

ANDRUS PARK (1949–1994): POLITICAL AND HISTORICAL PHILOSOPHER

Rein RUUTSOO

Andrus Park's (to 1990 Park) work as a philosopher and political scientist will undoubtedly go down as a shining page in the history of Estonian social sciences. His quickly-completed and well-researched degrees as a master (or candidate) in 1977 and doctor in 1984 were early evidence of this. By 1985, Andrus Park was a professor at the University of Tartu. As a further sign of recognition he was soon elected into the Estonian Academy of Sciences. As an outstanding scholar, Andrus Park became one of the youngest social scientists ever to be inducted into the Academy (first as a so-called corresponding member, and later as a full member when in 1990 the former titles were dropped). In 1987, the year he was elected, Andrus Park was only 38 years old. From 1990 until his unexpected and premature death on August 14, 1994, Andrus Park filled the post of Academician-Secretary of the Social Sciences Division of the Estonian Academy of Sciences.

In addition to his work in Estonia (which within the given particular Soviet system was inevitably characterized by *nomenklatura* structures), one must also mention Andrus Park's achievements and reputation as a very serious and talented scholar outside the Soviet Union. This was evidenced by Andrus Park's numerous articles in top Western journals, his fellowships at several European and American universities and foundations, his invitations to teach at Western universities, his appointment to the European Academy of Arts and Sciences (*Academia Scientiarum et Artium Europea*), and his membership on several editorial boards of prestigious journals. His scholarly bibliography included over 90 publications, including two books.

Andrus Park was also well known and recognized as an academic organizer. It was largely thanks to his persistence and personality that broader institutional support for the study of sociology and philosophy in Estonia could be pushed through during the Soviet era in imperially-centered Moscow. As a result, a separate sociology and philosophy institute was created in 1988 at the Estonian Academy of Sciences.

The weakening of Moscow's repressive bureaucratic control under *perestroika* and the restoration of Estonia's independence gave Andrus Park as a young academician new energy for improving the state of social

sciences in his country and raising their denigrated reputation and role. His personal contacts and authority abroad played a very important role in gaining new international respect for Estonia.

Andrus Park was also one of the leading advocates of the creation of a Tallinn university, in which the development of the social sciences would have a significant place. In this respect, he had an important ability to unite different scholarly groups. In a transitional society, that still tended to see things in black-and-white terms, Andrus Park was able to gain the trust of many different generational groups of scholars with varying political backgrounds. As a benevolent and balanced person, it was not his habit to sharpen existing disagreements or individual interests into conflicts.

The Soviet occupation had greatly politicized and "ideologized" Estonian social sciences. Many fields of inquiry, which are so normal to a modern society (including political science, cultural anthropology, ethno-sociology), had to be developed and planned almost from scratch. In this respect, much remained for Andrus in the planning stage. Moreover, no less as an academic administrator than as a scholarly researcher will Andrus Park's abilities also now remain untapped.

Had the times been a bit more normal or humane, had Soviet society and science been a bit more open, Andrus Park's life could have been even more spectacular. In contrast to many other creatively-minded individuals, for him the Soviet system did not become an organic environment. He did not follow the system's logic unconditionally. In that sense, he really had a "right to a biography" or life-story, as Juri Lotman has termed it¹, while many other people—"artificial beings of the system"—had long since lost that character. Those people simply followed the system's routine-like logic.

Andrus Park did not depend on the support of a corporatist, closed society for his advancement and self-realization. Judging by many of his later thoughts, one can say that he saw for himself a more satisfactory working environment in liberal America than perhaps Estonia. But certainly in the 1970s and 1980s the possibility that the Soviet system would fall to pieces was but an abstract idea or a pipe dream—even to the system's most public opponents, Western Kremlinologists.

Yet, every life is based on improvisation. For a young scholar from Estonia (or in Soviet imperial terms, from the provinces) the road would be complicated and difficult at best to first be able to "break into" the very closed and hierarchical Soviet academic system, and then "break out" of it into the West. That path had to fulfil certain conditions, in order to make both trajectories possible. The fundamental precondition, or *sine qua non*, was a devotion to serious research. Other factors, however, which grew from the prevailing pressures of life, its trials and disappointments, also undoubtedly played a part in Andrus Park's early death.

The cursory review of Andrus Park's academic career that follows does not cover in detail the works that are collected here in this volume. That would be a multi-dimensional research topic in itself. In the main, I have tried to figure Andrus Park into the spiritual life and context of the 1960s

and 1970s. I have tried to find points of reference through some of the main traits of his work. As a result, this article is a "commentary" on his work in the broadest sense of the word.

Andrus Park as an epistemologist would probably have thought himself that one could not sum up the life's work of someone simply through his/her written texts or just by listing them in chronological order and juxtaposing them. Portraying the life history of a creative mind is like reconstructing the past, and therefore it is just as necessary to include the background to that past as the events themselves. Andrus's scholarly discourse was largely the written or textual reflection of his personal values, intellectual abilities and societal goals. The fact that Andrus Park therefore became a logically-thinking philosopher of history and later on a political philosopher, represented also the particular crystallization of his individual talents.

The finding of a suitable discourse or textual field of exchange for one's spiritual expression and self-realization always carries with it strong traces of one's social environment. The issue of what kinds of philosophical thoughts would flow from Andrus Park's pen (and of why those in particular) would inevitably reflect his broader social context. In that sense, we should remember that both the study of historical philosophy and each person's individual methodological knowledge are social constructions.

THE CHALLENGE OF POST-STALINIST SOCIETY

Andrus Park's life and the meaning of all his work will be much more important than the individual achievements and written texts he left behind. His colleagues, for whom he and his achievements were inspirational, were as a rule impressed by his purposefulness and personal discipline, which seemed to epitomize his style of action. He seemed to have had already at a young age an amazingly clear picture of the limits of individual resources as well as of those of the world in which he lived. For many strategic choices and decisions in life had to be made very early during that era. This process was therefore of great epistemological significance and sociologically revealing.

I would say that the strategy Andrus Park chose in life was one of the most satisfactory and well thought-out answers to the opportunities (or challenges) offered by the Soviet system to the so-called sixties' generation to realize their potential and to try and change the world.

Andrus Park entered the University of Tartu as a history student in 1968. The brief "thaw" in politics and the social sciences, that had existed before then, was coming to an end. The events of the "Prague Spring" had a significant impact on the minds of the socially-conscious youth of that period (regardless of whether they went on to become dissidents or Communist Party reformers). It became apparent that the borderline between historical truth and falsehood had thankfully not yet become irreparably blurred for a people suffering under foreign occupation.

Instinctively people knew that our fate would be decided in Central Europe. In this respect, many hopes were pinned on the "premature perestroika" undertaken in Prague. By that same autumn, however, Soviet tanks were rolling into the Czech capital.

A few days after August 21, 1968, Andrus Park and some of his comrades scribbled the name of the symbol of the Prague Spring, "Dubček," on the red granite base of Lenin's statue in front of the Central Committee building of the Communist Party of Estonia in Tallinn. This was not only an act of protest against the violence in Czechoslovakia, but it would also have meaning for Andrus's future decisions in life. It was clear that in a society in which tanks were used as the main means for argument, it would be difficult for anyone to maintain a clean, pure self-identity. For anyone seeking a place in public life in such a situation, the result was a dramatic conflict between the scholarly ideal and the actual requirements of achieving success. Andrus Park reflected this kind of dilemma in many of his published works from the late 1980s.

On that August night in 1968, however, Andrus Park was lucky. Had that protest, which was unconventional for his personality, become known, the doors to the University could have well been shut for him for some time to come. Yet, despite all of the setbacks, the 1960s had been a sufficient enough turning-point in society to allow talented young people to go on with their ambitious and nonstandard plans. The University of Tartu itself had recovered from the shake-downs of the Stalinist era and was gaining again in the social sciences, at least to the level of Central Europe. Moreover, Tartu became for a time one of the most important centers of opposition thinking in the Soviet Union.

In the mid-1960s one of the strongest conferences ever to bring together the brightest philosophical and opposition-minded scholars of the Soviet Union took place in Tartu. At the same time the foundations were laid for a new contemporary sociology with a very promising group of researchers. Tartu became one of the few centers in the Soviet Union for the study of mass communications and social stratification. The 1960s also saw the beginning of studies in semiotics as well as the start of the so-called Tartu or "(Juri) Lotman school."

At the same time, even before the end of the Prague Spring all of these scholarly initiatives were already subjected to the harsh pressure of the KGB and Party machine. Methodological studies were blocked, their results chewed up by paper shredders.² The sociology laboratory at the University of Tartu was shut down, and sociology was transformed into an appendage of the Party apparatus.³

The semiotics school was also chased by the KGB. Fortunately, this "Jewish science," as it was considered in those days by the authorities (but was never called that publicly), was protected in many ways by its connection to the study of the Russian language. Yet it was indicative that the group's leader, Juri Lotman, was allowed to travel to the West and receive public recognition as an academician only after Estonia declared its sovereignty in the late-1980s.

Indeed, although some philosophy scholars in Estonia at times benefited from the work of the Tartu semiotics school (a good example of this is the work of one of Andrus Park's close colleagues, Igor Gräzin), the words of one of the semiotics school's own members are worth mentioning and contemplating. He said that "those, who in their student days at Tartu became 'infected by Lotman's germs' later lost all capacity of making a career."⁴

All of these intellectual innovations and movements filled with scholarly zeal had their part to play in Andrus Park's development. He attended Juri Lotman's lectures and often met with sociologists. And yet linking up with such tangled-up and repressed intellectual movements, or with such attempts to collectively "break through" the system, was not an especially promising strategy for advancement in the early 1970s. Such a strategy of bringing like-minded people together, creating your own school and thereby "drawing attention to yourself in the world" was worthwhile only in an open, mobile, and self-regulating society. Soviet society was extremely regimented. Such open action would only have attracted suspicion and unwanted attention.

It should be added that collective activity did not go well with Andrus's character. Andrus Park was an outstanding academic administrator and quite open to professional exchanges, but he did not seem to feel a deeper need to become a creative group leader. Philosophy, as it is, is quite an individual and personalized spiritual activity. Andrus therefore appears in retrospect to have been a "methodological individualist." He wrote only a few articles jointly with others, and even those did not come from his area. Andrus had instead enough self-confidence and sense of internal conviction "to go for the break" himself. Later on, as a recognized scholar, he did not look for joint projects or seek to bring students around him. In 1980, when he did win a collective academic prize from the Estonian SSR government, it was, to be sure, in recognition of his work. However, such "collective" awards were for the most part just another Soviet bureaucratic game.

In the domain of philosophy, where what was done (especially in the 'provinces') had little effect on politics, the repressions of the Soviet era were not as cardinal as in the social sciences. And yet signs of degeneration were evident here, too. The Philosophy Department at the University of Tartu had by the 1970s also lived through its liberal "period of moving and shaking" (to use Eero Loone's phrase). Any strategies bent on true scholarship soon came to compete again with the styles akin to "policing" philosophy, rather than studying it.⁵

Later Andrus Park admitted that, in his own thoughts, his real interest had always been political science and current history. However, he was able to deal with them seriously during the last half-dozen years or so of his shortened life. Political science as a separate academic field was recognized in the Soviet Union only in 1988.⁶ Andrus Park was also interested in the so-called macro-historical problems, such as the evolution of civilizations, the developmental dynamics of ethnic groups, etc. Unfortunately, many of these interests (including writings on Rostow,

Daniel Bell, Raymond Aron and others) remained limited to a few Estonian-language discourses.

Andrus Park's university years allowed him to concentrate on his historical-philosophical studies. The choices that were open to someone who was interested in philosophy and societal studies, have been summed up by Merab Mamardashvili as follows, "The choice of epistemology or reality consciousness as a field of study meant an inclination toward a traditional language or, in other words, toward a philosophical approach, which stood beyond the mere service of ideological goals. Decent people chose very conscious topics and in such a way differentiated themselves from the indecent people, who dealt with, for example, historical materialism, communist theory or other similar topics."⁷

Thus, the choices facing a young scholar, as Mamardashvili points out, were quite severe. It was in many ways similar to a Russian cultural drama. (Mamardashvili himself was at the time highly respected in Tartu and was a fairly well-known guest lecturer.) Of course, there were some 'decent people' even among those who studied scientific communism (in fact, a large number of Estonia's most respectable political scientists today began precisely from that area), but in principle Mamardashvili's characterization is accurate.

Yet, in comparison with Moscow, for instance, Estonia as a provincial center also had some advantages. As Andrus Park's university-era 'mentor' and later colleague, Eero Loone, has remarked, one of the advantages of the provincial status was "the possibility of doing what was forbidden in Moscow. The fact of the matter was that philosophy as a discipline was never a part of the Politburo's political decision-making process, so the system couldn't care less what the provincial philosophers were up to."⁸

The development of philosophy and of social thinking in general in Estonia was deeply affected by the fact that in a provincial national university no need was seen by the system for the creation of a separate department for the teaching of any philosophical or sociological sciences. Of course, the positive side of that was that Party-related studies (such as "the role of the Party in the development of Soviet science") did not proliferate as they did elsewhere.

Philosophy as a formal subject was restricted to post-graduate students or within the framework of some other subject. This naturally affected the atmosphere that developed for philosophy in Estonia. The world view and understanding of conscious activity of most would-be philosophy students was often greatly influenced by the state of his or her previous discipline and by the latter's epistemological approaches.

In 1968, Andrus Park was a history major and graduated as such in 1973. Yet, the role of the History Faculty at Tartu (known until 1973 as the Faculty of History and Languages) in developing Andrus's intellect and philosophical interests was minor. The department was, to be sure, already then a hidden center for national opposition to the Soviet regime and for the preservation of Estonian national identity. There is also probably truth in the assertion that most of the professors there helped to develop an uncompromising attitude toward the open falsehoods of the

official historical sciences. And yet the "baggage" that Andrus got from there as a historical methodologist and philosopher was not decisive for his later development. Rather, it was quite small. Attempts to draw his attention towards the study of the history of ideas in Estonia failed. Andrus Park was captivated by macro-level processes, whose study would take him outside of "area studies."

In Tartu the only antidote offered against the Leninist bastardization of history was the romantically-inspired ethnic and factological study of history, based largely on the spirit of writing about the 19th-century national awakening. Yet together with fending off the harm that was being done to honest historical study, this reaction also led to ideosyncracies in the development of theoretical and reflexive thinking in general. The study of how historians write, how knowledge of history is gained, did not become a separate object of inquiry in any course, with the exception of a few basic studies. Historiography itself did not extend beyond the role of a marginal, largely bibliographical sub-science. Thus isolated from theoretical ideas as well as from international historical studies in the 1960s and 1970s, history, too, became inevitably provincialized at the University of Tartu.

THE RISE OF AN ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY IN TARTU

Andrus Park's attraction toward the interpretation of history received a new impulse at Tartu University's Department of Historical and Dialectical Materialism, where he was able to focus on epistemological and methodological questions of the historical sciences. At that time, the still-young assistant professor Eero Loone, who had received much of his professional training under the "old-school" historians at Moscow University, began to give extra-curricular lectures on the philosophy of history at Tartu. This was quite unusual.

As philosophy was not a separate major at the time at Tartu, outstanding and talented students could often put together their own curriculum, if they found a suitable mentor. Eero Loone, who took on the role of mentor for Andrus Park, gave the young scholar, who had shown not only talent, but a clear-cut research direction, very broad room to develop himself. Andrus Park's senior thesis on historical narratives was thereafter awarded a first prize in an all-Union thesis competition.

Andrus Park's master's thesis was also on historical narrative ("Narrativism and Analytical Historical Philosophy") and his doctoral dissertation was entitled "A Critical Analysis of Conceptions of Historical Cause in Bourgeois Philosophy 1940–1980." In the course of his year-long research for this work, Andrus came to adopt a great deal of British intellectual thinking. In 1980–81 he even got the chance to study for a year at Cambridge University in England. In Estonia, this was an extraordinary achievement, which had demanded talent as well as an ability to break through in Moscow.

Through his first scholarly publications written already as a student in 1972, Andrus Park first became known as a philosopher of history rather than as a political philosopher. Later on, Andrus would continue to publish actively on the philosophy of history, where he contributed many important works.

In his overview of the evolution of methodological thought in the study of philosophy in the 20th-century Estonia, Rein Vihalemm placed Andrus Park among those philosophers of history who were focused around a center of logic in their analyses.⁹ Andrus Park (together with Eero Loone) played a notable part in attracting attention to Estonia's historical philosophical studies both in the East and the West. Estonia's works were seen as politically neutral, and therefore interest toward Estonia arose mostly from an epistemological point of view.

Andrus Park's colleagues at Tartu have characterized his greatest contribution as having "created through his breadth and depth a new view on the study of historical cause in Western philosophy." In a conceptual field hitherto largely bogged down in technicalities, Andrus Park brought a new impetus to the study of historical cause through the introduction of competing explanations.¹⁰

Andrus Park's subsequent switch from a highly-creative and trained philosopher of history studying epistemology to the field of political science can be explained in many ways. Firstly, the philosophy of history as well as Andrus Park's own conceptualization of cause had by then lost a great deal of their importance in the broader scheme of epistemological questions in the philosophy of history. This has happened even in English-speaking countries.¹¹

Secondly, the watershed events in Central Europe and Russia simply begged for analysis and offered food for thought for both social scientists and philosophers. Those issues that Andrus Park had researched in the 1970s and 1980s from an academic-theoretical point of view (modernization theories, convergence theories, the logic of post-industrial societies, etc.) had become practical political problems, critical for everyday life.

Yet, all of these background changes in Andrus Park's life were only external reasons for his development. His internal readiness for a re-orientation in thought had been ripe already earlier and was in him as a history student. By the mid-1980s and after defending his doctoral dissertation, Andrus Park had his scholarly merits sufficiently guaranteed.

BECOMING A PROFESSIONAL POLITICAL SCIENTIST

From this tribute to Andrus Park one could get the impression that he began his career as a political scientist already in 1982. Yet despite a few political and philosophical works written in 1985–86 on the philosophy of war and peace, Andrus Park became really well known (including internationally) as a political scientist only in the beginning of the 1990s, when he began to publish in English.

Andrus Park's attraction to the world of political studies had begun earlier and came as the influence of "ideological struggle" in the social sciences was beginning to wane. For researchers in this area, scholarly as well as epistemological concerns were secondary. For many Estonian philosophers, who aimed more at getting "an official right to a biography" than at practising science, the preference for ideological loyalty meant a clear scholarly degeneration. It represented a trend to compensate one's declining scholarly potential with a strengthening of administrative power over philosophical studies. Any hope of doing so without any price to pay, however, was self-delusion. The intellectual degeneration involved in the slide from philosophical discourse (textual analysis) to ideological discourse was suicidal. The pressure, however, from various parts of the already crisis-ridden Soviet system to rope scholars into this was increasing.

In 1984 a special Council for the Study of Foreign Ideological Currents (VIVU) was established under the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences. Soon afterwards, in September 1984, a department for social-political studies was re-established at the Academy after several incarnations had emerged at different institutes, including the Language and Literature Institute, the Institute of Economics, and finally the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law.¹²

The objective of these first institutions was quite practical and narrow: to expose the views of US imperialists and their collaborators among reactionary emigre Estonian circles. It was far from seeking any real scholarship and was instead greatly compromised by the personnel chosen to head up the sector.

Nonetheless, Andrus Park and his intellectual transition during those years was highly linked to his leading role in the VIVU (as vice-chairman) and in the social-political studies division (as director). This new niche was apparently a compromise between Andrus's more profound intellectual interests and the fixed environment in which they could be realized. He was without a doubt one of the foremost experts on Western political thought in Estonia, but he was not an ideological fighter. Thus the carrying of Andrus's interest in questions of "historical cause" into the political realm was for him an attempt to keep his scholarly development in step with the given opportunities of the moment. Fortunately, the job of finding "causes" to justify the actions of Soviet politicians soon became secondary and unimportant in the rapidly changing times.

It is fairly difficult to get a clear picture of Andrus Park's views and of their development during these years. A great deal of what he wrote was not meant for publication, but as part of particular official assignments. Based on his research reports, he completed 77 theoretical and practical studies during the years 1983–88. Of these, however, less than a third were ever published.¹³ Looking at his published works from that time, there was no discernible change in his philosophical discourse. Those works that were formally included into his research program remained almost without exception within the framework of academic philosophy. In these works he introduces the views of Ernest Gellner, analyzes

development trends in contemporary Western philosophy, and studies the philosophical bases for a happy life.

From the point of view of Andrus's own perceptions as well as of his goals for self-realization, these years were most certainly quite uncomfortable for him. For a researcher such as Andrus, who had set for himself serious scholarly objectives as well as aspired toward genuine international recognition, the writing of such nonscholarly texts was clearly just a waste of time.

Yet, his quiet "push" into the post of academician in 1987 revealed in many ways a new spiritual atmosphere in the Academy of Sciences at that time. Before then, philosophy had been represented more or less by Stalinist scholars in the hierarchy of the Academy. This "rejuvenation," which ignored traditional hierarchies, had become possible, however, in large measure thanks to the dawning of *perestroika*. Yet it also confirmed the readiness of the Academy for reform and was a sign of support for change.

Thus, a positive aspect of being named academician for Andrus was a broadening of his scholarly possibilities. Now as the room for maneuvering increased, every scholar's true identity could come out. Although still guided by a cautious sense of balance, Andrus Park was also outstandingly progressive during this time. He was clearly among those who sought to expand the new "window of opportunity" as best they could. His article in the Estonian daily *Rahva Hääli* in July 1988 entitled "Social Sciences and Perestroika" reads in this sense like a program for action.¹⁴ Later, in September 1988, twenty years after the "Prague Spring," Andrus Park gave a progressive speech at the Estonian Communist Party's XI Plenum (led by the new party secretary Vaino Väljas), which now seemed in many ways a symbolic continuation of the "Dubček" he had once written as a student on the base of Lenin's statue.

Andrus Park's 1988 lecture tour in the United States also left a big impression on the evolution of his new scholarly ideals. This is apparent in some of his fall 1988 articles (on the "noble idea of glasnost" and "thoughts of academic freedom"), which were written from a strong sense of scholarly duty and inspiration.¹⁵

A sense of some of the ethical problems, however, that Soviet-era social scientists had to resolve, could be found in Andrus Park's exceptionally candid article entitled "Truth, Falsehood and Ethics for the Social Scientist."¹⁶ At the time, Andrus Park was one of the few scholars who was capable of such a review of the self and of society and who considered such a review necessary.

While still working in a fairly politically sensitive position in 1989–90, Andrus Park prepared and published several articles in the West on the philosophy of history, in which he was critical of Soviet historical philosophy, or where he analyzed its official methods for the distortion of history from a moral and theoretical-consequential point of view. As examples, he cited the techniques Soviet historians used to distort the presentation of Baltic and Finnish history.¹⁷

Another sign of Andrus Park's individual traits coming to the fore together with the opening up of new opportunities was evident in his 1989 academic research plan, in which he included the themes "the history of philosophy, and the history and theory of political science."¹⁸ In the following years, Andrus began a relatively smooth switch to political science as well as to the world of Anglo-American political-philosophical thought. His contacts with American universities increased and in 1990–91 a fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington brought him together with the type of work that best fitted his character. This period of 1990–94 for Andrus was therefore very productive. During these years he published over a dozen articles in very prestigious journals. At the same time, a shift toward a more normal scholarly atmosphere took place in Estonia, where the ends and means were more harmonious and where political and scholarly ideals began to support each other.

Andrus Park's thankless fate and tragedy as a scholar were tied up perhaps most in the fact that everything ended for him just as everything was starting again in Estonia. In that connection it is also sad that everything ended for Andrus Park just at the point where he himself could begin again. He, after all, had put a great deal into bringing about that new beginning himself. Yet, Andrus Park as a scholar and as the potential author of a great many books would remain undiscovered.

CONCLUSION

As was mentioned above, this introduction and review of Andrus Park's life and opportunities does not encompass an analysis of his personal views. Thus, what follows below is a brief look at some of his characteristic research styles.

While in contemporary historical studies several different approaches are discernible (sociological theory, systems theory, political science theory), Andrus's work did not represent any particular school. A sociological approach, for instance, would have required the creation of an entire research team. Quantitative studies involving a detailed analysis of correlations of developmental factors would have also been based on the processing of numerous source materials and large datasets. All of this would have meant teamwork. But Andrus was by nature a "single experimenter" and philosopher. Even in the study of current history he remained a strong individualist, an industrious hermit. He trusted his own reason, its power to generalize and overcome obstacles. (This did not preclude, however, the possibility of Andrus Park combining these traits later on with those of an academic administrator and research director.)

When asking questions about contemporary events, Andrus Park often did so as a historian. He considered it very important to find out why a particular situation had developed, and he stressed that history always lives on with the present. His practice of following the dynamic of events, of building typologies of these processes, of comparing periods in time,

and of using ideal models, were all well-known methods for the reconstruction and "explanation" of the present taken from the historical sciences.

The present volume is thus a collection of recent international works by Andrus Park as a political philosopher and contemporary historian. Most of these works were spread out in journals, which are not available here in Estonia. From the point of view of Andrus's own development, some of them have also apparently been "out-grown." At the same time, in the course of a couple of years, Andrus Park had also been able to sufficiently prepare several of his ideas for potential generalization as books. Thus, some of his monographs had in fact reached the stage of book drafts and one had already been submitted for publication.

Being an academic scholar, Andrus Park did not have much time to be a public "crusader." However, as a principled devotee of science, he did have a large role to play in the politicized academic circles of the Soviet era. In terms of refuting the misperceptions spread by opponents of Baltic independence (often within academic circles themselves), Andrus Park's public talks and overviews played an important role.

In Estonia itself, our historical rebirth as well as societal watershed has remained still quite under-researched from a scholarly point of view. At times, there has been a dangerous movement away from historical truth and consciousness in favor of romantic nationalist themes. A more balanced view of Estonia, which would link its social processes with global content, is still very poorly represented in Estonian social sciences. Andrus Park's social- and political-philosophical works might serve well here as a valuable new impetus for research as well as an important collection of source material.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Juri Lotman, *Kultuurisemiootika* (Tallinn: Olion 1990), pp. 365–385.
- ² Lembit Valt, "Eesti teadusfilosoofia vastuseisust partei ideoloogiale", *Teaduslugu ja nüüdisaeg* (Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastuse Trükikoda, 1994), p. 49.
- ³ Ülo Vooglaid, "Nõukogude Eesti sotsioloogia algus ja lõpp". Intervjuu Sirje Kiinile, *Looming*, 1995, No. 1, pp. 115–122.
- ⁴ Pärt Lias, "Juri Lotmani meenutades", *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 1994, No. 10, p. 627.
- ⁵ Eero Loone, "Eesti filosoofia Ida ja Lääne vahel", *Tartu Ülikooli Toimetised*, 1993, Vol. 962, *Acta Philosophica*, No. 1(37), pp. 129–155.
- ⁶ Peeter Vares, "Poliitika ja poliitoloogiast", *Proc. Estonian Acad. Sci.*, 1991, No. 3, p. 210.
- ⁷ Merab Mamardashvili, "Natchalo vseгда istoritshno...", *Voprosy filosofii*, 1991, No. 1, p. 45.
- ⁸ Eero Loone, "Eesti ajaloo filosoofia tõus ja hääbumine", *Teaduslugu ja nüüdisaeg* (Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastuse Trükikoda, 1994), p. 54.
- ⁹ Rein Vihalemm, "Teadusfilosoofia staatusest nüüdisajal ning selle eripärast ja perspektiividest Eestis", *Teaduslugu ja nüüdisaeg* (Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastuse Trükikoda, 1994), p. 21.
- ¹⁰ Eero Loone, "Eesti ajaloo filosoofia tõus ja hääbumine", *Teaduslugu ja nüüdisaeg* (Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastuse Trükikoda, 1994), pp. 56, 58.

- 11 Eero Loone, "Eesti ajaloo filosoofia tõus ja hääbumine", *Teaduslugu ja nüüdisaeg* (Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastuse Trükikoda, 1994), pp. 56, 58.
- 12 Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Arhiiv, F. 1, nim. 10, s. 475.
- 13 Andrus Park's personal file (No. 51) at the Presidium of the Estonian Academy of Sciences.
- 14 Andrus Park, "Ühiskonnateadused ja perestroika", *Rahva Häääl*, 14. juuli 1988.
- 15 Andrus Park, "Glasnosti õilis idee", *Sirp ja Vasar*, 30. sept., 1988; Andrus Park, "Unistus akadeemilisest vabadusest", *Rahva Häääl*, 4. nov. 1988.
- 16 Andrus Park, "Tõde, väärt ja ühiskonna teadlase eetika", *Horisont* 1988, No. 15. pp. 11–12.
- 17 Andrus Park, "History, Lying and Moral Responsibility", *History and Theory*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1990, pp. 321–330.
- 18 Andrus Park's personal file (No. 186) at the Institute of International and Social Studies of the Estonian Academy of Sciences.