized. It was believed that sexuality should be destroyed for the sake of the communist revolution.

Bizarre texts appeared, like a brochure by Martyn Liadov in 1925. In the brochure the author argued that only under capitalism did women begin to have their periods every month. Before it, according to Liadov, people, like all other animals, mated only once a year, during the female's spring heat. Under capitalism, women became the property of men and were forced to satisfy them at any time. Sexuality became a dominant emotion of people, which was "unnatural" and, as Liadov believed, should not have continued in a free society.¹³

The article was chastised by Soviet health commissar Nikolay Semashko,¹⁴ but it can still be seen as a vivid image of an era when open debate about sex was still possible, even though it already bore the stamp of rejection of sexual pleasure. In general, the debate about sex in early Soviet times aimed not at liberation of sexuality, but served to justify the intrusion of the Bolshevik party into private citizens' lives.¹⁵ Other authors argue that the denial of sexuality was the main emotion already in the 1920s. They show that it is worth talking about a cacophony of varying and often contradictory views rather than just puritanism, even if certain double standards and sexophobia were already established.¹⁶

9 See Anna Rotkirch: *The Man Question. Loves and Lives in the Late 20th Century Russia*, PhD Thesis, University of Helsinki 2002.

10 See Dan Healey: *The Sexual Revolution in the USSR: Dynamics Beneath the Ice*, in: Gert Hekma, Alain Giami (eds.): *Sexual Revolutions*, London 2014, pp. 236-248, here p. 237.

11 Ibidem, p. 245.

12 See Eric Naiman: *Sex in Public: The Incarnation of Soviet Ideology*, Princeton 1997, p. 137.

13 Ibidem, p. 3; see also Martyn Liadov: *Voprosy Byta* [Household Issues, Report at the Meeting in Sverdlov Communist University], Moscow 1925.

14 See Nikolay Semashko: *Kak ne nado pisat o polovom voprose (bibliograficheskaya zametka)* [How Not to Write on Sexual Matters (Bibliographical Note)], *Izvestia* 1 (2334), January 1925, p. 5.

15 See Gregory Carleton: *Sexual Revolution in Bolshevik Russia*, Pittsburgh 2005, p. 230.

16 Ibidem, p. 11.

During the second, the Stalinist, period, scholarship and discussion about sexuality were totally banned.¹⁷ This period is known for large-scale repressive mobilization of Soviet citizens' bodies for the needs of industrialization, military efforts and reproduction.¹⁸ Physical and military training, as well as hygiene were promoted in the media, schools, universities, as well as in youth and party organisations. They became a part of the so-called Soviet *kulturnost'*. This concept denoted the desirable level of education, culture, manners, body-shape and ideological stance of a new Soviet man.¹⁹ However, health and body shape were not connected with sexuality and sexual pleasure, which were seen as decadent.

During the Stalinist period the discourse on sex was limited to reproduction. It became one of the duties of, first of all, Soviet women, but also men, as well as a form of labour for the good of the society.²⁰ Monogamous heterosexual families were re-glorified, homosexuality was criminalized again in 1933/34. There was no systematic sexual education for the young, although the moral education (*vospitanie*) was quite important.²¹ It was believed that sex life in the family comes naturally with proper general education and correct attitude, and talking about sex would only pervert young people. Many ideas from these times' moral education were later transferred to the sphere of sexual education. In this text I show this using the example of Victor Kolbanovskij's biography, who in Stalinist times authored books and articles on so-called communist morality (*kommunističeskaya moral'*) and later turned to sexual education.²²

Researchers are currently aware of only one book on sexual education published during the Stalinist era – the manual “Healthy Marriage and Healthy Family” by military physician Lev Zalkind, released in 1948. The appearance of this book showed that even during Stalinism with its years of silence and devastating repressions among psychologists and social researchers, there were still experts on the topic of sexuality who expressed the need for sexual education among young people.²³ However, Zalkind himself was quite ambivalent about this type of education. He stated that it was a problem that Soviet parents were unable to engage in the sexual education of their children because they lacked knowledge themselves, but at the same time emphasized that improper sexual education might cause premature sex and unpleasant consequences. All in all, his book described sex mostly allegorically and

17 See Healey, *The Sexual Revolution* (see note 10), p. 237.

18 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), p. 154.

19 See Vadim Volkov: *The Concept of Kul'turnost'. Notes on the Stalinist Civilizing Process*, in: Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.): *Stalinism. New Directions*, London et.al. 2000, pp. 210-230.

20 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), p. 155.

21 See Michele Rivkin-Fish: *Sexuality Education in Russia: Defining Pleasure and Danger for a Fledgling Democratic Society*, in: *Social Science & Medicine* 49 (1999), no. 6, pp. 801-814, here p. 803.

22 See Viktor Kolbanovski: *Communist Morality*, Sydney 1947; idem: *O kommunističeskoj morali [On Communist Morality]* (lecture transcript), Moscow 1949; idem: *O kommunističeskoj morali*, Moscow 1951; idem: *Kształowanie moralności komunistycznej [Shaping Communist Morality]*, Warsaw 1951.

23 See Rustam Alexander: *Sex Education and the Depiction of Homosexuality under Khrushchev*, in: Melanie Ilic (ed.): *The Palgrave Handbook of Women and Gender in Twentieth-Century Russia and the Soviet Union*, Basingstoke 2018, pp. 349-364, here p. 350.

rather advocated abstinence, and did this even more in the second edition of 1951 than in the first one.²⁴

Simultaneously with economic reforms, urbanization increased²⁵ and the construction of mass urban housing began so that communal apartments of the past were more and more replaced with single-family flats. This created new forms of privacy and ideals of individuality²⁶ and, according to some authors, caused a whole revolution of intimacy in Soviet society, which became a matter of debate.²⁷ This brought also new ways of disciplining and controlling the personal life of Soviet citizens – for example, through special party meetings at work, where a person could be collectively condemned for unfaithfulness to his wife or inattention to children.²⁸ I think that the whole series of new books on sexual education, which appeared in the late 1950s–1960s, could become a source for investigating this new process of imposing discipline. In addition to books by Russian authors, there were also translations from Czech and German, less didactic and more informative on many issues not addressed by Russian authors.²⁹ Such books, however, were rare, and the editors tried to “neutralize” and “naturalize” them with a “correct” introduction, as in the case of Neubert.

What is especially important is that in the 1960s, the development of both qualitative studies of families and newlyweds, and statistics of marriage, divorce and childbirth in the USSR started. One of the authors of such studies, Sergei Golod, was able to familiarize himself with the works of Alfred Kinsey in the late 1950s. He wanted to do a similar study in the USSR, but due to censorship he concentrated on the specifics of marital relations in Leningrad in the 1960s.³⁰ Golod, like later researchers, found that young couples in the 1960s did not reproduce the gender roles of their parents and sought to plan a family. He showed that divorce in the USSR was gradually losing its stigma, more and more women were looking for sexual experience before marriage, and sexual initiations were happening earlier than before.³¹ These changes in Soviet society, as well as the fact that discussions about them appeared in the professional community, Healey describes as the Soviet sexual revolution of the 1960s and 1970s.³² Appositely, not only did social research develop, but also medical knowledge about sexuality, which in the late USSR was institutionalized in the form of sexopathology.³³ This distinguishes the USSR both from other countries of the Eastern bloc as well as the USA, where research on sexuality in the 1960s and 1970s was

24 Ibidem, p. 351.

25 See Healey, *The Sexual Revolution* (see note 10), p. 238.

26 See Oleg Kharkhordin: *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices*, Berkeley et.al. 1999; Deborah Field: *Private Life and Communist Morality in Khrushchev's Russia*, New York 2007.

27 See Yulia Gradskaia, Alexander Kondakov et.al.: *Post-socialist Revolutions of Intimacy: An Introduction*, in: *Sexuality & Culture* 24 (2020), no. 1, pp. 359-370.

28 See Edward D. Cohn: *Sex and the Married Communist: Family Troubles, Marital Infidelity, and Party Discipline in the Postwar USSR, 1945–64*, in: *The Russian Review* 68 (2009), no. 3, pp. 429-450.

29 See Alexander, *Sex Education* (see note 23), pp. 352 f.

30 See Healey, *The Sexual Revolution* (see note 10), pp. 237-239.

31 Ibidem, p. 240.

32 Ibidem, p. 236.

33 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), p. 159.

not focused on pathological processes and also much more empirical than based on moral judgment.³⁴

In the early 1970s, in the European part of the USSR, the birth rate fell below the replacement level. The community of researchers of family began addressing the idea that demographic problems, as well as such “social diseases” as divorce, marriage without children, children raised without fathers, and venereal diseases, required education in sexuality. An important text on this topic is an article by sexologist and sociologist Igor Kon, “Sexual morality in the light of sociology”, published in 1966, where the author directly called for sexual education. All the new literature that appeared on the topic, however, contained the idea that sexuality requires, first of all, control and a highly moral culture, which will both save young people from venereal diseases and allow them to build happy families with children.³⁵

Some researchers combine these late discussions in a single period in the development of discourse about sexuality in the USSR. St Petersburg sociologist and gender researcher Elena Zdravomyslova characterizes this late Soviet discourse on sex as “hypocritical sexuality” (the author’s term), emphasizing that sexual practices had changed, but the official discourse on sex remained deeply sexophobic and fragmented.³⁶ The outlook on homosexuality, which remained criminalized, had not changed. Sex was viewed primarily in the context of reproduction. Zdravomyslova also shows that the liberalization of sexuality in the lack of knowledge and reliable contraception was costly primarily for women, who took care of birth control. In 1974, oral contraceptives were banned on the alleged ground that they were dangerous for women’s health.³⁷ Condoms were of poor quality. One of the important ways to control birth was abortions, which were carried out in the absence of proper anesthesia and accompanied by a rude attitude on the part of the medical staff.³⁸

At the same time, some researchers state that the 1960s and 1970s Soviet discourse on sexuality can by no means be considered unified because it had a distinct dynamic to it. American anthropologist Michele Rivkin-Fish demonstrates that under the influence of the demographic crisis announced in the 1970s, the main emphasis of moral and sex education shifted. From suppression of sexuality and moral purity it moved to strengthening the individual’s desire for family life.³⁹ Cultivating the ideals of femininity and masculinity and reaffirming a hierarchical relationship between boys and girls, became the main topic in educational materials and articles in the media. More idealized images of quite conservative, hierarchical families with children, began to appear in the media and arts.⁴⁰

Even while encouraging young people to start families and have children, late-Soviet authors managed to avoid describing the sex act and sexual pleasure and remain within the framework of a very rigid ideology. In this form sexual education was institutionalized in 1984. After long discussions, it finally turned into a special 34-hour course for Soviet

34 See Agnieszka Kościńska: *To See a Moose: The History of Polish Sex Education*, New York 2021, p. 11.

35 See Healey, *The Sexual Revolution* (see note 10), pp. 240 f.

36 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), pp. 151, 156.

37 See Rivkin-Fish, *Sexuality Education* (see note 21), p. 805.

38 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), p. 156.

39 See Rivkin-Fish, *Sexuality Education* (see note 21), p. 804.

40 See Healey, *The Sexual Revolution* (see note 10), p. 243.

schoolchildren in grades 9-10 (that is, for teenagers of 16-17 years old). The course was called “Ethics and Psychology of Family Life” and promoted the pro-natalist sex roles in the future family and gender relations.⁴¹ It was annulled in the late 1980s, when both the practice and discourse on sexuality drastically changed with the advent of *glasnost*’ (anti-censorship policy) and Gorbachev’s large-scale economic, social and political reforms. Foreign films and books began to appear in the USSR, as well as Russian writings, which had previously been banned. This opened the new (and quite short) period of the development of discourse about sex in the USSR, which became more open to global discussions.

War, religion, gender relations: broad interests of a Soviet sex educator

The person who contributed to the publication of the above-mentioned book by Rudolf Neubert in 1967 and edited it was Viktor Kolbanovskij (1902–1970) – Soviet psychologist, medical doctor and director of the Moscow Institute of Psychology. He also wrote the foreword to the book, in which he formulated exactly how Soviet people should comprehend sex and sexuality. Below, I focus on the main ideas of this preface, which are important for understanding the entire Soviet project of “sex education” and the late Soviet perception of romantic and family relationships, as well as education of children and adolescents. I am reconstructing the prehistory of the formation of those views on sexuality that Viktor Kolbanovskij propagated, using both his own professional biography and earlier texts that influenced him.

In his documentary story “Bison”, the Soviet writer Daniil Granin told the story of the “rare species” of the Soviet scientist – biologist Nikolai Timofeev-Resovsky (1900–1981).⁴² Timofeev-Resovsky, who was a geneticist, was slandered and harassed during the period of dominance of Lysenko’s approaches to biology.⁴³ He was sent to the labour camp, but despite imprisonment and the threat of death, he, according to Granin, changed neither his approach to science nor his beliefs.

In “Bison”, Granin exalted the position of Timofeev-Resovsky “as a person and as a teacher”.⁴⁴ The reference to the endangered animal underlined how rare, according to Granin, “real” scientists were in the Soviet Union. In the text, the author argued that it was precisely such people that were especially valuable for the country and society, and that they were often underestimated or even persecuted within the system.⁴⁵

One of the minor characters of “Bison” was Kolbanovskij. He is mentioned in the text only once, in chapter 44, in a plot devoted to criticism of cybernetics, a campaign that

41 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8), p. 160.

42 See Daniil Granin: *Zubr [Bison]*, Leningrad 1987. Quoted here after unpaginated online version URL: <http://lib.ru/PROZA/GRANIN/zubr.txt>, [last accessed: 8 October 2020].

43 In the 1930s, the Soviet biologist and agronomist Trofim Lysenko confronted a group of Soviet geneticists and argued that their ideas were anti-Soviet, politically incorrect, and that they themselves supported the Trotskyist-Bukharin opposition. As a result of the confrontation between Lysenko and the geneticists and the deployment of Lysenko’s political campaign against opponents, the entire group of researchers was repressed.

44 Granin, *Zubr* (see note 42).

45 *Ibidem*.

unfolded in the USSR in the first half of the 1950s. Granin described Kolbanovskij as the antithesis of his protagonist, as a bureaucrat without expertise who was invested only in the “battle” for Soviet science against its ideological opponents. According to Granin, Kolbanovskij was the one who “bashed the geneticists I. Agol, S. Levit, N. Vavilov, until they were arrested. Then he fought with O. Schmidt and joined Lysenko”.⁴⁶ Further, he not only accused Kolbanovskij of supporting the persecution of cybernetics and genetics, but also said that Kolbanovskij “opened an independent front of the struggle”, where “he was the commander and put all his efforts into slowing down the development of [...] science”.⁴⁷

A similar but still more complex impression of Kolbanovskij emerges from archival documents, memoirs about him, and his writings. Having followed the idea of “cultural capital” and “social capital”⁴⁸ and having looked at Kolbanovskij’s strategies for acquiring it, I want now to discuss how it became possible – and “safe” – for him to address the question of sex education, a controversial topic in late Soviet society. I believe that this can be explained by his status in the academy and his reputation as an ideologically “correct” author and public speaker, as well as by his impeccable reputation as an old Bolshevik and hero of the Great Patriotic War. At the same time, Kolbanovskij’s views on sex are quite explainable by his participation in the debates of medical doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists, as well as those of politicians and public figures of the 1920s and 1930s, who had an indelible impact on him and shaped him as an author and scholar.

Kolbanovskij seems to be an unambiguous supporter of the party and the Soviet Marxist approach in psychological science. This is also the way he presents himself in ego-documents like his official autobiography, which could be found in the personal file of Viktor Kolbanovskij at the Institute of Red Professors.⁴⁹ He became involved in the Bolshevik revolution very early: already in 1917, at the age of 15, he joined the Red Army and fought on the Eastern and Southern Fronts. Even before that he took part in “revolutionary activities” while still a student at the gymnasium. These activities of Kolbanovskij moved the imperial authorities to expel him from the school in the 5th grade, and from the age of 13 he was forced to earn a living independently as a private tutor. In 1919 Kolbanovskij joined the Bolshevik Party. Following this he served as a Komsomol worker in Donbas, then in the Moscow Komsomol Committee. Returning to Moscow, he entered the First Medical University, at that time part of the Moscow State University, where he studied to be a psychiatrist.⁵⁰ At the early stage of his career Kolbanovskij was engaged in empirical studies of principles of inheritance on twins, an interest that was later recalled against him in the process of persecutions of 1937, when Kolbanovskij almost fell victim to a purge among the supporters of the approaches of the so-called pedology, or science of child development, which was declared false in the USSR.⁵¹

46 Ibidem.

47 Ibidem.

48 Pierre Bourdieu: *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Cambridge 1984; Nan Lin: *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, Cambridge 2003.

49 See Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, f. 364, i. 3a, i. 37, p. 6.

50 Ibidem.

51 See P.I. Plotnikov: *Do kontsa razoblachit nauku pedologiyu i eye adeptov [(It Is Necessary) To Fully Expose the Pedology and Its Adherents]*, in: *Sovetskaya pedagogika* (1937), no. 1, pp. 46 f.

Kolbanovskij made an early and successful career, which was facilitated by a number of factors. Firstly, the active development of Soviet science required new, “ideologically correct” scholars. The “correct” biography of Kolbanovskij, who became a Bolshevik very early and supported revolution from his teenage years, played its role. In 1929 he entered the Institute of Red Professors, the forge of the new Soviet scientific bureaucracy.⁵² In 1932, after graduating from the Institute, thirty-year-old Kolbanovskij was appointed to his first and immediately a consequential position – director of the Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Social Sciences, later renamed the State Institute of Psychology. In 1935 he officially received the title of professor. He was able to avoid repression in the 1930s, surviving and continuing to publish and give speeches, although he lost his position as a director of the Institute of Psychology. He could return to it only after World War II, during which he volunteered for the front as a military doctor and became a war hero. The latter distinction made him much more respected in Soviet society and gave him a huge amount of social capital, which, I believe, furthered his career and made him fully reliable in the eyes of the authorities. In the post-war period, he seems to have prospered steadily. In addition to the institute, he worked in the editorial office of several scientific journals, wrote popular articles for newspapers and magazines, and delivered public lectures.⁵³

During a career spanning over 40 years, Kolbanovskij managed to study a broad spectrum of topics. From early empirical research, he quickly moved to ideological abstractions on labor psychology (before the war), military strategy (during WWII), psychology of religion, social psychology and pedagogy. All these topics have one thing in common: they all dealt with the agenda in the Soviet press and closely followed discussions and speeches of party leaders. Kolbanovskij always strived to be relevant in his work. According to the psychologist Konstantin Platonov’s memoirs, Kolbanovskij was a “barometer of the state of psychological science”. In Platonov’s words, Kolbanovskij “quickly, clearly and reliably reacted to all innovations [in psychology], pragmatically capturing the progressive elements in them, but not always seeing their prospects correctly”.⁵⁴ In the pursuit of trending topics, Kolbanovskij also took part in many dubious cases: in castigating cybernetics⁵⁵ and psychotechnics⁵⁶ and in the discussions of the Pavlovian session (1950), which stopped the new wave of development of Pavlov’s ideas. He harshly criticized his colleagues in print for inconsistency with the Marxist method in science⁵⁷ and always tried to follow it in his work.

52 See Lyudmila Kozlova: *Institut krasnoj professury (1921–1938 gody): istoriograficheskij ocherk* [Institute of the Red Professors (1921–1938): A Historiographical Sketch], *Sociologicheskij zhurnal* (1994), no. 1, pp. 96-112.

53 See Anonymous: Viktor Nikolaevich Kolbanovskij, obituary, *Voprosy psikhologii* (1970), no. 6, pp. 184 f.

54 Konstantin Platonov: *Moi lichnye vstrechi na velikoj doroge zhizni (vospominaniya starogo psikhologa)* [My Personal Encounters on the Life’s Journey (Memoirs of an Old Psychologist)], Moscow 2005, p. 194.

55 According to the recollections of Kolman, see Ernst Kolman: *My ne dolzhny byli tak zhit* [We Did Not Have to Live like That], New York 1982 (accessible online: <https://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=page&num=7992> [last accessed: 2 September 2020]).

56 See Platonov, *Moi lichnye vstrechi* (see note 54), pp. 195-197.

57 See Viktor Kolbanovskiy: *Retsenziya na knigu S. L. Rubinshteyna “Osnovy obshchey psikhologii”* [Review of the Book by S. L. Rubinstein “Fundamentals of General Psychology”], in: *Pod znamenem marksizma* (1941), no. 5.

The topic of family and relations between the sexes in the form of so-called communist morality began to interest Kolbanovskij in the second half of the 1940s, directly after WWII, which left behind a legacy of destroyed and incomplete families and a demographic imbalance in Soviet society.⁵⁸ His first speeches in this field are available in transcript, with telling titles like “Love, marriage and family in a socialist society” (1948) or “On communist morality” (1949). The first speech was delivered in the Central Lecture hall of the All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge (*Vsesoyuznoye obshchestvo po rasprostraneniyu politicheskikh i nauchnykh znaniy*; after 1947 – *Znanie Society*) in 1947. The transcript can be called an ideal document of the era, capturing all the main provisions of the gender policy of the USSR during the late Stalinist period: family orientation and strict norms for the marital relationship.⁵⁹ The only possible option in the lecture is the heterosexual family with several children, as already clearly marked through the reference to marriage in the title.

By the 1950s, Kolbanovskij’s interest in educating children and teenagers was superimposed on the theme of family and gender relations. He studied it under the great influence of Anton Makarenko, whom I discuss later in this essay. In 1950 Kolbanovskij published a widely discussed text on the need for the joint education of boys and girls in Soviet schools in the “Literaturnaya Gazeta” (Literary Newspaper), and in 1955 he gave a lecture on how such education should be organized; the lecture was a direct reaction to the abolition of single-sex education by the Soviet authorities. At the same time, in the late 1940s–1960s, he dealt with the issue of so-called communist morality and the problems of “communist everyday life” (*kommunisticheskij byt*), which included a discussion of the relationship between the sexes. He published several texts about it – articles and books which not only circulated in the Soviet Union, but were then translated into Hungarian, Polish and English.⁶⁰ The last shows that for the Soviet authorities he represented an ideologically correct and safe approach to these topics, which could be broadcasted to other countries.

Through his interest in the relationship of the sexes and “communist morality”, Kolbanovskij, by the 1960s, reached the topics of sex counseling and education. He was not only editing and commenting books like Neubert’s, but also made proclamations about the need to talk about sex in public. For example, in 1969 he published in “Literaturnaya gazeta” (Literary Newspaper) an article titled “Vslukh na intimnyu temu” (Talking out loud on an intimate topic). In this piece he entered the discussion on the need for sex education begun by another article, published in the same newspaper in 1968. In his text Kolbanovskij in many ways repeated the introduction to Neubert’s book: he complained that Soviet schools do not prepare children for future family life and neglect the issues teenagers meet with during puberty. Furthermore, he suggested starting to train specialists in sexology, who would help those who faced problems in their family life and relationships. Kolbanovskij

58 See Anatoly Vishnevsky: Demographic Consequences of the Great Patriotic War, in: Demographic Review 3 (2016), no. 2, pp. 47-78.

59 See Anna Temkina, Elena Zdravomyslova: Gosudarstvennoe konstruirovaniye gendera v sovetskom obshchestve [State Construction of Gender in Soviet Society], in: Journal of Social Policy Studies 1 (2003), no. 3/4, pp. 299-321, here pp. 312-314.

60 See Kolbanovski, Communist morality (see note 22); idem, Kształowanie moralności (see note 22); idem, O kommunisticheskoy morali, (see note 22); idem: Szeretem házasság és család a szocialista társadalomban [Love, Marriage and Family in a Socialist Society], Budapest 1952.

described the work of the only Soviet laboratory of sexology and sexopathology and the queue of patients who had waited a year for a chance to have a consultation. His suggestions were crystal clear: a sexological cabinet must be established in every Soviet big city and regional center.⁶¹

The professional biography of Kolbanovskij thus demonstrates what a huge amount of social and cultural capital and ideological reliability a scholar needed to be able to write on such a “dangerous” topic as sexuality under Soviet censorship. At the same time, it can be seen from his biography and other sources that the typical way to obtain this social capital in social sciences in the USSR since Stalinist times had been to engage in purely ideological abstractions in one’s research. Sexuality in the late USSR was most often discussed by people like Kolbanovskij, who did not conduct any empirical research (or had left such research in the past), relied on other texts and focused primarily on setting the boundaries of what is acceptable. This specificity of the development of the social sciences strongly influenced the content of late Soviet ideas about sexuality, which I will turn to next.

Sex and love in the USSR in the 1920s, 1930s and 1960s

Several details stand out in Kolbanovskij’s preface to Neubert’s book (1967). On the one hand, Kolbanovskij insisted on the need for sex education in the USSR for people of different ages – not only young people, but also adults. This – as well as other sources mentioned above – counters the stereotype about the absence of the idea of sex education and counselling in the late USSR. However, ironically, Kolbanovskij’s appeal on the importance of understanding sexuality aims at convincing Soviet people to have as little sex as possible and within the bounds of legal marriage. To be precise, he urges Soviet people to cultivate “sexual inhibition”.⁶²

According to the author, inhibition is necessary in order not to overexcite the “subcortical parts of the brain”.⁶³ If this does not occur, “passion” in a working person can “prevail over reason”⁶⁴ and over “culture”⁶⁵. Kolbanovskij cited the recollections of German Marxist activist Clara Zetkin, where she described Vladimir Lenin criticizing the “glass of water” theory, stating that, contrary to some new beliefs, satisfying a sexual urge should not be as easy as drinking a glass of water. Lenin, according to Zetkin’s recollections, insisted that love has a “social dimension”, that it must be responsible in relation to society and the collective.⁶⁶ Restraining one’s sexuality in such a description becomes almost a matter of state importance for a Soviet citizen.

61 See Viktor Kolbanovskij: Vslukh na intimnyu temu [(Speaking) Out Loud on an Intimate Topic], in: Literaturnaya Gazeta, 11. June 1969, p. 11.

62 Kolbanovskij, *Polovaya lyubov’* (see note 6), p. 12.

63 *Ibidem*.

64 *Ibidem*, p. 17.

65 *Ibidem*, p. 12.

66 See *ibidem*, p. 16; Clara Zetkin: *Iz zapisnoy knizhki* [From my Notebook], in: *Ibidem* (ed.): *K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin, o zhenskoy voprose* [K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin, on the Women’s Question], Moscow 1971 [1925], pp. 185-209, here p. 194.

The “glass of water” theory, mentioned by Lenin and then by Kolbanovskij, was for a long time attributed to the revolutionary and Soviet party leader Alexandra Kollontai.⁶⁷ The myth about her using this metaphor spread widely in the early Soviet state, creating a way to argue with Kollontai’s ideas (or any discussions about sexual freedom) without actually mentioning her name or any writings. In reality, Alexandra Kollontai did publish a number of texts about new love and free sexuality, for example, a book titled “New Morality and Working Class”⁶⁸ in 1919, or a famous essay, “Make Way for Winged Eros: A Letter to Working Youth”⁶⁹ in 1923. But she never used the “glass of water” metaphor.

In both texts Kollontai presupposed a new type of relationship that overcame the bourgeois morality of the past and was not limited to passion. In “New Morality and Working Class” she wrote about “erotic friendship”, which can exist outside of marriage, as a new, positive phenomenon. “Make Way for Winged Eros” is a political manifesto, proclaiming a new type of love – “Winged Eros” – which should become the new ideal of Soviet working youth in the new state. “Winged Eros” was a “love-companionship” (*lyubov'-tovarishchestvo*) that combined equality, respect for each other without pretending to be exclusive of other relationships, and sensitivity to the partner’s efforts. Kollontai’s “love-companionship” was inextricably connected with love for the collective, with social and revolutionary solidarity, though this love for the surrounding people, in Kollontai’s case, did not precede love for a partner and was definitely not more important than erotic love. Rather, the first complemented the second, made it complete and truly multifaceted.

Unlike Kolbanovskij, Kollontai did not believe that sexual love was appropriate only in a family. On the contrary, she wrote about the liberation of love from the “bourgeois shackles” of marriage, where this love actually could not exist.⁷⁰ She proclaimed that in a new society, love will go beyond home and family, emerge from isolation behind closed doors, and will unite all people in a free collective based on consent, equality, and enthusiasm for creative labor. Similar ideas can be found in different sources of these times, and even in fiction. For example, the 1926 Soviet play “Khochu rebenka!” (I Want a Baby!) by Sergei Tretyakov portrayed a young woman, Milda, a communist and activist, who decided to give birth to a perfect child for the new society. Although she was looking for the perfect father for such a child (a healthy working class man), she does not want to marry him. For Milda, marriage is not at all a necessary part of a new life and a new society.⁷¹

How did these ideas, the echoes of which can be traced in the text of Kolbanovskij, change in the late USSR to practically their opposite? My guess is that not only the inter-

67 See Marie Marmo Mullaney: Gender and the Socialist Revolutionary Role, 1871–1921: A General Theory of the Female Revolutionary Personality, in: Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques 11 (1984), no. 2, pp. 99-151, here p. 148.

68 Alexandra Kollontai: Novaya moral i rabochiy klass [New Morality and Working Class], Moscow 1919.

69 Idem: Dorogu krylatomu erosu! (pismo k trudyashcheysya molodezhi) [Make Way for Winged Eros! (A Letter to Working Youth)], in: Molodoya Gvardiya (1923), no. 3, pp. 111-124.

70 See Kollontai, Novaya moral (see note 68).

71 See Sergei Tretyakov: Khochu rebenka! in: Tatjana Hofmann, Yan Dichek (eds.): Khochu rebenka! Pyesy – Stsenariy – Diskussii [I Want a Baby! Plays – Scripts – Debates], St. Petersburg 2018, pp. 41-195.

pretation of Vladimir Lenin, retold by Clara Zetkin and replicated in this form in the USSR, played a role. In his introduction to Neubert, the author largely reproduced the ideas about sex education of Anton Makarenko, a Soviet pedagogue, the author of a unique methodology on the re-education of juvenile delinquents proposed in the famous “Pedagogical Poem”.⁷²

In his later work “The Book for Parents” (1937) Makarenko wrote about sex education, as well as other aspects of child education, relevant for these times and for the new state. For example, he wrote about how not to spoil a child (not to raise him to be bourgeois, asocial or lazy), or how to teach a child to work in a team. The book is a set of stories from the life of the author with a certain moral at the end of each. All the aspects of raising children in it are described as a project of creating a brand new state and a new Soviet man: “By educating children, current parents educate the future history of our country and, therefore, the history of the world”,⁷³ wrote Makarenko at the very beginning of his text. He described family problems and improper upbringing as real “catastrophes” that will affect future generations of Soviet people.⁷⁴

The seventh chapter of Makarenko’s book is devoted to love, relations between men and women, and discusses how to organize sex education in Soviet society. According to Makarenko, sex education was primarily “the education of the culture of the social personality”,⁷⁵ as well as teaching children how to recognize true love, which requires not “depravity” but secrecy and “restraint”⁷⁶. He was against open, “liberal” discussions about sex with children and adolescents, as well as among adults, and wrote about the importance of cultivating a kind of “sexual discipline” in a Soviet person: “The culture of love experience is impossible without the restraints obtained in childhood. [...] The ability to control one’s feelings, imagination, and emerging desires is the most important skill, and its public significance is under-appreciated.”⁷⁷

Makarenko, without explicitly mentioning Freud, ridiculed the latter’s ideas about the sexuality of children and the libidinal foundations of their relationship with their mothers, and of all early development. In “The Book for Parents”, the following passage makes a quite obvious reference: “Impressionable people really might think that the child’s view of the mystery of childbirth is like the tragic collision of some King Oedipus! I could only wonder why these unfortunate children do not commit mass suicide.”⁷⁸

The appearance of Freudian undertones is not accidental here: the early 1920s in the USSR were marked by the heyday of the development of Soviet psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis appeared in Russia even before the 1917 revolution, and the formation of the Russian psychoanalytic school is associated with names such as Nikolai Osipov, Tatyana Rosenthal,

72 Anton Makarenko: *Pedagogicheskaya poehma. organizaciya kolonii molodykh pravonarushitelej imeni Gor’kogo v 1922/23 g. bliz Khar’kova* [The Pedagogical Poem. Organisation of a Colony of Young Offenders Named after Gorky in 1922–1923 near Kharkov], Moscow 1935.

73 Anton Makarenko: *Kniga dlya roditeljev* [The Book for Parents], Moscow 1937, p. 3.

74 *Ibidem*, p. 4.

75 *Ibidem*, p. 209.

76 *Ibidem*, pp. 226, 233 f.

77 *Ibidem*, p. 234.

78 *Ibidem*, p. 209.

Sabina Spielrein, Otto and Vera Schmidt, and others.⁷⁹ Several cities were home to scientific groups, institutes, outpatient clinics and specialized schools, the employees of which used a psychoanalytic approach in their practice. There were several professional associations of psychoanalysts. Subsequently, the foundations of the psychoanalytic approach were revised and criticized from the point of view of Marxist philosophy, and in the early 1930s Freudian type Psychoanalysis was defeated and practically prohibited in the USSR.⁸⁰ Makarenko's text on sex education gives the impression that the author reproduced and criticized Freud's vulgarized ideas without openly referring to him.

Makarenko introduced in his book the concept of "non-sexual love", which, in contrast to Freud's theory of infantile sexuality, "could and should be discussed". "The powers of this kind of love [i.e. sexuality, E. R.] can only be found in the experience of incomplete human sympathy. A young man will never love his bride and wife if he did not love his parents, comrades, friends. And the wider the area of this non-sexual love, the more noble will be the sexual love. A person who loves his homeland, people, his work, will not become a debaucher."⁸¹ And we can also find statements showing what happens if this requirement is not fulfilled: "A person who is capable of treating a woman only with simplistic and shameless cynicism is not trustworthy as a citizen."⁸²

In other words, according to Makarenko, a person had first to learn love for one's parents, friends, country, as well as the culture of correct behavior, and only then was one ready to explore his or her sexuality. Sex education, in Makarenko's words, is needed to "cultivate" the sexual instinct, to turn it from a "wild" feeling into a civilized and highly aesthetic one, full of deep respect for a woman.⁸³ Kolbanovskij repeated the same ideas, highlighting, however, that even after mastering the necessary behavior and way of feeling, a person still should not pay too much attention to sexuality – as if it still remained a force that could not be tamed.

The connection between Kolbanovskij and Makarenko is not accidental: Kolbanovskij considered Makarenko his teacher and maintained a close friendship with him until the latter's death. This is clearly illustrated by their correspondence, which can be found in the Makarenko Fund in the Russian State Archives of Literature and Art. The letters show that their communication was very close and friendly; the families of Makarenko and Kolbanovskij also socialized together. For example, in a letter dated July 4, 1938, Kolbanovskij wrote to Makarenko about a trip with his family to the southern Russian town of Anapa, sent him greetings from his wife and son, and asked Makarenko to convey his regards to his wife Galina Stakhievna. In this letter, he also hinted at an ominous forthcoming joint project: "in the fall we will certainly raise flags on the towers", he writes, alluding to the title of Makarenko's book "Flags on the Battlements" (1938), which Soviet critics found rather controversial. The essence of this project is clarified in Makarenko's reply, dated

79 See Alexander Etkind: *Ehros nevozmozhnogo. Istoriya psikhoanaliza v Rossii* [Eros of the Impossible. The History of Psychoanalysis in Russia], St. Petersburg 1993. English edition: Boulder et.al. 1997.

80 See Nina Vasilyeva: *Psychoanalysis in Russia: The Past, the Present, and the Future*, in: *American Imago* 57 (2000), no. 1, pp. 5-24, here p. 7.

81 Makarenko, *Kniga* (see note 73), pp. 234 f.

82 *Ibidem*, p. 235.

83 *Ibidem*, pp. 235, 241.

August 17, 1938. It is about “Zateynik” (a children’s almanac) and an educational club for children.

Kolbanovskij continued to support Makarenko during the latter’s illness and during the period of rejection by readers and public criticism of his later books. After the early death of Makarenko in 1939, Kolbanovskij corresponded with his widow and took part in supporting his memory. The tone of the letters indicates that Kolbanovskij treated Makarenko with great tenderness and at the same time with disciple-like reverence and adoration. This adoration is evident also in Kolbanovskij’s early texts, for example, in the review “The Poetry of Pedagogy”, which was published in the “Red Virgin Soil” (*Krasnaya Nov*) magazine in 1935, immediately after the release of “The Pedagogical Poem”⁸⁴. Kolbanovskij expressed this positive attitude towards Makarenko for many years. It can be seen, among other things, in the desire to revive interest in Makarenko’s works in the 1950s and later, as well as in numerous references to him in Kolbanovskij’s journalism and popular lectures.

Kolbanovskij repeated an idea of love, whose origin in the “correct” Soviet person is inextricably linked with feelings of sympathy and love for relatives, thirty years after Makarenko. On the one hand, this idea is characterized by a departure from talking about sex as such – a switch to the discussion of “love in general”, and in particular, non-sexual love for the surrounding people. At the same time, if one looks closely at these lines, one can see that they are based on the idea that sexual attraction to your partner can arise from experiences that are not associated with the object of attraction. In essence, it is all about a deeply sexualized experience of unity in public life, which was supposed to develop directly into the real sex life of the two spouses (it is not clear, though, exactly how). In this, the Soviet system is a bit like Victorian England as described by Michel Foucault, who suggested that during that era sexuality was not entirely suppressed, as one might think, but rather encouraged in different ways.⁸⁵

Conclusion

In the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, large-scale repressions unfolded in the USSR. They destroyed thousands of lives, as well as numerous debates in the public sphere, several schools of social sciences, and interrupted many important discussions of the 1920s and early 1930s. But even state terror could not interrupt the development of the discussion about sexuality, which resumed with renewed vigor in late Soviet times.

In this article I have argued that early revolutionary ideas about relationships and sexuality shaped the late Soviet debates about sex, as well as Makarenko’s writings and early Soviet reflections on Freud. These sources created a very specific approach towards sex counseling and sex education, perfectly represented in Viktor Kolbanovskij’s preface to the translation of one of Rudolf Neubert’s books. I also showed that a specific professional biography was necessary to be allowed to speak publicly about sexuality in late Soviet Russia. The specifics of Kolbanovskij’s biography also shaped the way he wrote about sex.

84 Viktor Kolbanovskij: *Poeziya pedagogiki (o knige A. Makarenko)* [The Poetry of Pedagogy (About the Book of A. Makarenko)], in: *Krasnaya nov* 10 (1935).

85 See Michel Foucault: *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, New York 1978, p. 3.

His ideas about human sexuality were more connected with utopian projects of the past and moral categories than with real empirical research. According to Kolbanovskij, Soviet society was a unique project to “tame” the menacing libido in all spheres of life, and to transform it into safer and more useful activities in a communist society.

Researchers such as Elena Zdravomyslova and Dan Healey⁸⁶ have shown that Soviet ideas about sex did not disappear over time. After several transformations, they became the basis of post-Soviet Russia’s debates, especially on sexual education for youth, which have deep Soviet roots. The mix of ideas from early Soviet times, together with other discussions of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, strongly influenced the post-Soviet public discourse on sexuality and sex education.

A good example of this influence is the concept of “traditional family relationships” (*traditsionnyye semeinyye otnosheniya*), used as a legal term in Russian federal law against the promotion of homosexuality to children in 2013, as well as in one of the key concepts in governmental propaganda.⁸⁷ Healey, who studied the origins of the concept, underlined that it appeared after 1991, but has its roots in Soviet times. Healey showed that the conflict between the “traditional family relationship”, and everything which opposes it (described as not-normal, perverted) is actually a conflict between the Stalinist and late-Soviet views on sexuality.

Stalinist discourse on sexuality, according to Healey, appears to be a combination of silence on sex matters and the image of a conflict-free heterosexual relationship, filled with cheerfulness and spirit. According to Healey, it is this kind of sexuality that is perceived in Russia today as “normal”, “traditional”, “natural”, to which it is desirable to return. Such a discourse about sex presupposes the stability of heterosexual desire and of the dyadic relationship.⁸⁸ In the post-Stalin era it was replaced by a completely different, new discourse: the idea of the instability of sexuality returned to the literature about sex. The discussion became more open, not only about sex itself but also about its complex, contradictory, sometimes internally conflicted nature. I think that Kolbanovskij was trying to find a solution to this paradoxical nature of sex, using a variety of sources, from Makarenko to Lenin. His texts are full of anxiety and at the same time are based on the strong belief that knowledge and morality will neutralize sex for the Soviet people, making it less dangerous and controllable again. The echoes of these ideas are still heard in the Russian public sphere today.

Zusammenfassung

Nach einer langen Pause während der stalinistischen Ära begann in der UDSSR des Post-stalinismus eine neue Fachdiskussion zu Sexualität, sexueller Erziehung und Beratung. Am

86 See Zdravomyslova, *Hypocritical Sexuality* (see note 8); Dan Healey: *Chto takoe ‘traditsionnye seksual’nye otnosheniia’?* [What Is ‘Traditional Sexual Relations’?], in: *Tsentr nezavisimyykh sotsiologicheskikh issledovaniy* [Centre for Independent Social Research] (ed.): *Na pereput’e: metodologiya, teoriya i praktika LGBT i kvir-issledovaniy* [On the Crossroads: Methodology, Theory and Practice of LGBT and Queer Studies], St. Petersburg 2014, pp. 55-67.

87 See Healey, *Chto takoe* (see note 86), p. 65.

88 *Ibidem*, p. 60.

Beispiel eines kurzen Textes von dem sowjetischen Psychologen Viktor Kobanovskij (1967) sowie der Rekonstruktion seiner Biografie bespreche ich in diesem Artikel die Ursprünge der neueren sowjetischen Ideen zur Sexualität. Ich erörtere dabei, dass die späteren sowjetischen Fachschriften zum Thema Sex den frühen utopischen Diskurs über die neue Familie mit dessen späterer Kritik und Reflexion zur Theorie von Freud kombinierten. Ich zeige, wie die Nachzeichnung dieser Verbindungen zum Verständnis beiträgt, wie das Wissen über Sex über den Stalinismus hinaus transferiert werden konnte. Ich diskutiere weiterhin, wie ein sowjetischer Wissenschaftler über besonderes soziales und kulturelles Kapital verfügen musste, um einen solchen Transfer zu ermöglichen.